

**SuAsCo CISMA**  
**Minutes of the Steering Committee Meeting**  
**Held 9/15/09**

Present:	Lee Steppacher	NPS/River Stewardship Council
	Barbara Volkle	Friends of the Assabet River NWR
	Eileen McGourty	USFWS
	Libby Herland	USFWS
	Amber Carr	Mass Audubon
	Jeff Collins	Mass Audubon
	Bill Brumback	New England Wild Flower Society
	Lynn Knight	Carlisle Land Stewardship Committee
	Laura Mattei	Sudbury Valley Trustees
	John	Maynard Conservation
	Anna Wilkins	Lincoln Conservation
	Matt Burne	Walden Woods Project
	Debbie Dineen	Sudbury Conservation
	Delia Kaye	Concord Natural Resources

**River Stewardship Council Grant Awards**

Jeff announced that two grant applications were received totaling \$6,650 for the \$6,000 RSC grant funds. \$6,000 from SVT and others for a beetle-rearing and release to control purple loosestrife. \$650 from the Sudbury Conservation Commission to provide funding for tools and supplies for the Sudbury Weed Education and Eradication Team (SWEET).

Matt questioned if the group had considered using any of the funds for overhead for CISMA administration. Eileen and Debbie thought all of the \$6,000 should go directly to on-the-ground projects. Delia thought funds for overhead would be become important. Debbie noted that this Committee will be seeking funding for a Coordinator.

Matt suggested funding the SWEET grant in full with the remainder going to SVT for beetle rearing and release. He noted that the SVT budget appeared to be a bit flexible. Laura noted SVT member George Harrington had offered a \$1,000 donation toward controlling purple loosestrife with beetles, however the funds might need to be used only towards work in N. Framingham. As of now, Mass Audubon is the fiscal agent for CISMA funds.

Bill suggested Japanese knotweed might be controlled by cutting at least once each week. Libby suggested a focused trial in a manageable area to test this theory.

Jeff felt that the \$650 SCC request could be increased to purchase an additional weed wrench. Bill cautioned that sometimes well-intentioned volunteers burn out very quickly if they are not getting good results. It was suggested that the areas SWEET proposed to tackle might be too optimistic and would spread the group to thin, resulting in not achieving the goals in the application.

Laura thought that SWEET could serve as a good example in other towns.

Debbie asked USFWS what results they have had with the beetle release at the Refuge. Eileen explained that they have seen very good results. The beetles need the loosestrife for their life cycles. If no loosestrife, no beetles so there is not a concern that if the beetles are successful, they will turn to other vegetation. Barbara noted that the SVT grant application indicates much of the cost is staff time. Libby offered a USFWS contribution \$500 toward materials. The group discussed the materials needed and determined much of the basic supplies can be donated, purchased second-hand, or found at no cost (e.g. plastic kiddie pools).

Laura explained that more release sites will need to be identified. Debbie suggested areas along Hop Brook in Sudbury.

The SCC/SWEET project will need to have a revised work plan which will scale back and prioritize sites. A specific plant list for each site should be included. Libby suggested that Rebecca Chizzo, SWEET Coordinator, become involved in the CISMA Education & Outreach Committee for coordination of educational materials.

Lee moved: "to award \$1,000 of the RSC grant to SCC/SWEET conditional upon 1) a revised work plan; 2) a final report to RSC in December 2010; 3) a scaled back and prioritized site list; 4) a revised budget; SWEET to coordinate with CISMA Education & Outreach Committee; and 5) SuAsCo CISMA is credited on any information handed out to the public; AND to award \$5,000 to SVT for the beetle project with a requirement for a final report to RSC in December 2010. Libby added that Laura Mattei should be considered the Coordinator for the beetle project." Motion seconded by Lynn and voted unanimously in favor.

Barbara suggested a press release for the awards and Jeff will develop and send award letters.

### **NFWF Grant Application**

Jeff reported on the NFWF grant proposal. He is asking for \$50,000 to fund the NEWFS-led Early Detection/Rapid Response training and other activities, and to fund a CISMA Coordinator. The grant application includes a \$103,000 match made up of volunteer time on the ED/RR project and funding from the Nyanza Fund. Federal funds are not eligible as match, and it was questioned if the Nyanza remediation funds would be considered federal funds. Libby noted that the Nyanza Trust funds would be awarded through the State, so it should be OK to list this potential funding source as an anticipated match. Jeff pointed out that the match requirements also list obligatory payments, such as settlements, as ineligible for match. Libby made the point that the Nyanza funds were set aside as part of a settlement, but they will be awarded competitively, so they should not be considered obligatory. Barbara suggested deleting "settlement" from the Nyanza funding description in the application. Jeff will also provide a narrative as part of the application.

Nyanza Trust funds are now scheduled to be available Fall 2010-Jan 2011 with 18 mos. as the project time period.

Discussion followed on the position of CISMA Coordinator. Jeff offered that the person might be housed at MAS. Libby informed the group that she has one year of funding for an invasive species coordinator on her refuges. She is hoping for additional funding for a minimum four-year position, and ideally, would like Amber to be the successful candidate for the position. Delia felt that it made sense to house the CISMA Coordinator at USFWS.

Bill stated that worst -case the grant application will be a one-one match. Lee reminded everyone that volunteer efforts can be included in the match equation. Bill noted that his volunteers had accumulated the equivalent of \$18,000 in hours last year. Barbara noted that the grant application might explain how the match funds can be spent.

Libby questioned how other CISMA groups sustain a Coordinator and themselves. Jeff offered to look into that.

### **Sub-Committee Reports**

Early Detection/Rapid Response – Anna Wilkins; Eileen; Ted; Amber

Anna reported that the subcommittee discussed the scope of their responsibilities. IPANE can be used as a basis for mapping initially, however standards for mapping are needed. They plan to train and recruit volunteers beginning in Spring 2010.

Amber suggested Les Mehrhoff be consulted as he set of the protocol for NEWFS EDRR.

IPANE volunteers may be able to be redirected to EDRR areas within SuAsCo. Education is a big part of EDRR and will require communication between subcommittees. Libby added that the Coordinator should be managing the communication.

The EDRR Subcommittee plans to hold at least 2 educational events each year highlighting EDRR. Bill added that 4 training sessions within the watershed will be held if funding is available. Initial field work is likely to be on a Town-by-Town basis depending on where the volunteers are based. EDRR can receive information and field verify. Longer term management will be the difficult part.

Barbara: Crisis = Opportunity (for education and action).

EDRR would like to compile a list of likely volunteers in each area. Amber will do a flow chart for CISMA members showing the actions to be taken should a listed invasive plant be encountered. Action Alerts can be generated. An equipment & expertise loan system will be put in place. Work releases and work party organization will be needed. More research needs to happen on state rules for licensed herbicide applicators. Grant funding will be sought for EDRR conferences. Signage and distribution of available information needs to be discussed. A mid-October meeting is planned.

Lynne suggested sharing subcommittee groups meetings and reports through the Google Group. She added that the Administration Subcommittee will be holding a kick-off meeting in Oct. Lee suggested moving it to November.

### **Google Groups**

Jeff and Lynne began a discussion of member levels for access to the Google Group. Steering Committee could be level one with full access with the Partners having the next level of access and all interested parties would be the final level. Matt noted that levels within the Group are possible. Debbie questioned if there are any requirements for complete public disclosure such as the Open Meeting Law which might prohibit some or all levels within the Group. Delia offered to look into this.

### **WireFrame**

Matt emailed for comments and responses to the Steering Committee his 1<sup>st</sup> draft list of information for a website. He stressed the need to have a place to upload information for public access and education. Both Jeff and John added that funds will be needed for web design and hosting.

The next meeting of the Steering Committee was scheduled for Nov. 10<sup>th</sup> from 1:00 – 3:30 pm at GMNWR. There was consensus to skip the December meeting.

Submitted 10/5/09 by Debbie Dineen with edits by Jeff Collins