

Montana Wetland Council Meeting Summary
May 5, 2010 Meeting in Helena

[Lynda Saul](#), *DEQ Wetland Program Coordinator/Wetland Council Chair.*

Lynda thanked everyone for coming to the spring Wetland Council meeting. The Montana DEQ Wetland Program provides state leadership to conserve and restore wetlands for their water quality, water quantity, habitat, and flood control benefits.

Announcements:

- Resource table: particular interest for this meeting is the “Field Guide to Montana’s Wetland Vascular Plants” by Lessica and Husby. Free, contact DEQ.
- EPA Wetland Protection Development Grants – this competitive funding program is how we collectively fund priorities from the Strategic Framework: new this year – Wetland Program Plans. RFP was released today. Pre-proposals due June 4 to DEQ. Final proposals due July 9 to EPA Region 8. Talk with Lynda or discuss with Working Group leads to advance program development in the four core elements: restoration, monitoring/assessment, water quality standards, regulations. Looking for approaches to develop these, including education/training and watershed context.
- Remember the occasional wetland e-newsletter. Send [Lynda](#) news, trainings, studies, reports, and other information to share with your colleagues.

At this time she asked for a round-robin of self-introductions and brief participant announcements. Please see sign-in sheet at end of summary for list of all meeting attendees and contact information.

Introductions:

Glenn Patrick, FSA. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) Continue to sign up smaller acreage to the wetland buffer program with contracts for 10 to 15 years. They pay 50% of the cost share to practice plus 10% and signing bonus of 100 dollars per acre.

Dennis Silverman, Mineral County Conservation District. 310 permit. Don’t want to stop riparian activity but mitigate for the land owner.

Todd Garrett, FWP Bozeman. Looking for help with restoration project.

Erik Hanson, Dept. of Ag, Invasive Species Coordinator. Implementing check stations to monitor spread of invasives.

Bob Sanders, Ducks Unlimited. Developing the Wetland Reserve Enhancement Program through a capacity grant from the Intermountain West Joint Venture – Jennifer Boyer is contracted to lead this effort. WRP doesn’t allow grazing, developing a program that does allow grazing, WREP is a working lands program. 75% of what you would make from WRP. NRCS is looking to hire a person the end of June to pilot the WREP program for a one year position, based out of Bozeman.

Peter Lesica, Consultant. Monitoring vegetation and restoration at Milltown.

Clint Folden, CSKT. Working on restoration projects.

Linda Brander, DNRC. Economic impact study, can look at on web: <http://restoration.mt.gov/>. Doing a refined forestry reforestation study. Information on database will be sent out to listserv through Lynda. Doing a youth restoration partnership program to get students in the field. Holding a Symposium in 2011.

Janet Bender-Keigley. Montana Watercourse. Helping with EPA Region 8 Wetland Capacity Building Workshop being held in September in Bozeman.

Russell Smith, MSU. Working with wetland issues and saline seeps in central areas of Montana.

Joe Walks Alone, Northern Cheyenne Tribe. Works with wetland and surface water for the Northern Cheyenne Tribe. Worked at getting the wetlands in better condition last year on the Culver project. Working with the Natural Heritage Program.

Scott Mincemoyer, MTNHP. National wetland plant list has been in revision for a year and a half with EPA, this is being led by Corp of Engineers along with three other agencies. Helping EPA with Western Mountain region and Great Plains species. This should be open for comments in June. Will be doing wetland plant trainings around the state and looking for people to sign up and state their interests.

Jim Domino, DNRC. Does oversight of 23 state owned water projects through out Montana, also irrigation reservoirs. Involved with MEPA and EIS for the Water Bureau and noxious weeds on projects. Working on rehabilitation of the Ruby River dam; re-establishing the Ruby flow, working with Trout Unlimited and Ducks Unlimited. Also a project on the Clark Fork. All involve wetlands directly or indirectly.

Jeanne Spaur, Ft Peck Tribe. Monitoring wetlands and wildlife species in north east corner of the state.

Steve Guettermann, MSU/Montana Watercourse. Provide training for local decision makers on protection wetlands and other water issues.

Dennis Longknife, Fort Belknap Tribe Wetlands Program. Doing plant tours for college factuality. Documenting medicinal value of plants. Doing wetland field trips with school children. Providing water ID books and information for teachers and students. Completed revision to project quality assurance plan. Included a penalty matrix from Indiana DEQ projects. Included wetland ordinances and aquatic ordinances.

Dave Stagliano, MTNHP. Working on three wetland projects. Incorporating invertebrates in conservation projects. Introduced Bull frog eradication in the Yellowstone area and coal bed natural gas surveys.

Michelle Hutchins, Missoula County. Worked on a six county collaboration doing a public service announcement for riparian vegetation protection. (Video will be shown at this meeting). Website: watersmartmt.com

Karen Kaitala, Powell County Weed District. Working on Blackfoot River and Clark Fork River projects with EPA on an integrated management program.

Kerry Fee, Ducks Unlimited, Livingston Chapter. Mapped Gardner to Laurel and will continue this year.

Diane Tipton, FWP. Public information, developing a weed page.

Chris Forristal, US Fish and Wildlife Service. Leads invasive species strike team.

Updates from the Strategic Framework Working Groups.

Steve Carpenedo, DEQ. Public Education and Professional Training Working Group:

There are several projects that the public education and professional training working group has been involved with. Currently the DEQ Wetlands Program is working on a Common Wetland Plant Identification Booklet that should be available this summer. It targets non-wetland scientists and helps to identify common native and invasive wetland plant species. The DEQ Wetland Program has also sponsored MT Water Center to develop a wetland module for their Decision Makers Guide series that they are currently working on. Since the last MWC meeting we have conducted a training at the 2010 AMFM Conference on Using Maps to Identify Potential Wetlands, and sponsored 10 participants to attend the Wetland and Watershed GIS Training conducted by MTNHP, MWCC and DEQ Wetland Program.

Future items that are of interest in the public education and professional training include the Wetland Program Capacity Building Workshop, September 21st – 24th in Bozeman. And, the Wetland Training Institutes courses on the Wetland Delineation Regional Supplements in Missoula, September 9th-10th. DEQ Wetland Program will be providing limited scholarships to attend these trainings to interested participants. Please contact [Lynda Saul](#) for more information regarding scholarships.

Meghan Burns and Cat McIntyre, MTNHP.

Mapping, Assessment and Monitoring Working Group:

Cat reports MTNHP has just completed two large EPA funded wetland assessment projects. The first was the Montana Reference Network project where they assessed herbaceous wetland systems representing a range of conditions across the state. They also completed wetland assessments in the first rotating basin located in the Milk and Marias watersheds. Reports and data for both these projects will be available within the next couple of weeks. They are preparing for a second basin-wide wetland assessment in southwest Montana. They will be working in the Beaverhead, Red Rock, Gallatin, Big Hole, Madison, Bitterroot, Upper Clark Fork, Ruby, and Jefferson watersheds to describe

wetland condition across these watersheds. The MTNHP is also collaborating with CO, WY and UT to characterize minimally disturbed wetlands that occur within all 4 states. They hope to describe the natural variability that occurs in the absence of human disturbances so that we will be able to better tease out affects of anthropogenic stressors.

Meghan added on a related note the MTNHP has over 9,000 geo-referenced photos of wetlands from the Montana Amphibian Inventory and Monitoring Program. With funding from DEQ these photos have been reviewed and given a condition assessment:

- 1) Red Flagged: “Evidence of heavy structural impact and heavy water quality impact.”
- 2) Yellow Flagged: “Evidence of light to moderate structural or water quality impacts to wetlands.”
- 3) Green Flagged: “Impacts to wetlands not discernable.”

MTNHP has made several updates to the Wetland and Riparian Mapping Center webpage, <http://mtnhp.org/nwi/> including a funders map and addition of number of acres mapped. The Flathead, Upper Clark Fork, and Ruby Valley projects were submitted to USFWS in January. Yellowstone priority areas 1 and 2 and Rocky Boys projects were submitted in March. Yellowstone priority areas 3 and 4 are completed and will be submitted soon as well as Manning Lake refuge project. Sioux, Pryor, and Ashland have been mapped in the Custer National Forest and mapping in the Beartooth is under way. To date they have mapped 26% of the state are 40% funded.

Tom Hinz, Wetlands Legacy Partnership/DFWP.

Restoration Working Group:

Tom reported that the big news is that our partners, including EPA, USFWS, PPL Montana, USDA, and others nominated the Andrew Laszlo Family of Ennis for the National Wetland Award for Landowner Stewardship which was announced a few weeks ago as the national Award Recipient. This is the first time that a Montana farmer/rancher has been recognized with this highest of wetland awards in the United States. Ceremony will be May 19 at the U.S. Capitol where the family will be recognized. Will bring national focus on the tremendous efforts of the MWC, MWLP, and the restoration effort in Montana to recover vital wetlands, floodplains, and watersheds in our state!

Exciting new project in the Elkhorn Mountains southeast of Helena. Upper reaches of McClellan Creek watershed, looking at restoring beaver to a previously occupied area to increase wetland base naturally possible trapping old mine discharge or sediments in beaver pond wetlands, to enhance water quality downstream. Anyone having worked on beaver restoration recently, please contact [Steve Carpenedo](#) or [Tom Hinz](#).

Working with NRCS and BLM to develop multi-year funding for Madison River Conservation Initiative which would increase on the ground restoration efforts from the upper end of Ennis Lake southward up the Madison Valley for a distance of about 30 river miles. Building upon successes in the O’Dell Creek project area to date which is now in its sixth year of restoration.

Working with DEQ and partners in developing a Wetland Program Development Grant proposal in response to the RFP from EPA Region 8 which will likely address several tasks in response to the national core element: “Voluntary Restoration and Protection.”

Working with Steve Carpenedo in anticipation of a wetland/watershed restoration integration project that kicks off July 1. Looking for watersheds where TMDL is done and watershed restoration planning is at least being looked at to develop a replicable approach to integrate wetland restoration priorities with the needs of the TMDL to restore areas contributing to water quality problems in the watershed. Probably looking at two watersheds for this pilot work, possibly one in western MT and one in eastern. May look at continuing this work with future grants as well.

MWLP website update is now completed. Visit the Legacy at www.wetlandslegacy.org to see new projects plus find links to Legacy partners and sponsoring businesses.

September 21 will be a field trip in the Bozeman area as part of a regional workshop Blackfoot Trumpeter Swans – Blackfoot Challenge, USFWS, FWP

Lynda Saul, DEQ.

Vulnerable Wetland and Public Policy Working Group:

Works as an ad hoc Working Group – issued based – welcome ideas and participation. Regarding prairie pothole wetland and wetlands in grassland complexes: Ducks Unlimited reported last year (2009) over 11, 000 acres of native grass land were broken for the first time in Montana. Information is from county records. This is on the increase, with more than 46,000 acres of native grasslands broken for crop production in the last five years in Montana. What is the correlation with wetland loss or lost functions from habitat fragmentation?

On the policy front

- CWRA has been revised and a new bill introduced titled, “America’s Commitment to Clean Water Act” Bill: HR 5088.
- Water Quality Standards and 401 certification: New project beginning July 1 to integrate wetlands protection with more of DEQ’s Clean Water Act responsibilities.

Majority of Montana’s wetland are in riparian areas and in developments path. Recently, Working Group has focused on floodplains, riparian, land use planning issues.

Floodplain wetland specific projects:

- Three channel migration studies with local governments and local watershed groups. Include Flathead River (upstream, into the lake), Ruby River, (dam to confluence with Beaverhead), Prickly Pear Creek/Helena valley.
- Project with DNRC floodplain staff on a status map of mapped floodplains, We have about status map of where wetlands are mapped, similar tool for floodplains, local governments can only regulate in FEMA mapped floodplains.
- Governor’s Task Force for Riparian Protection. DEQ Wetland Program has funded a contract with MACD to conduct riparian best management practices

listening sessions across the state. Have held eight, four to go. Final report out in meeting in Helena October 8th.

- New project – RFP out mid-May. “Opportunities for strengthening policies and programs for the protection of natural floodplain functions and resources in Montana.” Critical in-depth analysis. Are there federal, state or local practices, policies, or laws that allow or contribute to impacts to the natural and beneficial functions of floodplains? Will involve research, interviews with practitioners, evaluation of case studies.

Riparian Public Service Announcement showed video for Council audience. This riparian education campaign is funded by a 319 grant from DEQ that includes television and radio spots, print ads, and Lewis & Clark Co has a billboard. All material is available for others to use.

Council Meeting Focus – Invasive Plant in Wetlands and Aquatic Areas.

Lynda Saul introduced the meeting focus and posed these questions: Why do so many of the worst weeds invade wetlands and aquatic areas? Why do so many of these invaders form monotypes? What should wetland restoration practitioners and wetland managers do about these challenges? Next to habitat loss, invasive species are resource management’s biggest challenge.

Joy Zedler and Suzanne Kercher botany department at the University of Wisconsin-Madison paper in Critical Review in Plant Science titled: “Causes and Consequences of Invasive Plants in Wetlands: Opportunities, Opportunists, and Outcomes”

They propose that the accumulation of material in wetlands make them particularly vulnerable to invasion, while at the same time supplying invaders with the resource they need (water, nutrients) to form monotypes

Lynda shared some information from Amy Bamber, Chief Technical Services Bureau, Montana Dept of Agriculture. Typically \$1.3 million is granted out annually in Montana via the Noxious Weed Trust Fund (for the development and implementation of weed management programs; provide for research and development of innovative weed management techniques, including biological control; and to support educational and other research projects that benefit Montana citizens). About one-third is spent on issues related to riparian areas and water bodies, yet wetlands and riparian areas make up about only about 5% of Montana land mass. This highlights the vulnerability of these areas and the need to focus on prevention of invasions for wetlands and aquatic areas.

Invasive plant control in wetland and aquatic areas should be approached with caution for a number of reasons:

- Proximity to water makes chemical contamination of surface and groundwater much harder to avoid or impossible to control.
- Wetlands are critical habitat areas for a large number of wildlife species, 60% of Montana species identified as having the greatest conservation need by DFWP. Invasive plant control can disturb or destroy habitat.

- Mechanical removal of invasive plants can lead to erosion and resulting siltation of the waterway.

In preparing for this Council meeting, Lynda learned there is a tremendous amount of work on weeds and invasives going on in Montana and there are many people with lots of expertise and experience, several of whom are with us today to share their knowledge. Lynda also stated that riparian areas infested with Salt Cedar, Russian Olive, and other invaders is a large issue and we will devote a future Council meeting to riparian invaders.

Wetland Weeds and Invasive Plants 101

Presented by Scott Mincemoyer, Program Botanist, MT Natural Heritage Program

Invasive weeds threaten many natural habitats across Montana, but they have the potential to be particularly problematic in wetland and aquatic habitats. To successfully manage and restore wetland habitats invasive species must be understood and addressed. A first step in that process involves familiarizing oneself with the potential invaders that need to be considered when working with wetlands in Montana. This overview will focus on wetland invasive plants with general information being presented on their distribution, abundance, habitat preferences, identifying characteristics and legal status.

Managing Invasive Aquatic Weeds in Western Montana – a Case Study

Presented by Celestine Duncan, Consultant, Weed Management Services

Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*), curly-leaf pondweed (*Potamogeton crispus* L.), and flowering rush (*Butomus umbellatus*) are non-native, perennial plants that grow in aquatic habitats including ponds, lakes, and rivers. All three plants are established in Montana, and threaten the ecological integrity of aquatic environments in the state. Eurasian watermilfoil (EWM) was first reported in Montana in 2007, and currently occupies about 364 acres in Noxon Rapids and Cabinet Gorge Reservoirs in Sanders County. Flowering rush was first reported in Montana in 1964 in Flathead Lake where it subsequently spread downstream infesting the Clark Fork River, and Thompson Falls, Noxon and Cabinet Gorge Reservoirs. The plant occupies 74 acres combined in these reservoirs, and about 1500 acres in Flathead Lake. Curly-leaf pondweed was first reported in Montana in 1974 and currently infests 668 acres in these lower Clark Fork reservoirs, and has been reported in rivers, lakes, and reservoirs both east and west of the Continental divide. All three weeds are classified as Priority 1B noxious weeds in Montana. Relatively recent dates for introduction, rapid spread characteristics, and potential impacts caused by non-native aquatic plants, increases need and urgency to protect non-infested water bodies; and contain, control, and eradicate (where feasible) existing infestations. Protection of non-infested waters is complex due to proximity of known infestations in adjoining states and provinces, abundance of susceptible water bodies, high levels of recreational use especially from out-of-state angler/boaters, water-flow characteristics, and disturbance of the aquatic environment.

The EWM Task Force formed in Sanders County in 2007 to develop and implement an integrated management program on EWM in Noxon and Cabinet Gorge Reservoirs. The program includes public education and outreach, prevention, inventory, research (management and monitoring) and development of long-term management strategies.

Point surveys of both lakes were conducted in 2008 to determine location and extent of invasive aquatic plants. Bottom barriers were installed near public and private boat docks to reduce potential for spread on watercraft, and a public education and boat inspection program was initiated. Dye and herbicide field trials were conducted in 2009 to determine efficacy of herbicide treatments and impacts to non-target aquatic plants. Triclopyr and endothall (aquatic-labeled herbicides) were applied in combination to control both EWM and curly leaf pondweed. Results 5 weeks after treatment indicated an average of 85% control over two sites with tolerance to treatments shown by a variety of native aquatic plants. Follow-up vegetation monitoring (1 year after treatment) and additional field trials are proposed for 2010. Three check stations for watercraft are scheduled to be established in 2010 to help reduce movement of invasive aquatic plants leaving reservoirs. There are two other mobile inspection stations scheduled for use at key access points in the state to help reduce movement of invasive aquatic species entering Montana.

Addressing the Pathways by Which Invasive Wetland and Aquatic Plants Are Introduced: Aquariums, Boats, Landscaping, and Field Crews.

Presented by Eric Hanson, State Invasive Species Coordinator, Montana Department of Agriculture.

Many of the pathways by which invasive plants can be introduced to Montana are addressed by current regulations and programs. Unfortunately, the majority on introductions in the United States have occurred by unintended actions, the kid releasing his aquarium pet, the homeowner stocking his backyard pond with a pretty flower, the boater from the East Coast with weeds on his boat trailer and the field crews that move throughout watersheds without cleaning their gear.

Most of these pathways can be addressed by education, but resource management work often creates pathways that could spread invasive species to unique and critical habitats for already endangered species. Next to habitat loss, invasive species are resource management's biggest challenge. There is a need for agency field crews to start implementing Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) to reduce or eliminate the spread of unwanted species. See HACCP Website: <http://www.haccp-nrm.org>. Examine existing sampling protocols and plans for the potential to transport invasive species. Other examples include: decontamination protocol to reduce the risk of spreading infectious amphibian disease www.ccadc.us/docs/deconforprofessionals.pdf Idaho DEQ Procedures for Decontamination of Monitoring Equipment http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water/data_reports/surface_water/monitoring/decontamination_procedures.pdf. The Pacific Northwest Interagency Monitoring Program Invasive Species Disinfection Protocol <http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/reports/watershed/invasivespeciesprotocolfinal.pdf> Bureau of Reclamation Inspection and Cleaning Manual http://www.usbr.gov/pps/EquipmentInspectionandCleaningManual_Sept09.pdf

Eric suggested a call for action is needed:

- Develop a state standardized set of procedures
- Promote adoption by state agencies
- Require state funded contractors, consultants and equipment operators to follow procedures as a contractual agreement

[Managing Weeds on MDT Wetland Mitigation Projects.](#)

Presenter Phil Johnson, Reclamation Specialist, Montana Department of Transportation.

MDT has an active wetland mitigation unit within the Environmental Services Bureau. Two positions, a wetland mitigation specialist and a wetland engineer work together to select candidate sites to design and construct projects that are used for crediting to offset impacts from road construction activities. Part of the crediting process involves establishing performance goals that become part of the application for credit. These goals –or standards- are measured each year and are used to evaluate the success of the project and determine whether or not the project goals are being met. Currently, the performance standard for weeds is to not exceed 5% total cover within the mitigation site boundaries. MDT actively monitors and reports weed populations during the establishment period of the wetland. In previous years MDT maintenance crews or County weed district personnel have conducted herbicide applications at our mitigation sites. Beginning in 2010, MDT will contract out weed control at our mitigation sites to a commercial herbicide applicator on a statewide basis.

Often times MDT projects are located in areas where noxious weeds and/or non-native grasses existed prior to wetland construction activities. We try to balance control of undesirable plants with potential non-target impacts that may conflict with the overall goal of the wetland development. This means that MDT does not employ a zero-tolerance strategy, but evaluate each site individually for compliance with our established goals and long-term trend assessment.

[Overview of the Current Permitting Process for Application of Pesticides in State Waters and Imminent Changes to a MPDES Permitting Process.](#)

Presenters: Jeff Ryan, Water Quality/Wetlands Specialist, Water Protection Bureau, Montana DEQ and Jenny Chambers, Water Protection Bureau Chief, Montana DEQ.

Presented an overview of how DEQ currently issues short-term exemptions from surface water quality standards (308 Authorizations) for application of pesticides in state waters and a brief overview of how that process will be changed to a Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (MPDES) permitting procedure, based on recent court challenges to EPA. Brochure titled: [“Aquatic Weed Management in Montana”](#)

Lynda reported that EPA’s Dave Rise indicated the scope of the Pesticide General nationwide. About 5.6 million applications annually by 365,000 applicators using 400+ different pesticides in about 3500 product labels. EPA has developed aquatic life benchmarks. Comparing a measured concentration of a pesticide in water with an aquatic life benchmark can be helpful in interpreting monitoring data, and to identify and prioritize sites and pesticides that may require further investigation.

http://www.epa.gov/oppefed1/ecorisk_ders/aquatic_life_benchmark.htm

Wetland Invasive Plant Panel: Restoration Practitioners Share Their Experiences

Short presentations will overview select target invaders, adaptations that make it successful, how to address the plants' traits during management (prevention, control, etc.) and restoration projects (pre- and post-construction), and techniques to increase diversity of desired plant species. Panel members will kick off the discussion and rely on participation from the audience to help identify management approaches.

Reed Canarygrass

Presented by Monica Pokorny, Wildlife Habitat Restoration Specialist, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Natural Resources Department, Wildlife Management Program.

Questions: Does water level make a difference? There are floating masses, but this hasn't been determined. Unfortunately, we did not capture the rich question and answer session for this portion of the panel discussion. Please contact Monica for more information about her experience with Reed canarygrass.

Invasive Grasses

Presented by Tara Luna, Botanist, Montana Natural Heritage Program

Question: Is creeping foxtail still recommended for pasture? Answer: Should be off the list now, but has been in the past.

Question: Is there a use for Garrison in the polluted ground around Anaconda? Answer: Probably wouldn't tolerate dryness of the Anaconda area. Garrison is tolerant of heavy grassing so won't control it.

Question: Would burning control it? Answer: Not aware of it. Garrisons sod is 12 to 15 inches and burning might get a couple of inches and that's it. With meadow foxtail not sure about burning for control but tarping would work better.

Cattails

Presented by Bob Sanders, Manager of Conservation Programs, Montana Ducks Unlimited, Inc.

Question: What about hybrid cattail? Answer: Narrow leaf or regular, the combination of the two seems to be the less desirable.

Question: How do you identify the hybrid? Answer: Don't know of an easy way.

Question: Is the concern over cattail more species diversity issue for providing wildlife habitat? Answer: Regarding the degrees of geological succession there are good aspects both ways. Typically you want some interspersed for any cattail stand to accommodate a variety of species. Examples are seed producers for birds for foraging or species for invertebrates and fish. Grasses sedges and rushes help the mix. There maybe a situation where you want a cattail colony for a particular species. Cattail is both a friend and foe.

Question: Is using muskrats a good management tool and is it legal? Answer: Same as beaver, would need a permit from DFWP to move animals. Animals naturally migrate in nature for habitat needs. If you look at the drought cycle the muskrats can be killed out.

Question: Can you design a shelf to break the wave action? Answer: Yes this is used.

You can create deeper water area and shallow areas and for wetland to contain cattails in a specific area. This can be done where you have sculpted edges for more diversity but is

more costly. The less side slope you have the less dirt you need to put in. Typical DU cost is \$2000 per acre to restore a wetland in eastern/central Montana, so this becomes much more costly when you start putting more variance in the wetland.

Yellowflag Iris

Presented by Peter Husby, State Biologist, Natural Resource Conservation Service

It's found mainly east of the divide and along 1000 irrigation miles in Lake county. Control via a late fall application of roundup has worked best. The county starts at the headwaters and works down stream. This plant will close an irrigation canal with overgrowth. Seeds float down the stream and they have put out mesh to catch the aspirin sized seeds.

Post Panel Discussion:

Managing invasive plants when we are trying to maximize the amount of wetland restoration with funding sources is tough because a lot of Montana just doesn't have the funds. With MDT the Corp of Engineer puts performance standards on mitigation sites with conditions that must be met. At some point it is an important consideration that we need to think about for future management of these areas. In some areas where they were trying to manage reed canary grass they are losing. Once established it's really hard to fix. If DNRC makes new standards for wetland water rights then vegetative diversity of restored wetland might not be able to meet performance standards because of monoculture of some of these plants. For some of these plants from a practical stand point are difficult to control. NRCS was recommending tall wheat grass for re-vegetation.

Learning as much as we can about the life history and cycle of these plants is the best approach to decide what plants are best for a given area and how to prevent and control invaders.

We don't have enough resources to control these invaders after the fact. Helpful to identify plants that are moving in so that we can look for these plants before they become a monoculture to control. There is free training going on around the state to help identify. When we think of restoration we are trying to maximize our dollar and may need to have a shift of mind set and restore smaller acreages to a higher quality. If we have the option to restore a large area that could come under development then we should get those acres and improve later. Open up an area or canary grass, identify the potential area and do the best we can for the site potential. Manipulate the site to make it more functional.

Other resources: Tara Luna spoke at a previous Council meeting about using native plants in wetland restoration. It was an excellent presentation and provides a good compliment to our focus on invasive plants. [Wetland Restoration Using Native Plants](#).

The State Department of Agriculture revised the [Montana Noxious Weed List](#), effective January 2010.

Next Council meeting in October will focus on ephemeralization of streams and the role of beavers in wetland development and keeping water on the landscape.

Reminder: September 21- 24, 2010. Wetland Program Capacity Building Workshop - Bozeman. MT, UT, WY, ND, SD, CO, Tribes. Sept 21 Field Sessions, Sept 22-23 Workshop, Sept 24 Sustainable Program Financing. See details at: [Wetland Capacity Building Workshop](#)

Council meeting adjourned. Thanked everyone for attending and contributing, especially thank today's presenters

**Montana Wetland Council
Sign In Sheet
May 5, 2010 Meeting**

	Name	Representing	E-Mail
1	Clint Folden	CSKT	clintf@cskt.org
2	Glenn Patrick	Farm Service Agency Bozeman	Glenn.patrick@mt.usda.gov
3	Rick Arnold	Bozeman	Rarnold50@bresnan.net
4	Kerry Fee	JBTU	Kerry86303@yahoo.com
5	Dennis Hildebrand	Mineral County CD	Spr3335@blackfoot.net
6	Jim Domino	MT DNRC, State Water Projects	jdomino@mt.gov
7	Linda Brander	DNRC	lbrander@mt.gov
8	Joe Weigand	FWP	joweigand@mt.gov
9	Michelle Hutchins	Missoula Water Quality Dist.	HutchinsM@ho.missoula.mt.us
10	Peter Lesica	Consultant, Missoula	Peter.lesica@mso.umt.edu
11	Joe Walks Along	Northern Cheyenne Tribe	Joe.walksalong@cheyennenation.com
12	Pam Boggs	FWP	pboggs@mt.gov
13	Russell Smith	MSU	r.smith@awsmt.com
14	Bob Sanders	Ducks Unlimited	rsanders@ducks.org
15	Erik Hanson	MT Dept of Ag	Ehanson2@mt.gov
16	Andrea Silverman	Prickly Pear Land Trust	andrea@pricklypearlt.org
17	Dave Stagliano	MT NHP	dstagliano@mt.gov
18	Scott Mincemoyer	MT NHP	smincemoyer@mt.gov
19	Todd Garrett	FWP	tgarrett@mt.gov
20	Janet Bender-Keigley	MT Watercourse	jkeigley@montana.edu
21	Meghan Burns	MT NHP	Mburns2@mt.gov
22	Cat McIntyre	MT NHP	cmcintyre@mt.gov
23	Erika Colaiacomo	MT NHP	ecolaiacomo@mg.gov
24	Joe Meek	MT DEQ	jmeek@mt.gov
25	Steve Guettermann	MT Water Center	Stephen.guettermann@montana.edu
26	Monica Pokorny	CSKT	monicap@cskt.org
27	Randy Apfelbeck	MT DEQ	rapfelbeck@mt.gov
28	Jeanie Spaur	Ft Peck Tribes	jeannespaur@yahoo.com
29	Dennis Longknife	Fort Belknap Wetlands Program	dlongknife@hotmail.com
30	Sarah Holden	MT Dept of Ag	saholden@mt.gov
31	William Andrews	Missoula Weed District	will@missoulaeduplace.org
32	Tracy Novak	Wetland Consultant. Bozeman	mtnovak@q.com
33	Linda Johns	MT Dept of Ag	ljohns@mt.gov
34	Celestine Duncan	WMS	Weeds1@wildblue.net
35	Mike Mooney	BLM – Dillon	Mmooney@blm.gov
36	Phil Walsh	USFS	pwalsh@fs.fed.us
37	Janet Ellis	MT Audubon	jellis@mtsudubon.org
38	Diane Tipton	FWP	dtipton@mt.gov
39	Steve Cook	MT DEQ	Scook2@mt.gov
40	Chris Forristal	USFWS	Chris_forristal@fws.gov
41	Alicia Stickney	DNRC	astickney@mt.gov

42	Melissa Griffiths	MVRG Weed Committee	mgriffiths@3rivers.net
43	Ron Orton	Allied Engineering	rorton@alliedengineering.com
44	Thomas Probert	BLM-HiLine District	Tom_Probert@blm.gov
45	Jeff Ryan	MT DEQ	jeryan@mt.gov
46	Phil Johnson	Mt Dept of Transportation	phjohnson@mt.gov
47	Bonnie Gundrum	MDT	bgundrum@mt.gov
48	Karen Kaitala	Powell County Weed Dist.	powellweed@bresnan.net
49	Tom Hinz	FWP	thinz@mt.gov
50	Steve Carpenedo	MT DEQ	Scarpenedo2@mt.gov
51	Lynda Saul	MT DEQ	lsaul@mt.gov
52	Carol Gilmore	MT DEQ	cgilmore@mt.gov