Minnesota DNR AIS Advisory Committee

March 26th, 2026, Final Meeting Minutes

Online via Teams

Members Present: Shelly Binsfeld, Andrew Dickhart, Beto Garcia, Liz Kaltenhauser, Jared Langer, Spencer McGrew, Patrick Selter, M. Mahmood Tajbakhsh, Amanda Weberg, Raining White

Members Absent: Nick Bluhm, Carrie Ohly-Cusack,

Ex-officio Members Present: Maddie Hayden

Ex-officio Members Absent: Amy McGovern

DNR Staff Present: Rafael Contreras-Rangel, Doug Jensen, Melissa Kuskie, Kelly Pennington, Scott Staples, Mike Verhoeven

Chair **A. Weberg** called meeting to order at 10:02am

Motion to approve Agenda: A. Dickhart, motion, **B. Garcia**, seconded, agenda approved

Motion to approve February Minutes: S. McGrew, motion**, A. Dickhart**, seconded, minutes approved

Meeting Summary

Committee discussed the following:

- Action items from January meeting
- Local AIS Prevention Aid Advocacy and Strategy
- DNR Updates, including Legislative updates
- New action items

Action Items

- **Action: S. McGrew** will form a Legislative Subcommittee and will present any relevant updates during meetings.
- **Action:** Send any missed questions or comments from today and the future for **M. Kuskie** to **A. Weberg** to compile then forwarded to **K. Pennington**
- **Action**: **M. Verhoeven** will take these suggestions on stakeholder input and permit conditions to the IAPM and APM teams to further alignment
- **Action: R. Contreras-Rangel** will forward to SAISAC invitations upcoming In-Person Workshops
- **Action: M. Hayden** will share the community science eDNA study report
- **Motion passes:** Next meeting is in-person, Thursday, April 23rd, 10 am – 3 pm, DNR Sauk Rapids, with hybrid option for presenters
- **Action:** Planners will email further information including location, time, along with lunch options and dietary restrictions likely from Granite City

Revisit Action Items from February Meeting

Priority topics for 2026 meetings results

Integration of Water Quality and AIS

- Members emphasized the need to better integrate aquatic invasive species (AIS) into broader water quality planning.
- Suggestions included framing AIS under "clean water" terminology and considering updates to legislative definitions.

Clarification of Low-Ranked Topic

- The topic "Management of Boater Movement / Operational Pathways Spread" received no votes, prompting questions about whether members understood its scope.
- Members noted connections to the watercraft inspection program, AIS Explorer, MAISRC research, and organisms-in-trade pathways.

Use of Topic Rankings

- The group agreed the survey results provide a solid starting point for identifying meeting topics, though additional prioritization will help guide presenter selection.
- High-interest topics, such as "Tribal Perspectives on AIS," may include multiple presenters.
- Program Direction and Funding Advocacy
- Members discussed the importance of highlighting AIS prevention successes to support future funding efforts.
- There was broad interest in developing a more programmatic approach to meeting topics, focusing on the top four priorities to inform a legislative report.
- DNR facilitators confirmed this approach is manageable and does not change the existing process for securing presenters.

Legislative Subcommittee

- A legislative subcommittee will be formed, with Spencer volunteering to serve as lead. Legislative updates will become a recurring agenda item.

Action: S. McGrew will form a Legislative Subcommittee and will present any relevant updates during meetings.

Legislative Update on Inspector Training

- A bill (SF 4229, Hauschild) proposes reducing required in-person and remote training for watercraft inspectors. Spencer will review the bill and report back at the next meeting.

Status of county survey

- Ongoing survey closes April 7. To date: 18 completed, 11 in progress.

Status of SAISAC webpage

- AIS Prevention Planners will update shortly with 2025 meeting minutes.

Status of SAISAC booth at UMISC

- Tina Fitzgerald, DNR, has offered space for SAISAC on the DNR's table.

Manoomin and Starry Stonewort Management

Raining White, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, raining.white@llojibwe.net

Background on Collaboration with MAISRC

- **A. Weberg** explained that initial engagement with MAISRC began during the first year of starry stonewort detection, when rapid response efforts were urgent. Her team contacted multiple partners and ultimately submitted a rapid response project application to MAISRC.

Supporting Tribal AIS and Water Resource Efforts

- **A. Dickhart** asked how agencies without nearby tribal governments can meaningfully support tribal AIS work.
- **R. White** recommended partnering with watershed groups and engaging with statewide or regional tribal councils. She emphasized acknowledging existing tribal programs when initiating contact.

Resources shared:

- Minnesota Indian Affairs Council: https://mn.gov/indian-affairs/
- 1854 Treaty Authority: https://www.1854treatyauthority.org/
- Minnesota Chippewa Tribe: https://mnchippewatribe.org/

Funding, Partnerships, and Opportunities

- **D. Jensen** asked how AIS planners can support tribal efforts.
- **R. White** noted that federal uncertainty has made the past year challenging, and tribes are actively seeking funding and partnerships.
- Transferring AIS Prevention Aid from counties to tribes appears possible and counties are encouraged to participate in tribal meetings.
- **D. Jensen** added that tribes can apply for AIS Landing Blitz events, with an April 7 deadline.

Starry Stonewort Identification Question

- **B. Garcia** asked whether early misidentification of starry stonewort could have occurred due to its similarity to chara.
- **R. White** responded that while the species look similar, DNR experts are trusted to distinguish them accurately.

Conference and Legislative Considerations

- **S. McGrew** encouraged submitting this topic as a UMISC conference abstract and appreciated the discussion of historical institutional impacts on tribal communities. He noted that the AIS Prevention Aid statute does not reference tribes, reflecting structural exclusion.
- **A. Dickhart** mentioned that UMISC abstracts include a submission from DNR staff on native speakers and that community grants may offer funding opportunities.
- **K. Pennington** shared that ENRTF Community Grants are accepting advisory council applications until April 10.

Additional Perspective from R. White

- R. White emphasized that AIS management should include stronger focus on protecting native species, including manoomin, as part of holistic resource stewardship.

Meet and Greet New DNR EWR Director

Melissa Kuskie, Ecological and Water Resources Director

- Former Deputy Director
- Grateful for SAISAC's commitment and experience to help shape and improve AIS management
- New permanent communication position posted; purpose to provide leadership on AIS communications to advance program goals on AIs prevention and minimizing impacts
- Good news! Updated SAISAC charter is being reviewed by the Commissioner's office

Questions and Answers:

- MPARS with IAPM and APM data has a huge disconnect with permits and data reporting. Can these issues and gaps in communications between divisions be addressed? **A:** Yes, there can be improved cooperation and collaboration between the two programs so that they are better aligned including permit processes. Any feedback is welcome. Mike Verhoeven will likely discuss some aspects of this during his upcoming presentation.
- Based on feedback received by county commissioners and legislators, solutions to replace the cuts to the Local AIS Prevention Aid are in three areas: 1) watercraft inspection surcharge increase, 2) community grants, and 3) IAPM grant increase. This is inaccurate. While thankful for these funding resources, where are legislators getting this information and is there ways to correct it? In the next legislative session, legislators may have the perception that the cut has been covered and may not support reinstatement of full Local AIS Prevention Aid for the next biennium. **A:** Yes, DNR did try to communicate and describe how these resources fit together and are not meant to replace cuts to Local AIS Prevention Aid. Continued engagement with legislators by DNR and partners is needed on how these funding resources are meant to being used. When DNR asked the Legislator for the surcharge increase, there was no intent that it would be to replace Local AIS Prevention Aid. Surcharge increase has allowed for an increase in IAPM grants and additional staffing needs with positions just posted
- Political optics is concerning. Counties conduct 80% of all watercraft inspections statewide. We need to make sure that our County Commissioners and legislators understand and know the difference. **A:** Agreed, those conversations are needed and SAISAC's survey will help to bring clarity to the situation
- What proportion of time do you spend on the various programs in EWR? How much on AIS? **A:** Unclear. Very new and still figuring that out in new role as director. There are over 30 programs, but that doesn't mean that time is evenly split. AIS does get a large portion of her time and is a part of every given week
- Given the misinformation, 1) what would you recommend this committee do? and 2) how do you suggest DNR AIS Planners work with county partners? **A:** SAISAC is in a good position to address this with direct connections to the counties. In the short term, AIS Prevention Planners should on a regular basis document misinformation and identify ways to counter that misinformation. In the long term, the survey will provide powerful targeted data and information

to counter that misinformation. She feels that there were a lot of moving parts at the time the budget was compiled and that there were assumptions made that the funding resources were directly related

- Comment via chat: It is easy to assume that these funds are intended to increase DNR's watercraft inspection program
- How does EWR inform decisions at the Commissioner's and Governor's levels? Are those budget proposals public information? **A:** As part of the overall DNR budget package, EWR creates budget proposals where DNR is proposing budgetary changes. If there are questions on how a specific budget relates to another, EWR provides that information for clarity. Budgets are reflected in documents called "Change Pages"
- She appreciates the opportunity to meet and looks forward to connecting in the future
  Action: Send any missed questions or comments from today and the future for **M. Kuskie** to **A. Weberg** to compile then forwarded to **K. Pennington**

Rare Species and Permit Conditions

Mike Verhoeven, DNR AIS Management Consultant, michael.verhoeven@state.mn.us

Overview of MPARS:

- MPARS is an online reporting system for a database of waters permitting data
- APM (fisheries) and IAPM (Invasive Species) use the same MPARS interface to share what each division is doing
- Divisions meet annually to determine what's worked, what's not, what needs improvement
- Often when issuing permits, there is direct consultation between Divisions when issues are discussed on a case-by-case basis
- Reporting and outputs have been developed by IT; additional outputs can be requested; custom queries, can be requested from **M. Verhoeven** and Shane McBride (Fisheries) who are internal team leads and serve as liaisons to MPARS IT management
- Rare and endangered species are considered in similar ways within AIPM and APM programs
- Purpose of this presentation focuses on overview of processes and regulations in four parts

IAPM Permit Request Processed:

- Regulations: 1) Statute 84D states that there will be a DNR Invasive Species Program and what is within that, 2) 103G lays out specifics for APM, effort must be selective for invasive aquatic plants and cause reduction in those plants, which is critical to APM that is nearshore where a majority of recreational activities happen
- For APM those are usually broad-spectrum herbicides and harvesting where there is no constraint to try to be selective in management of invasives
- This provides "teeth" when there is a proposal; when something is not particularly selective or effective which allows denial of such permits
- In MN rules, it digs in deeper to what is considered permitted specifically for rare, threatened and endangered species
- For rare species, generally statute and rule guides decision making; threatened and endangered species are prohibited "Take" (harvest or kill)
- Rule 6134 lays out which species are currently considered threatened or of concern

- Rule 6212-1600 lays out a process for how exceptions can be permitted for "Take" of rare species can be killed; permits can also be issued for study, survival, or for social-economic benefit
- Concerning permit requests enter the DNR through MPARS, which then: 1) enter a Natural Heritage Screen which asks if rare or protect species are close to the proposed permit area?, then 2) a Natural Heritage Review, which is a different team, that asks what is the likely impacts of proposed activity on rare and protected species?
- A permit may be granted if avoidance procedures are included for avoiding "take" (e.g., avoid in space and/or time)
- Regional AIS specialists and APM (Fisheries) is where the next steps happen using MPARS and rules and regulations to evaluate IAPM permits

Natural Heritage Screen of Activity Impact Area:

- Natural Heritage Screens are conducted by regional AIS specialists; for Fisheries, the regional fisheries APM Specialists conduct their own screenings; Natural Heritage is anything considered to be high value (e.g., old growth forests, calcareous fens, native plant communities of high value, threatened or concerned species)
- To manage this, DNR uses a Natural Heritage Information System, which is a large database of spatial locations of those high value natural resources, which asks if there is a high value resource which occurs within one mile of the proposed permit activity?
- Currently, DNR is working to improve consistent guidance in these processes

Natural Hertige Review of Activity:

- An activity impact area is what is screened (e.g., erosion, root matter removal) could have impacts beyond where the activity would happen
- Natural Heritage Information System data is often non-public data (listed in Statute), which means that DNR is not authorized to make location data public but generally can disclose a one mile area where the species is in the proximity
- In this scenario, specialists look through 6280 data regarding the quality of wild rice and getting to the Natural Heritage Screen, if the answer is yes, there is something within the proximity of the requested permit then a Natural Heritage Review is requested from a team of plant and non-game wildlife specialists: 1) is the rare species likely present in the area of the activity?, and 2) is the activity likely impact those sensitive species?
- During the review process, reviewers will look for potential "off ramp" avoidance measures, suggested actions that would help avoid killing a rare species which avoids the need for a "take" permit

Take Permit Request Process:

- Anyone can request a "Take" permit which are processed by a Rare Species Team located at Central Office, each request may take 6 months to year to process
- Consideration given when avoidance cannot be achieved
- Permits may be granted at the discretion of the team
- All data is considered for issuing, modifying or denying a permit

What has Changed? Why the Renewed Focus on Rara Species?

- Really, nothing has changed but over time DNR has identified that the IAPM and APM programs no longer match DNR standards(e.g., forestry, culvert removal); effort now is to bring both programs up to speed based on what has been discussed during this presentation
- Current processes include a couple of areas where there is mis-alignment (e.g., visually) and want to have technology interpret the data more consistently during the review phase (e.g., old guidance being used) with more synchrony and parallel with other processes within DNR

Expectations:

- This is a big change for AIS management efforts, but for 2026, DNR will keep using the old system while improvements are being made to make a smooth transition into new processes
- A large communications campaign will be launched this summer for customer permits
- Changes could be made to rare resource processes in 2027

Links Provided:

- https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/invasives/iapm.html
- https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/rsg/index.html

Questions and Answers:

- Will mechanical harvest operations be impacted by these changes? What's been the response? **A:** In 2025, DNR hastily tried to respond but did so inconsistently (permitting in some places but not in others). Complaints mostly came from LGUs and watershed districts. In response, DNR is stepping back to document reasons that are defensible. By increasing communication, it will lessen concerns
- **A:** LGUs and watershed districts are better at recognizing the protection of rare and endangered species, which is part of their mutual conservation goals, especially in the AIS management area
- **A:** DNR is examining all activities including physical harvest (e.g., mechanical, hand pulling, DASH); some mechanical harvest could be restricted in the future
- Timing? **A:** Natural Heritage Screen phase takes a minimum of 30 days and permit for "Take" takes 180-365days, which will help make the processes more functional
- What are rare aquatic plant resources that are available? Is the permit process habitat based? **A:** The resource links (above) along with these regional guides such as Paul Skawinski's "Aquatic Plants of the Upper Midwest", "Through the Looking Glass", and Steve Chaddes' Wetland Plants of the Minnesota" are good educational resources
- Comment: From a curly-leaf pondweed management perspective, getting approved permits in a timely manner is critical for efficacy of control and it should be noted that aquatic plant contractors are researching alternative types of treatment at different times of the year (early vs late fall); this will be challenging for treatment
- DNR has been asking more about what the treatment area will be before a permit is requestedWho does the survey work? **A:** Several organizations within (e.g., Minnesota Biological Survey) and outside DNR (e.g., Bell Museum, Ogalla Herbarium at UMD) can submit rare species data into Natural History Information System. Worth noting that ANYONE can submit rare species occurrences through the DNR's MBS program (https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/eco/mbs/staff.html)

- Can the Natural Heritage Screen and Review be conducted before a permit is submitted? **A:** No. Because if a permit is granted for say a three-year project, rare and threatened species might have been reported within that time period
- What is the process for local public input? It seems very top down. **K. Pennington** responds that if there are any ideas on how to do that she would be willing to take those ideas to leadership to explore opportunities to improve
- If an IAPM or APM permit is denied, it can be submitted to the Commissioner's Office based on a 15-day review period and if that is denied, the permit can be submitted through the Court of Appeals https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/6280.1100/
- Does this process help with and align with tribal management, culture and spirituality? If it does or does not, have tribal voices been included in this**? A: R. White** responds that tribal philosophical approach is to manage natural resources through the lens of Seven Generations. Tribes maintain their own threatened and endangered species lists, which include culturally and spiritually important plants. Historically, there have been battles with DNR over resource management, but it is improving. Balancing control of invasive species while protecting and managing native species is a challenge. Comment: **S. McGrew** says this is a role SAISAC can play in helping to elevate this issue and can DNR's Office of Equity make sure that policies are followed top to bottom? **A2:** No. Currently, this is an internal DNR process, and it isn't clear where public input is planned if any, not subject to any public comment in a formal way
- Comment: **B. Garcia** says that there needs to be balance so that the public is heard
- We estimate that bringing the NH screen procedures inline with the current DNR standards would resulting in about 300/500 IAPM permits being sent for NH Review. That is in contrast to current procedures that resulted in about a dozen NH Review requests last year (2025)
- What if the process would increase the rare species? **A:** Yes. In the final process, "Take" is considered for rare species with both positive and negative outcomes
- Mike thanks members for their input.
  Action: **M. Verhoeven** will take these suggestions on stakeholder input and permit conditions to the IAPM and APM teams to further alignment

DNR Updates

Kelly Pennington

Legislative:

1. DNR has testified with concerns over the Watercraft Inspection Training Bill (Sen 4229) which limits DNR's ability and frequency to provide training. She believes that the video provides some discussion on the genesis of Hauschild's bill. She doesn't believe that ir has been heard in the House but does know it has been laid over for possible inclusion by Senate, Environment and Legacy Committee - held as a candidate in a package for when there is an omnibus bill Hearing starts at about 1:24 - https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vVXd4tj1px0

   From chat: https://www.revisor.mn.gov/bills/94/2026/0/SF/4229/
   "When a bill is "laid over for possible inclusion," it means lawmakers aren't saying it's going to pass but they're not saying it won't be included in a bigger bill. It means the bills could be folded into a larger bill — an "omnibus" bill."
   (https://www.mprnews.org/story/2025/04/07/legislative-jargon-explained-what-are-omnibus-bills-in-min…)

2. DNR testified before the same committee concerning L&D5 Invasive Carp Deterrent amendment to extend the deadline in the appropriations law. This project was recommended by the Lessard Sams Outdoor Heritage Fund in 2024. Legislature appropriated $12 M over 5 years with a installation deadline of June 2029. Army Corps of Engineers has been contracted by DNR to develop design. Phase I is nearly complete but timing will not meet the design deadline of June 2026. The recommended amendment would allow design extension out to 2027
3. DNR testified in the House about the L&D5 project concerning the same amendment to the design contract

Community Grants:

- New $28 M is being provided to DNR Grants Office via ENRTF with AIS management as an eligible area to apply for grants until June 2029
- Invasive Species Program is not directly responsible for the Community Grants but are coordinating with the grants team for parts that are AIS management-related
- See link to ENRTF Advisory Committee website which will determine how the funding will be spent. A legislative report has been submitted. No RFP is available yet. SAISAC should also be aware there are some amendments and legislative changes being considered that would impact the Community Grants, a previous amendment is posted in chat (below), another hearing is today in the House Environment and Natural Resources Committee

From chat:
Ch. 116X MN Statutes - lays out the grant program and the advisory council
(b) Grants awarded under this section must be expended for benefits across all regions and residents of the state. A grant may be awarded under this section only for:
(1) helping adversely impacted communities respond to environmental degradation and related health concerns;
(2) education and awareness related to stewardship of air, land, water, forests, fish, wildlife, and other natural resources;
(3) preserving or enhancing air, land, water, and other natural resources that otherwise may be substantially impaired or destroyed in any area of the state;
(4) trail maintenance and improvement on state, regional, or local trails. No money allocated under this clause may be used to construct new trails or new trail segments; or
(5) aquatic invasive species management.

From chat:
- During the 2025 session, lawmakers appropriated just over $28 million from the ENRTF to the DNR for the Community Grants Program. That funding is available until June 30, 2029.
- From Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund Community Grant Program Implementation | Minnesota DNR

Communications Position:

- As **M. Kuskie** mentioned, DNR is excited to have this permanent position now, increasing our capacity from Conservation Corps Interns to another level; this committee has been very supportive of our increased efforts on communications

Questions and Answers:

- Are there any conflict of interest for members of SAISAC to apply ENRTF Advisory Committee? **A:** Do not know for sure - assumes that each applicant will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Members should apply and see how the process works. If a member is from a county and a project from their county is submitted, they would recuse themselves from that process
- Unsure if their Advisory Committee will be determining processes and reviewing grants for funding decisions
- Comment: Draft RFP that is being circulated appears to focus on underserved communities
- Increased surcharge allows for hiring the new Communications Position, increase in IAPM funding, and hiring more regional AIS specialists especially to support permitting in Region 3
- Regarding the surcharge, funding goes into the Treasury's Invasive Species Account and Legislature then appropriates the funding to the DNR and the Invasive Species Program
- Comment: **S. McGrew** suggests that this needs to be clearly articulated, explained so that the public can understand and suggests that a committee in support of our mission be formed to address next steps

Doug Jensen and Rafael Contreras-Rangel

UMISC Reminder:

- Oct 6-8, 2026, La Crosse, WI, abstract deadline April 15, registration open in mid-May https://www.umisc.net/

Summary of seven events below educated 964 attendees in February-March -

On-Line Workshops:

- Prevention Within and Across Borders: March 17, 1-4 pm – 87 attendees
- Successes and Cuts to Prevention Aid Funding, March 24, 1-4 pm – 101 record attendees
  - Jensen gave presentation: A Compelling Story of AIS Prevention
  - Partnerships: March 26, 1-4 pm – 67 attendees

Upcoming In-Person Workshops:

- South: April 14 9:30 am -2:30 pm Chanhassen Library (back up April 28 10:00 am -3:00 pm)
- North: April 21 10:00 am – 3:00 pm Crow Wing County Courthouse, Brainerd (back up April 27 same time from 10:00 am – 3:00 pm)

SAISAC members are invited to Local County and Tribal Partner In-Person meetings

Action: R. Contreras-Rangel will forward to SAISAC invitations upcoming In-Person Workshops

Member Updates

- No updates provided

Ex-officio Update

Maddie Hayden, MAISRC

- 2025 MISAC Annual Report was forwarded to counties and tribes (https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/43735328dfd44dbb980508aa73dbffb7)
- Four Externship Program Pilot one-year projects will be announced Monday which helps link local management to research by providing new tools to AIS professionals; helps provide funding for smaller projects (~$30,000) with smaller funding needs; managers are teamed up with researchers, projects start May 1st; hope is that this program will be offered yearly; announcement for Externship Program was also shared with counties and tribes

(https://maisrc.umn.edu/research/externship)

- Funding proposals received via the 2026 RFP are double the amount of funding available, extra time has been allocated for review
- Lab to Lakes was funded through a single funding allotment from DNR and the State:
    1. Common carp management reduced to two lake systems focused on eDNA; technician position will be offered this week, and equipment is being moved in
    2. Free eDNA sampling kits with protocols will be available for people to sample for four AIS; launch on April 19; timing: water samples will need to be collected when all four AIS are present

Questions and Answers:

- Has MAISRC developed an SOP for standard collection of eDNA samples? This has been an issue with other labs. **A:** Yes, MAISRC conducted a study comparing results of eDNA samples collected by researchers and 100 volunteers and found that volunteers can properly collect eDNA (99% accurate); detailed sampling guidance and a training video helped educate them
  Action: M. Hayden will share the community science eDNA study report
- Comment: It is important that any eDNA study include a control blank
- **M. Hayden** is asked what is the range of funding based on RFPs? **A:** 2026 RFP closed in early March, typically a research project is between $200,000-$260,000, high is $300,000; plan is to start effort earlier next year; suggests signing up for MAISRC newsletter

Discussion Time for Committee Action Items

How should SAISAC respond to the issue of misinformation?

- Suggestion to form a committee before April meeting with the intent of having something available before walleye fishing opener or Memorial Day; some watercraft inspection programs are already downsizing this year so this would help set expectation among boaters and anglers; **S. McGrew, B. Garcia** volunteer
- Comment: Wondering if this should be done outside of our committee role, more of citizen group? Another member expressed concerned about optics about a topic DNR is not interested in getting into. Another disagrees, that it is within our mission and one of the strongest things SAISAC could do. Another reminds that members are not DNR staff. Another says it's tricky because we need to recognize that SAISAC needs to speak out when DNR is not able to, this an important issue
- Comment: Based on **M. Kuskie's** earlier presentation, she is supportive of activities of SAISAC and did not suggest that SAISAC not submit letters to DNR and other organizations. Therefore, consider developing a letter from SAISAC or partner with other organizations such as Minnesota Lakes and Rivers Advocates and Association of Minnesota Counties. Others agreed that a letter in part of SAISAC communications mission to help set the record straight

April In-Person Meeting

- Discussion on April in-person meeting in-person with a hybrid option for invited presenters; must meet quorum (min 7); **M. Hayden's** availability is 50:50. If travel conditions are poor, decision to pivot to hybrid will via email 24 hrs in advance

Action Item: Planners will email further information including location, time, along with lunch options and dietary restrictions likely from Granite City

- **In-person meeting motion: B. Garcia, S. McGrew, second, passes unanimously**

Adjourned 3:05 pm
Next meeting is Thursday, April 23rd, 10 am – 3 pm **(in-person only)**
DNR Sauk Rapids Conference Room 3, 1035 S Benton Dr Sauk Rapids MN 56379