

INVASIVE PLANTS COUNCIL
SIXTH Annual Report
December 9, 2008

The Honorable Edward Meyer
State of Connecticut Senate
Legislative Office Building, Room 3200
Hartford, CT 06106

The Honorable Richard Roy
State of Connecticut
House of Representatives
Legislative Office Building, Room 3201
Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Senator Meyer, Representative Roy, and other members of the Environment Committee:

As Chairman of the Invasive Plants Council, I respectfully submit this letter and attachments for the sixth annual report on activities conducted during 2008. This Council was established and operates pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes 22a-381 through 22a-381d, and has the following responsibilities: developing and conducting initiatives to educate the public about the problems created by invasive plants in lakes, forests and other natural habitats; recommending ways of controlling their spread; making information available; annually publishing and updating a list of invasive or potentially invasive plants; and supporting state agencies in conducting research into invasive plant control, including the development of new non-invasive plant varieties and methods for controlling existing species.

The Council

The Council consists of 9 members representing government, the nursery industry, scientists, and environmental groups (see attachment #1). This group has shown a willingness to find solutions to problems and to work constructively. The Council has met 8 times since the fifth annual report dated December 11, 2007. See attachment #2 for the approved minutes for 8 meetings, including those for the December 11, 2007 meeting. The minutes for the December 9, 2008 meeting are not yet approved, and so will appear in next year's report.

I am Professor and Head of the Department of Plant Science, representing the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources at the University of Connecticut, and serve as Chairman. Commissioner F. Philip Prelli (Department of Agriculture) serves as Vice Chairman. Mr. William Hyatt of the DEP has been representing this agency at Council meetings. No other changes in membership have occurred since our last annual report.

The Council acknowledges the cooperation of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station (CAES), specifically the Valley Lab in Windsor, for providing conference room space for most of this year's meetings. The DEP has also provided meeting space when the group has convened in Hartford, and we recognize the assistance given by Ms. Nancy Murray in arranging conference call capability for us in that venue. Mr. David Sutherland and Ms. Sara Kuebbing are thanked for volunteering to take minutes. Council members agreed that it is best not to have a Council member taking minutes. Therefore, with the state funds provided, it is expected that the Invasive Plants Coordinator will take minutes and prepare the annual reports in the future.

Council Activities

The Council devoted most of its time to the implementation of a comprehensive invasive plants program in the state, following on last year's financial support provided by the General Assembly. It provided an advisory function in the production of two educational posters regarding invasive plants (one poster for terrestrial plants and one for aquatic plants). During the spring, much activity centered around providing information to legislators regarding necessary technical changes in the current laws, and testifying in support of proposed House Bill No. 5147, "An Act Concerning Invasive Plants" (see attachment #3 for testimony). Despite heroic efforts by the Council, and by lobbyists associated with the Nursery Industry and a variety of environmental groups, the bill was not successful, and the Council is now in the position of having to make its same legislative recommendations for these technical changes for the 5th year in a row (see below).

A major focus of Council activities this year was in-depth study of the role of highway maintenance and construction operations in the spread of invasive plants. Frequently propagules of invasive plants (seeds or living pieces of roots or stems) are introduced to an area when soil materials or sand are spread as part of maintenance operations. The group viewed a video called "Dangerous travelers: Controlling Invasive Plants along America's Roadways" which was produced by the US Forest Service, and held discussions with Ned Hurle, Director of Office of Intermodal and Environmental Planning, and Kim Lesay, a member of his staff at the CT Department of Transportation (DOT). The New Hampshire DOT has produced an excellent best management practices (BMPs) document, and the Council suggests promotion of the numerous BMPs that are low- to no-cost, given the budgetary constraints on our highway departments. The movement of invasives along our highways and their penetration into sensitive natural areas through this route of introduction is a serious problem. The Council plans an ongoing dialog with DOT and other agencies (such as municipal transfer stations which may be providing free "mulch" that actually contains viable pieces of invasive plants) about what steps can be taken to lessen these problems in our state.

At the end of last year's Council cycle, the group had been discussing the need to do something about Porcelainberry (*Ampelopsis brevipedunculata*), a plant on the invasive list but not on the banned list. Public comment on the plant had been uniform in recommending restriction. In response to the Council recommendation, the Nursery Industry (CT Nursery and Landscape Association) instituted a voluntary removal of the plant from sales and production, making national news with its fresh approach to this invasive plant problem. CT Agricultural Experiment Station inspectors will monitor for the plant and the Council will assess the success of this new approach next year. The Council feels this approach will be a model for handling other species on the invasive list that are not banned.

During several Council meetings, invasive plants were "nominated" for further consideration and suggested for review by the Council. The Council is in the process of gathering additional information regarding the individual requests before it begins its formal process of inviting public comment and technical consideration. In several cases, verbal notice of public interest in changing the status of a particular plant has reached the Council. The Council has deferred discussion on these until the actual requests have been received.

With regard to technical operations, the Council established a procedure for email balloting when necessary due to lack of quorum at a meeting and/or a matter requiring an urgent response. Care was taken to preserve the open transparency of the process while still allowing for a rapid response outside of regular committee meetings. As the state's plant regulator, Director Louis A.

Magnarelli of the CAES wrote to the State Attorney General and requested guidance on the matter of whether or not cultivars should be included in plant bans. In his letter (see attachment #4), the Attorney General stated that the Council should make this determination. The Council has been considering this complex issue for some time. Research in the scientific community regarding the differential invasiveness of cultivars is underway. The Council has deferred further action until it has a chance to evaluate these results. The Attorney General's letter also noted that the CAES does not have authority to enforce the invasive plant sale bans, so the options open to his inspectors if a store refuses to refrain from selling a banned plant, are to call local police or the DEP. At this time, DEP's enforcement authority is unclear, and the Council is looking at suggesting legislation that would clarify the enforcement function.

The Council was a sponsor of the Connecticut Invasive Plant Working Group Symposium held at UConn on October 1st, 2008. I presented an update of the Council's activities to the 400+ assembled participants during the morning plenary session. The benefits of using native plants instead of exotic plants, which may become invasive, was a broad theme of the conference. Earlier in the year, Governor Rell recognized the work of the Council and four other organizations in educating the public about invasive plants while proclaiming February 24 – March 1st as National Invasive Weed Awareness Week in Connecticut. The Council was honored to receive this recognition.

Suggested Plant Regulation Changes

1. Remove *Pistia stratiotes* (water lettuce) from the ban provisions of Sec. 22a-381d because it will not survive the winter and is, therefore, not invasive (recommendation also made in 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007).
2. Modify the word "move" in Sec. 22a-381d to ensure that removal of listed invasives for eradication, research or educational purposes is not subject to the sanction of the law (recommendation also made in 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007).
3. Ban the sale or use in commerce of any flowering or fruiting plant parts of any plant on the banned list set forth in Sec. 22a-381d (recommendation also made in 2005, 2006 and 2007).
4. Reinstate the prohibition on municipal regulation of the sale or purchase of invasive plants through October 1, 2014 (similar recommendation also made in 2005, 2006 and 2007).

Overview of Current Activities and Needs in Connecticut

Invasive plants continue to cause obvious environmental problems, and public concern about them continues to grow. The funding provided by the General Assembly has allowed Connecticut (through DEP) to establish desperately needed programs on public education regarding invasive plants as well as a program that provides grants to municipalities so that invasive problems on public use areas can begin to be addressed in our state (see attachment #5, CT DEP Invasive Plant Program Accomplishments, FY 08/09, and attachment #6, Summary of Proposals Received). We are very pleased that an Invasive Plant Coordinator, Logan Sennack, has recently been contracted through the University of Connecticut. The Coordinator position is absolutely critical to the success of our work. He will oversee these programs, further develop early detection and rapid response procedures for emerging problems and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive State invasive plant control and prevention program. The Council has been consulted by DEP as it has moved these programs forward. Funding through the DEP to the CAES and Department of Agriculture has supported education sessions for volunteers to inspect boats for invasive plant materials and helped cover costs for state inspectors to monitor for invasive plants at the state's plant nurseries and pet shops.

Council members respectfully request that the technical changes recommended in past years be reconsidered and passed by the General Assembly. Aside from municipal prohibition on regulating the sale or purchase of invasive plants for 5 years, the other suggested changes are minor. Council members feel that the authority for regulating invasive plants should remain with the state. Given the changing landscape with regard to invasive plants (voluntary removal of invasive plants by the nursery industry; public becoming more educated about the problem; the need to evaluate ongoing research regarding invasives), this pre-emption is strongly recommended.

I and other Council members are available to answer questions and provide advice as needed. We are grateful for the financial support by the General Assembly that allows the state to have a comprehensive program in place to address the important problem of invasive plants. Feel free to contact me at (860) 486-2925 if questions arise.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Musgrave
Chairman

INVASIVE PLANTS COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP SEPTEMBER 2008

Dr. Mary Musgrave (Chair)
Professor and Head
Department of Plant Science
University of Connecticut
1376 Storrs Rd., Unit 4067
Storrs, CT 06269
860-486-2925
mary.musgrave@uconn.edu

Mr. David Goodwin
149 Schroback Road
Plymouth, CT 06782
david.goodwin@snet.net

Mr. F. Philip Prelli
Commissioner
Department of Agriculture
165 Capitol Avenue
Room G-29
Hartford, CT 06106
860-713-2500
Philip.prelli@po.state.ct.us

Mr. Paul Larson
Sprucedale Gardens
20 East Quasset Road
Woodstock, CT 06281
larsonclan@sbcglobal.net
860-974-0045

Mr. William Hyatt
Director, Inland Fisheries Division
Department of Environmental Protection
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127
860-424-3474
william.hyatt@po.state.ct.us

Mr. Tom McGowan, Exec. Director
Lake Waramaug Task Force, Inc.
59 Beach Street
Litchfield, CT 06759
860-567-0555
tajmcgowan@yahoo.com

Leslie J. Mehrhoff, Director
Invasive Plant Atlas of New England
University of Connecticut
Box U-43
75 North Eagleville Road
Storrs, CT 06269-3043
860-486-5708
les.mehrhoff@uconn.edu

Dr. Louis Magnarelli
Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station
123 Huntington Street
P.O. Box 1106
New Haven, CT 06504-1106
203-974-8440
louis.magnarelli@po.state.ct.us

Mr. David Sutherland
The Nature Conservancy
55 High Street
Middletown, CT 06457
860-344-0716, x-317
dsutherland@tnc.org

**Connecticut Invasive Plants Council
December 11, 2007**

MINUTES

Present:

Chairman Lou Magnarelli, Dave Goodwin, Bill Hyatt (for Ed Parker), Les Mehrhof, Tom McGowan. Mary Musgrave

Others Present:

Donna Ellis, Nancy Murray, Richard Schaefer, Karen Weeks

Chairman Magnarelli called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

November Minutes – Musgrave moved acceptance, Goodwin seconded. Magnarelli pointed out that details about the ending of the meeting would be added. The minutes were approved as drafted, with the proviso that the adjournment information would be added.

Annual Report – Musgrave moved for final approval of the annual report. Mehrhof seconded. The motion passed. Magnarelli discussed distribution of the report and passed out the list of recipients. Production and distribution of the report and its 70-some copies is a major effort.

CAES Job Description: IPM – Magnarelli distributed this position description for an IPM coordinator at CAES and noted that the position included duties on invasive plants.

Porcelainberry –Magnarelli distributed copies of 2 emails that he has received in response to request for public input. Comment time will close at the end of December, and any additional feedback will be shared at the next meeting.

Discussion followed about the value of banning porcelainberry vs. letting educational efforts inform the public about its invasiveness. The nursery industry may voluntarily take it out of production. It was agreed to caucus on this and report back at the next meeting.

Review updated lists of invasive and potentially invasive plants – Following on discussion of these from the last meeting, Mehrhof inquired about the importance of *Lysimachia numularia* (moneywort), *Ampelopsis*, chocolate plant, and *Phelodendron amurense* (amur cork tree) to the nursery trade. Input from the nursery industry is needed.

DEP Invasive Plants Coordinator Position -- Murray distributed the position draft and requested that comments be sent to her ASAP, but before January 1.

McGowan asked where the Invasive Plants Council fits in this. Magnarelli emphasized the need for the person to attend the Invasive Plants Council meetings and prepare reports for the Council since the Council receives no clerical support from the Environment Committee. McGowan stressed the need for the person to hit the ground running so that major achievements could be seen within 6 months. Murray stated that DEP is getting ready to create the position and hopes to have someone onboard in the spring (March).

Discussion ensued about the articulation between the invasive plants coordinator and a sister position dealing with aquatic nuisance species (which include non-plants), and that the plant focus of the coordinator should not be diluted. For example, on p. 4 of the document, "species list" should be "plant list."

Legislative proposal – Sutherland's document was distributed (having been corrected as noted in the Nov. 13, 2007 minutes).

Next meeting – scheduled for January 8, 2008, at the Valley Lab in Windsor (2 pm).

Prior to meeting adjournment at 3:30 pm, the group honored Chairman Magnarelli's leadership as chair of the Council and thanked him for his service.

**Connecticut Invasive Plants Council
January 8, 2008**

Minutes

Present:

Members: Dave Goodwin, Paul Larson, Nancy Murray, Bill Hyatt (representing Ed Parker), Mary Musgrave, Lou Magnarelli, David Sutherland, Tom McGowan

Others: Donna Ellis, Bob Heffernan, Karen Weeks

Mary Musgrave called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm .

Minutes: Larson suggested that the DEP position be referred to as "DEP INVASIVE Plants Coordinator position". The minutes were approved.

Annual Report: Lou Magnarelli distributed copies of the report, and noted that he had checked with the state to ensure that about 80 copies were distributed to those required by statute. He distributed a list of those who received the report. He noted that December minutes are always included in the next year's report.

Porcelainberry: Magnarelli distributed a report on the comments he received regarding the idea of recommending the ban of sales of porcelainberry. Lou described a few conversations he had concerning the idea. Bob Heffernan reported that he received no comments from members opposing the placing of the species on the banned list.

Musgrave stated that she and Dave Goodwin do not support bans of any additional species. They feel that this species would provide a good opportunity to show that the industry can effectively curb the sale of an invasive plant through voluntary educational initiatives. Magnarelli stated that his inspectors can be on the lookout for any plants that are on the invasive list, even if they are not banned, and can point out to business owners that the plant is invasive. Mehrhoff agreed that he felt this would be a good chance to see how a voluntary effort would work, and suggested that if the voluntary effort does not work, the council revisit the issue of a ban.

Mehrhoft moved that the council endorse a voluntary effort to eliminate sale of the species and its cultivars; Goodwin seconded, and suggested an amendment that the council revisit the issue in October. Murray suggested that the endorsement include that any educational efforts stress the importance of proper disposal. The motion was unanimously approved.

[Tom McGowan arrived – 2:36.]

Poster: Murray reported on discussions she and Heffernan had had concerning the production of a color poster. Mehrhoff, Goodwin, and Larson discussed the idea of including three categories: Banned Plants; Invasive Plants that are not banned; and Plants that are being voluntarily withdrawn.

Heffernan suggested that the poster would need to be 24 x 36". He estimated that cost would be \$2,000 for 2,000 posters; with an additional \$4,000 for packaging and postage. He said he could do the design within a week. Murray said that she would still like to discuss whether we'd need 2,000 or 3,000, based on who we need to distribute it to. Goodwin suggested it might make sense to not include plants that no one is selling, to make more room for the more problematic species. Bill Hyatt will determine the best way to procedurally expend the DEP funds for the poster.

Murray noted that she and Heffernan had agreed a line be added noting that customers should consult with the nursery about alternative plants.

DEP Position: Hyatt reported that the agency expects to present the job description to its Human Resources Department to initiate a hiring process, and hopes that a person could be on board by May or June.

The group discussed the DEP's Implementation Plan for the Invasive Plants program. Mehrhoff stated that he thought the plan was very well thought out, but expressed concern that there is too much work for a new staff person to do. He questioned the proposal to fund part of the Aquatic Nuisance Species staff position with these funds. Mehrhoff asked where in the agency the staff person would be housed. Hyatt replied that the person would be in Bureau of Natural Resources, and hoped to know more specifically where in that Bureau by next year.

Mehrhoft questioned whether this staff person should be responsible for taking minutes and providing other secretarial services for the council. He asked if DEP might be able to provide other secretarial help. Hyatt said he would look into other alternative ways of doing that.

Mehrhoft stressed the importance of the council being ready to immediately contact the Governor's administration concerning the position if the state institutes a hiring freeze. Sutherland, Heffernan and Weeks will discuss the timing for contacting key legislators who may be able to help in such a situation.

2008 Goals: Musgrave stated that getting the technical changes passed by the legislature is a top priority.

Goodwin suggested that the poster be a goal.

Musgrave expressed concern that highway departments are spreading many invasives when they move earth during construction projects. Mehrhoff noted that many sand piles are covered with one invasive species that is then spread through sand application. He suggested that the council invite Ned Hurlle, DOT's Director of Environmental Planning, to a meeting to discuss these issues.

CAES Workshops: Magnarelli reported that 138 people from 37 towns attended training sessions at the Agricultural Experiment Station on invasive aquatic plant identification. He distributed a list of the towns.

Council Involvement with DEP position: McGowan stressed that the council should do all that it can to help DEP recruit the staff person. He said that the council should serve as a support, a sounding board, and a lobbying force for the new person. Murray stated that the current job description includes that type of interaction.

Other Business: Murray reported that two of their forestry staff said that Amur Cork Tree is a problem and should be listed.

Murray raised the issue of mail order companies that still sell banned plants.

The next meeting has been rescheduled for February 14th.

McGowan moved adjournment; Goodwin seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 3:43.

**Connecticut Invasive Plants Council
February 14, 2008**

Minutes

Present:

Members: Dave Goodwin, Les Mehrhoff, Mary Musgrave, Bill Hyatt (representing Ed Parker), Lou Magnarelli, David Sutherland, Paul Larson, Tom McGowan

Others: Donna Ellis, Nancy Murray, Sarah Kuebbing, Marie Lipsky

Mary Musgrave called the meeting to order at 2:00.

January Minutes: Dave Goodwin moved approval of the January minutes; Paul Larson seconded. They were approved.

DOT Presentation: Ned Herle, DOT's Director of Environmental Planning, had been invited to discuss DOT's practices as they relate to invasive plants, particularly in regards to sand being a vector. He noted that since DOT use of sand has dramatically decreased in the past year due to new road treatment practices, the problem of sand being a spreader of invasive plant seeds should be much less of a problem. He and Kim Lesay from the agency's Landscape Design Office noted, however, that most municipalities have not changed their practices due to the high cost of equipment changes.

The Environmental Planning Office works with the Landscape Design Office on eliminating use of invasives. Lesay noted the difficulty they have in planting on areas that will have very little maintenance and very harsh conditions. There also aren't many contractors who have the equipment DOT requires to implement their landscaping projects. They are short-staffed in their maintenance crews so it can be very challenging to keep them trained, but the crews are generally very interested in helping to control invasives.

The Merrit Parkway has its own standards for what the grass must look like.

Some solely native mixes do not provide adequate coverage or sufficiently quick germination or establishment.

DEP's Erosion and Sediment guidelines still contain recommended seed mixes that contain invasive species.

The EP Office is training staff to be on the lookout for certain invasive plants and to institute control or removal measures. They are requiring contractors in some cases to implement control measures.

Les Merhoff asked if there are any standards concerning the origins of hay bales. Lesay read from the guidelines that do include such standards.

Porcelainberry Update: Musgrave distributed a copy of an item in the Weekly Nursery e-news on a vote by the CNLA to voluntarily phase out sales of porcelainberry.

Attorney General Response: Lou Magnarelli distributed a letter from Attorney General Blumenthal responding to a request from the Connecticut Ag Experiment Station regarding the cultivar issue. Blumenthal stated that the Council should make the determination as to whether cultivars, sterile or otherwise, should be included in bans.

Blumenthal's letter noted that the CAES does not have authority to enforce the invasive plant sale bans. Magnarelli noted that his choices then, if a store refuses to refrain from selling a banned plant, are to call local police or the DEP.

Letter from Governor: Magnarelli distributed a letter from Governor Rell and copies of the relevant statutes, in which she asks boards and commissions to ensure that their members are aware of their duties and responsibilities.

Magnarelli distributed a chart on laws requiring boards and commissions to provide timely notice of meetings and reports on any votes taken.

DEP Position: Paperwork for the DEP position is awaiting approval from various DEP offices. They hope to fill the position by May or June. It is expected, but not confirmed, that the position will be housed in the Wildlife Division.

McGowan asked whether there is any way to ensure that the two-year funding will not lapse since the funding will not start to be spent until the end of the first fiscal year. Hyatt responded that there is no guarantee that the funds will not lapse.

Invasive Plant poster: Murray reported that quotes for printing, rolling (for mailing in tubes) and tubes would be \$4,000 for 2,000 copies, and about \$3,000 for mailing. If an additional 500 were ordered, they would not be mailed but hand delivered. Murray reported that she and Bob Heffernan discussed the idea of including a letter from CNLA, DEP and the Council with the poster. The goal is to have the posters completed by the spring growing/selling season

Connecticut Invasive Plant Working Group Annual Symposium: Musgrave distributed a flyer on the fourth CIPWG Symposium to be held at UConn on October 1st. Mehrhoff suggested that the council recommend that \$2,000 from the state appropriation for invasive plants be directed towards helping fund the symposium. Goodwin moved such a motion, Mehrhoff seconded. Hyatt reported that DEP feels that it is important to know more detail about why this funding would be needed this year, and to know if this is just replacing money that could have come from elsewhere. Les noted that the keynote speaker this year will cost much more than previous speakers and he said that he would assemble information about the costs. The council approved the motion

Governor's Proclamation: Ellis displayed a Governor's Proclamation proclaiming February 24 – March 1st as National Invasive Weed Awareness Week in Connecticut and noting the work of the council and four other organizations in educating the public about invasive plants.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50.

The next meeting of the Council will be AT THE DEP OFFICES in Hartford March 11th at 2:00.

Connecticut Invasive Plant Council
March 11, 2008

Approved Minutes

Present:

Members: Mary Musgrave, Bill Hyatt, Tom McGowan, Paul Larson, Dave Goodwin, Phil Prelli, Lou Magnarelli.

Others: Sara Kuebbing, Donna Ellis, Roselyn Selsky, Marie Lipski, Bob Heffernan, Nancy Murray

Mary Musgrave called the meeting to order at 2:00pm.

February Minutes: Dave Goodwin moved to approve the February minutes. Lou Magnarelli seconded. They were approved.

Legislative Update: Phil Prelli updated the Invasive Plants Council (IPC) that changes to current invasive bill have passed the Environment Committee and are waiting to be taken up on the House floor. Prelli gave testimony to the Environmental Committee and believes they are behind it.

Mary Musgrave asked if the minor language changes were made and Lou Magnarelli thinks that they were but that they need to check on that when the file copy comes out.

Mary Musgrave asked if IPC will need to testify again. Phil Prelli did not think it would be necessary.

Phil Prelli announced that Office of Policy and Management and Dept. of Public Safety are looking to move money to a central location and he is looking to do a training program for his inspectors. Mary Musgrave asked if there is a concern that the money will disappear at the end of this fiscal year. Lou Magnarelli says that there is a chance it might - depending upon whether the state has a surplus or not – and encouraged the group to continue moving forward on committing to spend the funds before the fiscal year ends.

DEP Invasive Plant Coordinator: Bill Hyatt updated the group on the 2 potential Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) positions. All paperwork is in the approval process, same as last meeting, but Human Resources has given DEP permission to post, interview and hire both positions from the same list of candidates. This will hopefully speed up the process and fill the positions by May/June.

The 2 potential positions are Invasive Plant Coordinator, funded by state legislature funds, and Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) Coordinator which has some federal funding also.

Question arose as to what the qualifications were for both positions. Both will be posted as an “Environmental Analyst II” which requires at minimum a 4 year bachelor degree with at least 1 year of experience. Mary Musgrave asked if the ANS and Invasive Plant Coordinator hires will have different backgrounds and Hyatt said in previous experiences they have had good success to hire and fill positions with qualified candidates. Hyatt will provide the 1 page announcement write-up to the group.

Department of Transportation (DOT) training video

Group watched the US Forest Services (USFS) “Dangerous Travelers: Controlling Invasive Plants along America’s Roadways.” video. It is available on-line at: <http://www.fs.fed.us/invasivespecies/prevention/dangeroustravelers.shtml>

Next steps with DOT: Mary Musgrave suggested providing the USFS video to town road crews.

Sara Kuebbing noted that the New Hampshire DOT has just published a document with Best Management Practices for town road crews. She will provide the internet link to this document for the group.

Nancy Murray reminded the group that there was an invasive plant species in a DOT Erosion and Sedimentation Control seed mix. Murray has received DOT contacts from Kim Lesay (who has now left CT DOT) to follow up on this issue. She will also see if they want to come in and address the council.

Mary Musgrave felt this is an important area for IPC involvement but realizes that towns will not be able to do without financial help. Bill Hyatt mentioned that there is a range of tactics that crews can implement – from cheap to expensive – and that education and outreach are the number one concern. Tom McGowan said that for this to work IPC needs a comprehensive picture of the issue in CT, especially in terms of what equipment is needed and what the overall costs would be.

Nancy Murray suggested that IPC should begin by working with the State DOT to put together protocols and to set an example for towns to follow.

Dave Goodwin stressed that education of crews seemed to be the key step, either in offering training sessions or posters to help them identify plants and understand the issue.

Paul Larson suggested beginning by focusing on a single, important species to cut down costs. Dave Goodwin suggested promoting Best Management Practices that are low to no cost. Bill Hyatt said that the simpler and clearer the directions the more effective. Mary Musgrave suggested to look at NH DOT document and to ask Leslie Mehrhoff to put together a list of the most common roadside invasive plants.

Phil Prelli agreed that choosing a species with an effective and easy treatment that could be successfully controlled – such as mile-a-minute vine – may get a success story under IPC’s belt and then allow them to broaden the issue to other plants. Western CT towns

have already put in some effort with mile-a-minute and IPC could jump on this momentum. Bill Hyatt added that it would be good to pick an “umbrella species” whose management techniques could be used with other species.

Connecticut has a State Aid grant that town road crews can use for funding, based on the length of roads in each town. Maybe look into a way to use this funding for invasive plant control.

Phil Prelli asked who the contact in DOT is – group agreed that Ned Herle is best. Nancy Murray suggested that IPC should put forth a plan and then invite him back to hear the ideas.

Mary Musgrave suggested that next meeting the group will look over NH DOT plan and continue this discussion.

Invasive Plant Poster: Group looked at draft poster, provided by Bob Heffernan. Bob Heffernan will update poster to new legislative language for the rules.

Nancy Murray voiced Leslie Mehrhoff’s opinion that the poster should be subdivided into 2-tiers: banned plants in CT and invasive plants that are not banned. He believes that IPC should not endorse a poster without all invasive plants on it.

Tom McGowan suggested that it would be helpful for the public to separate the poster into aquatic and terrestrial plants. Phil Prelli suggested that IPC may want to print 2 different posters. Dave Goodwin said that if you separated posters then IPC could put proper disposal methods on the aquatic poster, as previously discussed in earlier meetings. If the aquatic pictures were removed, then either the terrestrial poster could have larger pictures (currently their size is about 2 inches) or the extra 15 invasive but not banned plants could be added, per Les Mehrhoff’s suggestion.

Roselyn Selsky suggested that adding a web address for people to see more information and pictures would be helpful. She may be able to post this on CT Agricultural Experiment Station website.

Phil Prelli made a motion to create 2 posters – 1 aquatic and 1 terrestrial for banned plants – to insure they are printed before the end of the fiscal year. Lou Magnarelli seconded the motion. The group acknowledges through meeting minutes that Leslie Mehrhoff opposes this and motion passes.

Bill Hyatt noted that the subject of a poster, or possibly brochure or other educational material, for non-banned invasive plants will be revisited at future meetings and not forgotten.

Poster To-Do List:

- Bob, with the help of IPC to determine what plants belong on which poster, will make changes and send drafts via email to group.

- Nancy Murray noted that the group now needs a list of everyone who should receive an aquatic plant poster (ideas are pet shops, marinas, bait shops, CT Federation of Lakes) so she will know how many posters to print.
- Resource websites including Connecticut Invasive Plant Working Group, Invasive Plant Atlas of New England, and CT Agricultural Experiment Station will be added to both posters.
- Any additional text changes that members want should be forwarded to Nancy Murray or Bob Heffernan.
- Nancy Murray reminded group that a cover letter encouraging poster recipients to post the sign needs to be written to accompany the posters. It should probably be signed by IPC, Commissioners of Ag and Wildlife, and CT Ag Experiment Station. Murray will check to see if a cover letter can be inserted with the posters by the printer.

Old or New Business:

Lou Magnarelli informed the group that there is a National Invasive Species Management Plan that established a federal Invasive Species Council which involves many federal agencies. Magnarelli passed around an executive summary for the group to peruse and noted that if the ISC gets moving, there may be new funding available. Also, the comment period on this document may still be open – if anyone wishes to do so.

Nancy Murray informed the group that the town of Darien is pushing for IPC to consider bamboo for listing on the banned plant list. Listing bamboo is a complex issue because of the variety of species and ornamental cultivars available. The group should be aware that this issue will probably be brought forward at a future meeting and they should prepare to talk about it.

Nancy Murray also said she now has a phone number and pass code so future IPC meetings may be attended through a conference call. She will give these to Mary Musgrave to give to people who cannot make the next meeting.

Lou Magnarelli motions to adjourn the meeting. Dave Goodwin seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.

Connecticut Invasive Plant Council
April 8, 2008

Approved Minutes

Present:

Members: Mary Musgrave, Bill Hyatt, Lou Magnarelli, Tom McGowan, David Sutherland.

Others: Sara Kuebbing, Donna Ellis, Marie Lipski, Nancy Murray, Bob Heffernan, Richard Shaffer

Mary Musgrave called the meeting to order at 2:15pm.

March Minutes: In absence of quorum, the minutes were discussed and changes were collected for later approval by email ballot.

Legislative Update: The bill is still sitting with the Judiciary Committee. David Sutherland will check-up on it and report back to IPC.

Invasive Poster Update: Nancy Murray presented the posters with the corrections/changes from the March meeting. She had 1 smaller poster with 16 aquatic plant photos and a larger one with 66 terrestrial plant photos (which was 2 inches shorter in length than the original draft poster). She suggested that it would be possible to add the “invasive but not banned” species at the bottom of the terrestrial poster, with color identification to clarify that they are not legally banned (such as a bright red border around all). This could be accomplished by either removing the pictures of the grasses and listing them instead (because they would be challenging to identify with the pictures provided) and/or adding back the 2 inches to the poster and decreasing the size of the logos and text at the bottom.

Donna Ellis reminded the group that there were 4 additional aquatic plants that are banned and should be added to the aquatic poster. Nancy Murray noted that the Federation of Lakes is interested in getting copies of the aquatic invasive poster – a good sign that it will be well received.

Mary Musgrave noted that Les Mehrhoff was upset that the council was not going to add in the pictures of the “invasive but not banned” plants like they had promised but she explained to him, and to the group, that it was more of a steric issue, than political one. Bill Hyatt wanted to make sure that a complete message comes out in this year’s poster because there may not be another poster out for a while, but only if it is aesthetically possible to fit them in. David Sutherland agreed and would be okay with listing invasive cultivars of the not-banned plants; most agreed that this may get too complicated. Mary Musgrave said that Les had told her he would be happy with a list of the invasive, sans

pictures, if that was the final vote. A big concern for all is that it is clear to the public what is actually illegal and what is just invasive.

Bob Heffernan believed that if there are 81 banned plants, that there should be 81 banned pictures on it. He would rather try to add 2 inches back and re-jigger it to fit in the extra information.

There was not a quorum of voting members present at the meeting so no vote was called. All present agreed that a vote by electronic means, via email, was acceptable so the poster could be ordered and printed before the fiscal year end. Mary Musgrave will send an email, saying that vote needed on the poster. Lou Magnarelli suggested adding the March minutes for people to approve as well, which Musgrave agreed to do.

Update IPC position: Bill Hyatt reported that the position has been approved by State Human Resources and it is one more step through the entire process. The Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) position is still within the DEP and the decision was on hold until the federal funds are in place (approximately 2-3 more weeks). Where the position will reside within the department is still not definitive but the position will be under Nancy Murray, which will insure program continuity.

Overall Budget: Bill Hyatt reported that with the fiscal year drawing to an end and the \$500,000, which were supposed to go to the 2 positions and a invasive removal grant program, not being used yet will be rolled over to the next fiscal year. However, there is risk that it will not, due to the current fiscal situation. Thus, to save some of the money, DEP will place \$150,000 (\$75,000 allotted for each fiscal year) in an account allotted to Hydrilla removal work. This was already approved by the IPC in the December/January meetings. UCONN is interested in working on a Hydrilla project, where they will take out Hydrilla in the Silvermine watershed. A work contract with UCONN would include treating the hydrilla population by hand pulling and herbicide application, getting any herbicide permits necessary for treatment, evaluating the effectiveness of these control measures, and subsequently providing a detailed report for the IPC. DEP already has an umbrella contract with the University and would be able to make this contract happen. The overhead rate for these contracts is 20% to the University – assuming original intent – which would make the total costs approximately \$180,000. The overall project's goals would be to eliminate the Hydrilla from the watershed. Bill Hyatt reported that the hurdles over next few weeks are as follows: 1) To move the allotted funds to a secure account; 2) To insure that UCONN is still interested in undertaking the project; 3) To insure that the project is signed off by May, or at least by the end of the current fiscal year.

Other approved budget expenditures are:

- Funding towards the Connecticut Invasive Plant Working Group fall conference. Bill Hyatt is waiting for Les Mehrhoff to prepare a justification request as per request in February meeting.
- Approximately \$20,000 for the printing of the invasive plant posters – this cost may change due to change in poster design and additional aquatic poster.

- \$15,000 transferred to Department of Agriculture and Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station for invasive plant work.
- This leave some funds unspent – Hyatt looking for ways to creatively spend the money

David Sutherland has not heard anything about the \$500,000 not being available next year and believes it is still in the Appropriation Committee's budget. He said that if a coordinator is in place this fall, then the money will keep coming, though he projected that it is more likely that it will happen for IPC position rather than ANS position. If it happens that the IPC money is not appropriated, but federal money for the ANS is still flowing, that the bureau will find the funds to make up the difference.

Bill Hyatt said that by using this year's money on hydrilla, there will be more money next year for the invasive control grants programs that did not happen this year.

Mary Musgrave asked Hyatt if he saw any way to see a limited grants program for 2008, using this year's funds. Hyatt did not think that it would be possible because of the length of time it takes to get everything approved. He said that it is at least a 4-6 month process – so work could only begin in November. It could not happen by the end of this fiscal year. Nancy Murray assured that DEP is working with some towns on invasive control projects and that they will be getting financial aide. Mary Musgrave worried that IPC is missing a boat for people to get money in the fall for fall control. Hyatt and Murray agreed that they needed staff to allocate the money and file the paperwork but that Chuck Lee is already on board to help this staff person get started. Murray said that a stable grant program for Long Island Sound will be the base for CT's program. David Sutherland suggested that if there is anything small to be done, to get the legal side going, it would be good to do that. Bill Hyatt will check about that and report back at next meeting.

BMP Roadside Control Documents:

Mary Musgrave was most impressed by the New Hampshire Department of Transportation roadside control document and thought it would be most applicable for Connecticut. She reminded the group that at the meeting with CT DOT, Ed Hurle mentioned that there were a few items that DOT would be able to implement without a lot of extra overhead cost – like leaving plant material on site with black plastic covering. She liked the idea of picking a poster invasive and a work site to set up a demonstration site in conjunction with the DOT. She reported that Leslie Mehrhoff was also interested in this and said he would help pick a species and site if the council wanted.

Mary Musgrave thought that selecting a plant that was already described in the NH DOT document - Japanese knotweed, purple loosestrife, *Phragmites*, Asiatic bittersweet, or spotted knotweed - may be the best for IPC to choose. Route 2 may be a good road (as suggested at a previous meeting). Nancy Murray says that it would be important to bring this idea to DOT before too much planning so IPC and DOT can plan together.

Donna Ellis offered a great contact for the group, if they are interested and asked if there were any internal documents DOT used for management to which IPC could add invasive management planning.

Mary Musgrave passed around an article “State readies herbicide spraying plan” from the Massachusetts paper *The Recorder*, Saturday March 29, 2008 for the group to read and consider. The group discussed briefly the use of herbicides in invasive plant management. Nancy Murray said the DEP works with utility companies in their right-of-ways, allowing them to use herbicides but working with them to avoid native rare plants. She said that a similar program would work for roadsides, utilizing integrated management, a technique the council should approve.

Old/New Business

Mary Musgrave brought up the topic that the USDA will be voting to approve herbicide resistant bent grass for golf courses. She will find a speaker to attend a future council meeting so IPC can be informed of the consequences of this ruling.

Future Meetings:

This is the last scheduled meeting for the winter/spring. Future meetings are scheduled for the Valley Lab in Windsor, CT at 2:00pm. Dates are as follows:

- September 9, 2008
- October 7, 2008
- November 6, 2008
- December 9, 2008

Mary Musgrave asked Bill Hyatt and Nancy Murray if they would like to schedule a summer meeting after an IPC coordinator is hired. Hyatt and Murray agreed that would be a good idea and will let the council know a date for that event.

**Lou Magnarelli motioned to adjourn the meeting. Tom McGowan seconded.
Meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.**

Approved Minutes

Invasive Plants Council
Tuesday September 9, 2008
2PM, Valley Laboratory
Windsor, CT

Members present: Mary Musgrave, Lou Magnarelli, Dave Goodwin, Paul Larson, Bill Hyatt, Tom McGowan, Les Mehrhoff, David Sutherland.

Others present: Nancy Murray, Donna Ellis, Bob Heffernan, Logan Senack

1. The meeting was called to order by Musgrave at 2:10 pm.
2. **Approval of Minutes for 4/8/08 Council Meeting.** With inclusion of edits that were noted in the list of members present (add Sutherland) and on page 2 in the IPC position update, a motion was made (Sutherland) and seconded (Larson) to approve the minutes. The group voted to approve them.
3. **Absence of quorum, procedures.** The group discussed the problems that arose at the last meeting, when too few members were in attendance to have a quorum. The benefits and problems of having an email ballot procedure in place were discussed. Rather than spend Council time on group word-smithing, Musgrave offered to draft wording for consideration by the group at the next meeting.
4. **Legislative session recap; strategies.** Sutherland reviewed the fate of the technical change bill (containing the Council's recommendations) in the last legislative session. The bill was voted out of two committees. When it came up on the floor of the House, a couple of legislators got alarmed about pre-emption and had the bill held. Despite valiant efforts which got it amended onto two other bills (one in the House and one in the Senate), these were never called up for a vote. Magnarelli said there is legislative support to re-do it, and thinks we should give it another run. The group expressed frustration regarding the Legislature's unwillingness to pass the technical changes. Heffernan said he has pulled back the Industry lobbyists from this problem and wants to see as many people as possible agree to the bill in advance before he would re-commit them. Everyone must speak with one voice to get the technical changes passed and renew the \$1M biennial funding for the state's invasive plants program.
5. **Invasive plant poster.** Murray thanked Heffernan for his excellent work on putting together the invasive plant posters (a large terrestrial plant poster and a smaller poster on aquatics). DEP mailed out 2000 and they have another 800 to distribute. Approximately \$10K was spent to produce the posters, \$6K for postage and mailers, and \$500 for producing the letter inserts.

6. **Update on DEP Invasive Plants Coordinator Position.** Hyatt reported that the state hiring freeze has caused problems for getting the position posted. Currently the plan is to hire two people: (1) an Invasive Plants Coordinator to focus on terrestrial invasives and administer the grants to municipalities (through a co-op agreement with UConn) ; and (2) an Aquatic Nuisance Species specialist (federally-funded, so exempt from state budget hiring freeze) who would have responsibility for invasive aquatic species (both plant and animal). Other expenditures by DEP from the invasive plant funds include eradication and control of the aquatic invasive plant *Hydrilla* in the Silvermine watershed (which will develop a prototype approach) (\$150K through 2010); and \$15K/year to both the Department of Agriculture and the CT Agricultural Experiment Station for inspections. DEP has \$175K committed to their grants to municipalities program (eradication and control of invasive plants) and expects to issue the RFP at the end of September. Heffernan urged Hyatt to develop a 1 page accounting of where the funding has been committed and the accomplishments from the funding, for distribution to legislators as the group requests renewal of the funding.
7. **Henry (knotweed) letter and next steps with DOT.** Musgrave and Ellis distributed copies of the May 20, 2008 letter from Claudia and Andy Henry, which describes the problems caused by invasives (knotweed) carried into an environmentally-sensitive area by the highway department. This is a serious problem. The group agreed that highways are a major route of invasive plant spread. Mehrhoff said that likely demonstration species with regard to the highway problem would be knotweed, slender snake cotton, and tall peppertop (the latter, *Lepidium latifolium*, is not yet in CT but occurs on the Mass Pike). Larson said knotweed is a good choice because it is easy to identify, but Murray said it is too hard to control. NH has recommendations on how to control knotweed. Ellis volunteered to contact the NH DOT person involved. Mehrhoff said maybe doing it as an experiment or demo of how hard it would be to control would be worthwhile. Ellis said homeowners in Tolland have declared knotweed to be public enemy #1. Musgrave agreed to invite Ned Herle to a subsequent meeting, and also to arrange for a presentation on the roadside problem posed by herbicide-resistant creeping bentgrass.
8. **CT Invasive Plant Working Group's 2008 symposium.** Ellis distributed programs for this meeting, coming up October 1, and encouraged members to attend. She noted 50 co-sponsors and a very diverse audience (over 300 pre-registered). The keynote speaker, Doug Tallamy, will make a case for native plants based on whole-ecosystem relationships.
9. **Other old or new business.** Mehrhoff asked the group to consider adopting a technical definition of what constitutes a cultivar. Magnarelli pointed out that the ambiguity about whether a banned plant species includes the cultivars has not been an enforcement problem on the ground with the inspectors. Sutherland requested an update on the research at UConn regarding different barberry and

euonymus cultivars and the progress toward creating sterile cultivars (Mark Brand, UConn) for next meeting and the group decided to defer further discussion of the technical definition of cultivar.

10. Next meeting: scheduled for (Tuesday) October 7, 2008, 2PM Valley Lab
11. Adjournment. Goodwin moved adjournment and McGowan seconded, and with unanimous approval, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes

Invasive Plants Council
Tuesday October 7, 2008
2PM, Valley Laboratory
Windsor, CT

Members present: Dave Goodwin, Phil Prelli, Les Mehrhoff, Mary Musgrave, David Sutherland, Bill Hyatt, Tom McGowan, Paul Larson

Others present: Donna Ellis, Collin Ahrens, Nancy Murray

The meeting was called to order by Musgrave at 2:10 pm.

The minutes for the 9/9/08 Council Meeting were distributed and reviewed. Following incorporation of minor edits, approval of the minutes was moved by Goodwin and seconded by Sutherland. The vote to approve was unanimous.

Musgrave introduced the guest speaker, Collin Ahrens, a doctoral candidate at UConn. Mr. Ahrens spoke to the group for 20 minutes about herbicide resistant creeping bentgrasses and the potential for future invasive plant problems. The talk stimulated many questions and discussion about this complex issue.

Musgrave distributed draft language on procedures for the Council to use in the event of the need for an email ballot. Discussion centered on safeguards to ensure the transparency and timeliness of the process. Prelli proposed adding an additional step to the process, in which the results of the ballot and discussion of the issue would take place at the subsequent Council meeting. With this amendment, the procedure was moved for adoption by Prelli and seconded by Hyatt. The motion passed unanimously. The procedure is attached to these minutes.

Hyatt updated the group on the DEP Invasive Plants Coordinator Position. DEP is executing a cooperative project agreement with UConn Department of Plant Science through June 30, 2009 for implementing the position on a temporary basis. The scope of work and deliverables were read to the group and discussed. The Aquatic Nuisance Species position at DEP remains on hold despite the majority of its funding coming from federal rather than state sources. Hyatt explained that about 40 positions that were already in the pipeline at the time of the hiring freeze had to be resolved before this position can be considered, so the timeframe for filling the position is undetermined.

Hyatt updated the group on the Grants to Municipalities RFP. The RFP is expected to be issued October 17, 2008 with about 1 month available for response. Municipalities will be invited to propose expenditures for eradication and control of invasive plants (terrestrial and/or aquatic) in public use areas. Several council members expressed concern that the proposals had to come from municipalities (not including non-profits, land trusts, etc.), but Prelli said that this had worked well with several Dept. of Ag grants

because the non-profits then just associated themselves with towns. The DEP expects to award \$175K in response to these proposals. The funding must be committed to the projects by June 30, 2009.

Ellis gave a report on the CT Invasive Plant Working Group's 2008 symposium, which had been held at UConn on October 1. Over 400 people attended and the talks were excellent. McGowan asked what the attendance numbers meant for our Council. The group discussed the growing demand for information about control of invasive plants, and the expansion of groups involved with solving these problems. Ellis recognized the financial support for the symposium from DEP's invasive plants funding.

Musgrave discussed a potential highway demonstration project, perhaps using knotweed. Murray suggested that the issue be tabled until someone from the highway department can attend the meeting. The issue was tabled.

The group discussed what the Council's recommendations should be for the upcoming legislative session. Hyatt noted that the funding for the invasive plants program is in the preliminary budget, and Prelli suggested that the main role of the Council should be stressing the need to get the technical language changes passed this year. He suggested that one-on-one meetings with the legislators who have a problem with the language would be the most productive approach. Musgrave pointed out that the next meeting would be the last opportunity to get material into this year's annual report, since the report has to be turned in in December. She asked Hyatt to report at the next meeting on the accomplishments made with the invasive plant funding so that this could be reflected in the Council's report.

Other old or new business. Goodwin said that the Newtown Garden Club is asking the Council to reconsider the status of coltsfoot and one other medicinal plant. He is getting them to prepare a letter to the Council with the details so that it can be considered.

Next meeting is scheduled for (Thursday) November 6, 2008, 2PM, at the Valley Lab in Windsor. Mark Brand (UConn) will give an update on differential invasiveness of cultivars and development of sterile cultivars. Mehrhoff and Sutherland noted that they would not be able to attend the November 6 meeting and asked that Mark Brand's presentation on UConn's barberry and euonymus research be rescheduled. Musgrave agreed to ask Dr. Brand if he could accommodate this request.

Adjournment was moved by Sutherland; Goodwin seconded. Following unanimous vote, the meeting adjourned at 3:54 pm.

MINUTES

Invasive Plants Council
Thursday November 6, 2008
2PM, Valley Laboratory
Windsor, CT

Council members present: Lou Magnarelli, Bill Hyatt, Dave Goodwin, Philip Prelli, Tom McGowan, Mary Musgrave

Others present: Donna Ellis, Nancy Murray, Rose Hiskes

1. Musgrave called the meeting to order at 2:07 pm.
2. The Minutes for the 10/7/08 Council Meeting were moved for approval (as distributed) by Prelli. Magnarelli seconded. The vote approving the minutes was unanimous.
3. Hyatt introduced Murray to give the update on the DEP Invasive Plants Coordinator Position. A cooperative agreement is in place with Ellis at UConn and the job opening has been posted in several places. Applications are due by November 15, with a proposed start date of December 1. Equipment (computer, etc.) has been ordered to support the new hire and office space has been found at DEP and at UConn.
4. Murray continued with an update on the Grants to Municipalities RFP. This has been distributed by DEP and Bill Foreman has received lots of phone calls. Murray gave a short radio interview due to interest in Danbury. The Metropolitan District Commission (water utility) wondered if they qualified as a "municipality." Hyatt consulted the legal department and determined that the broader definition of municipality would include water districts, sewer districts, etc., but seeks Council input. Prelli moved and Goodwin seconded that the broader definition of municipality should apply with regard to eligibility to participate in the RFP. The motion passed unanimously. Discussion turned to the letter received by Bill Foreman (from Tony Bedini, a member of the Washington, CT, Inland Wetland Commission, circulated to the Council at the request of Bill Hyatt) which had urged DEP to retract the RFP due to the state's dire economic situation. Council members noted that the funds for this program were set aside by the state 2 years ago for this specific purpose and will serve an important need in the state. Since the letter was not sent on behalf of the Inland Wetland Commission, the group felt that the best approach for response was at a personal level. Tom McGowan agreed to call Tony Bedini and talk to him about the long process with regard to funding for invasive plant control; they are from the same town.
5. Hyatt provided a report on the accomplishments to date with Invasive Plant Funding to DEP. The edited report will become part of the Council's annual report for the year. Hyatt explained that \$142K of funding remains for FY09 and suggested two options to the Council for its use. It could be (1) added to the grants program or (2) used for continued support of the Invasive Plant

Coordinator beyond the current end-date of June 30, 2009. Magnarelli asked how these options fit with the legislative language that accompanied the funding, and Hyatt said that DEP's financial people have confirmed that it is in accordance. McGowan stated that continuing the Coordinator should be the priority, as well as continued funding for the inspectors. Hyatt summarized that the Council is favorably inclined to the carry forward idea. Prelli noted that it would be important to look at the proposal as well, in case a meritorious project could be funded with the allocation of some additional funding to the grant program. The plan of action can be determined at the January council meeting when more is known about the proposals. McGowan then raised a question about the intent of the RFP, noting that the language suggests that prevention is not allowed – he feels prevention is part of control. Murray and Hyatt noted that this was discussed but decided against for the initial RFP. Prelli agreed and said the next phase can be prevention. For the first couple of years it is important to do some clean-ups of existing problems. McGowan reminded the group of the need for rapid response. Hyatt explained that this is one of the tasks for the TBD Invasive Plants Coordinator. It is a complex process because of legal procedures and setting up a cadre of applicators to respond. Once this is in place DEP will need to set aside a pool of funding to carry out the rapid response.

6. The group discussed the annual review of the list of banned invasive plants and potentially invasive plants. Musgrave noted that some species had been nominated for further discussion and input from the nursery industry. These included chocolate vine (*Akebia quinata*), moneywort (*Lysimachia nummularia*), Amur cork tree (*Phellodendron amurense*); Amur silvergrass (*Miscanthus sacchariflorus*). The status of porcelainberry (*Ampelopsis brevipedunculata*) had gone through the Council's procedure of being opened for public comment and then discussed at length by the Council. Musgrave reminded the group that this had resulted in the Nursery Industry deciding to self-regulate the production and sales of this plant. The other plants are only beginning this process in that input is requested from the Nursery Industry.
7. Goodwin reported that the verbal request from Newtown Garden Club regarding the status of coltsfoot had not yet been followed by a formal request. When the formal request is received, the Council can consider the status.
8. Musgrave reported on editorial comments she had received on the draft Annual Report. Magnarelli agreed that it was important to include the letter from the Attorney General in the report and agreed to send it to Musgrave. The group also cautioned against having the cover letter include the names of the plants that are "in process" with regard to consideration of their status and asked that this paragraph be rewritten in more general terms.
9. Other old or new business. Discussion of the timing of the January meeting to optimize consideration of proposals coming in to the RFP resulted in setting Jan. 15 as the date, and continuing the standard meeting time of 2-4 pm. Other dates for 2009 are: Feb. 10, Mar. 10, Apr. 14, Sept. 8, Oct. 13, Nov. 12, Dec. 8. Musgrave will confirm the availability of the Valley Lab for these meetings. Magnarelli and Prelli noted that the minutes of the meeting must be posted on the DEP website within one week of the meeting date and the agenda in the week

- prior to the meeting. Hyatt will look into establishing a site within DEP's website for the Invasive Plant Council. In the meantime, the group is grateful for the continued regular posting of its agenda and minutes on the CIPWG website.
10. Next meeting: scheduled for (Tuesday) December 9, 2008, 2PM Valley Lab. Mark Brand (UConn) will give an update on the research regarding different barberry and euonymus cultivars' invasiveness, and progress toward development of sterile cultivars and native alternatives. Goodwin noted that he would not be able to attend and requested that the Council not consider any motion regarding cultivars at the December meeting. Musgrave said she would request Mark Brand's presentation materials for Goodwin.
 11. Prelli moved adjournment at 3:48 pm and Goodwin seconded. Unanimous approval followed.



University of
Connecticut



To: Committee on Environment, Connecticut General Assembly

From: Mary E. Musgrave

Professor and Head, Department of Plant Science, University of Connecticut
and Chairman, Connecticut Invasive Plants Council
and co-director, New England Invasive Plant Center
Email mary.musgrave@uconn.edu; phone (860) 486-2925

Date: February 18, 2008

Written testimony RE:

Proposed House Bill No. 5147, "An Act Concerning Invasive Plants."

Senator Meyer, Representative Roy, and other members of the Environment Committee: My name is Mary Musgrave, and I want to thank you for the opportunity to present testimony in support of House Bill No. 5147, "An Act Concerning Invasive Plants." My purpose today is to explain the reasons the Connecticut Invasive Plants Council recommends adoption of this bill and to encourage your support of the language within it.

The Invasive Plants Council was established and operates pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes 22a-381 through 22a-381d and has the following responsibilities: developing and conducting initiatives to educate the public about the problems created by invasive plants in lakes, forests and other natural habitats; publishing and updating a list of invasive or potentially invasive plants; and supporting state agencies in conducting research into invasive plant control, including the development of new non-invasive plant varieties and methods for controlling existing species.

As Chairman of the Invasive Plants Council I represent 9 appointed members who work in the government, the nursery industry, and environmental groups. This group has been meeting since 2003 and has issued five annual reports on its activities, including recommendations that have arisen out of its deliberations. Much of the time spent by the Council has been devoted to discussing technical changes needed in the current laws and the need to secure financial support to fund a program to manage aquatic and terrestrial invasive plants and to educate the public. In last year's state budget, an allocation of \$500,000 for each of two years was provided to support these activities. The Council thanks Senator Andrew Roraback and Representative Clark Chapin for introducing bills and Representative Richard Roy and the members of the Committee for their support of last year's legislation. This year's bill, no. 5147, is critical because it contains the legislative technical changes that the Council has been recommending since 2004.

Council members are eager to see these technical changes made to the legislation. The municipal prohibition on regulating the sale or purchase of invasive plants (section 3d) is very important because the authority for regulating invasive plants should remain with the state. Connecticut's ability to combat the invasive plant problem will be fractured if municipalities make their own regulations regarding problem plants. While we strongly support the spirit of section 3d, we do

recommend that the phrase “with an effective date prior to October 1, 2012” be deleted from Section 3d because it may cause unnecessary confusion.

The bill defines the roles of the two regulatory agencies involved (the Director of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, and the Commissioner of Agriculture), which will clarify procedures regarding inspection and enforcement. Further, it modifies the language to make legal the education- and research-related movement of invasive plants. This change is important for continued progress on the public awareness front, and to prevent restriction of research efforts at our Universities and Experiment Stations.

The bill removes water lettuce from the list of banned invasives, which is appropriate because the plant’s sensitivity to cold temperature makes it unable to become a problem in our ecosystems, and plantsmen in the state should not be prohibited from distributing it. Section 3b of the bill is an important addition because it specifies that reproductive parts of the regulated plants are included in the prohibitions. For example, because of this clarifying language, sales of bittersweet wreathes will become illegal when this bill is passed. Many environmentalists worry that discarded wreathes become a seed source that then leads to new invasions by the oriental bittersweet vine.

I am one of several University of Connecticut faculty members affiliated with the New England Invasive Plant Center, a new multi-state, interdisciplinary initiative supported by U.S. Department of Agriculture funds. The University of Connecticut serves as the lead institution for the Center, and together with colleagues at the University of Maine and the University of Vermont, our goals are to conduct research and public outreach to address problems caused by invasive plants that are economically and environmentally damaging to New England and the nation. The language changes in Bill 5147 will make our jobs of outreach and research easier to accomplish.

I urge you to support House Bill No. 5147, “An Act Concerning Invasive Plants.” The sooner we make the technical changes needed in the legislation, the sooner the people of Connecticut will recognize that they now have a comprehensive plan to address the issue of invasive plants in our state, and the considerable talents and resources that are available to combat this problem can be brought together in the most effective manner.

Supporting this bill will give more people the opportunity to learn about invasives, how they threaten our natural areas, and how they can be controlled with best management practices for environmental stewardship. Taking action now will help protect Connecticut’s environment in the future.

I would like to thank the Environment Committee for your continued interest in invasive plants as one of many important environmental concerns and for the opportunity to submit this testimony to you.

State of Connecticut

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL
ATTORNEY GENERAL



Hartford

January 15, 2008

RECEIVED

JAN 18 2008

**CT AGRICULTURAL
EXPERIMENT STATION**

Louis Magnarelli, Director
Connecticut Agriculture Experiment Station
123 Huntington Street - Box 1106
New Haven, CT 06504

Dear Mr. Magnarelli:

I am writing in response to your letter requesting assistance from my office regarding the enforcement of the invasive species law. You also want to know if certain cultivars of a prohibited invasive species could be sold in Connecticut if the cultivars are sterile, e.g., they cannot be propagated. I apologize for the delay in responding to your letter.

As you indicated in your letter, civil enforcement of the invasive species law is done with the Department of Environmental Protection; see Conn. Gen. Stat. § 22a-6 and § 22a-339g. Criminal enforcement involving potentially statutory infraction fines of a \$100 maximum -- would be pursued through the state's attorney's office. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 22a-381d. There is no statutory authority for the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station to enforce this law.

As to whether certain types of an invasive species could be sold in Connecticut, presumably these types known as sterile cultivars would be less likely as the standard form to spread. The issue of whether certain cultivars of a banned invasive species should be authorized for sale in Connecticut should be reviewed by the Invasive Plants Council. It has authority to recommend whether or not certain species -- and perhaps cultivars of certain species -- should be included on the statutory list of banned invasive plants. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 22a-381a.

I hope that this information is helpful. I am willing to assist your agency with any additional questions you may have.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL

RB/pas

CT DEP Invasive Plant Program: FY 08 & 09 Accomplishments

In 2003, the Connecticut General Assembly established the Invasive Plant Council (IPC) (CGS 22a-381) to develop strategies regarding public education, control methods, and prevention in order to address the adverse consequences of invasive plants. In 2007, the Connecticut General Assembly provided funding to establish an Invasive Plant Program, to be administered by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). This report documents the DEP's initial efforts in developing such a program. The Invasive Plant Program is being coordinated and integrated with other DEP efforts to address threats from invasive species (e.g., Aquatic Nuisance Species Plan and Wildlife Habitat Improvement).

Goal of the DEP Invasive Plant Program: To develop and implement an Invasive Plant Program that minimizes the impact of invasive plants to Connecticut's terrestrial and aquatic habitats and prevents new introductions. This goal will be achieved by developing a comprehensive program that addresses prevention, early detection and monitoring, rapid response, control, and education related to invasive plants.

A) Completed Tasks:

- Developed a DEP Invasive Plant Program Implementation Plan. The plan was prepared by the DEP Bureau of Natural Resources and was approved by the Invasive Plant Council (December 2007).
- Designed, printed and distributed two posters on terrestrial and aquatic invasive plants. The posters were designed by the CT Nursery and Landscape Association and were printed and distributed by DEP. They include photographs and information on 93 species and are intended to increase industry knowledge and public awareness of invasive plants. Approximately 2,700 posters were distributed to plant wholesale and retail businesses.
- Transferred funds to the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station (CAES) that enabled CAES to inspect 199 nurseries and garden centers for the sale of banned invasive plants: none were found. Copies of current invasive plant laws were provided to educate store owners and managers.
- Provided funding to the CT Invasive Plant Working Group to help cover expenses for an October 2008 symposium at the University of Connecticut that was attended by over 400 people. The objective of the symposium was to educate the public on invasive plants and effective means of control and eradication.
- Completed 2008 efforts to monitor and control water chestnut in the CT River watershed. DEP staff annually survey and remove plants from the main stem CT River and associated coves from Hartford to Essex. Water chestnut was eradicated from one new site in the Mattabesset River. Overall, fewer plants were found and removed than in previous years.

- Successfully treated infestation of yellow floating heart in a private pond in Columbia, CT. This was the first confirmed instance of this species in CT waters. The plants were eliminated by treating the pond with a herbicide in September, 2008.



Yellow floating heart in Columbia, CT. This invasive plant covered approximately 90% of the pond surface prior to treatment.

B) Completed Tasks with Ongoing Elements:

- **Hydrilla control in the Silvermine River watershed** (Westport, Norwalk): Developed and implemented a cooperative agreement with the University of CT Department of Natural Resource Management and Engineering and provided funding to implement and evaluate hydrilla control methods in the Silvermine River. This will include field surveys, implementation of control actions, assessment of control actions, and recommendations for optimal control methods. The goal is to eradicate hydrilla from the Silvermine River. Project began in 2008 and will be completed in 2010.
- **Invasive Plant Coordinator:** Developed and implemented a cooperative agreement with the University of CT Plant Science Department and provided funding to hire and support a Statewide Invasive Plant Coordinator. The coordinator reports jointly to the University and DEP and will provide administrative support to the IPC. The person in this position will be addressing selected tasks from the Implementation Plan pertaining to the prevention, early detection, monitoring, rapid response, and education about invasive plants.

- Transferred funds to the Connecticut Department of Agriculture that will enable them to inspect pet stores for banned invasive plants. Plans are in place to train inspectors in plant identification. We anticipate that inspections will begin in 2009.

C) Tasks in Progress:

- **Grants to Municipalities:** Issued a Request for Proposals (RFP – see attached) in October, 2008, to distribute \$175,000 to municipalities for invasive plant control projects on publicly accessible lands and waters. Project proposals will be reviewed by DEP and the IPC, successful applicants will be notified by February 15, 2009, and funds will be distributed prior to June, 2009.
- **Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) Coordinator:** Developed a cooperative agreement with the University of CT Institute of Water Resources and identified funding sources sufficient to support a Statewide ANS Coordinator. Approval of Project Agreement is pending. Funding will be provided by Federal ANS funds with match provided by IPC funds. The coordinator will report jointly to the University and DEP. The person in this position will be addressing selected tasks from the federally approved *Connecticut Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan* pertaining to the prevention, early detection, monitoring, rapid response, and education about aquatic invasive species (including invasive plants).

D) Future Tasks and Challenges: Invasive Plant Funding provided in the next biennial budget will be used to maintain ongoing efforts and to address the following challenges.

- **Control of Invasive Plants Requires a Long-Term Commitment:** Invasive plant issues are expected to increase due to the spread of existing invasives and the introduction of new species via increased global commerce and travel. Currently we have put in place temporary solutions (i.e., cooperative agreements and one round of Grants to Municipalities) that will enable us to initiate a Connecticut Invasive Plant Program. Long-term support is needed to maintain a sustainable and successful program.
- **Prevention:** The most cost effective invasive plant program is one that stops new invasive plants before they enter the state. We need to identify invasive plant vectors (i.e., moving soil or equipment), research existing prevention methods, and develop new methods to prevent further introductions or dispersal. Our objective will be to develop Best Management Practices for industry and the general public (see education below).
- **Early Detection and Monitoring:** Early detection is important because plant populations are often small enough to be eradicated. Coordination with in-state and regional partners facilitates finding new invaders early. CT needs to develop a comprehensive database to track the locations of invasive plant locations, site ownership, control actions, costs, and control results.

- **Rapid Response and Control:** Rapid Response refers to actions to eradicate, contain or control invasive species while the populations are small. CT needs to develop a generic rapid response plan that can be quickly modified to address specific invasive plants. Legal constraints need to be identified and addressed. Plant experts need to be available or on-call to conduct control actions and to confirm species identification.
- **Education and Awareness:** Educational efforts need to be expanded to include Best Management Practices for the nursery & landscaping industry, pet trade, municipal landfills and composting sites, and for the general public. A comprehensive CT based Invasive Plant website needs to be developed.



Mile-a-minute vine infestation. Control work is being undertaken to prevent further spread in CT.

NOTICE OF AVAILABLE FUNDS

Grants To Municipalities for the Control Of Invasive Plants

October 17th, 2008

The Department of Environmental Protection is pleased to announce the availability of funding through the Invasive Plants Council for invasive plant control projects on publicly accessible land and waters. Invasive species can directly harm the state's terrestrial and aquatic natural resources, and decrease the recreational, aesthetic and economic values of those resources. The goal of this program is to conserve the state's resources by providing additional opportunities for the control of and/or preventing the establishment of terrestrial and aquatic invasive plant species.

- PROPOSAL DEADLINE: MONDAY, DECEMBER 8TH, 2008, AT 4:00 PM.
- AN ORIGINAL AND COMPLETE APPLICATION MUST BE RECEIVED AND DATE STAMPED AT THE DEP, BUREAU OF NATURAL RESOURCES – INLAND FISHERIES DIVISION, LOCATED AT 79 ELM STREET, HARTFORD CONNECTICUT BY THE PROPOSAL DEADLINE. FAXED AND E-MAILED PROPOSALS OR LETTERS OF SUPPORT WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.
- Applicants will be notified no later than February 15th, 2009 as to whether or not their proposals have been selected for funding.
- MAIL ORIGINAL AND 8 COPIES OF PROPOSALS TO:

attention: Bill Foreman, *Environmental Analyst*
Department of Environmental Protection
BNR- Inland Fisheries Division
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127
- FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT:
Bill Foreman, Environmental Analyst at (860) 424-3868
Or E-mail us at: william.foreman@ct.gov

Electronic versions of grant documents can be found at: www.ct.gov/dep/invasivespecies

PROGRAM PURPOSE

The introduction and spread of invasive plants in Connecticut poses a serious threat to the biodiversity of native ecosystems, and can affect the ecological, recreational, and economic interests of the state. Nonindigenous invasive plants have the potential to establish and spread rapidly due to a lack of physical and biological constraints in the habitats to which they have been introduced. In 2003, the Connecticut General Assembly established the Invasive Plant Council (IPC) (Public Act 03-136) to develop strategies regarding public education, control methods, prevention, and related activities to begin addressing the adverse consequences of invasive plants. The IPC currently has a total of up to \$175,000 to provide to Connecticut municipalities in FY 2008/2009 to fund projects controlling or eradicating invasive plants on publically accessible lands and waters.

Who may apply: Only municipalities are eligible to receive grants through this program. Not-For-Profit conservation organizations (with 501(c)(3) status) and local interest organizations such as unincorporated lake associations can develop project proposals in collaboration with municipalities but only the municipality in which the project site is located can apply for funding. If the property or water body is located in more than one municipality, two or more municipalities may apply jointly. The property or water body must be located in Connecticut.

What types of projects are eligible for funding: Eligible project proposals should be for the control/eradication of non-native invasive plant species. Preferred projects will target new infestations (first observed at the property or water body within the last three years) or a recently-arrived invasive species with only a limited number of populations in the state. Eligible target species will be those plant species listed in the Connecticut Invasive Plant List in accordance with Sections 22a-381a and 22a-381b, or listed in Section 22a-381d of the Connecticut General Statutes (see Appendix E). Target properties and water bodies may be either publicly or privately owned and must be open to public access and use. Project proposals targeting native species, or for routine, periodic “maintenance” of invasive species are not eligible for funding.

Below are a few examples of eligible and ineligible projects (reasoning in parenthesis following each example):

Eligible projects-

The removal/eradication of mile-a-minute vine by hand pulling and herbicide application on land trust property open to full public access. (invasive species, full public access, also limited distribution of plant in CT).

Herbicide treatment to eradicate parrotfeather (*Myriophyllum aquaticum*) infestation in a lake with a state boat launch. (invasive species, full public access, also new infestation in CT)

Eradication of yellow floating heart (*Nymphoides peltata*) by dredging and hand pulling from a town-owned pond open to the public. (invasive plant, publicly accessible)

Eradication (herbicides, mowing prior to seed set) of Japanese stilt grass patches along hiking trail protected by permanent easement on otherwise private property. (*highly invasive species, although on “private property”, trail is publicly accessible and trail corridor is protected through easement*)

Ineligible projects-

Roadside spraying of poison ivy and other “weeds” along highway guardrails. (routine maintenance, native species)

Annual use of a mechanical harvester to clear boat lanes of Eurasian water milfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*) in a lake with public access. (routine maintenance).

Herbicide treatment of unusually dense growths of common bladderwort (*Utricularia vulgaris*) on a lake with a state boat launch. (native species).

AWARD PROCESS

Proposals will first be reviewed for completeness and eligibility, and then rated by DEP staff. Only complete applications will be reviewed further for eligibility (see Appendix F for an application checklist), and only projects determined to be eligible will be rated.

The Invasive Plants Council will then review the rated applications and submit recommendations to DEP concerning project selection. Subsequently, applicants will receive written notification from DEP of the decision on their application. Decisions may include suggested and/or mandatory modifications of the project and funding of the project in an amount that differs from the proposal.

Following approval of the project application, a contract will be drafted and mailed out for signature by the grant recipient and returned for subsequent state contract approval. Project work to be funded by the grant cannot begin until the execution date of the contract, and project funding cannot be released until a fully executed contract is in effect.

FUNDING GUIDELINES

In order to be deemed eligible for funding, applicants must meet eligibility requirements and review criteria (See Attachment A), follow application instructions (Attachment B), complete and submit a project proposal cover page (Attachment C), complete and submit a budget summary page (Attachment D), and submit all other materials as indicated in the application instructions.

Proposed projects must be completed within approximately **one** year from the contract execution date. All seasonal constraints that may prolong the project duration must be specifically discussed in the proposal. Proposals which demonstrate a commitment to maintain and continue the project beyond the initial year in which it is implemented, without DEP support, are encouraged and will receive additional consideration.

Awards will be provided for both terrestrial and aquatic projects (unless sufficient and suitable proposals are not submitted for one of the two categories). **The upper limit for a project is \$50,000 and lower limit is \$2,500.** Requests for larger grants (up to \$75,000) may be considered, but only for exceptional and well-justified proposals. Matching funds are required for at least 25% of project costs (the State will provide up to 75% of the cost). **Indirect costs are not eligible for funding** through the grant, but may be used as part of applicant’s match. At project completion, the awardee must submit a final report. This report must include a detailed financial summary. This financial summary must show full project costs and clearly identify

direct grant costs as well as matching and in-kind costs. *As post-treatment monitoring is an important aspect of invasive species control and management, please ensure that these reports are provided to DEP. They will be useful in determining which actions are most effective, and just as important, identify those actions that are not successful.*

A maximum of two (2) proposals may be submitted for consideration by an individual applicant.

COMMUNICATIONS NOTICE:

All applications/materials must be submitted to and communications shall be with:

Bill Foreman, *Environmental Analyst*
Department of Environmental Protection
BNR- Inland Fisheries Division
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127

Phone: 860-424-3868

Fax: 860-424-4070

Email: William.foreman@ct.gov

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION:

Applicants are advised not to include in their proposals any proprietary information. The Connecticut Freedom of Information Act generally requires the disclosure of documents in the possession of the State upon request of any citizen, unless the content of the document falls within certain categories of exemption. An example of an exemption is a “trade secret,” as defined by statute (C.G.S. § 1-19(b)(5)). If the information is not readily available to the public from other sources and the applicant submitting the information requests confidentiality, then the information generally is considered to be “given in confidence.” Confidential information must be isolated from other material in the proposal and labeled **CONFIDENTIAL**.

STYLE REQUIREMENTS

Proposals must conform to the following requirements: (1) be word processed or typewritten, (2) use Times New Roman font type and font size of not less than 10 and not more than 12 points, (3) be on 8.5” x 11” paper except for the maps and other attachments which may be no larger than 11” x 17”, (4) have margins of not less than 1” on the top, bottom, and sides of all pages, (5) be not more than 20 pages in length (*not including maps and other attachments such deeds, letters of consent, etc.*), (6) display the applicant’s name on the header of each page, and (7) display page numbers at the bottom of each page.

MULTIPLE SUBMISSIONS

An applicant may submit a maximum of two (2) proposals in response to this RFP.

CONTRACT COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS: (required for any application exceeding \$4,000.00)

See [CHRO website](#) for specific Contract Compliance forms. The following table will assist in determining which forms are required. **Note that CHRO has issued a temporary exemption from the requirements for contracts with municipalities. This exemption expires on 12/31/2008 and it is unknown whether it will be extended.**

Contract amount	<i>Bidder Contract Compliance Monitoring Report Required – Affidavit for Certification of Subcontractors as Minority business Enterprises (MBE's), as applicable..</i>	<i>Affirmative Action Plan Required</i>	<i>CHRO Requires Pre Approval of Affirmative Action Plan</i>
\$0-\$4,000.00	No paperwork required.		
\$4,000.01 - \$9,999.99	No	No	n/a
Non Public Works Contract			
\$10,000 - \$249,999.99	Yes	No	n/a
\$250,000 or more	Yes	Yes	No
Public Works Contract			
\$10,000 - \$50,000.00	Yes	No	n/a
\$50,000.01 - \$500,000	Yes	Yes	No
\$500,000.01 or more	Yes	Yes	Yes

ATTACHMENT A

I. **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING PROPOSALS MUST MEET THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

Applicant status: Applicant is a municipality. *Only municipalities are eligible to submit grant proposals. Not-For-Profit conservation organizations (with 501(c)(3) status) and local interest organizations such as unincorporated lake associations can develop project proposals but they must be submitted by the municipality in which the target site is located.*

Target species: Target plants are not native to Connecticut, and considered invasive, listed by the Invasive Plants Council and/or listed in CGS 22a-381d (see Attachment E).

Access: Target properties and water bodies are publicly accessible. *Areas must be open to public access and use. Sites do not have to be developed for public use (i.e. sites that do not have restrooms, picnic tables, parking lots, boat launch areas, etc. are still eligible for funding).*

Project type/goal: Project goal is the eradication, permanent removal or long-term control of the target plant(s). *Routine periodic maintenance projects are not eligible.*

PROPOSALS MUST INCLUDE:

- Submission of a complete application package (see Attachments B, C, and D), including free-form responses to questions 9-18 and all required maps and documentation materials in hard copy. *Note that an electronic version of the cover sheet (Attachment C) and the narrative of the Scope of Work (Attachment B, question # 15) in either MS Word or PDF file formats either emailed or saved on CD or DVD will be required from all applicants approved for funding following notification of decisions.*
- Demonstration that the funding requested will provide funding for a project that addresses a new or immediate threat, and not for on-going or continuing maintenance efforts.
- Demonstration that the project will have long-term benefits.
- Demonstration that any applicable federal, state and/or municipal authorizations (i.e. permits) have been obtained, or are obtainable in a timely fashion.

II. **REVIEW CRITERIA**

Proposals will be ranked and ultimately selected based upon the following considerations:

- Compliance with all eligibility requirements listed above.
- Degree of access available to the public.
- Amount of public use and potential for people to spread target species.
- Does the project target a new infestation (first observed with the last 3 years).
- Degree and imminence of threat posed by target species.
- Does the project target multiple species.
- Ecological benefits of project.

- Recreational benefits of project.
- Benefits to rare/endangered/threatened/species of concern.
- Effectiveness of control measures (completeness & duration).
- Effectiveness of site rehabilitation/re-vegetation component.
- Quality of post treatment monitoring plan.
- Quality of long-term management plan. (*Applications which demonstrate a commitment to continue the proposed project beyond the initial year of its implementation without additional DEP support will be viewed more favorably.*)
- Ability of applicant to implement and complete project in a timely fashion. (*This includes the extent to which proposals would be completed within one year from the contract execution date. It also takes past performance of the applicant into consideration if previously provided funding by DEP or other state source).*)

ATTACHMENT B

GRANT FUND APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

*These application instructions have been designed to apply to all activities eligible for funding. Please read these instructions in their entirety and provide answers to each question in order by number. These instructions have been designed to minimize the potential for incomplete applications. **Information required in items 1-8 must be provided by filling out the attached proposal cover page (Attachment C) using the space provided.** Responses to items 9-18 should be provided by attaching additional pages to the cover page.*

The level of detail required to fully answer each question is related to the scale and scope of the proposed project. Applicants are requested to provide a thorough description of the proposed project and answer each question as it applies to the activity. Submission of complete and accurate information will enhance the chance of the proposal being selected for funding.

An original and 8 copies of the application and other documentation must be mailed or hand-delivered to the following address:

Attention: Bill Foreman, *Environmental Analyst*
Department of Environmental Protection
BNR- Inland Fisheries Division
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127

DEADLINES: All applications and supporting documentation must be received by DEP's Inland Fisheries Division at 79 Elm Street, Hartford, CT by 4:00 P.M. on Monday, December 8th, 2008. Applications or supporting documents received after that date and time will not be considered. Applications or supporting documentation transmitted via e-mail or fax will not be accepted.

Note: All of the questions must be answered. If a question is not applicable to your particular proposal, please provide a brief explanation. **Do not leave the questions blank.**

(cover sheet, #'s 1-8)

1. NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF APPLICANT MUNICIPALITY (or municipalities):

Fill in the legal name(s), mailing address(es), and phone number(s) of the applicant municipality or municipalities. Phone number(s) must be a number(s) that is answered during business hours.

The applicant must be a municipality (or municipalities). If multiple municipalities are involved with a single project, a lead municipality must be identified.

2. NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF CONTACT:

Fill in the name(s), mailing address(es), phone number(s), and e-mail address of the contact. Phone number(s) must be a number where the contact is reachable during business hours.

The contact person is the individual who is familiar with the project details and who should be contacted for additional information or questions. Should the project be funded, this is also the

person who will be the primary contact during the course of the project through final completion.

3. NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:

State the name and title of the representative who, if the contract is awarded, is legally authorized to sign the contract on behalf of the municipality. Have this individual sign and date the application form in the space provided. **Applications which are not signed by a legally authorized individual shall not be accepted and will be deemed ineligible for further consideration.** The applicant must also supply a signature resolution indicating that the signer is authorized to sign legal documents and enter into contracts on behalf of the municipality.

4. FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:

Provide the federal employment identification number of the applicant, and state the name of the entity to which this number corresponds.

5. TITLE:

State the title of the proposed project.

The title should be concise and include project purpose/goal, target species, location and municipality all in one line (e.g. "Removal of mile-a-minute vine from Shady Acres Town Park, Wallingford, CT" or "Eradication of parrotfeather infestation in Town Pond, Enfield, CT").

6. BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

Provide a brief (200 words or less) description of the proposed project. Include target species, control methods, size of property/waterbody, size of infestation/area to be treated, degree of public access and any project partners.

e.g. The goal of this project is to eradicate water chestnut (Trapa natans) from a 20 acre pond. This plant was first found in this pond two years ago, and currently covers an estimated 5 acres. We propose to use herbicides (2, 4-d formulation) to initially treat the water chestnut. Additionally, a volunteer group will be established and trained to monitor the pond in subsequent years. Some Town staff will also attend training. The pond is an impoundment on a tributary to the "Big River". Public access to the pond is through a town park located on the west shore of the pond. The park includes a boat launch suitable for canoes, kayaks and small boats, plus 500 feet of accessible shoreline for fishing.

7. TOTAL GRANT FUNDING REQUESTED:

State the total amount of grant funding requested. For determination of such an amount, refer to question 17 for an explanation of how to provide the budget for the proposed project.

8. TOTAL MATCHING FUNDS:

State the total amount of matching funds committed for the proposed project. Please refer to questions 17 and 18 for a further explanation regarding matching funds.

(Project narrative, #'s 9-18)

9. NAME AND LOCATION OF PROJECT PROPERTY OR WATERBODY (as applicable).

Provide the name (names) of the target property or water body and the names of all municipalities within which the property/water body is located. Provide a map clearly showing the location of the property or water body and a description of its location. If applicable include the street address and copy of the map and lot number(s) of the site as identified by the Tax Assessor's Office for the municipality or municipalities in which the site is located.

10. PUBLIC ACCESS AND USE

Provide the following information concerning public access to and use of the property or water body:

- ✓ Degree of access (is the property/water body fully accessible, open to access only in some seasons or at certain times of day, restricted to local residents, closed to all use, etc.). If access is restricted, please explain.
- ✓ Facilities (parking, roads, trails, boat launches, shoreline access, picnic areas, ball fields, wildlife viewing structures, fishing piers, etc.). Please provide map of property or water body showing locations of these facilities. *Maps should be no larger than 11" x 17" in size.*
- ✓ Use patterns (what are primary/most popular uses of property/water body).

11. PROPERTY/WATER BODY OWNERSHIP

Provide information demonstrating ownership or other legal interest in the property, including:

- ✓ Copies of the Tax Map or Maps showing ownership of the affected property (or properties) and/or water body.
- ✓ Copies of applicable conservation and other access easements.
- ✓ When the applicant is not the owner, include signed letters of permission from all property owners to enter the property and consent for the control methods.
- ✓ Letters of permission should be provided for any non-applicant properties which must be crossed to gain access to the target site/water body.

12. TARGET PLANT SPECIES OR SPECIES

Provide information concerning target plant species, including:

- ✓ The name(s) of target species. List both common names and scientific names.
- ✓ Names, contact information of individuals, businesses/organizations/agencies who identified or verified identification of these species.
- ✓ Documentation of the actual presence of the target species on the property or in the water body (*attach photos, data from professional plant surveys, copies of relevant sections of reports and/or studies, etc.*).

13. STATE-LISTED SPECIES

Applicants should determine whether state listed species and/or significant natural communities are present within or near the project boundary, and if the proposed project will affect state listed species.

- ✓ Please provide the DEP Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDDB) map for applicant town showing location of project property/water body (location can be hand-drawn & names of water bodies can be written on the map with an arrow to the correct location on the map). Maps can be accessed from the following website: www.ct.gov/dep/endangeredspecies
- ✓ Should state-listed species and/or significant natural communities be present, applicants need to request an NDDDB environmental review and should attach review documentation.

Note that most projects can be designed to avoid negative impacts to state-listed species and significant natural communities, and preference will be given to projects that can show a definite benefit to these species and communities.

14. DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE AND NEED FOR, AND BENEFITS OF PROPOSED PROJECT:

- ✓ Describe the purpose of, and need for the project including a description of the extent of the infestation and its impact on native species, fish and wildlife habitat, recreational uses and aesthetic values.
- ✓ Describe the expected ecological and public benefits of the proposed project.
- ✓ Describe any past efforts to control/eradicate the target species on the project property or water body.

15. DESCRIBE THE SCOPE OF WORK:

Describe the scope of work identifying each task, product and service. Where applicable, include site maps and/or other diagrams indicating location and features of specific project tasks. Please at a minimum include the following information:

- ✓ Whether federal, state and/or municipal authorizations (i.e. permits) are needed (and the status of any requests for permits). **Preferred projects have either obtained, or can obtain in a timely fashion all necessary permits.** Attach copies of any permits already obtained. *Note that awardees will be required to submit copies of permits obtained following the awarding of funds.*
- ✓ Plans for pre-control monitoring.
- ✓ Narrative of the areal extent of target species coverage and a description of the site(s).
- ✓ Map(s) and photographs (when available) of the property or water body clearly showing the distribution of target species and areas targeted for control. Also clearly show on the same map locations of known populations of state-listed species.
- ✓ Description of all control methods to be used, including where each method will be used and how frequently during the course of the project. Also indicate who will be performing the various controls (i.e., licensed applicator/consultant services, volunteers, municipal staff, NGO). Please list separately and be as specific as possible:
 - All herbicides and other chemicals to be used (if known at time of submittal).

- All mechanical methods to be used (hand-pulling, brush-cutting, harvester, hydroraking, etc.)
- All bio-control measures (goat grazing, grass carp, “milfoil” weevil, etc.).
- ✓ Discuss how state-listed species or significant natural communities will be protected during the project.
- ✓ Expected outcome of control measures. Include an estimate of the area (i.e., acres, square meters or feet) of, or length (i.e. feet, yards, meters, miles of trailside, river bank or lakeshore) of target species controlled or eradicated.
- ✓ Discuss whether any changes in public access will occur due to this project.
- ✓ Plans for notifying/educating users and general public.
- ✓ Discuss plans for rehabilitation/revegetation of targeted sites.
- ✓ Plans for post-treatment monitoring.
- ✓ Long-term management plan including procedures for preventing the reestablishment of the target species (if goal was eradication) or preventing the spread (if goal was control).

16. DEFINE THE SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT:

Provide a proposed schedule for completion of each phase of the project as it corresponds to the scope of work described and the total number of months needed to complete the project. Identify any seasonal constraints or specific requirements for work scheduling. For example, work times may need to be coordinated with target species growing season, observation of environmentally sensitive periods, or the receipt of required authorizations.

Please note that projects should generally be completed within **one year** from the contract execution date. It is anticipated that the contracts will be mailed to award recipients for review and signature within two months of the grant award announcement. Within approximately six weeks from the date DEP receives the signed contract and all necessary resolutions or other attachments, the contract will be able to be fully executed, and funding can be made available for use by the recipient. Only expenses incurred following a properly executed contract will be deemed eligible expenses. Such a timeline should be taken into account in determining a proposed schedule for the project.

17. DEFINE THE BUDGET FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT:

Using the attached budget summary page (Attachment D), provide a list of the expenses for the proposed project. In addition, **on a separate sheet**, provide a brief narrative explaining each line item expense requested from the Grant Fund. **Indirect costs associated with projects may be used as matching funds. However, Grant Funds cannot be used for indirect costs.**

The upper limit for projects is \$50,000. For projects which are more expensive or in order to guarantee the continuation of the proposed project beyond the initial year of its implementation without Grant Fund support, matching funds or alternative funding should be considered. Requests for larger grants will be considered, but only for exceptional and well-justified proposals. Any work subcontracted must be arranged through a competitive selection process unless there is a demonstration of the need for a sole source.

A 100% payment of the grant amount will be initiated following execution of the contract. Following completion of the project, a report including documentation that all the elements of the project have been completed, the outcome of the project and a financial summary indicating expenses incurred must be submitted to DEP. **Projects that come in under budget or fail to meet contract obligations are required to return all unused funds to DEP.**

18. DESCRIBE THE AVAILABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE FUNDING OR MATCHING FUNDS OR IN-KIND SERVICES:

Provide a description of matching funds, in-kind services and the availability of alternative funding. Matching funds may consist of actual funds as well as other contributions such as in-kind services, materials and volunteer labor.

Applicants are encouraged to demonstrate a commitment to continue the proposed project beyond the initial year of its implementation without additional DEP funds. Funding for well matched projects will be viewed favorably, and a demonstration of a commitment of future funding for that purpose is strongly encouraged.

ATTACHMENT C

GRANT PROPOSAL COVER PAGE

(Please type answers using the space provided)

1. NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF APPLICANT MUNICIPALITY (or municipalities):
2. NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF CONTACT:
3. NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Name and Title: Signature: _____ Date: _____
4. FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:
5. TITLE:
6. BRIEF DESCRIPTION:
7. TOTAL GRANT FUNDING REQUESTED:
8. TOTAL MATCHING FUNDS:

Items 9-18 must be appropriately labeled and included as an attachment to this form.

Budget Summary

Name of Applicant: _____

EXPENSES:	Grant Funds	Matching Funds
Personnel		
Salaries:	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fringe Benefits:	\$ _____	\$ _____
Materials/Supplies:	\$ _____	\$ _____
Travel:	\$ _____	\$ _____
Contractual/Consulting Fees (specify):	\$ _____	\$ _____
Printing and Copying:	\$ _____	\$ _____
Office Expenses:	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other (please specify**):	\$ _____	\$ _____
Total Grant Funds Requested:	\$ 	
Total Matching Funds Provided:		\$ _____
Total Project Costs:		\$ _____

On a separate sheet, provide a brief narrative explaining each line item expense requested from the Grant Fund.

Note:

- *Indirect costs may be used as matching funds, but are not eligible grant expenses.*
- *Food and clothing (except for safety/work/protective items equipment such as gloves and chaps) are not eligible grant expenses.*
- *Where in-kind match (e.g. volunteers) is being provided, those costs must be specifically identified.*

Summary Of Proposals Received

Grants To Municipalities For The Control Of Invasive Plants Program

Invasive plant control proposals that were submitted to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) by municipalities in response to the Request for Proposals far exceeded the \$175,000 that was allocated by the legislature through the Invasive Plant Council (IPC). This overwhelming response demonstrates the towns' critical need for assistance in controlling invasive plants in the effort to restore habitat for fish and wildlife species and improve recreational land use. DEP will be evaluating the 41 proposals during December and reporting back the IPC in January with recommendations for allocating the available funding.

- Total dollar amount available in FY2009: **\$175,000**
- Total dollar amount of funding requested: **\$978,903**
- Matching funds offered by municipalities: **\$631,334**
- Received **41 applications** from a total of **37 municipalities**.
- Project proposals were relatively evenly split (aquatic vs. terrestrial):

Aquatic	17
Terrestrial	16
Both*	8

*Eight projects targeted both terrestrial and aquatic/wetland species (mostly phragmites).

- The average requested amount per project: **\$23,876**
- The median requested amount per project: **\$17,750**
- Largest requested amount: **\$75,000**
- Smallest requested amount: **\$2,500**
- Aquatic project funding requests averaged: \$25,594.00 *per request*
- Terrestrial project funding requests averaged: \$21,087.00 *per request*
- "Both" project funding requests averaged: \$25,800.00 *per request*