

### Introduction

Common reed (*Phragmites australis*) was introduced to eastern North America in the nineteenth century and colonized many fresh water, brackish, and salt marsh environments. In the past 100 years, common reed has largely outcompeted the native, and less dominant, American reed (Phragmites americanus), often forming near-monocultures that reduce the growth and diversity of native plant species (Farnsworth and Meyerson 1999)<sup>1</sup>.

In the late 1980s, common reed invaded the perimeter of a 1-hectare man-made pond in Redding, CT, eventually dominating the pond-side flora and reducing the aquatic viewshed.



### Results

### Phragmites Removal



### Viewshed



Removal of *Phragmites* varied initially by herbicide treatment in 2013, but was similar across all treatments by 2014. By 2017, almost all stems had been removed





One of the monitoring plots dominated by *Phragmites* prior to treatment (left) and replaced by a diversity of sedges and forbs after treatment (right).



view following *Phragmites* removal.

<sup>1</sup>Farnsworth, E.J. and Meyerson, L.A., 1999. Species composition and inter-annual dynamics of a freshwater tidal plant community following removal of the invasive grass, *Phragmites australis*. Biological Invasions, 1(2), pp.115-127.

# Response of Freshwater Wetland Flora to Removal of Phragmites australis Ed Faison, Geordie Elkins, Kathleen Kitka, and David Foster

### **Objectives**

- I. Remove *Phragmites* from the pond
- 2. Promote a more expansive aquatic viewshed
- 3. Increase native plant diversity
- 4. Understand the cost-benefit of different herbicide application techniques





The Highstead pondscape in 2012 (top) with two prominent patches of *Phragmites* restricting the view and in 2017 (bottom) with a more expansive



### Methods

### Management Approach

A. All *Phragmites* stems mowed



B. *Phragmites* population divided into four herbicide (Glyphosate) treatment areas



1-2) Hand-wipe 3) Wipe-on with glove: 2.3% wand applicator: sprayer: 2.3% solution & 25% 25% solution solution





4) Backpack solution

### Treatment Schedule

nuary 2013

All Phragmites stems mowed

June & September 2013

*Phragmites* treated with herbicide

uary 2014

All Phragmites stems mowed

June & September 2014

Phragmites treated with herbicide

### 2015 to Present

Spot-treated regenerating *Phragmites* stems as needed with Hand-wipe 25% solution



## Conclusions

- 1. *Phragmites* removal successful, but repeat herbicide treatment critical
- 2. Aquatic viewshed more expansive after *Phragmites* removal
- 3. Both native and non-native species richness increased after *Phragmites* removal
- 4. After initial differences, herbicide treatments converged over time in effectiveness against *Phragmites* and impact on other flora
- 5. Non-*Phragmites* herbs generally recovered quickly and woody vegetation was resistant to herbicide treatments
- 6. Impact of *Phragmites* removal on wildlife habitat and populations unknown (Anecdotally, nesting red-winged blackbirds appear to have declined)



127 Lonetown Road, Redding CT 06896 | 203-938-8809 | info@highstead.net

We thank field assistants Olivia Zukas, Amanda Pachomski, Alex Petzke, Aaron Lefland, Jill Hautaniemi, and Taylor Hendrickson for assistance with vegetation monitoring. We are also grateful to Darel Peck, Jesse Hubbard, and All Habitat Services, LLC for initial mowing and herbicide application of *Phragmites*. Dennis Whigham, Thomas Modzer, Eric Hazelton, and especially Elizabeth Farnsworth provided helpful advice on study design, vegetation sampling, and timing of chemical treatment. Finally, Bill Moorhead provided invaluable plant identification assistance.