



## Meeting Minutes: July 14<sup>th</sup>, 2022

July 14<sup>th</sup>, 2022 • 9:00 am to 3:48 pm  
MnDOT Training and Conference Center  
Shoreview, MN

### July 14, 2022, 9:00 am to 12:00 pm

---

#### Present

Most but not all participants were present for the entire meeting; some attended virtually

- |                     |                        |                    |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Bob Dunning      | 13. Jennifer Burington | 25. Doug Jensen    |
| 2. Monika Chandler  | 14. Jim Calkins        | 26. Dane Huinker   |
| 3. Emilie Justen    | 15. Mark Rhoades       | 27. Elliot Engen   |
| 4. Kelsey Taylor    | 16. Jeff Forester      | 28. Angie Gupta    |
| 5. Megan Weber      | 17. Jake Anderson      | 29. Maggie Barnick |
| 6. Kelly Pennington | 18. Chris Jennelle     | 30. Forest Eidbo   |
| 7. Sascha Lodge     | 19. Kevin Farnum       | 31. Chris Jenelle  |
| 8. Christina Bosch  | 20. Justin Townsend    |                    |
| 9. Val Cervenka     | 21. Ariana Richardson  |                    |
| 10. Mark Gaikowski  | 22. Mike Dockery       |                    |
| 11. Joe Shneider    | 23. Kate Wyman Grothem |                    |
| 12. Laura Van Riper | 24. Roger Becker       |                    |

#### Council Business

- Vote to approve the revised agenda, Approved
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from April 2022, Approved
- Treasurer's report submitted by Wildlife Forever, fiscal agent for MISAC (14 participants) of participants that voted approved, 1 abstained, Approved
- 2022 Leadership - Jennifer Burington, Chelsey Blanke, Ariana Richardson
- Upcoming meeting date: October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2022

#### UMISC Planning – Jennifer Burington

- UMISC will be held both in-person and virtually
- Abstracts needed
- CISMA sessions
- Confirmed Plenary Speakers: Chairman Tehassi Hill and Dr. Ajay Sethi

- Exhibiting: online & in-person utilizing EventMobi as in 2020
- Local Green Bay Field Trips Planning still underway

## 2022 Field Trip Planning - Kelsey Taylor

- The field trip was on May 24<sup>th</sup>, many folks
- Speakers on EAB, Biocontrol, Invasive species and Wild Rice, Sturgeon, and Highway 23 Mission Creek Project
- Very successful adaptation from on the water tour to a site-to-site hike due to high water levels.

## Website Committee Update- Ariana Richardson

- UMISC Links are updated along with current information
- There are still a few letters sent by MISAC to be uploaded
- Banner for Carol Mortenson Award added

## 2022 Carol Mortensen Award – Laura Van Riper

- Two categories; apps carried forward: 4 individual, 4 new, 2 team, 2 new. Also, Life Time Achievement award nomination
- Committee meeting on July 22<sup>nd</sup>

## Parking Lot

- Terrestrial vs. Aquatic state funding
- Fairness and efficacy of landowners bearing costs to manage invasive species

## Engagement Discussions:

### State Performance Measures and Metrics, Mn DNR – Tina Fitzgerald

#### Review of State AIS Performance Metrics

- Aid allocated by county
- Overview of county activities
- Metrics development related to 2016 Aquatic Invaders Summit to develop template
- Each category may be tracked and
- Permits issued are not a controllable metric, but permits issued on time are
- Emphasis on learning how to track what you can track and what is representative of controllable factors
- Powerful stories and images are key
- Efforts are making a difference
- Metrics are dynamic; always open to refinement
- Discussed take aways and implementation tables

## Tribal Perspectives on Invasive species and their management– Mike Dockery (University of Minnesota)

**Tribal perspectives on management are important.** Water is sacred and meant to be protected; Ash is culturally important. Forced removal and relocation are not new. Many tribes forced from MI and IL to OK. 574

recognized tribes manage lands through American Indian Forestry. 100 have significant forest lands ~18 M acres. Tribes manage for next generations. All tribes are different, separate nations, sovereignty, culture and history. Since 1500's, Tribes have addressed introductions of new species and colonizers. Until then, all lands in the U.S. were tribal lands. Tribes are forward-thinking, working with state and county governments, and actively preparing for the restoration of native plants in light of climate change, i.e., Fond du lac is experimenting with different species planted in swamps. Economies are impacted by invasive species, i.e., firewood sold and indigenous makers. Most Important Needs 1. Forest Health 2. Silviculture 3. Water Quality 4. Workforce Development/training 5. Fish and wildlife responses to treatments 6. Fuels management 7. Planting/ reforestation 8. Planning 9. Growth and Yield 10. Invasive species. Tribes are actively working on invasive species. For example, Fond du Lac is taking a different look at native species in swamps to see what trees will function there in the future due to climate change.

#### **Differences in state or federal agency-led natural resource management from Tribal natural resource management:**

- Pesticide uses varying opinions; Tribal ideas were different than biologists concerning the negative impacts of treatments. Consultation for management is done on tribal lands.
- Emerald Ash Borer in the early 2000s impacted tribes all across Midwest by killing culturally essential trees. Ash trees are used for baskets, lacrosse Sticks, and other goods.
- Canadian Forestry did not consult tribes and chose to clear-cut infested areas to limit the spread, which was ineffective, the example of a management decision that tribal land managers would not have backed.
- Living beings are all respected and related and considered in tribal management decisions
- Tribal perspectives view invasive species as indicators that something more significant is awry and evidence of the connection to the larger economy
- Tribes address invasive species issues from environmental, social, cultural, spiritual and economic perspectives.

#### **Partnership Building Strategies**

- Tribal goals should inform the basis of a partnership
- Four Strategies for building partnerships:
  1. Acknowledge Past and Present Harms: bring water resources to the table; need to acknowledge past and present harms, nothing is going to happen without acknowledgements
  2. Collaborate as equals: respect tribal perspectives, labor and goals
  3. Support Formal Agreements and Leadership: MPCA, DNR, UofM President Gabel
  4. Foster personal relationships: potential projects need to be brought to tribes at the beginning to consider tribal culture and activities.

#### **Summary:**

1. Tribes are resilient and forward thinking.
  - Exposure, learning and management of new species is not new to tribes; forced evacuations to OK and other states forced them to adapt to migrating climate, changing summers in the region.
  - Tribes conduct seed collection and store them for reforestation.
2. We are all related.

- Tribes think about what it means to be related. Trees are beings, forests let species in to form equilibrium; this has been going on for thousands of years and tribes have learned to live together
- 3. Tribes are diverse.
  - Tribes are modern governments, they have environmental management departments, roads, housing, health care, higher education, etc.
  - Tribes have responsibilities to their species and to each other. Abandoning ash trees is not responsible.
  - Partnerships support tribal goals; these can help all of us.
    - Bois Fort has 20,000 acres, Leech Lake 12,000 acres to manage.

Questions:

Q: What thoughts can you share regarding prevention and pushback?

A: Tribes are monitoring and collaborating on prevention efforts. I often hear that tribes want their values to be understood and are interested. The root of this is prevention, i.e., seed collection and wild-rice protections. Although partnerships are essential, tribes need to be consulted on management. Preventing spread of cultivated genetically modified rice to wild rice is critical. Tribes are often remote so they do not have to deal as much with invasive species.

Q: Is there a difference in how tribes would proceed with listing certain or endangered species?

A: The difference would be in how lists work; the tribal perspective is that everything is related, and cultural keystone species would be most strongly considered. E.g., Tribes in the Ojibwe ceded territories surveyed for species of most interest (e.g., keystone species). Forestry has data for balsam, paper birch, and white cedar that was of interest, and we presented reports for those. Need to move toward what is culturally important, as a part of their origin. Regional foresters have their lists, protect habitat for those species, which are part of broader habitats.

Q: Are tribal activities around aquatic invasive, i.e., inspections, much different?

A: Tribal governments center values but I would expect them to be similar to the biologist and foresters in the state and federal governments, as they likely have the same educational backgrounds and share an ecological approach (“trust responsibility”). Forestry has changed over the last 20 years that was not always the case. However, perspectives may differ between resource managers and tribal leaders.

## Ramsey County Plan and Metrics, Justin Townsend

Ramsey county has a 5-year strategic plan, on which we build a work plan. Metrics reported are based on actual measurements and rationale. We measure soft numbers because it is what we know and can measure now, allowing us to develop our understanding of the metrics. Our end-of-year report reviews measurements, rationale, cost, and results. This leaves a little grey area as far as what we are doing; **only what we can measure and should measure**. We may not know what we need to measure because we don't know if we need it and how to use it in the future. This helps reduce scope creep. What can we measure? Measure what you want to change; if not going to use it, there is no reason to study. This approach allows prioritization. The budget impact is worked into many metrics to measure what we know we can change.

Presentations should vary per the audience, and digestible presentations that show value to strengthen the rationale for management decisions, i.e., ecosystem service values, are impactful because we want to have people understand what is shared, what is important for them to know. We put value on ecosystem services. An example is whether to remove trees or not. Needs a rationale to show value; if we don't manage now, show how much it will cost in the future. Measurements need to speak to multiple audiences. For example: homeowners may not understand the concept of acreage. Instead, use an analogy of an infestation the size of a city park. Ramsey Co. uses DNR metrics because collectively we all need to tell our story, show the value of our work that we do. At the same time, we may need to pivot to explain in different ways. We are also mindful of false precision, i.e., the perspective that EDDMapS tracks populations of species when it tracks KNOWN populations of a species. We may report differently to DNR than other stakeholders; the goal is not to tell about accomplishments; it's to tell the story about what is being done and why it matters.

Q: How do you plan for change with your plan or new infestations?

A: It's a living document, so it can be changed midseason based on feedback from stakeholders to adapt quicker as needed. We ask, whether we get a good or no good answer, right or wrong, this is what we learned.

Q: How much does Ramsey county get in AIS Aid?

A: Approximately \$98,000.

Q: Do you report to the county commissioners?

A: No, we're a soil and water conservation district, but they see a report at the end of the year. It's also reported to BWSR and for higher levels of reporting.

Q: How do you determine the intrinsic value, and how are you funded?

A: We are self-funded without county dollars, with AIS aid and grants. I look at where I go, how much time I spend there, and whether the sites improve. Every hour is scrutinized by each organization. We build in the program costs/benefits. Example: We are prepared to show how effective management of an infestation is reducing the need for staff hours. If (e.g., a county commissioner) asked to stop an activity, we are prepared to show what it's going to go to. As the effort on this management activity goes down, this is what we can do instead. Again, we measure things that we can change.

Q: How do your annual reports and work plan metrics differ?

A: Not really. We embed "big picture" metrics in the report to give more detail for the readers to pursue themselves. Gaps being identified by using a work plan also allow us to include them in our next year's work plan. Example: eDNA technology is moving fast so we have that as part of next year's early detection work plan.

## Minnesota Coalition of Lake Associations – Kevin Farnum and Joe Shneider

The State of Minnesota appropriated funding to MN counties to delegate Aquatic invasive Species management and prevention in 2014 with the State AIS Prevention AID. Counties are legislatively required to submit reporting on funding use at the end of each year to remain eligible. Based on a session at the Aquatic Invaders Summit II in St. Cloud, DNR Prevention Planners developed metrics, which have been used to show the investment by the State highlighting the accomplishments of the work being done by counties statewide.

Based on county reports, an annual report is produced based on the metrics that the counties have agreed that they want to report on. That report is made available to the legislature, county boards, stakeholder groups and residents across the State. Prevention and monitoring efforts are not always presented effectively when counties report; it doesn't deal with the full picture. Some county reports don't include efforts by some lake associations. There is the need to track spending in different ways. That said, we consider that all lakes are not equal; they may not have metrics that imply certain actions and that some may be more successful than others. We believe that there is a need to build a track record. There is a need to deliver consistent answers that captures full county data, prevention as well as management. We think soft numbers should be avoided or defined, e.g., more volunteer hours look "better," but we may not know what the hours are spent on or where they are. Metrics that ask for specific actions may influence decision-making. A draft of metrics was developed independently of MN DNR's metrics by MNCOLA. Our framework for stopping the spread of AIS includes: Prevention, Education, Inspection/Decontamination, Enforcement, Response and Preparedness, Management (treat/track) and Program Coordination. Color-coded sections in a framework were based on what associations would like to see for smaller agencies and lake associations. Sections were weighed towards prevention (80+%), program coordination (5+%), and other things (10%). We adjusted based on infestation status and densities in counties and lakes. The legislation is loose.

- We think the counties need more clarity and that while it may be a bias, program coordinators are not likely to tell their boards and bosses everything to not look bad.
- Spread of AIS is not happening at the rate DNR is reporting – 8% infested. We talk square acres of infestations, which include the 10 largest lakes. Stearns County from 2011-2015 has not been stopping the spread of AIS, not looking very good; zebra mussels, starry stonewort and Eurasian watermilfoil is spreading. What new species are not being reported? Now have flowering rush. 64% are infested with AIS in Stearns County.
- We think there is the need to address 1<sup>st</sup> lakes before AIS spread to nearby lakes, those that are the busiest. Address those lakes 100%, not 8% of the problem. We also think counties should know what species they have, track inspections using protection percentages, and ask more specific questions when reporting on their actions. How to stop the spread is to look at the metrics at the five busiest lakes in the county, determine what effort is being done, not just based on the \$10 M in prevention aid funding (e.g., what are lake associations spending? How is funding tracked, prevention percentage, protection percentage). Otherwise, it's only a matter of time that starry stonewort will spread from Medicine Lake to Christmas Lake.
- Counties should ask whether they are making a difference, whether we are spending wisely, and whether the costs incurred to property owners are fair. Is more money the answer, or is the state funding enough?
- Better data presented may result in more county contributions, but a better policy is perhaps the most important.

Q: Did DNR have their budget cut when the prevention aid was allotted to the counties? Did their base funding continue at the same rate?

A: No, it did not take away from DNR, it was an additional allotment, and there is no equivalent to terrestrial species management, and land owners bear the brunt of the costs for terrestrial management as well.

Q: Did you have your metrics to share?

A: It's on the last slide, but we will send it out as a file.

Q: From a local standpoint, commissioner interest and presentation of interest varies greatly. Do you feel it's a lack of accessibility or structure or an issue of presentation for stakeholders?

A: If we had consistent reporting on a county level, legislators would perhaps do more seeing that rolled into a statewide picture.

Small group discussions/World Café

Notes for these discussions were captured elsewhere.

## Updates from Members

**Jim Calkins - Minnesota Nursery & Landscape Association-** Updated guidance will be distributed by MDA, Working on waste solutions.

**Jacob Anderson - Nature Conservancy-** Seasonal workers are out controlling invasive species.

**Jeff Forrester - Minnesota Lakes and Rivers Advocates –** Stop starry project has 20 out of 28 units deployed

**Kate Wyman Grothem - FWS-** Website is updated with new links, and the upper Mississippi river horizon scan with tribal and local governments is underway.

**Doug Jensen- MN DNR-**Take the pledge launched online, a prevention effort under CBSM principles; Outreach with Red Lake; Reaching out to DNR staff and counties; Working with BWCAW Coalition; Co-chairing UMISC's upcoming Fall meeting.

**Megan Weber –University of Minnesota Extension –** Starry Trek on August 20<sup>th</sup> is coming up. Workshops sold out.

**Jennifer Burington – MDA-** Community garden surveys, elongate hemlock scale, tree farms surveying, Spongy moth treatments up north, and a new brochure released. Palmer amaranth had an increase in reports on the report a pest site.

**Monica Chandler- MDA Noxious Weed Program-** Leafy spurge biocontrol is progressing, spotted knapweed biocontrol.

**Michael Rhodes- St Croix National Scenic Way-** European barberry treatment expanded, treating Grecian foxglove too. Surveying lakes in the watershed.

**Sascha Lodge – Minnesota DNR Forestry –** 2 new interns are surveying state forests and distributing a new invasive plant brochure at the state fair for the first time since the COVID-19 pandemic. Forty projects are rolling out with the new fiscal year.

**Val Cervenka –Forest Health Program Coordinator MN DNR-** September 12<sup>th</sup> – 15<sup>th</sup> is the North Central Forest Pest Workshop registration opens. Still surveying for oak wilt and looking at more lines of treatment, GIS terrestrial Explorer.

**Laura Van Riper – MN DNR Invasive Species Program –** Jumping worms' early detection up north, staff for volunteers at a state fair, lesser celandine has a webpage now.

**Roger Becker - UMN –** Knotweed research showing significant seed prediction published, garlic mustard biological assessment (black aphids found possibly specific to garlic mustard).

**Ariana Richardson - Meeker County-** Tool station projects to place CD3 tools at risky launches and our herbicide stewardship to reduce 2,4-D use and improve long-term ais control.