# Minnesota DNR AIS Advisory Committee

***September 24th, 2026, Final Meeting Minutes***

***Online via Teams***

***Members Present:*** Shelly Binsfeld, Andrew Dickhart, Beto Garcia, Liz Kaltenhauser, Byron Karns, Jared Langer, Doris Loe, Spencer McGrew, Carrie Ohly-Cusack, Sami Selter, Amanda Weberg

***Members Absent:*** Patrick Selter, M. Mahmood Tajbakhsh, Raining White

***Ex-officio Members Present:***

***Ex-officio Members Absent:*** Amy McGovern, Maddie Hayden

***DNR Staff Present:*** Tina Fitzgerald, Kelly Pennington, Grace Henrich, Eric Kenney

Chair **A. Weberg** called meeting to order at 10:01 am

**Motion to approve Agenda: Shelly Binsfeld** motion, **Doris Loe** seconded, agenda approved

**Motion to approve August Minutes: Jared Langer**, motion, **Shelly Binsfeld,** seconded, minutes approved

## Meeting Summary

Committee discussed the following:

- Action Items from August meeting, including SAISAC new member recruitment, and an update from the Minnesota Lakes and Rivers (MLR) advocacy campaign.
- **A. Dickhart** presented on the Prevention Aid County Survey.
    - The committee expressed concern over the long-term funding cuts and includes:
        - Loss of institutionalized knowledge and long-term partnerships.
        - How the funding cuts will affect work done by the DNR and MAISRC
        - A decrease in grants offered to lake associations.
    - A new Letter Writing Subcommittee was formed to write a letter to the DNR Commissioner regarding the results of the survey.
    - The Committee also emphasized how important it is to get this information out to legislators and the public.
- Planning for the booth at UMISC was discussed.
- A conversation with Mandy Erickson regarding the Fish and Wildlife Program with the DNR.
- Updates from the DNR and SAISAC members were discussed.
- Planning for the in-person October meeting was discussed.

## Action Items

- **Action Item**: **A. Weberg, J. Langer**, **S. Selter, S. McGrew**, **B. Garcia** and **C. Ohly-Cusack** will work on drafting a letter to the DNR Commissioner by October 29th in person meeting.
- **Action Item**: **Letter-writing subcommittee** and **B. Karns and D. Loe** will work on drafting a one-pager shareable info sheet with a summary of the AIS Prevention Aid reduction survey results.
- **Action Item: DNR** will bring volunteer name tags to UMISC.
- **Action Item**: **T. Fitzgerald** will print committee recruitment flyers and will bring them to UMISC.
- **Action Item**: **T. Fitzgerald** will put together a SAISAC sign and will bring it to UMISC.

## Revisit Action Items from April Meeting

### SAISAC new member recruitment

- **A. Weberg** notes that the end of September was the previous deadline for SAISAC applications, but it has been extended to October 15.
- **B. Garcia** notes to highlight that there are 8 meetings throughout the year for potential applicants.
- **J. Langer** has sent out the SAISAC application to MAISRC scholars.
- **L. Kaltenhauser** asked whether the information Rafa sent to the group about the application can be used as a flier for applicants to which Amanda Weberg replied that it can be.

### MLR Campaign for AIS aid update and how SAISAC can assist

- **S. Selter** summarizes Minnesota Lakes and Rivers (MLR) efforts to educate Minnesotans and relevant legislators about AIS prevention aid over the summer and is getting the word out about why it's useful and how it affects everyone. MLR got 750,000 impressions on an educational videos series about AIS with a very high completion rate. She notes there is still opportunity to save prevention aid with the upcoming election cycle changing the political landscape. Next steps will be evaluated after elections.
- **B. Garcia** asks if there is a place where candidates' positions are collected so people can be informed where they stand?
    - **S. Selter** responds that the best approach is to look at candidates' websites and fundraising information to get an idea, although, prevention aid is not always explicitly called out because it is a smaller budget item.
    - **S. McGrew** highlights that one track to save prevention aid would be to work directly with the tax committee to reauthorize the aid after this election cycle.
- **S. Selter** puts a plug in for MLR's Aquatic Invaders Summit on March 9-10. Prevention aid will be a focus but anyone looking to attend, present, or table there is welcome. MLR's newsletter is also a great place for more information on prevention aid advocacy and updates.
- **S. McGrew** is more optimistic than ever that we can get the $5 million dollars of prevention aid back after the upcoming election.
- **A. Dickhart** is also more optimistic than before about prevention aid. On a local level, the community in Carver County has been very vocal in favor of the AIS program and AIS work which has led to the continuation of some of the work being funded. He shares that stakeholders in his area are not only affected by cuts to AIS work but also care about the work broadly and its value for conservation.
- **S. Binsfeld** points out that counties are interconnected through water and movement, so we should support each other in any way that we can.

## Prevention Aid County Survey Presentation Discussion

Andrew Dickhart, SAISAC Member

- **A. Dickhart** presents on a survey conducted to try to figure out what county sentiments are on prevention aid and how they would respond to cuts. The survey was administered in the Spring of 2026. There was a 94% response rate from counties, with 78/83 counties participating, and

the ones that didn't have very little water in their area. Some summaries of the results are as follows:

- What kind of role are the program leaders in? Most were coordinators, some were supervisors, and even fewer were full-time techs.
- Local programs were split nearly evenly between SWCD and County programs, and then some were land management programs.
- The top response for what would likely be done as the result of cuts in funding was to reduce scope of program (83). Next were shift focus to fewer water bodies (38), rely on volunteers (29), increase partnerships (27), pursue more grants (24), etc.
- Fewer watercraft inspection hours, less monitoring and surveillance, fewer seasonal staff, reduced coordinator hours, and increased reliance on volunteers were all expected results of funding cuts.
- A large majority of respondents expected little to no support from local governments after funding cuts, which directly contradicts what the state anticipated would happen after statewide funding cuts.
- 89% answered that the funding cuts would increase spread of AIS. Reduced public compliance, higher long-term management costs, loss of EDRR capacity, and loss of institutional knowledge were also long-term risks identified by respondents.
- In summary, 1) smaller, narrower local programs, 2) more vulnerability due to less detection and response, 3) Broader statewide AIS risk
- If funding gets cut, tracking this data will be especially important.

## Discussion

- **S Binsfeld** highlights the importance of this data and notes that this is a great foundation for advocacy and education.
- **B. Garcia** asks whether anyone responded with an idea of how much long-term management might cost with the funding cuts? Also, are counties already preparing budgets for 2027 with these cuts in mind?
    - **A. Dickhart** answers that the survey did not get exact estimated numbers for costs from the survey but are hoping county practitioners will eventually give that data to leadership, if funding cuts remain. However, from this data, county practitioners clearly recognize the long-term costs associated with AIS. Most counties are in the middle of budget processes right now, and it might be helpful to get an update on that right now.
    - **A. Weberg** responds that St. Louis County is in the middle of budget processes right now and are planning as though the funding cuts will remain.
- **S. Selter** asks how shareable this data is?
    - **A. Dickhart** answers that it is super shareable and will check with Doug on sharing it out.
- **S. McGrew** says this data needs to be spread far and wide and should go to the leadership of the tax committee, and the governor's office, as well as other relevant organizations like AMC and MINNCOLA for sharing.
- **S. Binsfeld** notes that the loss of institutional knowledge highlighted in the survey also includes loss of relationships and partnerships, which is fundamental to our work as a whole state in addressing AIS.
- **D. Loe** agrees that the long-term costs associated with funding cuts will be substantial and emphasizes the importance of the survey.

- **J. Langer** offers to look at the slides for UMISC and beyond, if Drew is interested.
- **S. Binsfeld** points out the SAISAC logo should include what the abbreviation means on slide 1 of the presentation and language that speaks to the role of SAISAC in the administering of this survey should be put in.
    - **S. McGrew** and **J. Langer** both agree.
    - **A. Dickhart** can work to include those in the presentation in the future.
- **T. Fitzgerald** calls attention to a county talk upcoming in mid-October as an opportunity to address or expand on some of these issues highlighted in Drew's presentation about the survey data. If there is any data missing here, or any potential topics of discussion, think about that and get notes to Rafa/Doug/Drew ahead of that county talk.
    - **A. Weberg** notes that one thing that would be good to highlight is how funding cuts might affect the state and organizations like MAISRC that partner with LGUs (that sometimes do some of the work partners cannot do due to having more capacity).
    - **S. McGrew** notes that if the counties' capacity to do work is reduced the ability to support partner organizations gets reduced, as well.
    - **S. Selter** emphasizes that cuts are starting at the grant level and partnership opportunities with lake associations and local organizations will be reduced as a byproduct of this. The legislature should be aware of this and is starting to become aware of this due to advocacy and education efforts.
    - **B. Karns** explains that for some of the programs administered by lake associations, volunteers will have to chase some of the money that is no longer there which will lead to a lack of spending on other programs like outreach, education, etc.

**B. Garcia** says SAISAC should revisit what is going to be done with this survey. Is the committee going to write a letter? If so, to whom? The committee needs an action item to use this powerful information.

- **S. Selter** volunteers to help start drafting a letter with Drew.
- **J. Langer** is working with Rafa, Doug, and DNR leadership to roll this out carefully to make sure it does not appear as if the DNR is doing any advocacy work.
- **S. Selter** says MLR can link a letter on their webpage.
- **A. Weberg** suggests sharing the results with the DNR commissioner in a letter and then having a separate letter/flier for the results to be shared with the public on the ground level.
    - **S. Selter** agrees with this approach. Suggests a three-pronged approach: an official letter to the DNR commissioner, packaging the results for digital use for the public, and then presenting it at the local level at various meetings.
    - **S. McGrew** gives context behind the initial intention which was to put it on DNR's SAISAC website after a follow-up letter to the commissioner. If that requires a note, noting that the results do not reflect the position of the DNR, that's fine, but it should live on the website.
        - **S. Binsfeld** and **C. Ohly-Cusack** agree.
    - **A. Weberg** suggests starting work on a letter after UMISC, have a draft for the October meeting, and then go from there.

- **S. Binsfeld** says that notes from the UMISC presentation will be helpful to inform the letter, as well, agreeing that it might be helpful to hold off drafting the letter until after the conference.

**S. McGrew** proposes a motion to create a letter writing subcommittee and to have a letter drafted by October 29th to share with the committee during the October meeting. Final approval of the letter from committee will be gathered at the December 3rd meeting, after which the letter will be sent to the DNR commissioner. **B. Garcia** seconds the motion. Motion approved.

- **B. Garcia** makes a motion that **S. Selter, S. McGrew**, and **B. Garcia** as well as the committee chairs and co-chairs will be on the subcommittee. **C. Ohly-Cusack** also expressed interest in serving on the subcommittee. **S. Selter** seconds the motion. Motion approved.
- **B. Garcia, S. Selter** and **S. McGrew** all agree that google drive is a good place for file sharing. Others agree.

**Action Item**: **A. Weberg, J. Langer**, **S. Selter, S. McGrew**, **B. Garcia** and **C. Ohly-Cusack** will work on drafting a letter to the DNR Commissioner by October 29th in person meeting.

**S. Selter** notes that giving people knowledge of the survey and a potential upcoming one pager with shareable results might be helpful, if it is allowed (it is).

**S. McGrew** suggests having the cover letter done ahead of creating a shareable one pager. The DNR Commissioner's office should be the first ones to see the results ahead of the lake associations, LGUs, and general public. Everyone agrees.

**B. Garcia** also suggests having the polished survey presentation to attach as an appendix to any shareables.

**S. McGrew** makes a motion that the executives of the committee, as well as **B. Karns** and **D. Loe** will work with Drew to put together a one-page shareable info sheet with a summary of the survey results concurrently as the other subcommittee puts together an official letter to be sent to the DNR's Commissioner's office. This summary info sheet will be embargoed until after the cover letter to the DNR Commissioner's office has been sent. **C. Ohly-Cusack** seconds the motion. Motion approved.

**Action Item**: **Letter-writing subcommittee** and **B. Karns and D. Loe** will work on drafting a one-pager shareable infor sheet with a summary of the AIS Prevention Aid reduction survey results.

**S. McGrew** suggests the prevention aid survey work should be presented at DNR roundtable.

- **K. Pennington** responds that she is unaware of how a topic gets suggested and approved for DNR Roundtable but can check on how to suggest that as a topic.

## Planning for Booth at UMISC

**A. Weberg** asks if any SAISAC members want to help staff the DNR booth at UMISC. **A. Weberg, S. Selter, J. Langer,** and **S. Binsfeld** offered. **A. Weberg** will share after the meeting to figure out who wants to staff which slot.

### DNR volunteer name tags

**T. Fitzgerald** notes that DNR is bringing volunteer name tags that will be available for SAISAC members at the booth.

**Action Item: DNR** will bring volunteer name tags to UMISC.

### DNR created committee recruitment flyers

**A. Weberg** suggests the committee fliers that Rafa put together can be at the booth.

- **T. Fitzgerald** can print those out for distribution at the booth at UMISC.
- **K. Pennington** notes that the Natural Heritage Advisory Committee is also advertised on the flier and is an option for those that come up to the booth who are interested in more terrestrial invasive species work.

**Action Item**: **T. Fitzgerald** will print committee recruitment flyers and will bring them to UMISC.

### SAISAC sign at booth

**T. Fitzgerald** says if you want to put together something highlighting what SAISAC does, feel free.

- **S. Binsfeld** thinks it would be nice to have a sign highlighting what SAISAC does and who they are. As, simple as the name of the committee and come talk with us is sufficient – also sign can highlight the session related to SAISAC.
- **T. Fitzgerald** can put that sign together.

**Action Item**: **T. Fitzgerald** will put together a SAISAC sign and will bring it to UMISC.

### Possible advocacy work at other booths

**A. Weberg** asks if SAISAC wants to put together anything (like a petition) highlighting the prevention aid and supporting advocacy for it for UMISC.

- S. Binsfeld feels that's best left to organizations that are more equipped for full-time advocacy work.

## Conversation with Fish and Wildlife Staff

Mandy Erickson, MNDNR, Fisheries Operations Consultant

- **M. Erickson** is a project manager for Fisheries, including hatchery infrastructure.
    - **M. Erickson** also manages a variety of other projects, including the state record fish program, fishing tournament program, cast net permitting, and crayfish/frogs/turtle harvesting permitting.
- Fisheries have received $60 million in investments for fishing and fishing infrastructure. This is primarily split amongst the Waterville Hatchery, the Crystal Spring Hatchery, other hatcheries, and shore fishing.
- There are concerns about risk of using lake water in fish hatcheries. The DNR has been updating their risk mitigation procedures and completing filtration upgrades.
- Cast nets in Minnesota are only allowed to be used to target invasive species in infested waters.
    - About 224 permits this year. Applicants are required to complete AIS training. The permit is free. Nets are brought to their local fisheries office and tagged with an orange AIS tag.

- **S. McGrew** asks about the difference between a general permit to other types of permits.
    - **M. Erickson** explains that a general permit is something that does not have to be approved. It is just on the website. Some examples of general permits are the permit for importing red swap crayfish and the permit for transporting equipment from a lake directly to a decontamination station. Having this cast net permit become a general permit would lighten the administrative load for the DNR. However, it would still be required to tag your cast nets.
    - **S. McGrew** asks if this permit change would go through the rulemaking process with public comments.
    - **M. Erickson** answers yes.
- **M. Erickson** explains that they do not have the best understanding of the compliance rate for cast nets permits.
    - **J. Langer** is interested in learning more about cast net compliance.
    - **M. Erickson** says that word of mouth is helpful and there seems to be a good understanding in general.
- **M. Erickson** manages DNR crayfish permitting.
    - They have been working on updates within the last year, including cleaning up the crayfish trapping language.
    - There is quite a bit of crayfish harvest in Minnesota. Crayfish can be used as bait, and many people have a tradition of crayfish boils in the summer. They are also a part of aquaculture.
    - There is more interest in tapping rusty crayfish than native species.
    - Statute states you need a permit to trap more than 25 pounds of crayfish or in infested waters.
    - Traps are tagged with orange AIS tags.
    - Crayfish gear is often the same as minnow and native rough fish.
    - There are complicated regulations around crayfish.
    - **M. Erickson** is starting to receive emails from companies shipping crayfish. This is a change in the last year and is good to see. They are reaching the people they need to about crayfish regulations.
- There are complicated regulations around minnow harvesting as well because it is based on the species the water is infested with.
    - **K. Pennington** notes that Sec. 84D.03 MN Statutes - subd. 3 (b) (2) is about noncommercial personal use bait harvesting.
    - **M. Erickson** says her advice is always to call the DNR and they'll help sort through the complicated regulations.
- **B. Karns** asks about the definition of infested waters. Does "infested" mean infested by rusty crayfish or infested by any AIS? Also, lake associations provide crayfish traps for surveys. Some lakes in their chain of lakes have rusty crayfish and some do not.
    - **M. Erickson** explains that "infested" means it is listed as an infested water. View the infested waters list here. The presence of rusty crayfish does not mean it is infested water. Rusty crayfish are a regulated invasive species, not prohibited. The main concerns about invasive species and crayfish traps are small animals and plant fragments.

    - **K. Pennington** explains that the infested waters list is not a distribution map. It was created as a regulatory tool for just a few activities (water appropriation, crayfish harvest, minnow trapping). Whether or not a waterbody is infested, the basic steps of clean, drain, dry are still required. It is also not on a one to one based on prohibited versus regulated invasive species. "Infested waters" refers to an official regulatory list, not a general term.
- **M. Erickson** continues discussing crayfish harvest permits.
    - The DNR receives about 20 a year.
    - **M. Erickson** is very concerned about compliance with this permit. The DNR hopes they can improve education.
    - Crayfish harvest permits may move to a more general permit process like cast nets. The required tagging of equipment will be the same issue for crayfish harvest permits as cast nets permits.
    - There is no AIS training required, unlike the cast nets permits. This could be an issue in the future.
- **M. Erickson** discusses fishing tournaments.
    - **M. Erickson** does overall program coordination for tournaments.
    - Tournament permit requirements are covered in rule and statute.
        - A permit is required of the tournament that has more than 25 boats, prize value over $500, or an entry fee of more than $25. Many groups of anglers do not meet this threshold.
    - Over 450 tournaments each year throughout the state.
        - Tournaments draw large crowds and out of state anglers, which is an AIS concern. There is some evidence and history of poor compliance with AIS regulations.
    - Fisheries is trying to increase awareness that there might be an issue with some of the anglers that participate in your event.
        - They want to encourage awareness and good sportsmanship.
        - They recently changed the language in permit cover letter template and best practices document. See the best management practices doc here.
        - **M. Erickson** sends a list of tournaments to watercraft inspectors every two weeks through the summer. They want to do this carefully and respectfully. They do not want to target the tournaments throughout the state.
    - **D. Loe** describes her experience with fishing tournaments as a watercraft inspector. Some people don't care especially if they are from out of state, but generally most of the anglers and tournament organizers are pretty good about best practices
    - **M. Erickson** describes her experience speaking with tournament anglers not from Minnesota. Some anglers travel to different competitions all throughout the country and do not have foundational AIS knowledge or an understanding of Minnesota regulations. They asked what a zebra mussel was and explained they brought water from Wisconsin.
- Contact Mandy with questions on any of these topics!
    - mandy.erickson@state.mn.us, 651-259-5011

## DNR Updates, Member and Ex-Officio Member Updates

Tina Fitzgerald, MN DNR Watercraft Inspection Program Supervisor

- **T. Fitzgerald** provided information and current metrics on DNR roadside checks.
    - The watercraft inspection program works with the Enforcement division to conduct check stations. Check stations started in 2012 with a 31% violation rate
    - A sign requiring vehicles with water-related equipment to pull over is set up on a road. Watercraft inspectors and enforcement officers inspect the watercraft, and sometimes enforcement K9s are there.
    - The goal is to complete 12 check stations each year. The average violation rate was 14% this year, and Conservation Officers typically handed out warnings.
    - The three-year average violation rate is 18%.
- **B. Garcia** asks how check station locations are selected.
    - **T. Fitzgerald** explains they typically use the same locations that we've used in the past. Locations are selected based on safety requirements (space for people to pull over and staff to do inspection). They also try to do a couple in each of the enforcement districts in the state. Also, the county attorney must agree to prosecute violations that occur due to the roadside check.
- **J. Langer** asks what the inspection per hour goal is at check stations.
    - **T. Fitzgerald** explains that check stations reach an audience we may not reach at a public lake access. They don't expect to be inspected or have never encountered an inspection before. Compliance rate at the access is 96%, at the roadside check it is 88%.
- **S. McGrew** asks if this rate would go down if we had more data points from roadside checks. MAISRC completed a secret boater study to investigate if the 96% compliance is accurate.
    - **K. Pennington** notes that there is some bias in the 96% compliance rate. If you see there is an inspector you could leave, or you may expect inspectors to be at the access. The DNR consistently sees higher violation rates at roadside checks.
- **J. Langer** asks about the public's perception on check stations and how has it changed over time. Is the DNR planning on investing more into this in the future?
    - **T. Fitzgerald** explains that the DNR struggles with some of the aspects of doing check stations as a program. Five to eight staff members are needed at the event all day, which requires a lot of planning and rescheduling. They are disappointed with the inspection numbers for time they are there. Maybe more strategic check stations, and enforcement officers one on one with watercraft inspectors at the access would be effective.
    - **K. Pennington** notes the DNR wants to prioritize getting people in and out quickly, even if multiple watercrafts arrive at the same time. The team of staff takes about two minutes to inspect the watercraft, speak with the boater, and for a K9 to check the watercraft.
    - **T. Fitzgerald** notes that the average delay is three minutes.
    - **K. Pennington** highlights the importance of not making people late to where they are heading.
- **D. Loe** notes that roadside checks are good because they catch people off guard. Certain public water access could use enforcement officer presence.

- **S. McGrew** asks if enforcement officers would be one on one with LGU and delegated inspection programs, or just DNR program.
    - **T. Fitzgerald** explains the goal is to have DNR Conservation Officers with DNR staff. Conservation Officers can work to respond to violations. LGUs and delegated inspection programs can work with local enforcement partners to build more enforcement support.
- **B. Garcia** asks what makes a situation go from a warning to a citation.
    - **T. Fitzgerald** and **K. Pennington** explain that it is up to the Conservation Officer's discretion.
- General discussion on the difficulties of watercraft inspection refusal and violation enforcement.
    - **T. Fitzgerald** notes that refusals are a very small part of inspections across Minnesota. Refusal situations can be reported to Tina.

Kelly Pennington, MN DNR Invasive Species Program Supervisor

- State Fair season went well. The Enforcement Division K9s did demonstrations at the state fair and were successful.
- The DNR is currently in a busy season of program meetings and preparing for the Upper Midwest Invasive Species Conference.
- Watercraft inspection season is starting to slow down.
- Adam Doll is in a new position. The DNR is working to post the AIS Prevention Planner position.
- Garrett Miller and Emelia Hauk-Jacobs have been promoted to specialists. Their assistant positions have also been filled.

MAISRC update (from Maddie):

- **K. Pennington** shares the notes below on behalf of **M. Hayden**.
    - Research and Management Showcase: Oct 28th, Register Here. For new members, this is MAISRC annual event to highlight our yearly research. Attendees can participate in presentations, demonstrations, and tour MAISRC's containment and eDNA labs to see some research projects up close.
    - The Thursday AFTER the showcase, Skok 100 is reserved for the SAISAC Meeting in-person! Yahoo! Let me know if you need help catering, Nelson Cheese and Deli is wonderful and I already have a google form with their menu for easy ordering. We usually order the Box Lunch Plan B (12.75/meal).
    - New MAISRC Publication on mercury concentrations following ZM invasions
    - Putting a plug in for this - the MAISRC Grad Scholars and FWCB is looking to host a career panel luncheon next year (Jan or Feb). And if anyone is particularly interested - please let me know! I am helping to organize, and we are looking for NGO, Private Industry, Gov, etc.

## Planning for October In-Person Meeting

- **A. Weberg** states there is an opportunity for SAISAC to do a MAISRC (Minnesota Aquatic Invasive Species Research Center) lab tour.
    - **J. Langer** will be putting together a survey of who can attend the meeting in person.
- **A. Weberg** asks for the group's thoughts on opening the meeting to MAISRC grad students.
    - Generally agreed to have an open invite to MAISRC students.
- **K. Pennington** notes that the DNR will likely be providing lunch. It may be easier if DNR does the survey form and passes the meeting information along to MAISRC students. In the past, DNR staff has thought it was helpful to attend SAISAC meetings.
    - General comments on how DNR staff attendance is helpful at meetings.
- **C. Ohly-Cusack** asks if there is a topic or agenda planned. We could include this in the invitation.
    - **A. Weberg** states that they are open to suggestions.
    - **S. Binsfeld** comments that it would be interesting to learn about what the graduate program is like (application process, program format, etc.).
    - **J. Langer** notes that they could help a grad student early in their process by providing information and possible research questions.
        - **A. Rust** notes that this would be a great idea to share with Maddie to see what new students they have that might be looking for project ideas.
    - **A. Weberg** notes that SAISAC will also need to plan time to review the draft letter about the AIS prevention aid survey.
    - **S. Selter** suggests SAISAC ask MAISRC grad students a question that we would like their input on.
        - **B. Garcia** notes that it could be helpful to understand their perspective on specific topics and how they see their work going forward.
- **S. Binsfeld** highlights an appreciation for preparation and work **A. Weberg** and **J. Langer** have put in behind the scenes.
    - **J. Langer** notes that their work is possible because of all the work committee members putting in.
    - **A. Weberg** notes that the administration committee does not wish to intentionally exclude any committee members. Let them know if you would like to be included.
    - **B. Garcia** highlights that the survey was outstanding work.
- **A. Weberg** highlights that we will need new members and executive leadership for next year.
- October meeting plans
    - Time to draft cover letter for the AIS prevention aid funding cuts survey.
        - **B. Garcia** suggests reviewing the letter ahead of the meeting. **B. Garcia** will work with Sami, Spencer and anyone else interested to get a draft cover letter emailed to everyone for review before the in-person October meeting.
    - Lunch and networking.
        - **S. Binsfeld** suggests 30 minutes of eating, then 30 minutes of topic tables. Each table could have a question or a general topic discussion.
- **J. Langer** asks if there will be a hybrid meeting option.
    - **A. Weberg** is unsure if the room has that technology available.
    - **S. Binsfeld** notes importance of an in-person meeting.

    - **B. Garcia** states it may be helpful to have a laptop for people to listen to. It is difficult for everyone to be in person.
- The meeting room is estimated to have a 30-to-40-person capacity.
    - General comments about how we may want a different meeting room that is easier to facilitate discussions.
    - **K. Pennington** and **J. Langer** suggest checking in with **M. Hayden** about room reservations.
    - We will need an RVSP list.
- General comments about how the MAISRC showcase is a great and valuable experience.
- **A. Weberg** asks about parking information.
    - **K. Pennington** states that parking information includes MAISRC showcase information. **K. Pennington** will check in with **D. Jensen** and **R. Contreras-Rangel** about the process for submitting an expense.

Other DNR updates

- **S. McGrew** asks for an update on ERTF (Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund) community grants.
    - **K. Pennington** states that the request for proposals is not finalized yet. Sign up for updates at the bottom of this webpage.
- **B. Garcia** and **S. Binsfeld** note how great the DNR AIS state fair booth was (tattoos, trading cards, boot brushes).

## Discussion Time for Committee Action Items

- Application deadline for SAISAC positions was extended to October 15.

**Adjourned 2:59 pm**
Next meeting is in-person on October 29th, 9:30 am – 2:30 pm at the UMN St Paul Campus Skok Hall Room 100.