



VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE
LANDSCAPE ADVISORY COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, June 29th, 2021, 7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order:

The Special Meeting of the Village of Riverside Landscape Advisory Commission was held on Tuesday June 29th, 2021 at the Riverside Township Hall, Room 22, 27 Riverside Rd, Riverside, IL 60546. Chairperson Maloney called the Special Meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Chairperson Maloney; Commissioners Lambros, Lucero, Plunkett, Rubin, Schaff

Absent: Commissioner Cody

Also Present: Public Works Director Tabb

3. Consider Approval of June 8th, 2021, Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the June 8th, 2021 regular meeting minutes as amended by Commissioner Lucero, seconded by Commissioner Plunkett.

AYES: Maloney, Rubin, Plunkett, Lambros, Lucero

NAYES: None

Motion carried.

Changes include: Item 4, Review and Discuss Olmsted Outlook Plan, "Shaun Sinn to Shawn Sinn, owner of Semper Fi Landscape Services Inc."

4. Public Comment

None

New Business

5. Review and Discuss Swan Pond Maintenance Options

Chairperson Maloney asked the commission to comment on the white paper proposal to the Board regarding the Swan Pond maintenance plan. Maloney reiterated the commission's position on Swan Pond and the fact that they believe mowing to still be the best option for cost purposes, containment of invasives, and public engagement. Director Tabb confirmed the Village's plan is to not mow Swan Pond, other than a few paths, and move forward with controlling invasive species through two applications of an EPA approved aquatic herbicide twice per year. In addition, the Village would try and do a controlled burn in Swan Pond if conditions allowed. Questions were raised whether or not the sprayed areas would be flagged once herbicide had been applied. Director Tabb confirmed that the contractor was already made aware of the need to do this. Commissioner Schaff commented as part of the Commission's plan there should be photo documentation at specific periods throughout the year. The Commission agreed that although the discussion may be "closed" on the Swan Pond topic they would still like to present their plan to the Board.

Motion to approve the amended recommendations on the Swan Pond Maintenance Plan for Board presentation by Commissioner Schaff, Seconded by Commissioner Lucero. The recommendations will be presented to the Village Board via email.

AYES: Maloney, Rubin, Plunkett, Lucero, Schaff, Lambros

NAYES: None

Motion carried.

Old Business

6. *Review and Discuss Bench Policy*

Chairperson Maloney reviewed the Park Bench Policy asking commissioners to comment on aspects of the plan that may reduce the number of new benches. Director Tabb noted that donors of benches have specific locations in mind when applying for a park bench. Tabb mentioned that if the Village were to dictate locations, he surmised that people would no longer be interested in donating. Chairperson Maloney asked if any Commissioner would be interested in crafting a proposal to amend the Park Bench Policy. Chairperson Maloney did not receive interest from any of the Commissioners.

Review and Discuss No Mow May Update

50 out of 650 homes in Shorewood, Wisconsin participated in the No Mow May concept with positive reviews. Commissioners agreed that due to the public reaction on dandelions perhaps No Mow May is not a feasible idea.

Review and Discuss Landscape Video Status

Chairperson Maloney stated the Landscape Video, in its draft form, may be ready for viewing. Maloney suggested that each Commissioner take a look at their section and provide comments via email to the editing crew.

7. *Chairperson's Report*

Chairperson Maloney explained that Commissioner Cody's term on the Landscape Advisory Commission has expired and she will not be returning. Chairperson Maloney thanked

Commissioner Cody for all her creativity and effort during her tenure as Commissioner of the Landscape Advisory Commission.

8. *Standing Discussion Topics*

Master Landscape Plan

Commissioner Plunkett mentioned the great work that was done by the scouts on the triangle and her interest in possibly doing a similar project on a signature triangle. Chairperson Maloney suggested focusing on Swan Pond as part of the Master Landscape Plan.

Outreach and Education

Insect Bioblitz

Commissioner Schaff mentioned that the scheduled Insect Bioblitz will need to be rescheduled. A date of late August or early September was suggested. Commissioner Schaff will reschedule with the entomologist. Commissioner Plunkett discussed the possibility of interjecting an oak tree discussion during the Bioblitz.

Picnic Like its 1869

Commissioner Schaff stated the picnic banner was dropped off at Minuteman Press to get reworked. Commissioner Schaff continues to work on the picnic and is searching for an additional musical element.

ENewsletter Topic and Distribution Alternatives

Chairperson Maloney suggested possibly doing ENewsletter submissions on a quarterly basis due to the pace of postings.

Arboretum

Tours

Commissioner Plunkett suggested doing an arboretum tour in conjunction with the Insect Bioblitz and Picnic Like its 1869.

Data

Commissioner Rubin continues to upload pictures to iTree and looks forward to working with the Village's new GIS analyst.

Homeowner Guide to Planting Brochure

Chairperson Maloney mentioned that there was great interest in the brochure at the Village Hall. Cathy Haley would be printing additional copies for disbursement.

8. *Forester's Report*

No Report

Other Business

Commissioner Lambros is working on a write up for the Scout triangle that will be submitted to the Landmark. Commissioner Lambros suggested a possible collaboration between the LAC and Public Works to redo an additional triangle.

9. Motion to adjourn:

A motion to adjourn at 8:53 p.m. by Commissioner Rubin, second by Commissioner Lucero.

AYES: Maloney, Rubin, Plunkett, Lucero, Lambros, Schaff

NAYES: None

Motion carried.

Minutes Taken By:

Minutes Approved By:

Director Tabb



To: Board of Trustees, Village of Riverside

From: Landscape Advisory Commission

Re: Executive Summary and Memorandum in follow-up to June 17 VBOT appearance

Thank you for providing the Landscape Advisory Commission the opportunity to speak at the Board of Trustees meeting on June 17, 2021. We are all committed to a beautiful vibrant landscape for Riverside. As promised, the attached memo discusses the landscape concepts and criteria to help the Board as it moves forward with its plan to transition the landscape of Swan Pond to a managed natural area, both for 2021 and in planning for 2022.


To date, mowing Swan Pond has been successful. Mowing has controlled invasive species, and creates usable green space. In an Olmsted design, green space purposefully resembles the pastoral English style, "Village Green." The green space supports public gathering and passive recreation, activities like picnicking or children running and playing through the open space.

The Board has voted to transition the entirety of Swan Pond from the mowed turf approach to a managed natural area. For 2022, Public Works has proposed a plan for management that includes one spring mowing, and herbicide applications and prescribed burns to remove invasive plants. If this approach is approved, the LAC recommends that the LAC and Public Works collaborate to establish criteria for determining what constitutes success in evaluating Swan Pond's transition to a managed natural area. The LAC recommends that the site be formally evaluated at least three times in 2022: after the spring mowing, mid-summer, and in the fall. Photographic documentation of said site should be taken to compare against benchmarks of success.

We furthermore ask the Board to reconsider the original 2017 plan from Living Habitats to gradually add managed natural areas to the low-lying wetland areas where it would be more helpful in alleviating floods (as opposed to the south unmowed area).

For 2021, we recommend the continuance of mowing, since a comprehensive plan for managing the (unmowed) natural area is not defined for the present.

The LAC was pleased to work with Public Works on implementing the Swan Pond floodplain planting project in 2017. Through trial and error, the native plantings have successfully replaced the previous matted brown turf that resulted from flooding events, and the plantings have been successful in draining Swan Pond more quickly. Managing the floodplain was a necessary investment for the Village to make.



This 2017 plan also provided for an aesthetic additional planted area further south in Swan Pond. Should the current attempt to transition Swan Pond to a natural area need to be revisited, the Board may want to take a second look at the consultant's proposal for mowed turf with an additional large native planted area. This approach will require significant budget and volunteer investment, but it harmonizes the historical design of Swan Pond with the modernization of native natural plantings.

Thank you again for your stewardship of our village. Please let us know if there is any additional information we can provide.

Overview

Swan Pond is an exquisite asset to the Village of Riverside, and one named as “the hidden gem of the Village” by residents.¹ Part of a natural floodplain along the Des Plaines River, it serves important ecological as well as aesthetic purposes.

At its May 20, 2021 meeting, in a discussion on containing landscape maintenance costs, the Village Board voted to discontinue mowing Swan Pond. While we applaud the Board’s point of view that a naturalistic landscape is pleasing, this decision appears to have been made without the context of the:

1. Background of Swan Pond
2. Distinction between a “wild” landscape and a “managed natural area.”
3. Effect of invasive plants and noxious weeds
4. Investment already made in Swan Pond landscaping
5. Financial cost/benefit analysis of mowing Swan Pond
6. Alternatives on Swan Pond Maintenance

We urge the Board to reconsider this decision and be open to a recommendation from the Landscape Advisory Commission as contained within this memo.

1. Background of Swan Pond

When Frederick Law Olmsted designed Riverside, the Swan Pond area featured prominently as a haven of natural beauty. The topography differed then; an ox-bow stream meandered through the plain and then rejoined the river, forming what was called “Picnic Island.” Vegetation appears untrimmed during these early years as seen in photographs, or may have been kept under control by browsing ruminants. We do not know how this area was maintained, but the label on the plan, “Picnic Island” suggests that the area was intended for outdoor gatherings.

In Olmsted’s day, invasive plants (nonnative, aggressive plants that alter the natural ecosystem), were not a significant concern. Olmsted advised against so-called “exotic” plants (nonnative, showy flowers typically suited to tropical climates), however his concerns on these plants were primarily design-related. Invasive plants, largely due to human introductions, have increased significantly across the United States prompting the 1999 U.S. Presidential Executive Order to establish the National Invasive Species Council to respond to the accelerating problem of invasive species.²

In the 20th century, significant changes were made to the natural flow of the Des Plaines River including channeling and modifications to the Hofmann dam. In 2012, as part of the Hofmann dam removal project, the US Army Corps of Engineers regraded Swan Pond. Nonetheless, by

2016, increasingly frequent weather events such as intense rainfalls rendered the Swan Pond area unusable for active sports, and impenetrable for mowers.

The Village Board asked the Landscape Advisory Commission for input as to appropriate Swan Pond plantings. In 2016, based on LAC recommendations, the Village of Riverside entered into a contract with landscape consultant Heidi Natura of Living Habitats to develop a planting and maintenance plan for Swan Pond that considers environmental and design factors (Attachment 1). The essence of the plan was to plant the lowest-lying area subject to flooding (about $\frac{3}{4}$ acre) with native plant material that would 1) survive drought and flooding conditions and 2) ameliorate some extent of the flooding with plant selections that absorb material amounts of water. The rest of the Swan Pond area (just under 4 acres) would be mowed to keep invasive plants at bay and to provide the turf and trees contrast with the naturalistic “wetland” plants.

The previous Village Board approved the plan, and in 2017, the village staff, along with many volunteers planted about 10,000 native plant plugs in a section of Swan Pond. The intention was that Swan Pond be mowed, except for this newly planted site. Since then, the planted site has been monitored and maintained to assess its overall viability.

Due to the pandemic in 2020, and attendant resource constraints, Swan Pond was not mowed. While it was a novelty to leave Swan Pond unmowed last year and there was no harm done, the long-term impact of not mowing could undermine our most deliberate efforts to support Olmsted's design in this quintessential Riverside vista. It would not take long for the novelty of a naturalistic area to become just another area of overgrowth with no maintenance plan in place.

2. Distinction between a “wild” landscape and a “managed natural area.”

At the May 20, 2021 Village Board meeting, mention was made that residents and Board members alike appreciated the “look” of a natural landscape. While the LAC is delighted that people enjoy naturalistic designs, it should be made abundantly clear that there is a major difference between a “wild” or “natural” garden or landscape, and a managed natural area. It is as fundamental as the design of Riverside itself: Olmsted designed Riverside as if to appear carved out of a wilderness, but of course, it is an illusion. A great deal of forethought, and thousands of hours and effort over the past 150 years have been required for Riverside to maintain its “natural look.”

If the mowed area of Swan Pond is allowed to devolve into an unmanaged property, it can become infested with noxious weeds, invasive plants, and undesirable plants such as poison ivy or wild parsnip. Even with a spring and fall mowing, the undesirable plants could be an attractive nuisance during the growing season, and can spread to the managed area of Swan Pond and beyond over a few years. As the Illinois Department of Natural Resources notes, “Management of any habitat is critical in conserving the integrity and connectivity of native habitat.”³

A case in point is the famed “Ramble” in New York City’s Central Park. As the Central Park Conservancy notes:

Park co-designer Frederick Law Olmsted described the Ramble as a “wild garden” to evoke a place that appeared wild but was in fact heavily designed and managed. The substantial upkeep needed to maintain this type of landscape was a challenge and for much of the 20th century, the Ramble and the Park’s other woodland landscapes suffered from neglect, essentially treated as self-sustaining natural environments. This resulted in many problems, including deteriorated infrastructure and the rise of invasive plants.⁴

The Conservancy has since developed a multi-year management plan to restore the Ramble.

3. Effect of invasive plants and noxious weeds

It is a fair question to ask why invasive plants and unmanaged natural areas are undesirable. To many, it is indiscernible if a greenspace is full of native plants or weeds. It may just look like green space. First, definitions:

Invasive plants: Plants that are not native to the Midwest, and which cause (or are likely to cause) harm to environmental, economic, and/or human health.⁵

The negative effects of invasive plants include:

- Invasive species have contributed to the decline of **42%** of U.S. endangered and threatened species, and for **18%** of U.S. endangered or threatened species, invasives are the main cause of their decline.
- Invasive species compete directly with native species for moisture, sunlight, nutrients, and space.
- Overall plant diversity can be decreased
- Establishment and spread of invasive species can degrade wildlife habitat
- Degraded water quality
- Increased soil erosion
- Decreased recreation opportunities⁶

Noxious weed: Any plant which is determined by the Director, the Dean of the College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences of the University of Illinois and the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station at the University of Illinois, to be injurious to public health, crops, livestock, land or other property.⁷ Riverside’s Village ordinance (Chapter 7) specifies that landowners must remove all noxious weeds. There are 10 species currently listed as Illinois noxious weeds (Attachment 2)

Weedy plants: Describing “Weedy” plants can overlap with definitions of invasives and/or noxious weed plants. Illinois wildflowers lists 35 “Weedy Wildflowers of Wetlands” (illinoiswildflowers.info) and lists more than 100 “Weedy Wildflowers of Meadows.” Indicative

of the subjective nature of this classification, the latter list includes plants generally perceived as weeds (poison ivy (*Rhus radicans*), common ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia*), wild parsnip (*Pastinaca sativa*), or poison hemlock (Poison Hemlock (*Conium maculatum*)), but also those typically classified as native and beneficial (e.g. common milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*), or lemon balm (*Melissa officinalis*)).

Because Swan Pond is frequently flooded, the river water can contain undesirable seeds from many upstream sources. Swan Pond, as a relatively open area, is also subject to seed droppings from birds and wind. Closely mown grass, while a monoculture, prevents weeds from spreading by wind, and mitigates rhizomal spread.

As noted in the Chicago Metropolitan Agency Planning (CMAP) study for Riverside, “Shoreline habitat is an essential component of a healthy river system. Improving the quality of shoreline vegetation can help reduce the quantity and improve the quality of stormwater runoff, stabilize site hydrology, and provide habitat, recreation, and aesthetic benefits.”⁸

Invasive plants have become an increasingly significant threat in Riverside and globally in the past several decades.

4. Investment already made in Swan Pond landscaping

As noted, in 2017, at the VBOT direction and after a competitive bid process, the LAC recommended Living Habitats LLC ([Living Habitats - Landscape Architecture](#)) to evaluate the site and prepare a planting plan. About ¾ acre of the land most subject to floods was planted with native plants. This area was selected because mowing there became infeasible due to flooding. The plan contemplated beginning with this area, and, assuming success, gradually expanding the planted area to include successively larger native plant areas radiating outward from the original site. This would address the areas most frequently inundated.

See drawing in Attachment 1.

Costs of the implementation, and maintenance to date are approximated as follows: \$28,000 for design and planning and \$2280 per year for maintenance.

Over the course of three years of monitoring, (2017 – 2020), we have discovered that about 50% of the plant species survived. With this data, we better know which plants are suited to this site. As Swan Pond is a very dynamic site, we expect that this evaluation will be ongoing.

As with any garden, a planting of herbaceous material will need to be weeded and maintained. A planting of native plants, particularly when new, and particularly near a river or stream, will need to be monitored. This will be true of the area proposed near the new riverbank access planned for 2021. Today, our Forestry Department does not have the resources to maintain herbaceous plantings, and this work, such as taking care of the downtown planters, is outsourced.

5. Alternatives For Swan Pond Maintenance

We understand that Swan Pond is a dynamic environment and will need to be constantly monitored, and maintenance plans accordingly adjusted. We understand that cost constraints are in place this year. We also have complete confidence in our Forestry Department to care for our landscape.

For 2021, we recommend continued mowing since a comprehensive plan for a managed natural area has not been implemented (burns or herbicide not planned). This is the safest approach to adopt while additional research is performed. If it is feasible to mow every two weeks instead of every week (during the growing and seed-setting season) this would reduce mowing costs.

In a meeting with the Village Forester, Public Works Director, Village President and Landscape Advisory Commission Chair on June 24, 2021, the Forester and Director of Public Works presented a plan for 2022 for managing the entire Swan Pond area (Option 4 below). The Village President indicated that 1) he and Public Works preferred this option 2) that the Village Board would be unlikely to vote against a staff recommendation and 3) an LAC report would therefore be unnecessary. For this reason, we have not documented herein nor continued our research efforts to include other scientific or independent literature or best practices from other natural area landowners and municipalities. Should the Village Board wish us to proceed with this research, please let us know.

The below are possible alternatives for 2021 and 2022.

Description	Pros	Cons	Approx. Cost*
Option1-Weely mowings (all but existing planned native plantings) (Status quo until 2020)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current native plantings intentionally designed & maintained address area of largest inundations • Mowing remaining area offers grass for aesthetics and passive recreation • Reduces ultimate expansion of invasives 	Mowing cost	\$2400 (6 hours per week for mowing at \$33 average cost per hour times 12 weeks)
Option2-Spring only (Proposed by Public Works for this summer 2021)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces mowing costs • Removes woody invasives (buckthorn, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential “creep” of invasives into native plantings and 	\$200 6 hours per week for mowing at \$33 average cost per hour, spring

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers naturalistic look throughout Swan Pond, but includes possibility of invasives and weeds 	woodlands Potential for pests such as ticks, poison ivy, etc.	
Option 3: Biweekly mowings for 2021	Same as option 1, reduced mowing cost		\$1200 6 hours per week for mowing at \$33 average cost per hour times 6 weeks (assumes straight-line costs – this needs to be verified)
Option4: Spring mowings with application of selective herbicide AquaNeat against Reed Canary Grass. Prescribed burns to promote native plant health.	Same as Option 2 except Reed Canary Grass, phragmites, and cattails are targeted.	Other invasives may establish a hold. Verification of broadcast AquaNeat spraying needed**	\$2400 for herbicide spraying of about 3 ¼ additional acres; cost to perform prescribed burns unknown. (Cost and recommendation obtained from contractor, ILM)


***all options, add \$2280/year to maintain current native plant area. (3 site visits at \$760 each)**

**AquaNeat is currently used on a spot-basis in the small ¾ acres of intentionally planted native plants. In Option 4, the entire 4 acres would be sprayed. At this time, the LAC feels more research is needed, both pro and con on herbicides.⁹

LAC Recommendation:

For 2021, we believe that mowing continues to be a successful method for curtailing invasives. Even if the mowing schedule is adjusted to a bi-weekly schedule and is limited to the primary growing season (July and early August), this should reduce seed spread of undesirable plants, and avoid safety questions to pets and wildlife (ticks and injurious weed growth).

For 2022, we concur that the option proposed by the Public Works Department (Option 4 above) is a viable solution as an experiment. We suggest that this, (and all natural areas) be



maintained following the Integrated Vegetative Management protocol recommended by the EPA. (This is the “plant equivalent” of Integrated Pest Management where the first approach is most benign to the earth and humans/wildlife, and successively, as infestations and/or costs may grow, more stringent methods are used).

We would hope, however, that the Board reexamines the proposal (approved by the previous Board) from Living Habitats that proposes an increasingly wider area of native plantings around the current intentionally planted bed. This would also reduce the amount of mowed area, and direct native plantings where most needed (the low-lying flood-prone areas).

This recommendation also presumes that the LAC can work with the PW Department to identify specific benchmarks to measure the success of the trial. It also presumes that the Village Board considers the following questions:

1. Any potential hazards associated with a large area sprayed with herbicide? Will we need to post signs that children/pets are not allowed during the herbicide application?
2. Will it be possible to perform controlled burns in this area to encourage native plant growth? (Previous efforts to perform burns by the PW and Forestry Department have shown that timing and wind conditions are fickle). Costs for burns have not been factored in.
3. Any potential issues with ticks and other pests (affecting pets and anyone who walks in the new unmowed acreage? Will signage (not something that is particularly desirable) be needed?

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the questions about stewardship of Swan Pond. The Landscape Advisory Commission is fully supportive, and has always enjoyed a wonderful working relationship with the Public Works and Forestry departments. We cannot compliment their service to the community enough. We will be delighted to have them leverage our ability to perform further research.

Attachment 1: Selected Option from Living Habitat's proposal



Note the radiating areas suggested for phased plantings of native plants around the first planted area. Also note recommended maintenance of 30 hours/month.

Attachment 2: Noxious weeds in Illinois (per Illinois Noxious Weed Act)

<u>Canada thistle</u>	<i>Cirsium arvense</i> (L.) Scop.
<u>common ragweed</u>	<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i> L.
<u>giant ragweed</u>	<i>Ambrosia trifida</i> L.
<u>hemp/marijuana (sativa)</u>	<i>Cannabis sativa</i> L.
<u>johnsongrass</u>	<i>Sorghum halepense</i> (L.) Pers.
<u>kudzu</u>	<i>Pueraria montana</i> var. <i>lobata</i> (Willd.) Maesen & S. Almeida
<u>musk thistle</u>	<i>Carduus nutans</i> L.
<u>perennial sowthistle</u>	<i>Sonchus arvensis</i> L.
<u>sorghum-almum</u>	<i>Sorghum x alnum</i> Parodi

Attachment 3: Weeds of Illinois (from [Weedy Wildflowers of Meadows \(illinoiswildflowers.info\)](http://illinoiswildflowers.info))

Wetlands

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Amaranthus rudis</i>	Tall Water Hemp
<i>Amaranthus tuberculatus</i>	Western Water Hemp
<i>Apium graveolens</i>	Wild Celery
<i>Bidens bipinnata</i>	Spanish Needles
<i>Bidens cernua</i>	Nodding Bur-Marigold
<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	Common Beggar's Ticks
<i>Cannabis sativa</i>	Marijuana
<i>Cardamine hirsuta</i>	Hairy Bitter Cress
<i>Conium maculatum</i>	Poison Hemlock
<i>Eclipta prostrata</i>	Yerba de Tajo
<i>Erechtites hieracifolius</i>	Pilewort
<i>Erigeron philadelphicus</i>	Marsh Fleabane
<i>Iris germanica</i>	Bearded Iris
<i>Iris pseudacorus</i>	Yellow Iris
<i>Iva xanthifolia</i>	Marsh Elder
<i>Lysimachia nummularia</i>	Moneywort
<i>Lysimachia vulgaris</i>	Garden Loosestrife
<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>	Purple Loosestrife
<i>Myosoton aquaticum</i>	Giant Chickweed
<i>Nasturium officinale</i>	Watercress
<i>Persicaria coccinea</i>	Scarlet Smartweed
<i>Persicaria hydropiper</i>	Marsh Smartweed
<i>Persicaria laphifolium</i>	Pale Smartweed
<i>Persicaria pennsylvanica</i>	Pennsylvania Smartweed

<i>Persicaria persicaria</i>	Lady's Thumb
<i>Persicaria punctatum</i>	Dotted Smartweed
<i>Phyla lanceolata</i>	Fogfruit
<i>Rorippa palustris</i>	Common Yellow Cress
<i>Rorippa sylvestris</i>	Creeping Yellow Cress
<i>Salix interior</i>	Sandbar Willow
<i>Senecio glabellus</i>	Butterweed
<i>Teucrium canadense</i>	American Germander
<i>Typha angustifolia</i>	Narrow-Leaved Cattail
<i>Typha latifolia</i>	Common Cattail
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i>	Common Cocklebur

Meadows

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Acalypha rhomboidea</i>	Rhombic Mercury
<i>Achillea millefolium</i>	Yarrow
<i>Allium vineale</i>	Field Garlic
<i>Amaranthus hybridus</i>	Smooth Pigweed
<i>Amaranthus retroflexus</i>	Rough Pigweed
<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i>	Common Ragweed
<i>Ambrosia trifida</i>	Giant Ragweed
<i>Anthemis cotula</i>	Dog Fennel
<i>Apocynum cannabinum</i>	Dogbane
<i>Arctium lappa</i>	Great Burdock
<i>Arctium minus</i>	Common Burdock
<i>Artemisia vulgaris</i>	Mugwort
<i>Asclepias syriaca</i>	Common Milkweed
<i>Asparagus officinalis</i>	Wild Asparagus
<i>Aster pilosus</i>	Frost Aster
<i>Barbarea vulgaris</i>	Yellow Rocket
<i>Bidens frondosa</i>	Common Beggar's Ticks
<i>Brassica spp.</i>	Mustards
<i>Calystegia sepium</i>	Hedge Bindweed
<i>Cannabis sativa</i>	Marijuana
<i>Cerastium arvense</i>	Field Chickweed
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	Lamb's Quarters
<i>Chenopodium simplex</i>	Mapleleaf Goosefoot

<i>Chrysanthemum leucanthemum</i>	Oxeye Daisy
<i>Cichorium intybus</i>	Chicory
<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	Canada Thistle
<i>Cirsium discolor</i>	Pasture Thistle
<i>Conium maculatum</i>	Poison Hemlock
<i>Consolida ajacis</i>	Rocket Larkspur
<i>Coronilla varia</i>	Crown Vetch
<i>Daucus carota</i>	Wild Carrot
<i>Dipsacus laciniatus</i>	Cut-Leaved Teasel
<i>Dipsacus sylvestris</i>	Teasel
<i>Erechtites hieracifolius</i>	Pilewort
<i>Erigeron annuus</i>	Annual Fleabane
<i>Erigeron strigosus</i>	Daisy Fleabane
<i>Eupatorium altissimum</i>	Tall Boneset
<i>Euphorbia cyparissias</i>	Cypress Spurge
<i>Galeopsis tetrahit</i>	Hemp Nettle
<i>Gnaphalium obtusifolium</i>	Sweet Everlasting*
<i>Helianthus annuus</i>	Annual Sunflower
<i>Helianthus tuberosus</i>	Jerusalem Artichoke
<i>Hemerocallis fulva</i>	Orange Daylily
<i>Hesperis matronalis</i>	Dame's Rocket
<i>Hypericum perforatum</i>	Common St. John's Wort
<i>Iris germanica</i>	Bearded Iris
<i>Lactuca canadensis</i>	Wild Lettuce
<i>Lamium purpureum</i>	Purple Dead Nettle
<i>Lapsana communis</i>	Nipplewort
<i>Lathyrus hirsutus</i>	Singletary Pea

<i>Lathyrus latifolius</i>	Everlasting Pea
<i>Lespedeza cuneata</i>	Silky Bush Clover
<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>	Birdfoot Trefoil
<i>Lysimachia nummularia</i>	Moneywort
<i>Matricaria perforata</i>	Scentsless Mayweed
<i>Medicago lupulina</i>	Black Medic
<i>Medicago sativa</i>	Alfalfa
<i>Melilotus alba</i>	White Sweet Clover
<i>Melilotus officinalis</i>	Yellow Sweet Clover
<i>Melissa officinalis</i>	Lemon Balm
<i>Mentha spicata</i>	Spearmint
<i>Nepeta cataria</i>	Catnip
<i>Oenothera biennis</i>	Common Evening Primrose
<i>Ornithogalum umbellatum</i>	Star-of-Bethlehem
<i>Pastinaca sativa</i>	Wild Parsnip
<i>Physalis heterophylla</i>	Clammy Ground Cherry
<i>Physalis subglabrata</i>	Smooth Ground Cherry
<i>Phytolacca americana</i>	Pokeweed
<i>Polygonum pensylvanicum</i>	Pennsylvania Smartweed
<i>Polygonum persicaria</i>	Lady's Thumb
<i>Potentilla recta</i>	Sulfur Cinquefoil
<i>Potentilla simplex</i>	Common Cinquefoil
<i>Prunella vulgaris</i>	Self-Heal
<i>Ranunculus abortivus</i>	Small-Flowered Buttercup
<i>Ranunculus acris</i>	Tall Buttercup
<i>Reseda luteola</i>	Weld
<i>Rhus radicans</i>	Poison Ivy

<i>Rumex acetosella</i>	Sheep Sorrel*
<i>Rumex altissimus</i>	Pale Dock
<i>Rumex crispus</i>	Curly Dock
<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	Bitter Dock
<i>Saponaria officinalis</i>	Soapwort
<i>Senecio glabellus</i>	Butterweed
<i>Silene pratense</i>	Evening Campion
<i>Silene vulgaris</i>	Bladder Catchfly
<i>Silene noctiflora</i>	Night-Flowering Catchfly
<i>Sisymbrium officinale</i>	Hedge Mustard
<i>Solanum carolinense</i>	Horsenettle
<i>Solidago canadensis</i>	Canada Goldenrod
<i>Sonchus arvensis</i>	Perennial Sow Thistle
<i>Stellaria graminea</i>	Grass-Leaved Chickweed
<i>Tanacetum vulgare</i>	Tansy
<i>Teucrium canadense</i>	American Germander
<i>Torilis arvensis</i>	Common Hedge Parsley
<i>Tragopogon dubius</i>	Western Goatsbeard*
<i>Tragopogon pratensis</i>	Yellow Goatsbeard
<i>Trifolium aureum</i>	Palmate Hop Clover
<i>Trifolium campestre</i>	Pinnate Hop Clover
<i>Trifolium hybridum</i>	Alsike Clover
<i>Trifolium pratense</i>	Red Clover
<i>Trifolium repens</i>	White Clover
<i>Triodanis perfoliata</i>	Venus' Looking Glass*
<i>Valerianella radiata</i>	Common Corn Salad
<i>Verbascum blattaria</i>	Moth Mullein



<i>Verbascum thapsus</i>	Great Mullein
<i>Vicia dasycarpa</i>	Smooth Vetch
<i>Vicia sativa</i>	Common Vetch
<i>Vicia villosa</i>	Hairy Vetch
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i>	Common Cocklebur

USDA Forest Service. 2001. Guide to Noxious Weed Prevention Practices [Microsoft Word - Forest Service Weed BMP 2001.doc \(fs.fed.us\)](#)

¹ Village of Riverside Central Business District Plan. 2013. 44.

² National invasive species council secretariat U.S. Department of the Interior (2019). The interface between invasive species and the increased incidence of tickborne diseases, and the implications for federal land managers. [tick-borne disease white paper.pdf \(doi.gov\)](#)

³ IDNR. Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) Habitat Management, [CSPManagementIntro.pdf \(illinois.gov\)](#)

⁴ Central Park Conservancy website. [The Ramble | Central Park Conservancy \(centralparknyc.org\)](#)

⁵ Midwest Invasive Plant Network [MIPN - Midwest Invasive Plant Network](#)

⁶ U.S. Forest Service website: [Invasive Plants \(fs.fed.us\)](#)

⁷ Justia U.S. Law [505 ILCS 100/ - Illinois Noxious Weed Law. :: 2016 Illinois Compiled Statutes :: US Codes and Statutes :: US Law :: Justia](#)

⁸ CMAP, 47

⁹ Tatu, C. (2016, June 22). Public works accidentally removes important riparian buffer along Easton's Delaware River -- again. *Morning Call, The (Allentown, PA)*. **Note here that both mowing and herbicide inadvertently destroyed a desired section; but the herbicide destruction was permanent.**

Back, C., Holomuzki, J., Klarer, D., & Whyte, R. (2012). Herbiciding invasive reed: indirect effects on habitat conditions and snail-algal assemblages one year post-application. *Wetlands Ecology & Management*, 20(5), 419–431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11273-012-9265-3> **Note here that this may not be the exact habitat comparison.**