

L-SOHC Alternatives for Addressing Emerging Issue of Aquatic Invasive Carp Species

The Council has some options on how it approaches the issue of aquatic invasive carp species. Those options and some thoughts about them are:

1. At the Aug. 23 meeting, ask the DNR to discuss their AIS strategy and allow them to submit a request as soon as possible to be heard on September 7 or 8.
 - Puts the burden on DNR for strategy and tactics, including permitting and construction
 - How is effectiveness measured?
 - Responsive to issue

2. Re-open application period specifically for aquatic invasive carp species and hear all requests on September 12 and 13, prior to Sept. 20 allocations.
 - Responds to request to re-open process
 - Provides an opportunity for all organizations to respond to issue
 - Calls into question integrity of process if the Call for Requests deadline is changed
 - What if no one responds?
 - How is effectiveness measured?

3. Set aside an amount of money to be dedicated to aquatic invasive carp species requests at the Sept. 20 allocation hearing either:
 1. for a special Call for Requests to be reviewed and allocated on November 15th, or
 2. for the DNR to coordinate an set of aquatic invasive carp species requests with other possible proposers.
 - Puts the executive branch in the driver's seat
 - The timeline appears to be not as responsive as other options

J:\Lessard Council\MEETING Folders by Meeting date\2011\Council options - aquatic invasive carp species requests.doc

Bill Becker

From: Landwehr, Tom (DNR) [tom.landwehr@state.mn.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2011 11:55 AM
To: Bill Becker; Skinner, Luke C (DNR)
Cc: 'David Hartwell'; 'Jim Cox'; Heather Koop; Sandy Smith; Schad, Dave R (DNR); Wilson, Grant (DNR); Hirsch, Steve A (DNR); Meier, Bob (DNR)
Subject: RE: Presentation before LSOHC August 23rd

Thanks very much, Bill, and thanks to the Council for acting expeditiously. I have not had a lot of discussion with others on this, but here are a few thoughts.

1. There is only one pending project, to my knowledge, that could be submitted for rapid implementation (the proposed Prescott sonic/bubble barrier). This still has lots of hurdles, presents some feasibility questions, but has had agency/organization discussion. I suspect there are other ideas out there, but I don't think any are ready for immediate funding.
2. Similarly, I don't think there are any other organizations or agencies out there that have project proposals that can move quickly, or that they are in the lead on. I believe the Department is the natural organization to lead implementation, and am not sure if any other can or will.
3. I believe there is a lot of interest in research, but don't think the Council will/should entertain that.
4. At the upcoming meeting, DNR staff will give background on Asian carp, and control methods, but we'll wait until the request comes to submit a proposal.

It would be my recommendation that the Council solicit a proposal from DNR for the one project that seems ready to go. If you want to open to a broader potential pool, I would suggest we use a technical team to evaluate the merits of proposals before consideration by the Council. That would require a longer lead time, but may uncover ideas I'm not aware of. I don't know if we'll be able to provide someone from the Commissioner's office to attend – we'll certainly try to – but you should know that we are committed to working with the Council on this, and will have a proposal to you by your requested date.

Again, thanks to the Council for your collaboration on this. It is unfortunate we are having to deal with this, but your assistance in addressing the issue will help us to better protect Minnesota's critical natural resources.

Tom Landwehr
Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Take a Child Outdoors Today!