

INVASIVE SPECIES REGULATION IN MICHIGAN:

Stakeholders Workshop

Transgenic and Invasive Species Act Part 413, P.A. 451 of 1994

New law enacted in July, 2005

Established lists of "prohibited" and "restricted" species.

Established penalties for possession

Created the Invasive Species Fund, supported by collection of fines for possession

Required posting of information on the web

Required annual report to legislature and governor

Created the Invasive Species Advisory Council
(aquatic and terrestrial)

Invasive Species Advisory Council (ISAC)

Membership: directors of

Department of Natural Resources (chair)

Department of Environmental Quality

Department of Agriculture

Aquatic Nuisance Species Council

All members of ISAC are also members of the ANS Council, though ANS Council includes others, such as Department of Transportation, university and conservation organization representatives.

Responsible for overseeing implementation of Michigan's ANS State Management Plan.

Proposal to integrate the two councils; meeting jointly since October 2006.

ISAC Responsibilities

Review lists of prohibited and restricted species

Recommend additions to and/or deletions from the lists

<><><><><><><><><><><><><><>

No definition of "prohibited" and "restricted"

No process for reviewing nominations or criteria for recommending species to list or de-list

State Management Plan Project

Working with ANS Council staff members in Michigan's Office of the Great Lakes to develop suitable approach.

ANS Council staff members (also staff to ISAC) requested help with developing the process for listing/de-listing.

To List or De-List?

Developing the Process

Recommended stakeholder workshop to provide input/develop buy in for process development.

Stakeholders would discuss and recommend important elements for ISAC to use in its process.

ISAC staff would use recommendations in drafting a proposed process.

Stakeholders would have an opportunity to comment on proposed process.

ISAC would consider those comments in finalizing the process.

To List or De-List?

Developing the Process

Worked with ISAC and Sea Grant Extension staff members to develop list of relevant stakeholders and to identify appropriate representatives to invite.

Invited more than 40 representatives from landscape and nursery, aquaculture and baitfish, pet/aquarium, conservation and environmental organizations, federal, state, tribal, international government agencies, aquarium clubs and universities.

To List or De-List?

Developing the Process

Invited out-of-state speakers with experience in invasive species management process:

Paul Zajicek – Florida and ANS Task Force

Barre Hellquist – Massachusetts botanist and New England council

ISAC staff members presented background information about existing laws.

Stakeholder representatives spoke on issues, needs and concerns about regulation.

To List or De-List?

Developing the Process

Michigan Sea Grant Extension staff members facilitated breakout discussions.

Great Lakes Commission staff members introduced and welcomed and recorded presentations and breakout discussions.

Workshop conducted in “neutral” setting, away from offices, other distractions.

To List or De-List?

Developing the Process

Breakout discussion questions:

What elements should the process include to ensure that it is:

Scientifically sound

Risk-based

Consistent

Fair

Protects Environment and Economy

“Thinking points” sent in advance; those unable to attend could respond in writing

To List or De-List? Developing the Process

Stakeholder Workshop

September 21, 2006

Bengel Wildlife Center

Bath, Michigan

State Efforts to Prevent and Control AIS Asian Carp and Snakehead

- Indiana (DNR)
 - Illegal to import, possess or release (without a permit) listed species
 - Includes snakehead, black, bighead, and silver carp
- Pennsylvania (Fish and Boat Commission)
 - Lists aquatic species banned in Pennsylvania (sale, barter, possession or transportation)
 - Includes live snakehead species, black, bighead and silver carp
- Minnesota (DNR)
 - Prohibited invasive species list (fish):
 - Includes bighead, black, grass, and silver carp



2005/2006 Comparison

2005

- 1,691 applications
- 1,665 permits & COCs issued
- 255 amendments issued

2006

- 1,875 applications (+11%)
- 1,848 permits & COCs issued (+11%)
- 273 amendments issued (+9%)

New England Invasive Species Programs

Gregory Hellquist
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, Emeritus
North Andover, Massachusetts 01247



Conclusion

- Future legislation and workings within our current Regulations that would be acceptable to MI's Green Industry include open communication, a transparent process, and the use of a scientific foundation to establish whether a plant is truly invasive (as defined by the Executive Order), and would also provide for a funded, realistic plan for eradication and/or suppression of truly invasive species in Michigan's environment.





7. Mechanism of structural plasticity

Man in white shirt presenting to a group of people seated around a table.

(1)
-Scientific Quantification
-Expert Review
-Stakeholder participation
-Tools
-Feasibility
-Triphasic status change
-Also feasible
-Apparently compete with other species
-Past history of species in similar environments
-Change of surface bacterial taxa
-Negative impact obvious
-Propagate beyond immediate model





• ACROSS TAXONOMIC GROUPS

DAY #3

ELEMENTS = SCIENTIFIC SOUND

• DEF OF INV Sp

→ ELLIOTT HART

→ HOW SCIENTIFIC THEORY?

• NATIVE VS. NON-NATIVE (INVASIVE VS. NON-INVASIVE)

FAIR



Question II → Finalized

- 1 Explains why
- 2 MANDATORY R
- 3 Council only has legislative M
- 4 Define the OF RISK

(2)

- Expert panel (Scientist)
- Trade expert
- Legislation or Rules
- Add "No/Yes Dept?"
- Add "201"
- Contact with other states or not concerned

Question 3 + 4

- 1- Process → consistency
- "Beaver Center Protocol"
- 2- Involve stakeholders
- 3 All stakeholders
- 4 How do you inform stakeholders
- 5 Input from stakeholders on experience and impacts

proactivity
consensus on process

(3)

- Shared panel
- Panel has to put
- Consistent at state level
- Best case of 1991
- Budget of request

(4)

- Stakeholder involved
- 201's support
- Multiple parties involved from

Question 5

Ecological Economics: what Species that have the potential to impact the "ecosystem"?

APPROPRIATE TOOLS FOR DIFFERENT SITUATIONS

LAW IN PLACE - NO SUPPORT

FUNDING TO IMPLEMENT PLAN

APPROACHES

(5)

- Shared panel
- Panel has to put
- Consistent at state level
- Best case of 1991
- Budget of request



- Legislation or Rules
- Add Health Dept.?
- Add DOT?
- Contact with other states on risk assessment

RISK BASED

- EARLY DETECTION
RAPID RESPONSE
- LOOK OUTSIDE OF MICH.
- RECOGNIZE ALL PATHWAYS
- DON'T FORGET SMALL THINGS, i.e. FISH VIRUSES

"Senge Center Protocol"

- 2 - Involve Stakeholders
- 3 All stakeholders
4. How do you INFORM STAKEHOLDERS
5. Input from stakeholders & their experiences and impacts

- Process as...
- Dependant...
- Brand serv...
- Biology of...

PROACTIVITY
 CONSENSUS ON PROC
TIMELINESS - imple



Question 5

FOCUS ON Economically important
Species that have the potential ^{and out of}
to impact the environment ^{high likelihood}

APPROPRIATE TOOLS FOR
DIFFERING SITUATION

LAW IN PLACE — NO ENFORCEMENT

FUNDING TO IMPLEMENT Mgmt
Plan

PREVENTION

COMPREHENSIVE APPROACHES

LEADERSHIP

(5)

Enforcement

- Usually side an environmental
- Less Director should have an
- will be used.
- Rapid Response

Economic

- Educated - information
- Multiple approach
- Stakeholders
- Culture is the
- Income of
- Design
- List
- Program





To List or De-List?

Developing the Process

Workshop Evaluation

Moderately successful in meeting objectives

Successful in organization

Presentations were informative

Facilitators guided participants effectively

Most expected to participate in reviewing and
commenting on draft process

Facilities and food highly rated

To List or De-List?

Developing the Process

Participants appreciated the opportunity to discuss the issues with other stakeholders and to influence the development of the ISAC process.

Some people were disappointed that the workshop discussion wasn't designed to actually draft the process.

To List or De-List?

Developing the Process

Between September and March ISAC staff discussed and developed

- (1) draft process
- (2) information guide

Sea Grant conducted follow up meeting on April 23, 2007 at Michigan State University.

Invited all workshop participants, those unable to attend then, encouraged them to invite others and submit written comments if unable to participate in the meeting.

Sent draft documents to invitees.

Five sets of comments submitted.







To List or De-List? Developing the Process

What's next?

ISAC staff members meeting Monday, May 14 to consider comments and discuss final process and information guide.

Expect to incorporate elements in updating Michigan's ANS State Management Plan

Lessons Learned

State management plans exist in a fluid context. Michigan's new laws required patience and a different approach than originally anticipated. Had to reckon with the new realities (including state budget crisis) in updating and implementing the plan.

Stakeholders are crucial to success of planning and implementation and can be engaged constructively.

Working on this task strengthened relationships among ISAC staff, increased connection with Sea Grant, engagement of stakeholders.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Great Lakes Commission

Kathe Glassner-Shwayder

Erika Jensen

Tom Crane

Invasive Species Advisory Council

Roger Eberhardt – DEQ

Emily Finnell – DEQ

Mary Ellen Cromwell – DNR

Ray Rustem – DNR

Gary Towns – DNR

Mike Bryan – MDA

Robin Rosenbaum – MDA

Michigan Sea Grant Extension

Mark Breederland

Chuck Pistis

Ron Kinnunen

John Schwartz

