Using a community herbicide shed to eliminate a barrier to invasive weed control
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Assessing a local need

The problem

Invasive species are an increasing problem along the north shore of Lake Superior.
Assessing a local need

The challenges

Management Mosaics

1. Landowners can disregard practices on adjacent land
2. The incentives needed for landowners to control weeds increases as ownership diversity increases

See Epanshin-Niell et al. (2009)
Addressing that need

Education and outreach
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University of Minnesota Extension

Cook County Invasives Team

Sugarloaf

The North Shore Stewardship Association
Participants in all workshops reported that they:

(1) learned how to identify invasive species,
(2) learned how to control invasive species,
(3) had situations where they could apply what was learned, and
(4) would change their practices based on what they learned.

_BUT..._
Addressing that need

Few landowners reported being willing or able to purchase the equipment and herbicides needed for controlling invasive weed populations on their own properties

BUT...
Eliminating barriers

The Community Shed
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Eliminating barriers

The Community Shed
Eliminating barriers

The Community Shed

1. Escort
2. Transline
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Eliminating barriers

The Community Shed
Achieving impact
On-the-ground control

7 landowners treated 10 acres
Figure 1. Knowledge gained during herbicide training. Each value is the average proportion of correct answers by all participants; pre-scores (blue) are from a population size of 7, and post-scores (red) are from a population size of 6.
Figure 2. Change in attitude that occurred during herbicide training and application. Scores range from 1 (favorable opinion of herbicides) to 7 (unfavorable opinion of herbicides) and values illustrated are the average score from 11 Likert scale questions given to each herbicide training participant. Participant 3 did not submit a post-evaluation.
Conclusions

• A barrier to weed management among private landowners is a lack of herbicides, equipment, and training

• A community herbicide shed can effectively change the knowledge, attitudes, and practices of all participants

• Using evaluations in processes like these can guide community developers to better meet the needs of the community
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