

Minutes: Noxious Weed Advisory Committee

Date: 12/11/2024

Participants

Members

Ann Messerschmidt (League of MN Cities), Christina Basch (MnDOT), Cody Dock (MN CAIs), Fawad Shah (MCIA), Hunter Pederson (MN Farm Bureau), Jane Youngkrantz (MN Assoc. Townships), Jen Larson (USDA FS), Jim Calkins (MNLA), Kelsey Taylor (FDL), Laura Van Riper (DNR), Liz Beery (TNC), Mark Westphal (MNACLC), Mary Jo Youngbauer (MN SWCDs), Raining White (LLBO), Rob Venette (UM MITPPC), Roger Becker (UM Agronomy), and Steve Chaplin (TNC)

Guests

Chris Evans (University of Illinois), Mackenzie Manicki (Wisconsin DNR), and Peter Hendrickx (East Otter Tail County SWCD)

MDA

Emilie Justen, Julie Dellick, Kimberly Thielen-Cremers, and Monika Chandler

Introductions

Approval of Agenda and Past Meeting Minutes

Fawad motioned and Laura seconded to approve the agenda for this meeting. There were no objections.

Cody requested a change to the minutes. His affiliation should be changed to MN CAIs. Laura moved to approve the minutes with this change and Cody seconded. There were no objections.

MDA and Member Updates and Old Business

Listing Subcommittee Updates

At the November NWAC meeting, we discussed which species to update existing assessments for in 2025. There was a survey afterward and the highest ranked species were black swallow-wort, Japanese barberry, narrowleaf

bittercress, Palmer amaranth, brown knapweed, poison ivy, and purple loosestrife. We'll work on these assessments next year.

There are assessments in progress to continue in 2025. These include winged burning bush variety 'Fireball Seedless', yellow archangel, hardy kiwi, and the MDA Seed Lab is doing 'Freedom' honeysuckle seed germination testing to inform about invasive potential. 'Freedom' honeysuckle is a Tatarian honeysuckle hybrid that is regulated.

Management and Policy Subcommittee Updates

There is an upcoming Management and Policy Subcommittee meeting on January 9th to discuss the next steps for the ranking list and if the list should be expanded to other groups such as County Agriculture Inspectors (CAIs). The subcommittee is also figuring out what management plans could be worked on next year. Finally, there were conversations regarding the 2025 MDA workplan and completing data clean up and outreach.

New Business

Vote on 2024 regulatory recommendations from the Listing Subcommittee

Canada Thistle

Laura gave an overview of the voting process and that there will be a role call vote. Laura stated that if the vote doesn't go the way your organization would like, you have the option to write a letter to the commissioner to let him know you disagree with the committee.

Laura made a motion to move Canada thistle from the prohibited control to the restricted category. Christina seconded the motion. Kelsey opened the discussion. Some organizations voted no on the proposal to move Canada thistle to the restricted category because they said it should stay prohibited and some organizations voted no because they said Canada thistle should not be regulated at all.

- Jim said MNLA prefers that Canada thistle is delisted or it could be county listed. The restricted category is mainly to prevent sales and Canada thistle is not a species that is sold.
- Steve asked why Canada thistle is recommended to move to restricted rather than be delisted? Laura answered that restricted plants are also plants that are widespread in Minnesota and that there are still concerns about this species so it seemed like a good compromise. Laura went over sections of the risk assessment document and explained how Canada thistle could fit as restricted. If it were restricted, education and designated importance would continue, and this is important to some committee members. Laura said that there is a separate weed seed list and Canada thistle is a prohibited noxious weed seed. This would not change if the plant were moved to restricted.
- Kelsey shared that she will vote no because Canada thistle is not widespread on the reservation yet and worries the plant would spread more if it were moved to restricted.
- Laura said that she will be voting in alignment with the assessment.
- Liz Beery wanted to share that she is voting yes because Canada thistle is very widespread in road ditches and natural areas, but it is not abundant where it is outcompeted by native plants in well

managed ecosystems. She prefers delisting the species but believes moving it to restricted is a move in the right direction. This would make land management more feasible.

- Cody reached out to other ag inspectors about their viewpoints. There was a wide range of viewpoints. Some would vote yes, some would vote no. He said that in his county, Canada thistle is one of most common complaints from farmers, especially those next to federal and state lands. Those constituents would want to see control done, but besides that group, he cannot widely speak for everyone.
- Christina said that MnDOT will be voting yes. Canada thistle has been regulated since the 1800s and we're still not seeing control of this species. We need to try something else and redirect our priorities.
- Jane asked that if Canada thistle were moved to Restricted, would it's control still be eligible for grant funding? Emilie explained that it would be eligible but would be lower priority than prohibited weeds. Jane said that many of the township applications for MDA grants were for funds for Canada thistle management. Ann asked whether this was because they were forced to control Canada thistle. It wasn't clear what prompted the proposals for Canada thistle control. Kelsey said that other grants may also lessen the priority for Canada thistle control. Jason said that for BSWR's Cooperative Weed grants, they look at the species priority but the applicant's knowledge about what they are trying to accomplish and how to go about that is more important. If someone wrote a very good application about a targeted approach to Canada thistle management and why this is important, it would be considered. Kelsey asked if it were delisted, would that change things for BWSR. Jason answered, yes, it would decrease the likelihood for funding if it were delisted.
- Jason added that there is more harm done than good with people spraying Canada thistle in restoration projects. If it is moved to restricted, people will become less sensitive to Canada thistle and that will lead to better projects going forward.
- Mary Jo requested feedback from SWCDs on voting. She received 7 responses: 4 to leave as prohibited, 1 move to restricted and 2 wanted it delisted. Therefore, she will vote no.
- Fawad wanted to make sure that he understood correctly that MnDOT would be voting yes. Christina said that is correct.
- Emilie reiterated that voting 'no' means keeping Canada thistle in the prohibited control category.

Canada thistle will be recommended to be moved from the prohibited control to the restricted category with 10 'yes' votes, 7 'no' votes, and zero abstained.

Christina asked if recommendations will go to the commissioner soon or do all 3 years of recommendations go to the commissioner at once? Monika answered that recommendations will go to the commissioner soon.

Kimberly asked when regulatory changes will go into effect. Laura answered we are on a 3-year cycle. January 2026 is when any changes from this 3-year cycle would go into effect.

European Mountain Ash

Laura made a motion to add European mountain ash as a restricted noxious weed. Kelsey seconded the motion.

Jim said that the MNLA agrees that European mountain ash should be listed but it is a landscape species that is currently sold. The MNLA would like to see a phase-out period for this species. Monika and Laura said a 3-year phase-out is in the risk assessment. Steve asked when the phase out would begin. Laura clarified that the 3-year

begins at the time of listing (2026). The plant will be specially regulated during the phase out then become a restricted noxious weed.

Kelsey asked where plants are being grown, sold and transported. Jim answered that they are being sold inside and outside of Minnesota. The sales numbers in the assessment are based on sales in Minnesota only. Growers are already reducing production of the species for a variety of reasons. Mountain ash, including native mountain ash, has a lot of problems including fire blight and other issues.

Laura moved to clarify and update her motion that European mountain ash be added as a restricted noxious weed with a 3-year phase out period. Kelsey seconded.

Kimberly asked if the motion should be to add European mountain ash as a specially regulated plant. Laura explained that the assessment process lands at a final destination which in this case is restricted. MDA decides how to handle the phase out and this has been accomplished with the specially regulated designation during the phase out.

Laura clarified her motion that European mountain ash be added as a restricted noxious weed with a 3-year phase out period and that MDA may choose to show the phase out as specially regulated then move to restricted. Kelsey seconded.

Kelsey asked for the value on European mountain ash in Minnesota. If we were to skip the phase out, what would be the impact on Minnesota growers. Laura said it is estimated to be between \$411,000 – 470,000 annually. Jim clarified the value is based on sales within Minnesota and includes both wholesale and retail values. Christina verified that the 3-year phase out has been done with other woody species in the past.

Kelsey said she has concerns with the phase out period. She understands the phase out period from the growers' side, but as a resource manager, she doesn't believe that state should allow the growth of plants deemed problematic. Raining echoed Kelsey's sentiments. Emilie said it would be interesting to learn if growers do sell any plants in 2025 since they are phasing out already. Jim said they can find that out. Jim said that there are no new European mountain ash plants going into production since the nurseries are phasing them out already. He said he does not believe they would appear to be a big problem in the next few years with the production scaling down. Kelsey asked if there is a way to mandate that we could cut off sales of the plant within the state but allow out of state sales. Jim said nurseries might like to see that, and that we don't account for sale of plants outside of state, but it could be significant. Laura said it hasn't been in our purview before, but previously MDA gave permits, and that would be a discussion for later.

The vote passed unanimously with 17 'yes' votes. Kelsey voted yes but requested a note that she objected to the phase out period. European mountain ash will be recommended to be listed as a restricted noxious weed with a 3-year phase out.

Asian/Heart Copperleaf

Laura made a motion to not list heart copperleaf. A 'yes' vote accepts the recommendation and voting 'no' sends the species back to the listing subcommittee for reassessment. Kelsey seconded the motion.

Monika brought up the fact that the species is found in row crop fields in Iowa. The Iowa State Extension says they are currently able to control the species with herbicides in crop fields, but there is concern it could develop herbicide resistance. If that happens, the committee may need to review again later.

Christina asked if there are other means to control the plant if it becomes herbicide resistant. Monika answered that in the native range of China and Korean, this plant is problematic in soybeans. They are using herbicides with different modes of action. Roger added that this plant is unlikely to be as problematic as waterhemp because it doesn't have as many genetic tools to rapidly develop resistance. Resistance could happen and seed destructors could be tried. It is yet another problem that will adapt to the planting cycles.

Rob asked about the rationale for the assessment conclusion that the plant cannot be reliably eradicated. Monika explained that the plant has not been eradicated in Europe, New York and Iowa. How the plant is spreading is not understood. We may try to eradicate it if it turned up in Minnesota but based the answer to the assessment question is based on the experience where it has been found. Laura added that the assessment question 10F is *Is the plant known to cause significant ecological or economic harm and can it be eradicated using existing practices and available resources considering the distribution, reproductive biology and potential for spread?* Part of the answer is that there is insufficient information to determine if it is a threat to row crops. Rob said this was inconsistent with a previous answer that it could be a significant threat to agriculture. Rob said he will vote no so the assessment will go back to the committee for more work. Laura added that question 8B is *Does or could the plant cause significant financial losses associated with decreased yields, reduced crop quality, or increased production costs?* Although the plant does not cause significant financial losses at this time, it has the potential to with herbicide resistance. Laura added that there isn't much that could be added to the assessment if no additional information is available. If there is new information, we can update the assessment. Monika added that she will follow the situation in Iowa.

Hunter said that because the species is so close to Minnesota and has the potential to harm row crops, he will vote no.

The vote passed with 15 'yes' votes, 2 'no' vote, and none abstained. Asian/Heart copperleaf will not be recommended to be regulated as a noxious weed at this time.

Autumn olive

Laura made a motion is to add autumn olive as a restricted noxious weed. This plant is not widely sold at this time and there is no current phase out suggested for the plant. Laura asked Jim for his comments about no phase out. Autumn olive is not reliably hardy in Minnesota so isn't grown. MNLA will not ask for a phase out. Laura reiterated her motion and Kelsey seconded it. There was no discussion.

The vote passed unanimously with 17 'yes' votes. Autumn olive will be recommended to be listed as a restricted noxious weed.

Willow Austree

Laura made a motion to not list willow austree. A 'no' vote would send the species back to the listing subcommittee for continued assessment. Kelsey seconded the motion. There was no discussion.

The vote passed unanimously with 17 'yes' votes. Willow austere will not be recommended to be regulated as a noxious weed at this time.

Queen of the meadow

Laura made a motion to not list queen of the meadow. A 'no' vote would send the species back to listing subcommittee for continued assessment. Kelsey seconded the motion. There was no discussion.

The vote passed unanimously with 17 'yes' votes. Queen of the meadow will not be recommended for regulation as a noxious weed at this time.

Russian olive

Laura made a motion to not list Russian olive. A 'no' vote would send the species back to listing subcommittee for continued assessment. Kelsey seconded the motion. Steve asked if Russian olive is still being sold in the state. Christina said it is sold, but in a limited capacity. Laura checked the assessment and verified it is not a significant income source for growers.

Liz said she is surprised this species would not be listed since it does invade native habitat. Laura said that the length of the noxious weed list is a factor, and that the committee tries to be thoughtful about the impact of adding new species. Since the species is widespread in Minnesota and not widely sold, adding it to the list might not have a big impact. She stated that the assessment does say to continue education on the plant. Christina verified that regulation would not have a big impact on existing populations.

Monika asked if the DNR has a webpage on Russian olive. Laura said yes and it will remain online.

Roger stated that this species is one to watch because of how big of an issue it is in Nebraska and the Dakotas, stating that it could be increasingly problematic in western Minnesota.

The vote passed with 16 'yes' votes, zero 'no' votes, and one abstained. Russian olive will not be recommended to be regulated as a noxious weed at this time.

Stiltgrass

Laura made a motion to add stiltgrass as a prohibited eradicate noxious weed. Kelsey seconded the motion. There was no discussion.

The vote passed with 16 'yes' votes, 1 'no' vote, and zero abstained. Mark wanted to state that he voted 'no' as he said stiltgrass can become an economic constraint for small land departments to manage it. Stiltgrass will be recommended for regulating as a prohibited eradicate noxious weed.

White crack willow

Laura made a motion to not list white crack willow. A 'no' vote would send the species back to the listing subcommittee for continued assessment. Kelsey seconded the motion. She completed this assessment and said it was challenging since there are so many names for this species. There was no discussion.

Rob voted yes with an asterisk that he hopes counties would add crack willow to their lists. Monika said that it is widespread across the state and is under reported. We heard from DNR botanists that crack willow is so widespread that it would take too long to map. The biggest problem with reporting is that willows are difficult to identify so few will report them. Monika agreed that there are not many EDDMapS reports. In his book (Trees and Shrubs of Minnesota), Welby Smith documented that white crack willow is widespread. Rob said that was a surprise to him based on how the assessment is written. He said that if we don't believe the EDDMapS map to be true, then it shouldn't be in the assessment. Kelsey said it was difficult to get a handle on which willow species were reported as white crack willow. Laura also said the assessment does not have the offhanded comments from botanists, but focuses on the maps. There aren't herbarium specimens. It is a plant that needs more formal documentation in order to do a more formal assessment. Jim agreed it is widespread but with a low density. He also said that there are problems with reporting on EDDMapS.

Monika asked if DNR has a webpage for white crack willow to continue education about the plant. Laura said there is not one for any willow at this time. She said the assessment doesn't have a specific recommendation for increased outreach, but she said it could happen. Laura said willows will most likely stay on our radar, but it is challenging to message information to the layperson about since identification is a challenge. Jim added that willows hybridize making identification even more difficult.

Rob said that white crack willow is a high priority for MITPPC. Laura and Monika said we need help with this plant. Kelsey suggested that she liked having this plant on a "watchlist" to reassess when more information is available.

Rob suggested removing the EDDMapS map from the assessment. Laura said she does not like that idea since it is still the most reliable information at this time, but we could add information from Welby's book. Jim said he thinks the data on the map is reliable but that many people don't report the plant because they think it is native. So, we might not have as much information on distribution. Chris Evans asked whether we make composite maps from a compilation of sources. For instance, querying state herbaria and adding that information all on a single map? Laura answered that the U of M herbarium data are in EDDMapS unless samples are recent additions. We also query U of M herbaria directly. Roger supported leaving in the reliable data.

The vote passed unanimously with 17 'yes' votes. White crack willow will not be recommended to be regulated as a noxious weed at this time.

Wisconsin Invasive Species Council's process for species evaluation and regulation – Mackenzie Manicki, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

NR40 is shorthand for Wisconsin's invasive species rule. It started with a grassroots effort in the 1990's and early 2000's for a statewide plan for invasive species. Overall, the goal is to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species by identifying which species are invasive, classifying them into regulatory categories, and controlling them. Invasive species are described as non-native species that cause harm (human, ecological, or financial). Identification of these species is done through literature review, discussions with peers, and input from industry, land managers, researchers, and the public.

Classification is based on the species potential to cause harm, extent of presence, likelihood of establishment, potential for eradication or controlling spread, and the socio-economic value of regulation.

The list has two classifications – prohibited and restricted. Species are classified into prohibited if they are not yet established, may cause harm if established, and/or if management/eradication is feasible at the state level. Species in the restricted category are established and widespread species that are harmful, but large-scale management is not feasible. Some species fall into both categories depending on the range of the species in the state, so some species are prohibited in some counties but restricted in others.

Species control has a variety of forms under NR40. Control is done through regulating transport (site to site), transfer (trading), introduction, and possession of plants. Restricted species are unlawful to transport, transfer or introduce. Prohibited species are unlawful to transport, transfer, introduce, or possess.

Species Assessment Groups (SAG) are assembled to develop classification recommendations and advise the council on species classifications. The council reviews the recommendations, may request public input, may revise recommendations, and advises the DNR. DNR reviews the council's recommendations. DNR determines full scope of revision, develops and publishes a scope statement which starts the rule-making process. They have 30 months to complete the process. If not finished in 30 months, DNR would have to start over. They draft rule language revisions. An economic impact analysis is an important component of this process and outlines the economic consequences of proposed changes to the rule. There are opportunities for public input during the process. There are several layers of formal approvals. If it makes it through all of this, the rule becomes law.

In addition to species, cultivars are also assessed for regulation. The assessments are based on literature, data, and discussions with experts. Each cultivar is examined on a case-by-case basis. There are discussions about whether to create a cultivar advisory committee. Ultimately, DNR would end exemptions for cultivars, unless science suggests otherwise. Wisconsin has been reaching out to New York to learn whether their cultivar committee is achieving the desired goals, what the workload like, and for more insight.

Monika asked Mackenzie about how receiving input from the public is going for Wisconsin. Mackenzie said there is not much feedback from the public, at the last session there were about 40 responses. Mackenzie also said she has only been in her current role for one cycle, so she is interested to see how the next cycle goes. She has not gone through the DNR's public input process. Previously, there was more feedback at this stage.

Laura noted that Wisconsin used to post the literature reviews online and NWAC would reference them in our risk assessments. Laura asked if the most recent assessments will be posted online? It helps states find consistency when sharing information. Mackenzie said that assessments are not currently posted because DNR got a new web platform and they can no longer post pdf documents as they had previously. Reposting the assessments is a continued discussion.

Rob asked how often the dual classification of plants occurs and how often do you revisit to see if the boundary still applies. Mackenzie said there are not that many species classified under both categories. Dual classification only occurs when there is very specific data that supports the split categorization. There is no set schedule in statute to reassess the boundary. There is a loose schedule for reassessment which is when the SAGs convene.

Christina asked, "How does Wisconsin determine priorities with the length of list?" Mackenzie is unsure of all the conversations that occurred before she started in her role, but there are current conversations about whether the list is too long and difficult to manage. However, there are no set guidelines on the length of the list. Mackenzie asked if Minnesota had any guidelines for noxious weed list length. Monika said there have been vigorous discussions about list length of list since NWAC was created. The argument is that if the list is too long,

species priorities can be diluted. She stated that there is no specific regulation limiting length, but that the committee is sensitive to length of list. If listing a species will not make much difference on the landscape, the committee will usually opt to not list it in order to keep the list more focused and actionable. Mackenzie said they have had similar conversations.

Roger commented that Minnesota had a very long noxious weed list until weed law was revised in 2009. The list has increased since 2009. It's not clear where the sweet spot is with length.

Roger asked how enforcement is handled. Mackenzie said there are two types of enforcement in trade. Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection has nursery inspectors who look for pests and sales of regulated plants. The Wisconsin DNR has an Organisms in Trade Coordinator who goes to exotic pet expos, visits pet sales centers, and does outreach to increase awareness. The coordinator also looks for regulated species then correct issues.

Roger asked about native plants and whether any were listed. Mackenzie said NR40 does not address native species, but local ordinances or local weed laws can address weedy natives. A person can talk with their county weed commissioner about problematic species regardless of whether it is native or non-native.

Illinois Invasive Species Council's process for species evaluation and regulation – Chris Evans, University of Illinois Extension

Chris presented about the Illinois Invasive Species Council and how they evaluate and make recommendations. The council is non-regulatory. Instead of one overarching law, there are three regulations: Illinois Exotic Weeds Act, Illinois Noxious Weed Law, and the Illinois Injurious Species Rule.

Illinois Exotic Weeds Act is administered by the Department of Natural Resources and is the primary mechanism for regulating terrestrial invasive plants. It covers buying, selling, distributing, intentionally moving, planting regulated species but it does not regulate possession and control. There is a clause that includes all cultivars unless otherwise excluded. A petition can be submitted to DNR to exclude a cultivar. If DNR agreed, it would need to include the cultivar exclusion in the rule-making process. There are no cultivar exclusions at this time. Years ago, a group of nurseries petitioned for Fine Line® buckthorn to be excluded. That was denied because the data presented was not convincing that the cultivar would not be invasive. There were very few species on this list until 2015 which is when the majority of species were added. New species have not been added since then. The reason is that a legislative amendment was needed to add plants. Beginning January 1, 2025, plants can be added via an IDNR administration rule. This will make it easier to add new species going forward. There will be a short period between January 1 and the end of the rule-making process when no plants are regulated.

The Illinois Noxious Weed Law is administered the Department of Agriculture. The noxious weed list regulates the possession of plants and can mandate control. They have generally given authority to the counties for enforcement. Each county should have a weed inspector. There are not many species on the list and it has not been updated in a long time. It includes two natives – common and giant ragweeds that are regulated within cities and villages for allergen reason. The list is haphazardly enforced, and many counties don't have a weed inspector. Usually, enforcement is based on a specific complaint. To update the list, the dean of the University of Illinois and the head of the IL Department of Agriculture can convene a committee to change the list.

The Illinois Injurious Species Rule is administered by the Illinois DNR fisheries and focuses on aquatic species. It's mostly an aquatic invasive rule and is all taxa. Possession, propagation, purchase, sale, or transport of listed species is prohibited. The species list is long. The list is updated through the rule making process. The aquatics folks have done a great job of working with other great lakes states to unify regulations.

The Illinois Invasive Species Council looks at all invasive taxa. The Council has no regulatory power but instead provides official recommendations to the Illinois Departments of Natural Resources and Agriculture. The Council was active from 2005 – 2015 then went dormant until 2021. The Council is made of four subcommittees; these include terrestrial plants, pests and pathogens, aquatic life, and wildlife. Chris chairs the terrestrial plants subcommittee. The assessment protocol is qualitative rather than quantitative. There are a series of questions to answer by providing evidence-based information on biology, ecology, distribution, impacts, control, etc. Draft assessments are presented to the full committee for feedback. Assessments are finalized and the committee votes on the recommendations. The process takes approximately 6 months. Once adopted, recommendations and assessments are sent to Illinois Departments of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

The subcommittees gather input from stakeholders by sending out an intent to review notification, specifically looking for relevant information on the species. There is a 90-day period for input about the species distribution, damage caused by the species, etc. This notice is sent to the Council's stakeholder list.

When selecting species to assess, they start with a compiled list of species regulated in the Midwest. The goal is to unify regulations regionally.

Illinois is currently struggling with the plant cultivar question as well. Currently they can allow the exclusion of cultivars but haven't done so yet. Their big struggle is about what evidence would be sufficient to demonstrate a cultivar is not invasive. Industry would like to know what would be convincing evidence for a cultivar to be excluded. They want to know this before they do studies and submit petitions. The Council formed a subcommittee to look into this and will look at what other states are doing.

To update the Illinois Exotic Weeds Act list, the rule process will start in January to add list the following species: Garlic mustard, sericea lespedeza, leafy spurge, tree of heaven, stiltgrass, wild parsnip, Callery pear, black and pale swallow-worts, and Amur cork tree.

Laura asked if the Illinois assessment protocol is posted online. Chris said not currently. This is because their group is new, and they are building their website. The council is currently working with DNR to have space on their website and will hopefully be posted by the end of January.

Mackenzie asked "Does each sub-committee come up with their own protocol for assessing their species? If so, are there any concerns with inconsistent assessments between the sub-committees?" Chris said each subcommittee comes up with their own process for assessment since they can vary depending on type and taxa.

Roger asked about the loosestrifes *Lythrum virgatum* and *L. salicaria* and their cultivars. What is Illinois doing with them? Chris said they have not done these assessments yet. *Lythrum salicaria* is regulated. Because *L. virgatum* is in trade and has been implicated with invasion, they want to evaluate it. Roger said he is curious about whether *Galerucella* beetles are found on *L. virgatum*. Chris noted that Illinois does not have as big of an issue with purple loosestrife as Minnesota does.

Roger said that with multiple groups with authorities on plants, how does that work out for land managers to deal with these different authorities? Chris answered that although it can be confusing at times, there is a MOU between DNR and Ag. This gives Ag nursery inspectors the authority to do enforcement for species on the Exotic Weeds Act list. If a situation is outside of nursery, DNR Conservation Offices can be brought in.

Rob asked about how they consider management feasibility. When answering assessment questions, are assumptions made about whether or not management is occurring? Chris answered that there is a section on management that includes many questions. How easy is it to control? Are there known management methods? What is the cost of management? Has the plant been successfully managed previously? If there are not good management options for a species and it is not widespread, that raises the priority for regulation. Rob followed with a question about whether the priority is lower when there are good management options. Chris answered yes, the plant would not be as big of an issue if it were well managed.

Discussion about species evaluation and regulation

Monika asked if there are ways we can utilize each other's work to lighten our individual workloads to assess species. As Laura suggested, sharing assessments is helpful. Are there other things we can do?

Monika brought up the possibility of a regional approach for low fecundity cultivars. She stated that this could help unify the region and reduce the workload for each state. Could we work through the Midwest Invasive Plant Network? It would be helpful to industry if we had a regional approach. Mackenzie said the cultivar advisory committee was suggested by the woody species SAG. They looked into what New York was doing and talked with plant breeding experts. The consensus was that it would be ideal if USDA were the regulatory agency for this advisory committee, but the suggestion has not progressed further than that. Chris agreed that collaboration would be beneficial for industry. He mentioned that the Midwest Invasive Plant Network has a project led by Theresa Culley in Ohio. She has grant funding for pulling together assessment resources such as literature and combining these resources into a single location database with keywords. Then you can quickly find documents related to the keywords, shortening the information collection step. Chris said that for Illinois assessments, the literature and other supporting documents are in a Google Drive and documents can be shared upon request with others working on assessments.

Roger asked how you identify or fingerprint cultivars in trade if they don't have clear genetic distinctions? Chris said that Illinois regulates cultivars unless there is a specific exemption. The business with the trademark for a cultivar can petition to have that cultivar exempted. That's how we can handle it with our current regulatory structure. Mackenzie said Wisconsin lists the cultivars that cannot be sold. She heard from people doing enforcement that it is very challenging to figure out what cultivars are being sold. Labeling requirements are not consistent.

Monika said it would be helpful to learn about plant breeding techniques used to create low fecundity cultivars, the type of data collected and length of time needed for cultivar evaluation, who is doing this plant breeding, which cultivars are in development, etc. Chris added that low fecundity will vary by species. Mackenzie said their SAG talked a few years ago with Mark Brand, Ryan Contreas, and Tom Ranney. Mark Brand's research on barberry fecundity was used for regulatory purposes. Monika added that Ryan Contreas spoke with NWAC's Listing Subcommittee.

Roger asked how you address plants that are native elsewhere moving with climate change. Mackenzie said they have been talking about this issue, but they don't have a specific set of guidelines. They looked at definitions for native and non-native in the rule and how they could apply these definitions. They have not figured out how to factor in climate change with these definitions. Chris said the Wildlife Subcommittee has done the most work on this topic. Armadillos have been moving into southern Illinois over the past couple of decades because of climate change. Are the native or not? Because the armadillos arrived on their own with a range expansion due to climate change, they decided to not consider them invasive. It would be different if humans moved an organism beyond a geographic boundary that it could not cross otherwise.

Next Meeting Date and Goals

Next meeting date

- 2025 meeting dates have not been scheduled yet. Meeting doodles will be sent in January for scheduling. The next meeting will be in February or March.

Future meeting goals

Please contact Monika with topics you would like to learn about or discuss. One option is to continue to learn about how other states are making recommendations and regulating invasive plants. Below are topics that were suggested in 2024.

- Assisted migration - [Superior National Forest's plan](#) was recommended by a committee member
- Length of list – Prohibited Eradicate category
- Presentation from a township about weed management
- Presentation about goats and buckthorn control research

Based on discussions today about white crack willow, Kelsey would like to learn more about what MITPPC has done thus far on white crack willow and/or what led MITPPC to prioritize this tree. Rob said he will share the assessment with Kelsey. MITPPC has not identified a researcher to work on white crack willow.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 1:47pm.

Voting Results 2024 NWAC Voting Members	Canada thistle	European mtn ash	Heat copperleaf	Autumn olive	Willow Austree	Queen of meadow	Russian olive	Stiltgrass	Crack willow
Board of Water and Soil Resources	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
League of Minnesota Cities	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	y
Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Association of County Agricultural Inspectors	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Association of County Land Commissioners	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	y
Minnesota Association of Townships	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Crop Improvement Association	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Department of Transportation	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	y
Minnesota Farmer's Union (absent)									
Minnesota Forest Industries									
Minnesota Invasive Terrestrial Plants and Pests Center	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y
Minnesota Nursery and Landscape Association	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Minnesota Soil Water Conservation Districts	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
The Nature Conservancy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
University of Minnesota Agronomy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
USDA Forest Service	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TOTAL YES VOTES	10	17	15	17	17	17	16	16	17
TOTAL NO VOTES	7		2					1	
PASS (P) or FAIL (F)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P