

## Minutes from IN Aquatic Plants in Trade Working Group Meeting May 21, 2008

Attendees: Glenn Weust, Patt Weust, Lisa Bihl, Reuben Keller, Ellen Jacquart, Pat Charlebois, and Kristin TePas

### Welcome and Housekeeping

Pat Charlebois welcomed everyone and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Re-assess Six Species

The members broke up into three groups: trade (Glenn Weust, Patt Weust, and Lisa Bihl), policy (Ellen Jacquart and Doug Keller's notes) and academia (Reuben Keller and Jaci Chase's notes). Each group discussed the six species among themselves and agreed upon a group scoring for each species.

The six species assessed were:

*Myriophyllum spicatum* (Eurasian watermilfoil),  
*Hydrilla verticillata* (hydrilla),  
*Glyceria maxima* (reed mannagrass),  
*Aponogeton distachyus* (water hawthorne),  
*Najas minor* (slender/brittle naiad), and  
*Typha minima* (miniature cattail).

Each of the three groups then discussed the three new species among themselves and agreed upon a group scoring for each species.

The three new species assessed were:

*Myriophyllum aquaticum* (parrot feather),  
*Iris pseudacorus* (yellow flag), and  
*Caltha palustris var. polypetal.*

### Analysis of Group Assessments & Comparison with Univ. of Notre Dame – Reuben Keller

Reuben Keller led this next session discussing the different group's scoring and how it compared with the Univ. of Notre Dame's outcomes.

G. Weust mentioned he was concerned that the importance to the trade industry of certain plants is not considered in this risk assessment. It was explained, however, that this model just focuses on the biology of the plant species. It is within the process model (decision-making tree) where a species' importance to the trade and the economic impact of listing it are considered.

Notre Dame's scores are consistently higher than the trade and managers. Are they reading the information differently? R. Keller thinks the difference is that they are using primary literature from all over the world to get their information. Thus, if the plant shows up as invasive anywhere in the world, they will likely read about it and include that in their scoring

consideration.

Comment: When a species is not in IN already, it is difficult to predict the impacts that may occur if the species got established in IN. Basing decisions on other locations and going with worst case scenarios may not reflect what actually would happen here in IN if it was here. It would be conservative scoring in terms of using worst case scenario.

G. Weust asked why, if it has been around for a while and isn't a problem in our state, should a plant get a bad rap, even if it is a problem elsewhere.

Lag time is something to consider since even if something has been around for a while but just didn't take off right away it still might in the future (e.g., garlic mustard).

Tool is really to identify hi, med, lo risk. Need to test it with species that we agree are hi, med, and low risk and then score. We've asked Greg Speichert to come up with a list. Five of high, med, and low in each category: submerged, emergents, wetlands. Speichert should get that to us by mid June and then we would e-mail to everyone for their input. Once we get everyone's input and agree on our list, we will send it to Jaci Chase to run through the risk assessment. We can then see how the species fall out and modify tool if needed.

Jacquart said it seemed like a good idea.

G. Weust had a question regarding Q1.3 and how it was worded with *free-floating* plants scoring a 2 in the *sediment* section. R. Keller said he would re-word the question so that it is clearer why free-floating plants are included in that question.

Q7.2, what is meant by vegetative segments? It needs to be clarified.

Charlebois asked the group a question regarding outreach. What is going to motivate gardeners to change behavior (such as not dump water garden plants)? How are they impacted directly by an invasion (are they also boaters, anglers, conservationists)?

G. Weust said they caution people if they want something that might take over. Depending on what they use the water body for—will they fish in it, is it a small pond just for a garden, Impact on their land/property may be most influential. P. Weust said people are suddenly becoming more aware of the environment and how our actions are messing it up. Concern for the environment may be motivation enough these days.

### **Next Steps – Pat Charlebois**

We will put together a list of (ideally) 5 highly invasive submerged species, 5 mildly invasive submerged species and 5 non-invasive submerged species. We'll do the same for emergent species and wetland/marginal plants, giving a total of 45 species. Need to make sure, if possible, that the species listed as non-invasive have been in trade long enough to be given a good chance to establish and invade if they were going to. We plan to get input on this list from Greg Speichert.

Once list is established, we will send out to the group to get everyone's approval.

The Notre Dame group (primarily Jaci Chase) will assess these species using the current risk assessment tool (Version 3) and primary literature.

Once some species are assessed, the tool will be tweaked to be sure that it gives us the correct outputs (i.e., that it correctly identifies species as invasive or not). Depending on the output of the risk assessment, we may have to do a combination of removing questions that are not useful and changing the scoring of others to make them more useful. Any changes will be brought back to the group members for their approval.

At the next meeting, the Notre Dame group will update everyone on the work they've done. Hopefully this will include a risk assessment model that accurately and consistently discriminates between invasive and non-invasive species.