

Thorn Comments – London Invasive Plan Management Strategy:

- The document is very detailed about the policies and legislation supporting the control of invasive plant species, and I understand the need to provide a policy context for the development and implementation of an invasive plant management strategy. However, the document spends too much time directly quoting the supporting sections out of these various policies and legislation. Many of the statements supporting the control of invasive species are very similar among the policies and legislation, which makes the “Policy Context” section difficult to read. Perhaps this section can be made more concise by summarizing the main ways in which the existing policy and legislation support the invasive plant management strategy.
- Incorporate the various departments of the City directly into the “Strategic Process” section of the management strategy instead of talking about the Storm Water Management and Parks Operations departments as separate sections at the end of the document. This will better establish the need to incorporate all relevant departments of the City into the invasive plant management strategy.
- Why were the four priority invasive plant species selected? It would be helpful to specifically explain why Phragmites, Japanese Knotweed, Dog Strangling Vine, and Giant Hogweed were selected as priority species.
- In the “Socio-Economic” subsection of “Impacts of Invasive Species” the primary example provided for the economic impacts of invasive species was Emerald Ash Borer. Though I agree this is an important invader, the example is poorly chosen given the section is about the impacts of invasive plants. Perhaps a specific example of the economic impacts of plants would be more effective and illustrative.
- The document could be improved by making a section emphasizing the effectiveness of invasive plant species control programs. The document speaks broadly about how the control of invasive species is important for the health of the natural heritage features and will reduce future control costs. However, do invasive plant species control programs work and on what scale? Are there existing examples of programs that are effectively controlling invasive plant species? St. Thomas was used as a case study, but there is not sufficient evidence provided about this example to support whether invasive plant management is truly effective. Providing evidence to support the viability of invasive plant species control programs will help bolster support from council and the community because there are doubts about whether we can manage such a persistent and widespread threat.
- More detail about the implementation of the strategic process for invasive plant species management would strengthen the document. Currently, the strategic process section is very high level and provides few specific details about the implementation of the strategy. Also, more information regarding “who” will be involved in the various steps of the strategic process will be helpful. For example, who is going to do the inventory/mapping or deal with early detection? Who will be involved with the rapid response to an early detection of an invasive plant? Providing more detail on implementation will make the strategy seem more feasible and realistic.