

**From:** [Jim Martell](#)  
**To:** [Rulesinfo](#)  
**Cc:** [Terry Lee](#); [Bonnie Davis - Washington](#); [Alan Martinson](#); [John Cenarrusa](#); [Whitmill, Mitch](#)  
**Subject:** 02.06.22 noxious weed rule  
**Date:** Thursday, May 18, 2017 3:44:03 PM

---

Hello, I am Jim Martell. I am the weed superintendent for Canyon county Noxious Weed. I am opposed to all 4 options presented for this proposed rule. This issue is clearly not a state wide problem, as illustrated by the map presented by Fish and Game at the May 17th 2017 meeting. Therefore please do not pretend to solve the issue with additions to a statewide Idaho code. Blaine County has taken the lead in establishing a program that may serve as a model for affected areas. This model may allow for creating zones by county ordinance for high risk areas.

I am concerned that the 40 Noxious Weed departments will not be able to fulfill the goals of the petitioners for the many reasons suggested in the letter presented by Superintendent Terry Lee on May 17th. I feel that a very important issue has been overlooked. Current owners legally purchased, installed and cared for their shrubs and or now 40ft trees. Who will replace or compensate their losses. I know those 40 weed departments are never adequately funded to accomplish even 20% of the tasks outlined in the Noxious Weed Law as it reads now. So what happens every time someone adds to the work load that "they" (weed departments) are asked to complete. I will say that less of the work that is capable of success will be completed. My experience and observations across the State lead me to believe that the current list of noxious weeds needs to be treated with common sense by reducing the list, not adding to it.

Thanks, Jim

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone