

Meeting Notes for Aquatic Invasive Species Work Group
Monday, November 23, 2015

ATTENDEES

Bruce Michael
Jonathan McKnight
Jay Kilian
Margie Brassil
Joseph Love
Donna Morrow
Kelley Johnson
Gary Burnett
Barbara Beelar
Elliott Campbell
Mark Lewandowski

Via Phone
Matt Ashton
Carol Jacobs
Eric Null
Julie Bortz
Sarah Milbourne

Work Group Introductions

- B. Michael – Provided hard copies of latest draft of report including updated matrix table

Finalize Alternatives Options

- M. Ashton – Cautioned about using hyperlinks in final report since website updates could make links obsolete over time.
 - M. Brassil – Agreed and recommended striking hyperlinks from report
- B. Beelar – Asked about appendices in report
 - B. Michael – Literature cited sections will be removed from individual chapters and all literature cited will be listed in a separate section at end of report
 - B. Beelar – Recommended including relevant documents (e.g., zebra mussel) as appendices
- M. Lewandowski – Described sources of cost estimates in matrix table
 - C. Jacobs – Would there be a cost to lake users for boat decontamination cleanings?
 - M. Lewandowski – No cost to lake users; cost will be covered by state
 - M. Lewandowski – Cleanings would not be free to all boaters; boat cleaning would only happen if AIS were found
 - Group agreed to include an estimate of cost to lake user on matrix table

Discussion and Reach Consensus on Report Recommendations and Actions

- D. Morrow – Asked if the self-inspection and certification approach could be voluntary
 - J. McKnight – Signs at boat ramp already offer the voluntary approach
- E. Null/ S. Milbourne/ J. Bortz – Would like to include a sentence in the report about the role of lake managers in deciding which approaches from the toolbox to use.

- E. Null/ J. Bortz – Recommended removing “Deep Creek Lake” from mention in the recommendations section of the report
- J. Bortz – Recommended that first recommendation in the report should be to conduct a lake assessment; DNR needs to ask legislature for the funding needed to conduct surveys
- Group discussed priority lakes list, how to prioritize, criteria, etc.
 - J. Love – Are expected costs for prioritization realistic in the matrix table, or should estimates be higher to cover costs associated with lake assessment surveys, etc?
 - J. Love – Recommended bolstering “cost to agency” to cover costs for prioritization
 - B. Michael – Agreed; will update the matrix to cover prioritization costs
 - J. Love – What data would be used in the prioritization?
 - J. Kilian – Data on lake usage, potential economic impacts to local community, biological resources (e.g., presence of rare species, important habitats, etc.) could be used in prioritization
 - E. Null – It would be expensive to acquire boater use data for DCL
 - G. Burnett – MD Park Service cannot cover costs of additional stewards, etc.; additional funds must be obtained to cover these costs
 - M. Brassil – It is important to clearly state the costs of actions in the report; must spell the costs out to the legislature
 - Group - Requests for funding should include costs incurred so far at DCL and a description of what isn’t being done now as a result of the AIS efforts now underway
 - E. Null – Will provide an estimate of DCL expenses to date
- K. Johnson – Closing boat ramps for mandatory inspection will not be practical; would cause huge outcry from public
 - J. McKnight – Boat launch would have to be closed if inspection was mandatory; agreed that it would be impractical and would anger lake users
- J. Bortz – Recommended providing costs for AIS control in report so that the legislature sees the full picture of AIS costs; also recommended including estimates of what other states spend on AIS
- M. Lewandowski – Asked M. Brassil if the group should ask for a dedicated funding source
 - M. Brassil – Yes, in the funding section of the report
- M. Brassil – Recommended removing the section titled “Other Recommendations” from report
- J. Love – Should we include costs to other agencies (e.g., SHA, MDE) for their involvement in AIS prevention (e.g., education/outreach)
 - B. Michael – Only costs to DNR should be included in the report
- C. Jacobs – Cost estimates in the economic analysis, matrix table, and approach descriptions do not match
 - J. Kilian - Will check and fix inconsistencies in cost estimates listed throughout report
- J. Bortz – Recommended including a line item cost estimate in report document
- D. Morrow - Commented that the Waterways Improvement Fund (listed in the Funding Options/Approaches section) is a tax and can only be changed by an act of Congress

- C. Jacobs – Recommended adding J. Bortz as a Workgroup member in the report
- J. Love – Should we embed cost of monitoring and AIS assessments into matrix and eliminate the paragraph currently under “Other Recommendations”
 - M. Bressler – Recommended moving the lake AIS assessment task to “Actions needed prior to implementation” section
 - D. Morrow – Recommended moving it to a section titled something like “Supplemental actions that would improve success of implementation”
 - J. McKnight – Recommended that we do not include anything that we can’t currently afford to do because it could come back as an unfunded mandate
- D. Morrow - Recommended removing Option 3 “Integrating into Existing Programs” from the Funding Options/Approaches section.
- J. Bortz – Recommended including case studies to provide legislature with idea of how other states have funded similar programs.
- M. Brassil – Recommended “Costs for AIS Control” under the Economic Analysis should be made into a table to be more reader-friendly; or leave as text in that section, and include a table in the Funding Options section. M. Brassil – offered to create the table
- J. Bortz/ M. Brassil/ B. Beelar/ and E. Campbell – Will work to include costs estimates from other states into report
- B. Beelar – Suggested using voluntary approaches to AIS (e.g., payroll tax donation, license plate program, etc.)
- C. Jacobs – Commented on the Economic Analysis section; requested that the \$5,000 estimate of lost boat mooring revenue attributed to Hydrilla be removed.
 - E. Campbell – Agreed to remove the estimate and replace it with a discussion of how AIS vegetation can impede access to moorings
- E. Campbell – Recommended moving the Economic Analysis section to follow the Matrix table
- D. Morrow – Recommended changing the first sentence in the Education/Outreach description to read “the Department would” rather than “the Department will”.
- B. Beelar - Asked for clarification as to whether or not Blair’s Valley Lake is in Maryland
 - Group - Yes, the lake is in Maryland and should remain on list of state lakes

Final Report Review and Time Line

- M. Brassil – Offered to proof read the report; will need a couple of days to complete
- Comments on current draft should be submitted to B. Michael by December 4
- Final draft to be completed by Mid-December

Determine Need for Next Meeting:

- No additional meeting is scheduled at this time