

## Weed List Working Group

October 7, 2005

Leader: Joe DiTomaso

Facilitator: Alison Stanton

Notetaker: Elizabeth Brusati

### Attendees:

|                   |                                |  |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Joe DiTomaso      | UC Davis                       | <a href="mailto:jmditomaso@ucdavis.edu">jmditomaso@ucdavis.edu</a>               |
| Alison Stanton    | BMP Ecosciences                | <a href="mailto:alisonstanton@sbcglobal.net">alisonstanton@sbcglobal.net</a>     |
| Elizabeth Brusati | Cal-IPC                        | <a href="mailto:edbrusati@cal-ipc.org">edbrusati@cal-ipc.org</a>                 |
| Forest Gauna      | USFS – Modoc NF                | <a href="mailto:fgauna@fs.fed.us">fgauna@fs.fed.us</a>                           |
| Dave Moorhead     | University of Georgia          | <a href="mailto:Moorhead@uga.edu">Moorhead@uga.edu</a>                           |
| Cynthia Roye      | CA State Parks                 | <a href="mailto:croye@parks.ca.gov">croye@parks.ca.gov</a>                       |
| Marla Knight      | USFS – Klamath NF              | <a href="mailto:maknight@fs.fed.us">maknight@fs.fed.us</a>                       |
| Emma Underwood    | UC Davis                       | <a href="mailto:eunderwoodrussell@ucdavis.edu">eunderwoodrussell@ucdavis.edu</a> |
| Susan Erwin       | USFS Shasta-Trinity NF         | <a href="mailto:serwin@fs.fed.us">serwin@fs.fed.us</a>                           |
| Ann Howald        | Garcia and Associates          | <a href="mailto:annhowald@vom.com">annhowald@vom.com</a>                         |
| Peter Warner      | CA State Parks                 | <a href="mailto:corylus@earthlink.net">corylus@earthlink.net</a>                 |
| Sarah Chaney      | NPS – Channel Islands          | <a href="mailto:sarah_chaney@nps.gov">sarah_chaney@nps.gov</a>                   |
| Bruce Delgado     | BLM – Fort Ord                 | <a href="mailto:bdelgado@mbay.net">bdelgado@mbay.net</a>                         |
| Samantha Hillaire | USFS – Plumas, Mt. Lassen CNPS | <a href="mailto:shillaire@fs.fed.us">shillaire@fs.fed.us</a>                     |
| Lincoln Smith     | USDA-ARS                       | <a href="mailto:lsmith@pw.usda.gov">lsmith@pw.usda.gov</a>                       |

Joe and Alison explained the process for the new weed list, using the Cal-IPC website to show how to find PAFs and the summary spreadsheet as well as the full criteria ([www.cal-ipc.org/](http://www.cal-ipc.org/)).

### Outline of process:

The criteria file contains full explanation for each question, for instance, what severe vs. moderate impacts mean. There is a strong hierarchical weighting in Section 1, so that high impacts in that section will cause the overall score to be high. The score received depends on literature available, or observations available. Some questions: for example, is *Carpobrotus chilensis* a native? Received a B in impacts.

- A few species were not reviewed due to lack of information.
- Documentation comes from all over, not just California. The committee had to make a judgment call on impact information, because it varies so much by climate. If systems were similar, we definitely used the information.
- One weakness in the list is the way it deals with plants that have different effects in different regions of California. For example, *Eucalyptus* is a big problem on the coast, but not Central Valley. Need to include that in comments somehow. Species distributions are problematic. It was a problem in writing the criteria to apply to CA, AZ, and NV. The three states agreed not to change criteria without consulting the others.

- Is a statewide list useful for land managers that have to convince their local supervisor to spend money on a particular plant? Statewide list does have value for overlap with CDFA, but regional is more appropriate for on the ground management. Weed Management Area scale would be good.

Discussion:

Joe: High, Moderate, Low categories debated. People think low means “no problem”, which isn’t true. Low species can be regionally problematic.

Ann Howald: Doesn’t like H, M, L. No matter how you define the terms, supervisors will misinterpret them. Old list used “A-1”, “B”, etc. List needs to say it doesn’t tell you how to map, survey, etc. Don’t want to make people ignore the lows. Low and Mediums might be more appropriate for management because they’re easy to work on.

Peter: Need better definition of each category and what they mean, especially Low. Need to specify that Low means little documentation for some species.

Marla K.: Liked the old (1999 Weed List) system because made regional more specific.

Peter: Don’t want to overpopulate High (or old A-1) list because could lose credibility. Trying to address the concerns of broad audience, from practitioners to policy makers.

Sara Chaney: Could we get rid of judgmental words, and instead add comments on where it’s a problem and whether it’s widespread and really strong impacts, or not?

Emma U.: Did we discuss local/regional H, M, L?

Joe: We hope WMAs can make own list based on our criteria, regionally high, etc.

Example: scarlet pimpernel widespread but low impacts, so shouldn’t be a priority compared to other species. Maybe the Low list should be split into low - lacking info and low - lesser impacts.

One possibility would be to create a double rating for everything. Part 1 - statewide. Part 2 - regional. Second high is significant impacts on a local level. For example, *E. globulus* mod-high would mean moderate impacts on a statewide level, but high impacts regionally on the coast. Keep all highs just high. Others could be mod-high, or mod-mod, low-high, etc. Other examples - Gorse: bad north of Monterey, iceplant, *Ammophila* - high-low (only a problem on foredunes). But the problem is quantifying it and making it transparent. The point of this criteria is to keep the process transparent rather than relying on a few people sitting in a room.

For example, look at the ecological types table (question 3.2) for *E. globulus*  
We know how bad things are in specific habitats.

These changes may be made on a future list. Joe is worried about having list destroy management programs because of L, M, H designations.

Who in the working group volunteers to develop the regional list for their area? (No answer)  
One person commented that something from Cal-IPC has more authority than a list from a local group. (*Notetaker’s comment: Cal-IPC is 1000 members, including those who know about the impacts of specific species in their local area. We can’t do everything from Berkeley.*)

Peter agrees that H, M, L needs to be changed. Alphabetized list with other information can include everything without the subjective interpretation. Could encourage people to give information.

Joe: Would that be more helpful for managers? (No answer from participants.)

Question: What if this becomes more citable for official purposes, more accepted by the state?

Ann H.: Keeping everything on one list makes it more usable, keeps credible. What about indicating local differences in a comments column or print in bold, etc.?

Extra designation needs to be very obvious, not buried in comments.

Peter: What about using quantitative scores from each section rather than H, M, L.

Comment: Using Jepson regions overlaid with counties as a map with different colors... Some day.

CNPS has two lists: high and low. But still works.

Ann: Many of these species are not in Jepson. Should this be indicated in comments?

*Notetaker's comments: The weed list committee will finish the updated Invasive Plant Inventory at the end of 2005, at which time it will be published. We are working on improving the Cal-IPC website to make the plant assessment forms more user friendly and to add photographs and a method for weed workers to submit new observations, particularly for species that lack published documentation.*