

Meeting Notes for Aquatic Invasive Species Work Group
Wednesday, November 4, 2015

ATTENDEES

Bruce Michael
Jay Kilian
Matt Ashton
Margie Brassil
Joseph Love
Donna Morrow
Kelley Johnson
Barbara Beelar
Elliott Campbell
Lee Karrh

Via Phone
Jonathan McKnight
Carol Jacobs
Eric Null
Julie Bortz
Sarah Milbourne
Mark Lewandowski
Seth Metheny

Work Group Introductions

B. Michael – Thanked all in the workgroup that have provided input and analysis on the alternative options, costs, funding, etc.

AIS Work Group Committee Update

Review of Alternative Options Matrix

- M. Lewandowski – provided update on the latest version of the matrix sent to group prior to meeting.
- B. Beelar – seeking a clarification on HB860 regarding if bill requires mandatory inspection.
 - the consensus of the group was that the bill does not require mandatory inspection.
 - B. Michael will obtain clarification on this from AG office
- J. Love – recommended estimating true costs of staff time and replacing “staff time” under the Cost to Agency section of the matrix with a real dollar estimate.
 - Group agreed with this suggestion
- B. Beelar – questioned the legitimacy of the WID cost estimates since not all lakes have “hard” launches.
 - Group agreed to include a range of costs rather than hard numbers.
- Group discussed including footnotes and sources of the cost estimates included in the matrix.
 - B. Michael – M. Lewandowski will revise the matrix table and include footnotes and documentation of sources used to estimate costs
- B. Beelar – asked for clarification on mandatory inspection vs. WID
 - The difference between these options is that for WID – a wash station will be provided and/or boaters will be required to clean their boats/trailers at a nearby car wash

- B. Beelar – asked for clarification of “Burden on Public” vs. “Burden on Community” titles in the matrix
 - “Public” refers to boaters and other lake issues
 - “Community” refers to lake residents, small businesses, etc.
 - M. Brassil – suggested changing “Public” to “Lake Users” and “Community” to “Local Community”
- Group agreed that “Potential loss of tourism” should be listed under Burden on Community under the Mandatory Inspection option.
- J. Love - recommended including the E. Campbell’s economic analysis as a footnote under the “Burden to Public” and “Burden to Community” sections
- M. Ashton – commented that since none of the options in the matrix will be 100% effective, it would make sense to replace “None” with “Loss of habitat and ecosystem function” under each option in the Burden to Community section.
 - Group agreed with this suggestion; recommended that the loss should be reduced in options that are more restrictive (e.g., voluntary inspection, WID)
 - M. Ashton - will provide these changes to M. Lewandowski to update the matrix
- E. Campbell – commented that the current matrix lists “No cost” to the agency under the Mandatory Self-Certification option even though there will be costs associated with implementation
 - B. Michael - M. Lewandowski will update the matrix with an estimate of cost to agency for this option
- B. Beelar – shouldn’t there be a cost estimate for AIS control under the “No Action” option
 - J. Love – recommended that examples of AIS control costs (e.g., Hydrilla, Zebra Mussels) could be included in the text of the report, not the matrix table
 - E. Campbell – future costs of AIS control (if no further action is taken) will be included in the Economic Impact Analysis chapter

Progress of Report Update

- Background
 - J. Love – background section has been reviewed by some group members, but still in draft form.
 - B. Michael – requested that mention of economic impacts be added to background chapter
- Maryland Law
 - B. Michael – Jennifer Wazenski is pulling together information for this chapter
- State-Owned or Managed Lakes List
 - B. Michael – group is finally comfortable with the list
 - B. Michael – DNR’s Tidewater Ecosystem Assessment Division has initiated a survey of all DNR lakes to establish baseline understanding of AIS plants
 - L. Karrh – TEA is using surface inspections only
 - B. Michael – costs of these ongoing surveys will be mentioned in the HB860 report

- J. Kilian – recommended including costs for a survey of DNR lakes that includes all AIS taxa (e.g., gastropods, mussels, crayfish, other invertebrates, fishes, etc.), not just vegetation; he will provide cost estimates for adding other taxa groups to the survey for inclusion in the report.
- List of MD Invasive Species of Concern
 - J. McKnight – will provide the list for inclusion in the report
 - J. Love – recommended using the list of species in AIS plan since it is already in MS Word format
- Economic Impact Analysis
 - E. Campbell – will include an analysis of a mandatory self-certification program
 - J. McKnight – commented that the HB860 bill is already a mandatory self-inspection approach and that a self-certification program would just require documentation that the boater conducted the self-inspection (as already required by the HB860)
 - J. Kilian – commented that one of the benefits of a self-certification approach is that by requiring boaters to complete a checklist form each trip reinforces the desired behavior
 - K. Johnson – strongly recommended that if this approach was implemented, that e-versions of certification forms be acceptable
 - C. Jacobs – paper copies are also important since boat owners are not always present when boats are moved around by marinas
 - J. Bortz – using a sticker and a questionnaire approach could provide useful data on lake use, where boaters have been, etc.
- Alternative Options and Cost Analysis
 - Group reviewed the handouts provided by M. Lewandowski (tiered options example) and J. McKnight (menu of options example)
 - J. McKnight – the goal of his menu of options was to spell out and clarify that more than one option can be selected by the group
 - Group consensus that education/outreach is an important component of any recommendation
 - J. Love – risk varies by lake; all lakes do not have the same boat traffic (i.e., propagule pressure), so a blanket approach that applies the same prevention options to all lakes may not make economic or ecological sense
 - J. McKnight – a mandatory inspection approach would limit boater access to state lakes because DNR could not manage access points 24-7
 - J. McKnight – based on data from current voluntary stewards program, compliance has been high; to E. Null – will mandatory inspections cause a negative response from the Deep Creek Lake community? E. Null/J. Bortz – yes, a mandatory approach would not be well received
 - M. Ashton – voluntary compliance of 98% is as good as a mandatory program
 - D. Morrow – would DCL marinas be amenable to stewards (paid by DNR) to inspect boats/trailers at their facilities? C. Jacobs – it would be a mix,

some would not be amenable; a mandatory approach may push the community away from working with DNR.

- Funding Opportunities
 - B. Michael asked group to review and provide comments on the funding opportunities document provided by B. Beelar

Finalize Alternative Options and Tiered Approach

- Group discussion leaned toward using a combined approach of education/outreach and voluntary inspection at DCL and other high-risk lakes
- J. Bortz – commented that each lake that has Hydrilla and other invasives will present their own challenges for management
- B. Michael - the group will use lake usage data to make recommendations as to which lakes should implement a Lake Stewards approach
- J. Bortz – recommended that the recommendations should use a “toolbox” approach so that each DNR unit (e.g., Park Service, Wildlife and Heritage Service) responsible for a state lake could use the tools most appropriate for their situation
 - Group agreed that a toolbox approach should be used
- J. Kilian/M. Ashton – will there be policy oversight (by ISMT or other entity) to set priorities over what tools should be used in certain high-risk lakes?
 - Group agreed that there will be internal review of the approaches used at each lake
- M. Ashton – DNR needs to assess the efficacy of education/outreach efforts
 - L. Karrh – recommended including an efficacy assessment in the HB860 report
 - K. Johnson – recommended that education/outreach regarding HB860 should start immediately to raise awareness of the new regulations among boaters
 - B. Michael – estimated costs in staff time needed for Education/outreach must be included in the matrix and report
- C. Jacobs – monitoring and cost of launch stewards need to be included in HB860 report
- M. Brassil – will the toolbox approach still be a tiered approach?
 - B. Michael – yes, the recommendations will be tiered
- B. Beelar – recommended utilizing volunteers to assist with surveys of state lakes – modeled after other citizen science efforts (e.g., stream waders)
 - B. Michael – this will be included as a recommendation in the report.
- B. Michael, J. Kilian, and M. Lewandowski will draft the toolbox/ recommendations chapter for group to review

Final Report and Timeline

- Drafts of all report chapters should be submitted to B. Michael by November 18
- B. Michael will compile chapters into the report

Next Meeting: Wednesday, November 23, 1:00-4:00 pm at DNR