

# Minnesota Statewide AIS Advisory Committee (SAISAC)

---

## ***March 25, 2021 Meeting Minutes***

***Virtual Meeting via WebEx from 10:00 a.m. – 1:45 p.m.***

***Members Present:*** Justine Dauphinais, James Johnson, Kate Hagsten, Holly Kalbus, Ryan Wersal, Isiah Tolo, Roger Imdieke, Kelsey Taylor, Pat Brown

***Members Absent:*** Michaela Kofoed, Eric Johnson, Chris DuBose

***Ex-officio Members Present:*** Nick Phelps, Doug Jensen

***Ex-officio Members Absent:*** Amy McGovern, Nicole Lalum

***DNR Staff Present:*** Heidi Wolf, Phil Hunsicker, Tina Fitzgerald, Shane Kirlin, Chelsey Blanke, Jan Shaw Wolff

***Guests:*** Jeff Forester (Minnesota Lakes and Rivers Advocates), Dr. Amy Kinsley (MAISRC)

***Meeting began at 10:02 a.m.***

***Motion to approve agenda. Motion made by K. Hagsten and second by I. Tolo. Motion approved unanimously.***

***Motion to approve Meeting Minutes of February 25, 2021 made by J. Johnson and second by K. Hagsten.***

***Motion approved unanimously.***

## **Meeting Summary:**

- The Committee discussed the process MISAC is currently going through to update the State's Invasive Species Management Plan, which was originally approved in 2009. The DNR uses the plan to apply for federal grants. The Committee would like to provide input to the plan revision.
- The Committee learned about the contents of a legislative report entitled, Statewide Surveillance and Early Detection Program. The report, which includes recommendations about future AIS Prevention Aid funding, was written and submitted to the Minnesota Legislature by MAISRC.
- The Committee discussed HF228, a bill that would require the State to update its Invasive Species Management Plan every five years and include references to climate change and its impacts on invasive species.
- The Committee agreed to write a letter of support in favor of HF 1896, which proposes to raise the boat registration surcharge from the current \$10.60 to \$25, which would support the DNR Invasive Species Program, stable funding for DNR invasive aquatic plant control grants, and stable funding for MAISRC.

## Committee Member Updates

- **J. Dauphinais:** With flowering rush positively identified in a long ditch system, she has consulted with AIS applicator, Patrick Selter, about acceptable methods to treat the infestation. He suggested doing a drip treatment or damming the ditch before treating so water is not flowing.
- **H. Kalbus:** The wheels are in motion to develop a video for the Community-Based Social Marketing (CBSM) campaign addressing behaviors associated with cleaning and drying water-related equipment. Working with Wildlife Forever to create a 5-10 minute video that can be posted online for the public to see.
- **I. Tolo:** Received word of two unsuccessful grant funding requests. One was to investigate a parasite that affects golden shiners, so stocks could be developed that didn't carry the parasite. The second grant was to look at new techniques for rapidly diagnosing pathogens. Working on eDNA techniques to detect the Koi Herpes Virus.
- **J. Johnson:** Ice is leaving smaller lakes, so business is about to pick up. Has been receiving positive feedback on the DNR's new grant lottery process. Glad to see that smaller lake groups made the cut and are now involved in, and more knowledgeable about, AIS management.
- **K. Hagsten:** The Leech Lake Band's Natural Resources Advisory Committee met to discuss bait harvesting regulations on Leech Lake. Good conversations. Discussed restrictions for when shiners are spawning. Fisheries Director will go out with harvesters to observe their claims of a lack of diversity in the fishery. Positions have been posted to staff the decon unit. **P. Brown** adds that shiners are found throughout Minnesota. They are preyed on a lot. **I. Tolo** says there is a parasite that can affect fecundity in shiners. It is more a stock production problem than a wildlife problem. **K. Hagsten** says that some band members didn't appreciate the new proposed restrictions made by the band. The harvesters claim to know when it is appropriate for harvesting shiners; they don't need more restrictions. **H. Wolf** adds that these restrictions are not coming from the DNR. The band is imposing these restrictions. The band and the DNR have similar harvesting seasons. The DNR doesn't have jurisdiction over tribes on harvesting bait on tribal lands. Sean Sisler (DNR) is doing a statewide bait harvest review and tribal input would be appreciated.
- **K. Taylor:** Expected long season of netting this year. People at the landings 24/7 for 45 days. Working on eDNA with partners. Tribal youth are being involved in sampling and trapping operations. **K. Taylor** has to leave the meeting for other responsibilities, so Chair asks if she wants to share her views on the MISAC State Plan rewrite. **K. Taylor** says the tribal consultations section is under review by the DNR. Ideally, this will be a plan used by everyone around the state. That tribal section is rather vague. So is the cultural component. Would like to see those sections more robust. **H. Wolf** says that there is a challenge. The plan is used by the DNR to obtain federal funding, so it is often viewed as "DNR's plan" even though it is really MISAC's plan. The DNR already has an official tribal consultation protocol in place. Should that be incorporated into the MISAC plan, or will that section be different from what the DNR already does? These discussions are going up the DNR chain of command.
- **P. Brown:** Attending lots of coordination meetings. He is a proponent of keeping bait local. Harvest locally and use it locally.
- **R. Imdieke:** No AIS news to report, but wanted to share about the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's monarch butterfly protection program. When public works projects happen, an environmental review is required. Now, if X acres are dedicated to monarch protection/habitat, the current required environmental review process can be bypassed. County is looking to plant the upslope of ditches with milkweed. Have received lots of positive responses from property owners in the county.
- **R. Wersal:** Current President of Aquatic Plant Management Society (APMS). Society will have an in-person conference in New Orleans this year. There will be a virtual component to the meeting. In 2023, the APMS conference is being planned for Indianapolis. He adds that he has done work on managing flowering rush in flowing water systems, so he can offer some ideas to **J. Dauphinais'** situation.

## DNR Updates

- **H. Wolf** says that 2 GLRI grants to the DNR were successful. One was to support work to find an alternative to the use of non-native *Phragmites* in water treatment plants, and the other grant was to support Community-Based Social Marketing (CBSM) and education. The DNR has started the process to hire watercraft inspection interns, seasonal Level 2's and AIS trainers. Fifty interns have already applied, despite the late start. Still looking for more candidates to cover all areas. The Modified-Unified Method (MUM) to capture invasive carp in the Mississippi is not new. It has been used in China and the southern U.S. with success. Press release is going out today. Some captures have already occurred this year. Starting April 5, 2021. There will be a carp coalition symposium, possibly with Dr. Sorenson leading it and funding provided by LCCMR. The DNR received some funding from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to hire a contractor to investigate what invasive species are found in Minnesota's pet shops and food trade. There will be no enforcement actions, but hope is to educate those unaware that they are potential pathways of spread. At the legislature, HF1896 proposes to increase the surcharge from \$10.60 to \$25. \$2 would support IAPM control grants. \$4 would go to support MAISRC. The rest would go to the DNR. One hearing so far. **J. Forester, N. Phelps**, and a lakeshore property owner testified. Bob Meier (DNR) also gave testimony. **J. Dauphinais** asked what that increase means in dollars total. **H. Wolf** says \$2 would equal about \$543 K/year for IAPM control grants. This year, DNR gave out \$430 K in control grants. In the governor's budget proposal, the surcharge would be increased from \$10.60 to \$11, which would mean an extra \$109 K for the DNR. In the current calculation, all money goes to support the DNR's Invasive Species Program. None of it goes to support MAISRC. **J. Forester** says the \$25 proposal goes back to a 2019 proposal for an increase in the \$5.00 surcharge to support DNR plant control grant dollars and stable funding for MAISRC. It was negotiated down to \$10.60, which goes to the DNR. No support for MAISRC is included in the current surcharge.
- **H. Wolf** says that the current recruitment to fill three empty seats on the AIS Advisory Committee is being held up at the Commissioner's level to better understand tribal participation on DNR advisory committees. It's complicated. The tribes are sovereign nations, so what is their role in representing the citizens of Minnesota?
- **P. Hunsicker** summarized the DNR's completed workshops with county AIS coordinators and their partners. DNR hosted 6 virtual workshops on topics such as public engagement during COVID, invasive aquatic plant management, CBSM, tools, washes and improving decon numbers, early detection and response, and organisms in trade (OIT). Excellent attendance with averages over 60. Most of the 10-15-minute presentations were given by county coordinators. Some DNR staff and Sea Grant also presented. Even after COVID when meetings can once again be done in person, the feeling is that these virtual workshops will still have a place. **T. Fitzgerald** shared that we took 23 pages of notes, which will be made available to workshop participants, along with PDFs of the PowerPoint presentations. **J. Dauphinais** attended some of the workshops. She liked that each meeting was geared to a specific AIS topic. Also liked that they were not regionally organized like the in-person workshops, so participants could hear what was going on in other parts of the state. **H. Kalbus** presented at two of the workshops, and she commented that she learned a lot.
- **J. Johnson** asks if the watercraft surcharge increase is supported at the legislature. **J. Forester** says there is strong support in the House. He has met with Senate leaders. **J. Johnson** asks if the \$25 fee is arbitrary. According to **J. Forester**, it is not. This figure was used in 2019 to provide adequate funding for the DNR, for DNR control grants and for stable funding to MAISRC. In 2019, legislators complained about the increase, but the surcharge hadn't been increased for many years. Much of their concern was for places like church/youth camps that have a lot of canoes that need to be registered and that extra cost is too much for them to absorb. Because of that, there could be some special amendment language in the final bill for groups like church/youth camps.

- **J. Dauphinais** asks if the Committee supports the \$25 surcharge proposal. Motion by **J. Johnson** that the Committee write a letter of support. Second by **I. Tolo**. Motion passed unanimously. **J. Forester** shared a link for whom the letter of support should be written. **T. Fitzgerald** found a letter in the files that had been written by the Committee back in 2019 in which the Committee supported an increase to the surcharge. **J. Dauphinais** will work with **J. Johnson** to use the old letter as a guide to create a new letter of support. It will be posted on Basecamp for Committee member comments before sharing with legislators.
- **C. Blanke** announced that the DNR launched an organisms in trade (OIT) surveillance project in retail stores with Fortin Consulting. DNR is doing outreach for crayfish boils, which have become popular. Generally, red swamp crayfish (an invasive) are shipped up live from the southern U.S. This is illegal. Letters have been sent to Minnesota restaurants and to distributors around the country to educate them about the invasive species transport laws in Minnesota. **I. Tolo** asks if the project is looking at pathogen transmission that could happen by illegally transporting invasive species like crayfish. No, that's important, but not part of this project.

## Discussion of Status of MISAC's State Invasive Species Management Plan Update

- **C. Blanke** explained that the MISAC Plan for Management of Invasive Species was originally done in Minnesota in 2009. **D. Jensen** was part of that process. It was intended to meet state and federal requirements. A pool of federal funding is available to those states with approved state management plans like the one created by MISAC. The process now is to update the existing plan. They would like partner review to happen by May 28, 2021. An announcement should be coming out next week. This would provide an opportunity for the SAISAC to submit comments.
- **H. Wolf** says that MISAC wrote the plan that was approved in 2009. It has been eleven years, so it needs an update. DNR recognized the need for an update and added the plan rewrite to position we applied for grant funding for. **C. Blanke** was hired by the DNR, and one of her responsibilities was to take the lead to help update the state plan. The plan was already being updated when HF 228 was introduced at the legislature. This bill requires that the plan be updated every five years and include aspects of climate change, which is also being done during this update process. Requiring an update of the plan every five years, which isn't required by the federal government, is problematic. The very structured process to update the plan can take two years. Plus, every five years would require additional funding to make the update happen. **C. Blanke's** current position is only a 3-year appointment. The DNR relies on federal funding to support its invasive species program work, so any delay in the process might put federal funding in jeopardy.
- **J. Forester** says 84D, section 2, requires the DNR to write a plan. This has been in place since 1996. 84D, subdivision 1, says the Commissioner shall prepare and maintain a long-term plan. The need for the DNR to have a plan was in place long before the MISAC plan was created. A lot has changed in the last decade. MAISRC is here. AIS Prevention Aid is here. Climate change is here. The MISAC plan is more aspirational than programmatic. How do we connect the MISAC plan to those doing the work on the ground?
- **H. Wolf** says climate change is part of our current AIS discussions, and has been for a while. The MISAC plan is meant to be a broad, high-level plan because it involves multiple groups coordinating to create it.
- **C. Blanke** says those involved with the MISAC plan understand that many people aren't familiar with it. How can it be better promoted?
- **J. Forester** says \$9 million goes to the DNR every year for AIS work. \$10 million goes to counties. \$6 million is spent by lake groups to deal with AIS. More money is being spent on AIS by other groups than the DNR. We need local groups to participate in the development of a coordinated state plan and not just ask them to react to a plan that has already been created without their input. The plan should also be specific about roles and responsibilities.

- **C. Blanke** says that many active local partners have participated in the updating process of the MISAC plan. The process is open to all voices who want to participate.
- **J. Dauphinais** reminds Committee members that the purpose of this discussion is to determine the role of this Committee. Do we want to provide comments on the MISAC plan, and do we want the DNR to have a more detailed operational plan than the MISAC plan? We can talk more about this during the discussion session that will happen after Amy Kinsley's presentation. We should also have **D. Jensen** in attendance during that time, and he was involved in the creation of the plan in 2009, as well as the current updating process.

## Legislative Report on a Statewide Surveillance and Early Detection Program

**Presenter: Amy Kinsley, Assistant Professor of Aquatic Epidemiology with the Department of Veterinary Population Medicine at the University of Minnesota**

- **A. Kinsley's** background is understanding mechanisms associated with the spread of infectious diseases, invasive species, and pollutants – mostly in aquatic environments. Uses a variety of modeling approaches for informing surveillance, analyzing surveillance data, planning, and optimizing systems.
- Points to address:
  - The most effective structure for a statewide aquatic invasive species surveillance and early detection system.
  - Whether to employ eco-epidemiological models, optimized decision models, or related tools as a mechanism for determining how best to deploy limited resources.
  - How the statewide system should be funded and at what levels.
  - Regulatory, policy, and statutory changes that would be needed to fully implement the statewide system.
- Project team had a variety of experts on: species, risk, modeling, public affairs, and engaging stakeholders.
- They conducted information gathering through: Engaging stakeholders in one-on-one interviews (about existing programs and structures) including 16 counties, lake associations, local governments and businesses; focus groups; and reviewing government documents and scientific literature. Focus groups were different than the interviews – stakeholders went back and forth on feedback on drafts of the reports and more detailed information gathering. Looked at other states and countries too.
- Report overview ([available online](#)): Key Concepts of Surveillance; Components of a Statewide Surveillance and Early Detection System; The use of decision support tools for resource allocation (aka epidemiological models); Gaps and Opportunities for existing efforts; Funding and regulatory implications.
- Key Concepts of Surveillance
  - Defined surveillance because everyone has their own definition and this one gives a broad sense and includes categories. Surveillance is broadly defined as the systematic collection and analysis of outcome-specific data, meaning that the data are collected with the intent to plan, implement, and evaluate management activities.
  - There is no such thing as “perfect” data, the process is iterative – data to knowledge, knowledge back to data.
  - Surveillance can be used in many ways: detect new populations; document distribution; hypothesize pathways of spread (helpful for early on when there are a lot of unknowns); evaluate management strategies, including prevention; assess the safety of control strategies and response procedures; identify research needs; and track evolutionary changes.
    - In other words, “making decisions with the lights on, knowing what the full picture is.”
  - Types of Surveillance – wide in purpose and activities

- Public reporting – when the public identifies new infestations.
- Syndromic surveillance – Aiming to identify an AIS based on statistics (vs. direct observation).
- Periodic surveys – Done at regular intervals (may not cover a large enough area to reach levels needed for early detection).
- Risk-based surveillance - Allocation of activities guided by the probability of occurrence (more attention to high-risk areas).
- Sentinel surveillance – Choosing a subset of waterbodies to conduct surveillance—these are to be representative of all of the waterbodies in the area of interest.
- Combining (e.g. periodic, risk and sentinel) = you don't have to search the whole waterbody, focus on high risk areas like boat accesses; focus on high risk lakes, etc.

## Legislative report continued

- Components of an Effective Statewide Surveillance
  - Surveys and inspections – species and habitat, pathway, clear directions; partnership and communications – mechanisms to foster this; education, research and training – maintain public awareness and new technology; evaluation – judicious, effective, non-duplicative, and has sustainable funding.
  - All of these are happening, but we would benefit from more guidance and purpose.
  - Direction on surveillance activity
    - Protocols, standardized techniques, location, frequency, and intensity (AIS specific)
      - By standardizing methods, we can create consistency in data collection that allows for comparisons across time and space
      - The dissemination of the results (positive detections and negative) should align with the system's purpose and objectives and be available to all stakeholders.
    - Standards
      - Input standards –what you intend to do
        - E.g. sampling strategy, sample size, method, frequency
      - Output standards – what to intend to achieve
        - We want to be 99% confident that X waterbodies are free of a specified AIS at a specified detection threshold
        - Risk-based sampling-waterbodies or locations within waterbodies are sampled based on a pre-determined risk threshold (increase in efficiency and efficacy because it requires less sampling)
    - Many people doing work – a statewide program would help consistency.
- Decision Support Tools
  - [AIS Explorer](#) is an online decision support tool. It includes a Risk Model for Surveillance and Prioritization for Watercraft Inspectors. **N. Phelps** presented this tool to the Committee at a previous meeting and there is a [recorded webinar](#) about it.
- Funding
  - The current funding model is the county AIS Prevention Aid which is based on watercraft trailer launches and parking spaces in each county.
    - The pros of the current funding is that it: fosters innovation (obvious through the interview process – for surveillance work and ability to partner), creates local opportunities, has potential to harness local-level knowledge of natural resources, brings government closer to the citizens that play a large role in AIS prevention, and has a greater opportunity for collaboration.

- The cons are that it: only considers public access points, some counties do not receive adequate support and therefore creates additional burden (sometimes spend more than they get), doesn't take into account the breadth of risk factors that contribute to the spread of AIS (e.g. the proximity to infested waters), and no specific funds are allocated for surveillance.
  - The proposed funding model includes:
    - A baseline \$15,000; understand not enough to hire, but still helps with bottom line.
    - 80% of total funds based on risk-based prevention activities (25% launches, 25% trailer parking, 30% registered watercraft)
    - 20% risk-based surveillance and early detection priorities.
    - A gradual transition to this model is suggested: Year 1 – prevention only; year 2 – 10% risk-based; year 3 – 20% risk-based.
- Regulatory, statutory, and policy changes
  - A statewide AIS surveillance and early detection plan; A statewide web-accessible database; Strengthen communication; strengthen the legal framework for early detection and surveillance of AIS.

## Discussion of Legislative Report

- **P. Hunsicker** asks if an analysis has been done of the proposed funding change and how it would impact individual counties. For example, what Crow Wing County gets now versus what they get using the new formula. The base \$15,000 and scientific basis for distribution is a good idea. If you need to sell this to the counties, it might be nice to have a comparison. **A. Kinsley** says in the current funding the launches and parking spaces were very correlated, which means one or the other is not really adding anything new. Adding the registered watercraft to be 30% of that 80% does allocate funding differently than launches/parking. They didn't include specifics in the report, but does provide some ideas related to the 20% risk-based surveillance piece. They didn't attach specific risks to counties or lakes yet. Don't have raw numbers. It was more of an inspiration to thinking about risk and getting resources in the hand of the people that need it.
- **J. Dauphinais** asks if they have received any feedback from the legislature or counties. **A. Kinsley** says nothing from legislature. Have heard from people that were part of the process as well as not part of it and a large part were supportive. This support is likely because it was an iterative process. They are open to criticism and feedback. **N. Phelps** adds he sent this to the legislative chairs and the environment committees in the senate and house – no response and no action. He adds that this report doesn't necessarily require legislative action. Still can be done, by us, trying to implement in different ways.
- **H. Kalbus** says the funding baseline is a great idea. Counties are affected by AIS even if they don't have accesses, because their boaters go elsewhere. Appreciates the science-based approach, but seems to be missing the social aspect. For instance, different counties get different support from other local organizations like associations and watershed districts. She wears a lot of hats and doesn't have anyone else to do AIS work, which means she is forced to pick and choose. How you would put that into a formula, no idea, but still something to think about. **A. Kinsley** says the baseline funding tries to address that and build that over time. Thinking about how this would be sustainable, so they can take on projects over the long term, with confidence the funding will be available. Things get scary when we talk about moving funds. She has heard the baseline funding is important and could be more.
- **J. Johnson** says the funding is focused on agencies and local governments. Lake people are highly motivated to do something on their specific lake. Could communicate to counties that there is motivation and funding available. Put that into the plan. **A. Kinsley** says it is challenging to think about very local level and at the same time make it into a statewide program. **J. Johnson** says guidance, methodology, and public database would excite individuals at the lake level. Just need to make sure it is not just ending at the county level.

- **J. Dauphinais** asks, what feedback has the DNR received? **J. Shaw-Wolff** says the DNR has received some feedback expressing concern with redoing the county funding formula. The DNR and MASIRC worked together for 16 months on this report. The statute language was “to develop... in conjunction with the commissioner of natural resources...”, but the DNR’s role in the report was as one of the many reviewers; and not a collaboration. The DNR had some concerns about what is recommended in the report that were fully shared with MAISRC. For instance when talking about input standards and sample size – the report claims representation by all 83 counties, but only 16 counties were consulted. Therefore the sample size might not be fully adequate for counties as well as lake associations and businesses. The DNR also wanted the report to be significantly more broad and include a pathway lens, not just focus on the county aid. The DNR wanted the report to better identify current efforts and where current efforts could be more coordinated at the state, regional, etc. levels. The DNR was also concerned with defining surveillance with the end-goal of control and eradication – that is not always possible. Realistic expectations need to be set. The DNR was hoping to see more recommendations for effective and more efficient efforts through current funding mechanisms. Feedback was given with respect, this is a good report with good ideas.
  - Was there specific feedback to the DNR from outside parties? Understand this isn’t a DNR plan. **H. Wolf** says one person who was interviewed was very concerned. They were listed as someone who contributed. It was a very brief interview. They were concerned and upset, it made it seem like they supported the recommendations in the plan and agreed with it. They were concerned about funding. They contacted legislative staff in their county and contacted MAISRC to be listed differently. Meg Duhr provided an updated version of the report to clarify contributions. **P. Hunsicker** says counties just want to know how this will impact their funding, concerned about staffing, etc. They are concerned about the \$10 million anyway, every year. Fear that they have been flying under the radar, but now that it is brought up, it going to bring up the funding as a whole. **H. Wolf** says there is always concern about unintended consequences whenever you address statute changes.
  - **N. Phelps** asks, how best to move forward? Not doing something more effectively and efficiently just because you are worried? At odds and hearing resistance to change. But maybe the change is ok? **H. Wolf** says the counties have full control of the funds – they could spent 20% on surveillance now. All or one could do that. A ton of flexibility now. Yes we want people to use adaptive management. They can do that now, they could just use more communication and education. The most success in coordination has been **T. Fitzgerald** and **P. Hunsicker** getting counties together. Could get counties together to discuss now on what tools or resources they use and need for surveillance. **P. Hunsicker** says the “Top 10” counties – the counties that receive the most aid – agree that they have more responsibility to do more statewide, but have had a really hard time coming together and making decision to pool money together to make something happen. Some have freedom and some have very little control of their funds.
- **J. Johnson** asks, county to county, what kind of change or difference would be seen? **N. Phelps** says in the preliminary calculations St. Louis stays the same, Hennepin goes up, Itasca goes down. We didn’t share it in the report, because we wanted them to get conceptually on board, whether or not they are going to get more or less money. Using the watercraft registrations shifts to urban areas; but risk allocations shifts it elsewhere. We want them supporting the process, not a dollar amount. **J. Shaw-Wolff** says she appreciates the point and agrees fear shouldn’t prevail over well-informed changes. The DNR’s concern is of representation of counties and other entities that could be impacted by this. It is an exciting starting point and good catalyst for conversations. But without a substantive and comprehensive base, it makes things vulnerable. There is a need for a collective commitment that engages the full range of stakeholders. **N. Phelps** says this is just a starting point. The Committee just talked about this in the state plan update and stakeholder involvement in that. There will always be a subset involved. There is an efficiency to the process that they had to follow. He’s not sure how they could have done it better. **A. Kinsley** adds that for the 16 counties involved, they started with



the highest amount of aid, and eventually accounted for 50% of the aid. None of this was done in secrecy. They are open to feedback.

## Discussion: Committee Action Items Regarding the State Plan and Legislative Report

- **J. Dauphinais** starts off by saying in these conversations today she is hearing there is a lack of coordination between major AIS players and stakeholders in the state that have/receive a lot of money. What are Committee members thinking? What are the next steps for this Committee?
- **P. Hunsicker** asks **N. Phelps**, what do you want from the Committee regarding the surveillance report? **N. Phelps** says, if he hears anything from the legislature, he will share with this Committee. Same with the DNR. The DNR would make their own recommendations. There is a place/system for this Committee to weigh in, in a formal way, if something gets introduced (e.g. letter writing). The report provides a framework. The Committee could send a letter to the Top 10 counties. The DNR could implement parts in some way. The State Plan being updated by MISAC doesn't have a surveillance and early detection framework. The Committee could encourage or support it at different levels.
- **J. Johnson** emphasizes the need for guidance for surveillance methodology and a database. He is very interested in these parts.
- **C. Blanke** says for the State Plan, there is a great advantage in having a statewide coordinating entity highly involved in the development of the State Plan. There is room for more detailed plans on specific topics. Invasive species management is huge, that is why the State Plan is so broad. There is room for specific plans on specific topics like watercraft inspection. She encourages members to check out other state plans too. Even though people may not be aware of the plan, they are implementing it. Changing the State Plan might not be the way to make change to a specific issue.
- **P. Hunsicker** asks **D. Jensen** to provide more history about the State Plan. **D. Jensen** says the first plan was meant to be general and vague, so that other plans can plug in to this plan. Minnesota was the first state to develop a combined aquatic and terrestrial invasive species management plan. The DNR and Minnesota Department of Agriculture both need to report to legislature. The DNR can also use it as their state plan to meet federal requirements. They held a workshop on it. One area fell short – implementation tables. Work groups completed them, but didn't really become part of the plan. Meanwhile all this activity is going on and many are implementing plan components. As we move forward, we should challenge the entities involved – what are you doing to implement the plan? **K. Taylor** asks, what we should do as advisory to the DNR? Do we make sure there are no red flags in DNR implementing it? This could be a letter to the DNR. Everyone in this group should be a partner, review and provide comments as individuals. **J. Dauphinais** asks, will the DNR be submitting feedback to MISAC? **H. Wolf** says DNR is a member of MISAC. During the update process we are thinking about: does it make sense for the state of Minnesota to do? Does it make sense to submit as our plan for federal funding? Things have changed a lot in many years. The counties are following the current plan – they use the template local plan which directly locks into the State Plan. They are using it to guide their work. Is the plan still relevant? Are the counties involved in the State Plan update? **D. Jensen** confirms that yes, there is an ad-hoc committee of MISAC members doing the update. Yes the plan is relevant and many parts are still accurate. The update looks at gaps and have already received federal feedback to address those gaps. He is amazed they have made this much progress in such a short amount of time. Once the plan update is ready for review it will be sent to MISAC and partners. They are already 2 years into this update. MISAC doesn't have a legislative mandate, they are doing this because they want to. **P. Hunsicker** and **T. Fitzgerald** are doing an awesome job of seeing how the counties are spending the money.
- **J. Forester** says the plan is for the federal money and there is no obligation to write the plan, but there is an obligation that the DNR Commissioner shall write a plan. The proposed legislative change requires a plan be updated every 5 years. It lays out the partners for the plan. He is concerned with the combination of the two

plans. Does the one serve the other? Does the invasive species council plan satisfy the state statute? He doesn't think it meets the statute requirements. **D. Jensen** says he hasn't read the statute, but it does meet the requirements of the federal funding. It is done in coordination with all 44 state and interstate plans in the nation. **J. Forester** says that Senator Rudd said at a follow-up hearing if the DNR has a state plan they will lose federal funding. **H. Wolf** clarifies that federal funding is linked to a statewide plan, which is met by the MISAC plan. The proposed House File change is 5 year update and adding the impact of climate change. There has been no suggestion that this State Plan doesn't meet statutory requirements. What they have expressed is that 2009 to 2020 is too long, and we agree and are addressing it through this update. **J. Forester** says the people in the hearing room's impression was that if they passed this law, and DNR writes the plan, you would lose federal funding.

- **J. Dauphinais** refocuses the conversation and asks, is this Committee is going to support or not HF 228? **D. Jensen** asks if **C. Blanke** talked about the opportunity for addendums to the plan as a way to update it in the future. **C. Blanke** said no, she didn't cover to that level of detail, but the review team has talked a lot about it and will assess how it is updated periodically. That is something to pay attention to in the review process. There are other ways. Next week! **J. Johnson** recommends that members take a look at the State Plan update between now and the next meeting. **J. Dauphinais** agrees, members should read the State Plan update and then make the decisions about review timelines and if the plan is sufficient or not.

## Wrap-Up

- Next virtual meeting is scheduled for **Thursday April 22, 2021**. This will be the last meeting before the Committee's three-month summer hiatus. AIS Planners will work with the Chair and Vice-Chair to develop an agenda based on the Committee's expressed priorities for 2021. Potential topics are to continue the state plan discussion, look at how the Committee can initiate a campaign to accept voluntary contributions that support AIS work in Minnesota and an update on MUM efforts on invasive carp control in the Mississippi River.

***Adjournment at 1:45 p.m.***