

Wetlands and Natural Areas Meeting Notes
2/28/19

-Circling back to last meeting, we should emphasize the use of a “Rapid Response Team” – folks who monitor for species to control as part of the IPM plan. Also monitoring for EDDR species AND monitoring treatment effects and non-target effects.

-The IPM should be codified. Also the IPM should be revisited and revised yearly. It should also spell out the basics of IPM.

-Another recommendation is that staff keep written notes on following the IPM – basically documenting what led to the application of a strategy. This process would live within the staff (set in stone) and not need oversight by a review committee.

Before the next meeting, James will explicitly look at gaps in the current IPM.

-Reasonable recommendation would be that staff could conduct pilot studies to test alternative methodologies. Evaluate viability, how it might work in the city, etc.

We need to be cognizant and to note in each of our recommendations any non-target or unintended impacts.

Volunteers could be used to do pilot study monitoring through the University and other groups. Other models for volunteer monitoring include the “adopt a park” programs.

Could MPRB or Hennepin county form a CWMA (Cooperative Weed Management Area) to improve.

For all species included on Marcia’s list of species, there are risk assessments done already that include management methods. Those (and MIPNs) recommendations could form the backbone of our recommendations.

For Canada thistle, Milestone and Transline are both very effective but we are unclear on the “toxicity” of these alternative herbicides. So do we recommend effective alternatives, even if they may be more toxic?

So do we use or recommend an EIQ (Environmental impact quotient) to assess the hazard of a specific chemical or treatment? Some EIQs are available already and others would have to be done.

Could we have MPRB or staff provide a ranking of toxicity of what is currently used?

We had a whole discussion about transparency – can data be public? maybe Jeremy can weigh in.

For the next meeting:

We're going to focus on the methodological alternatives to glyphosate organized by species life cycle grouping (annual, perennial, etc) and discuss which species they can be applied to and also discuss the pros and cons to each.

Woody perennials – trees, shrubs, vines
Herbaceous perennials (upland/wetland)
Herbaceous biennials (upland/wetland)
Annuals (upland/wetland)
Species hazardous to touch

Mechanical – pulling, cutting, goats, smothering
Cultural – planting or species changes, fire/torching, volunteers
Chemical – vinegar, salts, other herbicides (?)

With sections on effectiveness, cons, target species and situations.