

Meeting Notes for Aquatic Invasive Species Work Group
Thursday, June 25, 2015

ATTENDEES

Bruce Michael
Mark Talty
Kelley Johnson
Donna Morrow
Elliott Campbell
Daryl Anthony
Mark Lewandowski

Mike Naylor
Jay Kilian
Carol Jacobs
Lisa Eutsler
Rich Norling
Eric Gally
Barbara Beelar

Review Work Group Charge:

M. Talty explained the bill that passed (HB 860). “After April 1, 2017, an owner of a vessel may not place the vessel or have the vessel placed in a lake at a public launch ramp or public dock unless the owner has cleaned the vessel and removed all visible organic material.” Created this work group to draft a report that includes:

- Recommended actions to reduce the spread of AIS from vessels placed in lakes that are owned or managed by the State
- Recommend Budget items
- Recommend potential funding sources to implement the actions
- Prioritize activities and resources
- Develop an implementation plan

The work group must submit the report by December 31, 2015 to the Maryland General Assembly (MGA). Once the work group has made the recommendations to the MGA, it is the MGA that will make the final decision as to what will be done

- R. Norling – reminded the work group that the MGA must be given a 15 day advanced copy.

It was discussed that if we wanted fines/fees it must be included in the funding sources. B. Beelar requested that the original 2003 legislation be posted on the website that B. Michael has started up –<http://mddnr.chesapeakebay.net/ais/> . Also, it was noted that Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) is a general phrase to cover species instead of listing every one.

The webpage will also include a list of relevant literature on invasive species, Watercraft Inspection and Decontamination (WID) inspection stations, relevant regulations, etc.

Logistics:

The work group has decided that they shall hold monthly meetings, the last Tuesday of the month, starting at 1 pm. The first 3-4 months will be provided with background information.

Around September/October, with the cooperation of everybody's input, an outline for the report to the MGA will be started. October/November will be a review process that everybody will be involved with. November/December will be the fine tuning so that the report can be finalized and sent to the MGA prior to December 31, 2015.

Aquatic Invasive Species Overview (M. Lewandowski):

- All state/jurisdictions are dealing with this issue nation wide
- Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANSTF) is lobbying congress to restore funding under the Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990
- Many western states using different approaches, but most WID programs run through boater license fees
- ANSTF working with states and other industry groups to come up with consistent WID approaches across jurisdictions
- There are no East Coast WID programs like the western states, except Lake George, New York
- The Lake George program costs ~ \$600,000 annually for 6 WID stations – 3 at launches and 3 are privately owned. This dollar represents mostly the start up fees. There is a vessel inspection seal posted on the boat once inspected. The seal indicates you will go in the fast track lanes and not have to go through inspections when launching repeatedly.
- Deep Creek Lake (DCL) has implemented an education/outreach program of AIS; currently have voluntary WID inspection at DCL State Park that is modeled on western state Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) programs
 - C. Jacobs – Must factor lost tourism into costs of WID stations; education/outreach is effective and less money than WID stations; Deep Creek Lake (DCL) has eight boat launches; her marina launches approximately 3,000 boats/year; cannot run all boat launches through the State Park – not logistically feasible
 - M. Lewandowski - Other states have a \$10-20 fee at launch to cover inspections; there are ways to accelerate inspection process (e.g., use of inspection seals)
 - B. Michael – one of the workgroup's task is to assess the costs associated with preventive activities (i.e., WID inspections, education/outreach)
 - B. Beelar – Must do a full cost accounting; if you do not prevent AIS, the cost in control/eradication is exorbitant
 - M. Naylor – What happens now if a boat shows up to a marina with ANS, mud, etc. attached? C. Jacobs – responded that marinas typically will clean the boat as part of maintenance. M. Naylor - It would be good to have a separate location to take a boat for decontamination once ANS is discovered
 - C. Jacobs – Expressed concerns regarding waste water – where to dispose of decontamination wastewater?
 - D. Anthony – Are there other state lakes where there are both private and public launches? Group discussion – DCL might be unique in that way; all other state lakes have only state-run public launches.
 - C. Jacobs – What works best, WID or education outreach?
 - M. Lewandowski – ANS prevention programs are on a continuum – not a one size fits all approach; effectiveness ranges from 88% (visual inspection and hand removal) to 62% (low pressure wash). Information is from a study conducted by

John Rothlisberger, Lindsay Chadderton, Joanna McNulty and David Lodge entitled *Aquatic Invasive Species Transport via Trailered Boats: What is being moved, Who is moving it, And what can be done?* Effectiveness percentages referenced in article abstract are 88% for visual inspection and hand removal, 83% for high pressure boat washing, and 62% for low pressure washing.

- B. Beelar – ANS study determined that education/outreach alone is insufficient to prevent the spread. ANS stated that more enforcement and compliance is needed.
- M. Lewandowski - There is no 100% effective approach; need a combination of both WID and education/outreach.
- J. Kilian – other states that have devoted ANS staff and funding have shown that education/outreach alone is not sufficient; changing behavior of boater and anglers is very difficult and requires consistent efforts, money, and time
- D. Morrow – If decontamination is not 100% effective and 10-15% of ANS slip by, then shouldn't efforts be focused on control rather than prevention?
- J. Kilian - Decontamination, even when it is less than 100% effective, can dramatically reduce the potential that an ANS will become established.
- C. Jacobs – Inspection process needs to be addressed; boats are private property, how to handle drain plugs; liability of stewards conducting inspection, potential property damage, etc; there are inspection liability and search-and-seizure issues to consider
- B. Beelar - As it stands currently, unless the steward is given permission, they are not allowed to conduct inspection
- D. Anthony – Is it sufficient for boaters that want to do the right thing to clean their boat on their own prior to launch? M. Lewandowski – Yes, a commercial high-pressure carwash can be effective
- B. Michael - there is a potential business opportunity for companies in local area to provide boat cleaning services
- M. Lewandowski – In 2015, only one boater has refused inspection to date.
- M. Talty – under the current regulations, it is illegal to place a boat with ANS on state waters; stewards could call NRP.
- B. Beelar - stewards could take photos of boats before launch for boaters that decline inspection
- B. Michael – If there is a problem, how long would it take the NPR to respond?
- K. Johnson – NPR maintains a day and night shift on the lake during the summer; response should be rapid
- D. Anthony – State Park personnel, including stewards, cannot be confrontational if a boat owner refuses inspection; they are not law enforcement
- M. Lewandowski – Last year, there were 21 out of 1000 boats that had AIS material on them; this material was removed by stewards.
- B. Beelar – Are stewards currently inspecting live wells? M. Lewandowski – Yes, and boaters with full live wells are asked to empty the water and replace with lake water
- M. Lewandowski – High numbers of live bait fish are trucked to DCL from Pennsylvania

Maryland Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (J. Kilian):

(See handout attached).

- MDNR Invasive Species Matrix Team is currently working on a draft plan
- The plan should be completed and submitted to the ANSTF by early 2016
- If approved by the ANSTF, the state plan will give MDNR and collaborating partners access to annual funding (approximately \$25k) provided under Section 1204 of the Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Species Prevention and Control Act of 1990.
- Prevention efforts recommended by this work group should be consistent with strategies/actions included in the state plan.
- Much of the background info compiled for the Maryland ANS Management Plan will be useful for the work group report

Develop Work Plan (B. Michael):

- E. Campbell and C. Jacobs will work together to assess economic impacts
- This work group is tasked with prioritizing actions to be taken and location where action should be taken; some state lakes may not be a big concern and will not require attention
- The work group will be providing the science aspect of this and our recommendations should be based on sound science
 - C. Jacobs – Much of the focus is on boat launches; kayaks, canoes, and other small watercraft are also a concern; kayaks, etc. can be launched from anywhere; inspecting all kayaks, canoes is unrealistic; outfitters are a good outreach opportunity
 - B. Beelar – education efforts should not just focus on boat launching; boaters removing their boats from the lake are also a concern for ANS spread to other areas; education should focus on both
 - J. Kilian - Stop Aquatic Hitchhiker signs include the “before launching, before leaving” message
 - C. Jacobs - Signs appear to be working; more folks aware of AIS issues
- Information Needs?
 - B. Beelar - Are there examples of state management plans to review? J. Kilian – Yes, the ANSTF website has several examples (e.g., Lake Tahoe) of state management plans.
 - E. Campbell – It would be good to obtain boat launch use data from launches other than the state park. C. Jacobs - many private marinas are hesitant to provide their use data due to competition concerns, etc.
 - D. Morrow – Marinas could provide data anonymously
 - C. Jacobs - will ask other private marinas operators to provide a total launch number; many boats are launched for service – many from nearby states - PA, OH, etc..
 - C. Jacobs – what about sailboats and the yacht clubs? M. Lewandowski – will reach out to the yacht club to find out more about use, etc. B. Beelar – many of the sailboats are “frozen”- used only on DCL; there is a regatta once a year where many sailboats come from other states; Yacht Club is waiting for DNR’s specifications; we should work with yacht clubs and sailing schools for education/outreach opportunities
 - M. Lewandowski – there is a growing use of education/outreach and WID demonstration at fishing tournaments

- Developing a rough outline of work will be focus of future meeting

Other Business:

- B. Michael/Mark Trice (DNR Resource Assessment Service) has set up the Aquatic Invasive Species website as already noted: <http://mddnr.chesapeakebay.net/ais/>
- Background documents will be posted before next meeting

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be on Tuesday, July 28, 2015 at 1pm. Location (DNR Tawes Office Bldg.) and room TBD.

Handout –

Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan for Maryland:

A sub-committee of the MDNR Invasive Species Matrix Team is currently reviewing a draft ANS plan for the state. The intent of this plan is to identify and address ANS problems and coordinate prevention, monitoring, and control efforts among the various jurisdictions and partners. The ANS plan will:

- Describe ANS impacts (global and in MD)
- Describe research needs and knowledge gaps
- Describe and rank the vectors and pathways responsible for ANS introduction in MD
- List priority ANS established in MD waters
- List Red-Alert ANS (species with high-potential for introduction in MD)
- Describe prevention strategies for each vector/pathway and priority species
- Develop a coordination and communication structure for rapid response to ANS introductions
- Describe strategies to control and slow the spread of ANS
- Identify and describe existing authorities, programs, and partners that will participate in plan implementation
- Identify potential funding sources for plan implementation
- Establish an implementation schedule

Once completed, this plan will be submitted to the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force for review. If approved, the state plan will give MDNR and collaborating partners access to annual funding (approximately \$25k) provided under Section 1204 of the Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Species Prevention and Control Act of 1990.

Tentative Timeline:

August 2015:	Initial draft of ANS plan completed
September 2015:	DNR internal review of plan completed
October 2015:	Draft of plan sent to external review by all partners (including the AIS Workgroup)
December 2015:	Final draft submitted to Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force