

**Regular Meeting of the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board**

9:00 a.m. January 19, 2018

Natural Resources Building, Room 259 and  
Online/Teleconferenced via WebEx

Handouts provided for meeting:

- Agenda for Meeting
- November 1, 2017 Draft Minutes
- November 2017 Office Report
- December 2017 Office Report
- November 2017 Budget Report
- FY18 Class A eradication funding proposals and summary sheet
- 2018 noxious weed list

**Meeting called to order at 9:01 am by Chairman Tony Stadelman.**

**ROLL CALL:**

*Board Members Present*

Tony Stadelman	Janet Spingath	Rod Gilbert
Bill Agosta (WebEx)	Commissioner Wes McCart (attended first part of the meeting)	Jenifer Parsons (WebEx)
Dirk Veleke (WebEx)	Carey Caruso (WebEx)	
Brad White (WebEx)	Tim Miller	

*Others present:*

- Alison Halpern, Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board
- Wendy DesCamp, Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board
- Greg Haubrich, Washington State Department of Agriculture
- Justin Bush, Washington Invasive Species Council
- Ray Willard, Washington Department of Transportation
- Dave Heimer, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Todd Palzer, Washington Department of Natural Resources
- Dana Coggon, Kitsap County Noxious Weed Control Board
- Bill Wamsley, Lewis County Noxious Weed Control Board
- Angelica Velazquez, Cowlitz County Noxious Weed Control Board
- Anna Thurston, Washington Native Plant Society (WebEx)
- Emily Stevenson, Skamania County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)
- Cathy Lucero, Clallam County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)
- Laurel Baldwin, Whatcom County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)
- Joseph Shea, Skagit County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)
- Cindy Jennings, Stevens County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)
- Marc Eylar, Kittitas County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)

## **BOARD MEMBER UPDATES:**

Bill Agosta mentioned that Cathy Lucero attended the San Juan County NWCB meeting in January to talk about the successful changes to the roadside ordinance in Clallam County that provided conditions for which herbicides could be used to treat noxious weeds on roadsides and right-of-ways.

Tim Miller noted that he was still in “meeting and conference season” and was traveling frequently to attend meetings and give presentations.

Janet Spingath noted that Pierce County Park & Rec had volunteer groups such as the Sierra Club pulling noxious weeds. She had noticed pink tape around knotweed plants on Mercer Island that had knotweed information printed on it.

Jenifer Parsons let everyone know that Ecology had updated its webpages. The flowering rush summit was going to be in late February in Spokane.

## **STATE AGENCY UPDATES:**

Justin Bush, Executive Coordinator for the Washington Invasive Species Council (WISC) provided the update.

- He thanked Alison Halpern, Steve Burke, Anna Lyon, and Vic Reeve for serving on WISC as members and alternates.
- The next WISC meeting would be on March 29 in Olympia. The June 21 meeting would be in Airway Heights in Spokane.
- The flowering rush summit would be held February 27-28 at the Northern Quest Casino. There would be a day of presentations and a day of discussion. There was a basin-wide management plan, and USACE had committed \$1M towards flowering rush eradication.
- There would be a Columbia Gorge workshop on invasive species scheduled for March 1. The theme centered around wildfires.
- On April 3 there would be a Palouse and Panhandle Region invasive species workshop in Pullman, WA
- WISC was working on standards for aquatic and terrestrial decontamination, particularly protocols for decontaminating construction equipment and vehicles.
- Proceedings and presentations from the Scotch broom symposium were available online.

Ray Willard, WSDOT provided the update.

- His program would be implementing the new HAT mapping system this spring.
- The budget was challenging since projects such as road maintenance, paving, and snow removal the past year resulted in less money for noxious weed control. There had been a large reduction in 2015.
- One recent goal of his program was to do some long-term restoration work along some stretches of road, which would result in the presence of more native plants – especially pollinator-friendly species and less overall maintenance once established.
- Class A noxious weeds that they had on WSDOT-owned land included giant hogweed in western Washington, garlic mustard in Clark County, Johnson grass and wild four o'clock in eastern Washington.

Dave Heimer, WDFW provided the update:

- He provided a written summary of noxious weed control by WDFW.
- They had treated noxious weeds on about 12,000 acres of WDFW land.
- They were developing a noxious weed app that would map both noxious weed infestations and treatment data. The beta version would be available in February
- The annual budget for noxious weed control was about \$1M. However, Dave noted that 40% of his budget came through external grant funding and about 25% of their weed control was grant-related and was up to about 50% if interagency contracts were included.
- Noxious weed species prioritization was determined based on requirements set by the noxious weed law and at the regional level by the thirteen regional managers.

Todd Palzer from DNR provided the update.

- They did not have their budget for FY18 since the capital budget had not been passed yet.
- Of the \$590K of funding they did have, \$480K was used towards spartina eradication.
- The Puget Sound Conservation Corp was not funded, but they had allocated \$50K towards knotweed and other noxious weeds in Snohomish, Island, and Skagit counties.
- DNR’s Aquatics program focused on such species as spartina, flowering rush, yellow flag iris, and purple loosestrife.
- Tony asked how much of DNR land was in private leases. Todd replied that there were about 1.8M acres of forestland and about 1M acres of agricultural land in private leases. The agricultural land consisted of wheat fields and other cropland, some rangeland, and orchards.
- There were about 2.6M acres of navigable aquatic lands. Most aquatic lands management occurred in western WA, though DNR worked on some projects in eastern WA, such as Eurasian watermilfoil control in Okanogan and Pend Oreille counties.
- WDFW managed some noxious weeds on DNR land.

**MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

The Board reviewed the draft meeting minutes for the November 1 regular meeting.

<b>VOTE</b>	Wes McCart	Moved to accept the minutes for the November 1, 2017 regular meeting.
	Bill Agosta	Seconded the motion
	<i>The Board</i>	All in favor, no opposition, motion carried.

**OFFICE UPDATES**

Alison Halpern reported that:

- She was still working on the biennial report. She was just using Word, at least for now, rather than InDesign to make the creation process easier. She was still waiting for some state agency updates.
- To help with the report, Alison had sent out an updated county weed board survey. She was pleased with the response she had received from the coordinators. So far 36 county weed board and weed district coordinators had filled out the survey. Alison provided a few PowerPoint slides showing some of the summary results.
- She had attended the January Grays Harbor County NWCB meeting and had invited Greg Haubrich, Chad Phillips, Jon Still, and McKenzie Watson from WSDA to talk about potential

opportunities to work on spartina and knotweed projects. The meeting had been productive and positive, as the Weed Board and WSU Extension Director further discussed plans to share one employee for two separate positions (Weed Coordinator and Small Farms Educator).

- She had finished all rule-making for the 2018 noxious weed list and had distributed the Concise Explanatory Statement (CES).
- Nomination forms for the special election to fill Position 1 had been mailed out. She had already received a call from an interested county weed board member who wanted to learn more about serving on the State Weed Board.
- She had submitted a proposal to the WSDA Nursery Advisory Committee for funding towards the reprinting of both eastern and western GardenWise. Wendy would be updating both versions later this year in hopes of the proposal being funded. In writing the proposal, Alison had looked back at all printings and reported that over 170K booklets had been printed since its first publication in January 2006. Wendy mentioned that the cover art by Laurel Baldwin was lovely and hoped that Laurel might be interested in providing new artwork for the redesigned booklets.
- There was no money in the budget for Bee-U-Tify seed packets this biennium. Alison would apply for any pollinator conservation grants that would allow them to purchase more.

Wendy DesCamp reported that:

- The collection phase for the invasive ivy study was winding down. They had received about 330 samples. Samples were submitted from 15 counties. The most samples came from Snohomish County with 154. King County was second highest with 85 samples. Overall 86 unique collectors submitted samples for the study. We did accept some additional samples after the deadline and if someone else wanted to submit samples they could talk to her.
- She was working on a new booklet based on the Full Circle brochure.
- She had created the 2018 noxious weed list and it had just come back from the printer. Copies were available for county weed boards and others.

## **WSDA UPDATE**

Greg Haubrich reported that:

- They were working with Alison to roll out the public Weed Data Viewer. She would be setting up a webinar for the noxious weed community to provide feedback. The Viewer was currently set up so that GPS points on private land disappeared as the viewer zoomed in.
- He was updating the CWMA webpage and was sending out a questionnaire to compile current information.
- He was updating noxious weed distribution maps based on specific new information from a couple of county weed coordinators but would try to update them all this spring.

Brad White reported that:

- Director Sandison had planned to attend today's Board meeting but had to be in eastern Washington.
- Tony asked if the Task Force would be active in March. Brad replied that he would ask.

## **FINANCIAL REPORT**

Alison provided the update. The Board reviewed the November budget report and the Class A eradication proposals that had been submitted.

- There was an unanticipated expense in the November budget for a software license fee. Alison was working with the Plant Protection Division Coordinator to confirm that it was for an annual renewal of the Microsoft Office software for the two computers.
- The Board had received seven Class A eradication proposals. The Board asked Alison to send out previous final reports for projects seeking continued funding. The Board would vote on proposals in March, and Alison would have contracts ready to be sent out after the March meeting.
- Greg mentioned that he would be sending out an RFP for its FHP funding, which totaled about \$50K this year. He noted that his RFP would have a maximum of \$5K per project.

### **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Alison provided the update. She mentioned that SB 6322 was similar to a bill introduced in 2016 with respect to the proposed submittal of monthly records to the department of health by pesticide applicators. It also increased notification requirements for the application of air-blasted, aerial or fumigated pesticides.

- Wes mentioned that the bill was unlikely to go beyond committee as written, because the 4-day notification window could not be realistically implemented.

### **COORDINATORS FORUM**

Bill Wamsley mentioned that WSDOT was no longer paying noxious weed assessment fees and that he had heard that some county attorneys were addressing the issue. He was concerned that if WSDOT was not paying then other agencies might follow suit.

- Alison explained that this subject had been brought up at several state weed board meetings. The AAG had informally noted that RCW 17.10 needed to be amended to explicitly state that the noxious weed assessment was to be collected on state-owned land. She had heard that Kittitas County was pursuing the issue. Marc Eylar said that it was slowly moving along.
- Cathy Lucero noted that state lands were included in her county weed board's land classification and wondered if the statute superseded land classification.
- Tony cited RCW 17.04.180, which addressed state and county lands within a weed district, as an example of language that could be incorporated into RCW 17.10.
- Dana Coggon mentioned that WSDOT had hardly paid any noxious weed assessment fees since they own few parcels in Kitsap County. The county weed board had a good working relationship with WSDOT.
- Angelica Velazquez pointed out that parcel numbers are needed when collecting the noxious weed assessment, and that it was challenging in Cowlitz County since much of the land in that county did not have assessment numbers and, therefore, noxious weed assessments could not be collected. She also mentioned that some lands had been gifted to state agencies but the process was in limbo, so they cannot do anything with those lands. She said that the county board of commissioners needed to put in a resolution to collect delinquent fees; otherwise they cannot collect them.

Angelica asked the State Weed Board about its mission statement and how the Board saw itself as a resource to county weed boards. She asked whether county weed boards were asking for more than what the Board can provide. She mentioned the need to educate new coordinators and asked if the State Weed Board can provide more than just education, such as in situations where the Board assisted county weed

boards and county BOCCs or oversaw state agencies. She pointed out that new coordinators had many hats to wear and needed more than things to hand out.

- Tony explained that RCW 17.10 did not authorize the State Weed Board to assist county weed boards.
- Alison further explained that the weed law directs the Board to do certain tasks such as adopting the weed list and providing education and outreach. She noted that while it was not explicitly stated in the statute to support county weed boards, she had helped facilitate dialogue in several counties when it was useful to have an outside person there and the county weed board and county were at the table and needed clarification. She mentioned that the Conservation Commission had produced Good Governance Guidelines for Conservation Districts. She said it would be great if RCW 17.10 implemented a similar set of guidelines for county weed boards. However, it would take additional staff at the State Weed Board to work with county weed boards to make sure they are all following the general guidelines. She felt that her current position was actually two jobs – administering duties for the State Weed Board as directed in RCW 17.10 and supporting county weed boards by providing information, advice, and guidance via email, phone, and in person.
- Angelica asked whether the WSDA Director was responsible for RCW 17.10 being followed correctly. Alison replied that under RCW 17.10, the WSDA Director addressed intercounty complaints about weed control and controlling noxious weeds in counties without a weed board.
- Dana pointed out that it was the State Weed Board that had spent money on multiple occasions to update the Coordinators' Handbook and wondered if maybe that should be delegated to the Coordinators' Association.

Tony announced that he wanted to disband the Legislative Committee and then appoint all new members consisting of: two coordinators from assessment-funded counties; two coordinators from general-fund counties; one eastside coordinator; one westside coordinator; and two or three State Weed Board members.

- Alison noted that this action item was not on the agenda and could not be taken at this meeting, but that she would put it down on the March meeting agenda.
- Dana agreed that to be in compliance with Robert's Rule of Order, a motion had to be made first and that it should wait until the March meeting so it could be added to the agenda.
- Tony explained that he wanted to get started on the Committee now so it would be ready when the WSDA Task Force was created. He asked Alison to provide a list of the State Weed Board committees to the Board.

Angelica expressed her concern that filling State Weed Board positions was difficult due to the timing of the election period. She explained that not all county weed boards met during November or December when nomination forms and then ballots were mailed out.

- Tim Miller pointed out that the voting for State Weed Board members was an individual decision by each county weed board member and not a board decision.
- Alison noted that the by-laws called for a minimum time of about two weeks for the nomination process; however, she provided more ample than time for both the nomination and voting process in the State Weed Board elections.

Joseph Shea appreciated the support he'd received from the State Weed Board and Alison. It helped to have the publications they created and their help getting up-to-date with requirements. He noted that it

helped to have a third-party person such as Alison there to help at meetings, as the county BOCC and Public Works Director might not have time to facilitate. He agreed it would be helpful to have more support.

**PUBLIC QUESTION AND COMMENTS** – There were no questions or comments.

**MEETING EVALUATION**

The next meeting would be March 7 at 1:00 pm in Chelan for the Coordinators’ Conference. Alison would be requesting travel reimbursement for Board members from OFM.

The meeting adjourned at 12:18 pm by a motion by Bill Agosta, seconded by Janet Spingath. All in favor.

---

Tony Stadelman, Chairman  
WSNWCB

---

Dirk Veleke, Secretary  
WSNWCB

---

Alison Halpern, Executive Secretary WSNWCB