



**Great Lakes – Northern Forest CESU  
Managers Meeting  
Wednesday, April 28, 2004  
100 Skok Hall  
University of Minnesota  
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

Present: Dorothy Anderson, Alan Ek, Susan Stafford, Lisa Wiley, Jerrilyn Thompson, Mike Blotzer, Bill Burkman, Kirk Lohman, Fred Kollman, and Gary Vequist

Absent: Geoffrey Walsh

## **I. Introductions and Opening Remarks**

Dorothy Anderson opened the meeting with introductions. All federal agencies were represented except for the Bureau of Land Management. Dr. Anderson presented a Power Point presentation describing the GLNF CESU.

### Overview of the GLNF CESU:

- Where it is and the size (map), partners, mission
- Mutual benefits for participation: federal agencies and non-federal agencies
- Funding totals by partner
- Partner participation
- Project updates

### National CESU Network Update:

- Consortium of federal agencies, universities and others linked by a coop agreement
- Intended to enhance interaction, cooperation, and exchange of information in a timely manner
- Applies ecosystem perspective to natural resource management

### National CESU Objectives:

- Provide resource managers with high-quality scientific research, technical assistance, and education
- Deliver research and technical assistance that is timely, relevant to resource managers, and needed to develop and implement sound adaptive management approaches
- Ensure the independence and objectivity of research
- Create and maintain effective partnerships among Federal agencies and universities to share resources and expertise
- Take full advantage of university resources while benefiting faculty and students
- Encourage professional development of federal scientists
- Manage federal science resources efficiently

### Mutual Benefits:

- Federal
  1. Better access to university and other partner expertise
  2. More interaction with other federal agencies, universities and others
  3. Flat 17.5% overhead rate (which does not pass through the host institution)
- University
  1. Better access to federal resources to conduct projects of mutual interest
  2. More interaction with federal agencies, other universities and others
  3. Enhanced ability to conduct research at multiple sites

### GLNF CESU “Pressure Point” Topics:

- Integrate economic, social and cultural with biophysical
- Conduct landscape level studies
- Conduct watershed/water resources studies
- Determine the sustainability of Great Lakes aquatic and terrestrial systems
- Determine the use, protection, and management of forested landscapes
- Determine impacts of diseases and exotic species on resource
- Measure and monitor biodiversity and habitat fragmentation
- Develop effective species restoration and resource conservation techniques
- Monitor climate change and its impact on GLNF resources
- Identify and manage for renewable energy sources
- Measure and monitor continued growth in outdoor based recreation and tourism, including growth in second homes, and its impacts on GLNF resources
- Link landscapes to lifescapes
- Develop knowledge and tools to manage ecosystems

## **II. Administration of the CESU**

### How do we make the GLNF CESU more effective:

- Think about identifying research, technical assistance and education needs and common issues for their particular federal agency.
- One goal is to develop more multi-agency, multi-scale projects (e.g.: Role in Public Trust project – in partnership with the UMN, NPS, and the USFS)
- Provide the GLNF CESU office with proposed needs that have been determined by the agency
- Identify ways to share resources and expertise
- Provide the opportunity to manage federal science resources more effectively and efficiently

Fred Kollman from the NRCS mentioned that the technical representative for the Nature Conservancy in Lansing Michigan (Larry Clemens, Upper Mississippi Basin Team Leader) has many Canadian connections. This is someone whom we should educate about the mutual benefits of the GLNF CESU.

The discussion moved to adding other federal partners. The EPA was mentioned as having about 10 million in grants under the Restoration Act. This money is targeted for Great Lakes restoration projects. Another area of high concern with the EPA is the hypoxia problem in the Gulf of Mexico. John Paricony works from the EPA’s Great Lakes Program office in Chicago. Gary Vequist will provide contact information for John Paricony. GLNF CESU will pursue adding the EPA as a partner and whether they can sign on at a regional level.

The DOD was also mentioned as a potential federal partner to the CESUs. They have IM issues and have the money to have these projects done. This agency is required to manage the lands in a sustainable manner.

A catalog of research, technical assistance and education needs is in the initial phase of development. This will provide a linkage between agency needs and university expertise. It will generate organized accessible information that relates to research, technical assistance and education. The GLNF CESU office will work with agency technical representatives to identify the needs information specific to their agency. A counterpart to the catalog will be a searchable keyword list. These will be available on the GLNF CESU website soon.

### Initiating a CESU project:

A procedural protocol will be established for each federal agency. To date the following agencies have their protocols in place or close to completion: NPS, USFS, USGS, BLM, NRCS. Work to establish the NASA protocol will begin. It is critical to have a GLNF CESU tracking form for required annual reporting to the National CESU office. This form needs to be completed by the PI and returned to the GLNF CESU office.

### Marketing:

The GLNF CESU has a website (<http://www.cnr.umn.edu/cesu>) that is based on the open file system. Current and past projects are available and abstracts and reports are published on this website. Other marketing/communication tools include the following:

- The GLNF CESU is in the initial development phase of providing an electronic newsletter to subscribers
- Conference and seminar presentation
- Fact sheet for distribution
- Poster available for display

### Induction Policy:

The induction procedure was reviewed. Cleveland State University and the University of WI, Stevens Point have been approved for induction into the GLNF CESU. Once the National CESU office prepares the addendum to the Cooperative Agreement and partners ratify this addendum by signature, these institutions can be added to the partner list of the GLNF CESU. The National CESU network has updated the induction policy to read that once a unanimous vote has been reached and the addendum has been prepared, partners will have 45 days to sign and return the addendum to the CESU office. If no signature is received within the 45 day period, no signature will be required.

### CESU Funding Potential:

Alan Ek and Susan Stafford led the discussion on this initiative topic. Due to the Omnibus Management Act, funding authorization for the CESUs and the CESU National Network is in place, but support needs to be obtained from the Appropriations Committee. This initiative would annually provide \$75,000 (\$1,275,000 total) in funding to the CESUs. It is supported by the National Association of Professional Forestry Schools and Colleges (NAPFSC) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). Both Alan Ek and Susan Stafford serve on the NAPFSC Executive Committee (handout provided). Together NAPFSC and NASULGC are making contacts in Washington with both the Administration and Congress to urge support of this modest funding initiative. We all have a stake in this initiative because CESUs are efficient in making connections and getting funding out fast to meet agency needs. In support of this initiative, everyone around the table has an important role in conveying the importance and effectiveness of the CESU program.

### Other GLNF CESU Activities:

- In March 2003 a Strategic Planning meeting was held and a report was drafted that will guide the direction and development of the GLNF CESU.
- The GLNF CESU has co-sponsored two conferences: Great Lakes Mollusk Waters Workshop (February 2004) and the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Western Great Lakes Research Conference (March 2004).
- The annual Executive Committee meeting will be held in the Twin Cities in August 2004. This meeting will include all Federal, University and non-university partner technical representatives. (Note: Soon we will be contacting partners with a tentative agenda and date. Please contribute agenda topics to be included.)

### **III. Agency Needs:**

Each agency representative was given the opportunity to express ideas and specific needs their agency requires. The following is a summary of the information each agency representative provided.

#### **NASA (Glen Research Center in Cleveland)**

##### **1. History:**

- Plumbrook Station in Sandusky: 6400 acres (acquired from DOD – took farms by eminent domain, was used to build TNT during War, liquid hydrogen is manufactured here)
  - a. Prairie plant species are high on site – species survey done by a private contractor is complete
  - b. Six habitats: that include oak savannah, oak prairie, and meadows
  - c. 30 state/threatened/endangered species (e.g.: bald eagle)
  - d. Deer population is high – initiated a hunt last fall
  - e. Will prepare an RFP – Mike Blotzer will contact his legal department for procedural protocol

##### **2. Needs:**

- Update habitat and species surveys and the current management plan
  - a. Most of the historic preservation and archeology information has been completed
  - b. Have an inventory on their website that can provide ideas for projects that cross agencies
- Complete an EIS of the area that has the T/E species because there are encroachment and development issues
- Determine if the management plan is consistent with the remediation plan mission
- Develop a restoration plan in FY2005 for a 27 acre site identified in the remediation plan (site to be restored to prairie, but are questioning whether it should be northern forest)
- Restoration of site in 2006-2007
- Decommission nuclear reactor on site (environmental assessment is complete)

Money is an issue and therefore NASA wants the CESU partners to make proposals to grant funders to get these items underway. Fred Kollman added that each state has a State Technical Committee (each state conservationist manages a state budget and personnel). In order to access the money earmarked for environmental quality assessments, it was recommended that NASA become a member of this committee. It was noted that habitat management and restoration plans fit best with Universities and to pursue partnering with them.

#### **NPS**

##### **1. History:**

- Is involved with military surplus lands – it is legislated that these lands be evaluated for park and recreation uses and needs
- Working with USGS on plant issues (e.g.: pollinators do not come into areas of leafy spurge)
- Lots of inventory and monitoring work is happening – success/control for a specific species
- High concerns with exotic species
  - a. Approaches/techniques for control
    - i. Cutting
    - ii. Hand pulling
    - iii. insects
  - b. How they spread
  - c. How it affects biodiversity on federal lands
  - d. How to handle aquatic exotics
    - i. Not possible to treat as site specific
    - ii. Becomes multi-agency issue

## 2. Needs:

- Public education to teach how to take action to protect the resource
- Establishing buffers to protect parks from environmental contaminants that enter through the waters: Hg, polybormide
- Maintain cultural aspects in parks (interested in a HG tribal project with Fond du Lac that involves monitoring and students)
- Wetland restoration, protection, mitigation (money comes through NRCS for this)
- Develop a list of natural areas that define areas needing restoration
- Protect biodiversity (endangered species, reintroduce missing species)
- Expert identification (money comes from NFS)
- Protect the resources they already have
- Protect endangered species (e.g. mussels, piping plovers, various plants)
- Monitoring of keystone species
- Habitat fragmentation
  - a. How it impacts biodiversity
  - b. How do you measure this - interested in patch size (unlike buffer size – NRCS is concerned with this)
- Identify restoration and how to accomplish it
  - a. Who has the expertise
  - b. How to obtain funding
    - i. CCI
      - 1. Has to be a 50-50 match (flexibility due to 32.5% savings in ICR)

## USGS

### 1. History:

- Doesn't own or manage lands
- Is involved with military surplus lands – it is legislated that these lands be evaluated for park and recreation uses and needs

### 2. Needs:

- Develop and refine I&M
- Coordination of monitoring
- Interested in ways to screen and predict for the “next” exotics
  - a. Cindy Kohler is the invasive species tracking person
- Education components
  - a. Forest pest control
  - b. Negative effects of transporting wood

## NRCS

### 1. History:

- Budget related issues
  - a. Presented to Congress
  - b. Allocated at a state level
  - c. Spent on private lands
- Doesn't own land
  - a. Farm Bill: Ag lobbies to get funding support for them (is more like an executive-type office)
- Have a history of partnering with the Army Corp and the EPA
- Will be partnering with NASA – using their satellites to do surveys – will need an expert to interpret this information
- Issues center around nutrients and how it affects ag lands – private lands
- Their natural resources concerns are mostly on private lands
- They are the application people – not the researchers/scientists, therefore want to collaborate so as to provide guidance
- Have a priority to spend money on tribal lands and currently work with White Earth (Mahnomen, MN) and Onida (Green Bay)

## 2. Needs:

- Need assistance from CESU with the design of the applications
  - a. Air quality issues relating to confined animals
  - b. Water quality issues
  - c. Manure management
- Partnership Management Team (PMT) handout defined the NRCS 2003 National High Priority Research and Technology Development Needs. The needs are listed as follows.
  1. Effects of conservation practices related to nutrients and pathogens from land applications and farm runoff.
  2. The role and effectiveness of conservation practices for particulate matter and/or odor control related to animal feeding operations.
  3. Environmental or public benefits related to conservation practices.
  4. Nutrient removal/harvesting from animal waste.
  5. Groundwater contamination from animal waste and seepage measurement associated with wastewater holding facilities.
  6. Efficiency of vegetated filter areas in removing nutrients, pathogens, and suspended solids.
  7. Acceptable and scientific basis for tests in determining thresholds for nitrogen and phosphorus.
  8. Identify new forage, crop varieties, and other vegetative means that remove large amounts of phosphorus from the soil.
  9. Causes and effects (including health impacts) of gaseous emissions and/or greenhouse gases.
  10. Rehabilitation of aging flood control dams.
  11. Relationship and restoration of upland riparian and floodplain processes that contribute to improve aquatic habitats.
  12. Stream corridor restoration design tools.
- CESU to provide the technical assistance and educational information and NRCS would incorporate it into their plans/work
- CESU to provide the synthesis of information/data
- Monitoring of their monitoring practices
- Monitor the success of treatments to rid the area of problematic issues

## USFS

### 1. History:

- Are involved with issues that cross agency, county, and state borders
- Partnered with the WI DNR to complete inventory and monitoring work, but no one set of information that gives comprehensive/location information is available
- The Chief sets the direction as to which way they will go
- Look at relationships while using systematic techniques

### 2. Needs:

- Fire issues
- Unmanaged recreation
- Invasives
- Healthy forests
  - a. Emerald Ash borer affecting multiple counties in MI, IN, and OH
  - b. Develop landowner specific information to convert agricultural lands to native forests
- I/M on national forest systems
  - a. Want to come up with a target list to work with
  - b. Want to identify sites/plots to target
  - c. Want to identify what characteristics enhance or don't enhance the stand
  - d. Need systematic landscape level I/M information
  - d. Want to develop a landowner guide that relates to technical assistance
  - e. Determine how to get landowner guide information into the landowners hands
  - f. Want to tap the USGS for monitoring related information off of the Mississippi River

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.