

Minnesota Statewide AIS Advisory Committee (SAISAC)

October 28, 2021 Meeting Minutes

WebEx Online Meeting

Members Present: Justine Dauphinais, Chris DuBose, Will Bement, Pat Brown, Kate Hagsten, Roger Imdieke, James Johnson, Holly Kalbus, Michaela Kofoed, Miss KoriiRay Northrup, Kelsey Taylor, Ryan Wersal

Members Absent: Brian Gross, Eric Johnson

Ex-officio Members Present: Nicholas Phelps, Doug Jensen

Ex-officio Members Absent: Nicole Lalum, Amy McGovern

DNR Staff Present: Chelsey Blanke, Tina Fitzgerald, Shane Kirlin, Jan Shaw Wolff, Jake Walsh, Heidi Wolf

Guests: Dr. David Fulton and Kiley Davan with the Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Conservation Biology at the University of Minnesota

Chair J. Dauphinais called the meeting to order at 10:04am

Motion to approve agenda: First by H. Kalbus, second by J. Dauphinais

Motion to approve Meeting Minutes from September 23, 2021: First by H. Kalbus, second by J. Johnson

Meeting Summary:

- Two new members joined the Committee: Will Bement, White Earth Water Division Manager, and Miss KoriiRay Northrup, a grassroots activist and enrolled member of the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa.
- The Committee learned about a new research project by the University of Minnesota aimed at understanding the attitudes and perceptions of Minnesotans on the use of genetic biocontrol technologies to control invasive species. The Committee offers a diversity of perspectives and will have opportunities to provide feedback on draft materials.
- The Committee discussed potential directions for one-time and traditional funding for the 2022 Control Grant Program. Individual members were supportive of funding projects that support more evaluation components of treatment activities, address new infestations, and support organizations new to IAPM work.

Member Updates:

- New members:
 - **W. Bement:** White Earth Nation. Coordinates Fisheries Program.
 - **K. Northrup:** Enrolled member of the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa. Does grassroots work for water protection and land defense and a lot of work on Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women.

Member updates continued

- **J. Dauphinais:** All patches of invasive *Phragmites* in Anoka County were treated with herbicide in the last month. It is present at only seven percent of the total extent recorded three years ago. Area lakes folks are pulling zebra mussel samplers and still have not found a single zebra mussel on any lake in Anoka County. They are evaluating the Anoka County Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Prevention Program and working on deciding whether they will be able to continue the local grant program or have to cut watercraft inspection hours.
- **J. Johnson:** It has been an interesting year with hybrid watermilfoil (HWM). For whatever reason, there have been a lot of lakes found with HWM. Part of this is due to increased testing. In the past, HWM looked mostly like Eurasian watermilfoil. According to Ryan Thum, researcher at Montana State University, species identification is uncertain unless it has very few leaflets. **J. Johnson** proposed setting up a meeting over the winter about HWM with the DNR. Need some guidance as a delineator to make sure large patches of native plants are not being killed. Also wants to know how many patches should be tested, where (e.g., a few spots throughout a population?), etc.
- **H. Kalbus:** Wrapping up inspection data and noticed half the number of inspections were done this year compared to last year. This year we still have the pandemic and low water so that affects boater traffic. Working on completing the AIS metrics template, which is a very valuable evaluation exercise. Has an advisory committee meeting for the county coming up. Community-based social marketing (CBSM) program is wrapping up. Got some great feedback on their pilot project and hope to continue the project for the next couple years. The yard signs have been really positive, and a lot of people want to take a look at them. [Le Sueur County AIS Education and Outreach webpage](#).
- **C. DuBose:** Had a good season on the lakes. Making progress on invasive *Phragmites* control. No new zebra mussel lakes; only Comfort Lake has them that they know of.
- **K. Hagsten:** Did a wetland delineation training within the department. Wrapping up work on a starry stonewort infestation that they had newly reported this year. Conducting follow-up outreach. Attended local Indian Council meeting to show people what starry stonewort looks like and what to look for next year.
- **P. Brown:** No adult zebra mussels on Red Lake. Looking through plankton samples to see if they have veligers again this year. Continue to work with the state on AIS on the reservation and working to get some decontamination stations in place off the reservation.
- **R. Imdieke:** Continuing monitoring. Water levels are back up in the middle fork of the Crow River. His County Commissioner duties have increased, therefore, he has asked the Association of Minnesota Counties to recommend someone else to take his place on this Committee. In the past there has been strong interest from some of his colleagues. This will be his last meeting.
- **R. Wersal:** Winding down projects with the Army Corps of Engineers on Cuban bulrush, starry stonewort, etc.
- **N. Phelps:** End of field season, just winterized boats. [Minnesota AIS Research Center \(MAISRC\) Showcase presentations](#) are available online; reach out to Nick or researchers if you have questions. Carrying out their research needs assessment process: Just met with technical committee this week, made some changes to priority species list and had some ideas and comments on priority research needs that will ultimately inform the request for proposals from researchers. If you have suggestions, send them to **N. Phelps** and they will try to incorporate those as best as they can.

- **M. Kofoed:** Interested in preventing spread during fishing tournaments and continuing work on the Aqua Weed Stick.
- **W. Bement:** Avoided AIS for quite some time but they are creeping in. Two lakes are infested with zebra mussels. Faucet snails are in seven lakes. Doing a lot of education work. Also working with resorts and lake service providers, checking equipment. Have been doing plankton tows and veliger monitoring and have found no new zebra mussel populations.
- **K. Northrup:** Looking into doing more with invasive species. Helped restore the Kalamazoo River and wild rice after an oil spill.
- **D. Jensen:** Attending the Great Lakes Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species meeting this week. Leading an effort to create new signage for the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness: Narrowing down options and will be having a focus group with businesses, lake associations, and others to make sure messaging is on-target. Hosted an academic fair and educated international students about the importance of declaration as part of the “Don’t Pack a Pest for Academic Travelers” project. Yellow iris is spreading and of concern in the Duluth area; it is a regulated species so can be purchased. Collaborating on the update of the state invasive species management plan. Beginning to plan the Upper Midwest Invasive Species Conference for October 2022 in Green Bay. Invited to be first plenary speaker on AIS and social science at [22nd International Conference on Aquatic Invasive Species](#) in Belgium!
 - **J. Johnson:** Is yellow iris in the Duluth area being managed or just mapped? Who has appropriate management strategies? **D. Jensen:** Working with Jeremy Pinkerton with the DNR, 1854 Treaty Authority, and other partners to map infestations and looking for information on appropriate management. Working with Wisconsin to determine management strategies. Yellow iris can be difficult to identify when it is not flowering. **J. Johnson** offered to help figure out appropriate management strategies.

DNR Updates:

- **J. Shaw Wolff:** Welcome to new members. She is the Section Manager for the Ecosystem Management and Protection Section in the Division of Ecological and Water Resources. The Invasive Species Program is one of five programs that she manages. Thank you for the work you are doing. Natural Heritage Advisory Committee (NHAC) also works within the section and its focus is to help conserve and manage Minnesota’s natural heritage into the future. NHAC does some work with terrestrial invasive species, makes recommendations for Nongame Wildlife and Scientific and Natural Areas programs, and provides recommendations for forest ecologists and forest management, wetlands, and prairies. The application to serve on NHAC is currently open and will be closing on November 22nd. Please share with [the announcement](#) with your contacts.
- **S. Kirilin:** is the Enforcement Division’s Operations Manager. The DNR Enforcement Division is heavily into fall work activities (including waterfowl hunting, aquatic vegetation on duck boats, etc.).
- **T. Fitzgerald:** is a Planner with the Invasive Species Program. Primarily works with local governments to implement their AIS Prevention Aid programs. Has also been leading a [community-based social marketing \(CBSM\) project](#) for the DNR, which aims to encourage adoption of positive invasive species prevention behaviors by the public.
- **H. Wolf:** is the Invasive Species Program Supervisor. Updates:

- The Modified Unified Method Exercise is going on now. It is an effort to capture and remove invasive carp in the Mississippi River. Also did this earlier this year and removed 30 invasive carp. The process involves slowly blocking areas off with nets to corral fish in one spot and then pull the invasive carp out of the water. Done in close partnership with the U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Worked with a waterfowl group to ensure the work would not affect waterfowl.
- The program's invasive species rulemaking process is moving forward, in which several species will be proposed for listing as prohibited invasive species.
- Bait harvest in infested waters. This is a permitted activity and there is concern by some members of the public of there being a lack of bait in the state (esp. spottail shiners). The program has been working with DNR Fisheries to revisit permit conditions. Additional permit conditions exist for bait harvest in infested waters, especially for zebra mussels. One possibility being considered is a pilot project that would generate some data to assess what is going on. There is not good data on what is being harvested and if and why things may have changed. DNR Fisheries is also relaxing viral hemorrhagic septicemia (VHS) testing requirements this year. The pilot would help us to avoid making a lot of changes at once. Might look at specifically spottail shiners and one other gear type but none of this has been finalized yet. Would have to tag all of the gear, DNR Enforcement would have to be heavily involved, and we are not sure of costs for Enforcement.
- Recruiting new members for this Committee! We are working with the DNR Commissioner's Office to get approval to proceed with the 2021 process. Want to finish current process before initiating the next round and continue to diversify the Committee.
- **C. Blanke:** Invasive Species in Trade Specialist for the Invasive Species Program. Will soon provide a summary of recent work on trade pathways for invasive species and will be looking to discuss options for next steps with this Committee.

Genetic Biocontrol of Invasive Species: Understanding Attitudes and Risk Perceptions

Presenters: Dr. David Fulton (Adj. Professor & Asst. Unit Leader) and Kiley Davan (Ph.D. Graduate Research Assistant) with the Department of Forestry, Wildlife and Conservation Biology at the University of Minnesota

- Their project is funded through the Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources. They are not conducting genetic biocontrol, they are doing a social science study on the use of genetic biocontrol.
- Genetic biocontrol background: These are new technologies with promise to control invasive species. There have been calls from managers to explore the benefits and risks of genetic biocontrol. There is a need to understand how the public perceives the benefits and risks of using genetic biocontrol technologies to help guide if and how we use these technologies.

Genetic biocontrol presentation continued

- Project objectives:
 - Understand risk and support of using genetic biocontrol technologies on common carp and zebra mussel (species with most advanced research).
 - Understand antecedence (things that happen before support) and consequences of level of support for using genetic biocontrol technologies. Based on (1) nomological network: thoughts and social influences of why people support it and behaviors toward it; and (2) cognitive hierarchy: core values, orientations, attitudes/norms, behavior intentions, behaviors.
 - Understand preferences for using genetic biocontrol technologies. Gather a better understanding, to better guide where policy goes.
 - Explore and gain initial understanding of potential concerns of tribal nations in Minnesota with genetic biocontrol technologies. These are not stakeholders in the traditional sense. They are sovereign nations, have treaty access, etc.
- Theoretical context:
 - Psychometric approaches: values and ideology, attitudes and risk perceptions (genetic biocontrol technologies and invasive species – specifically common carp and zebra mussels).
 - Discrete choice experiments to understand preferences of genetic biocontrol technologies – approach pioneered in New Zealand on invasive species; which is based on Choice Modeling Approach developed at the University of Minnesota and awarded the Nobel Prize.
- Implementing state choice modeling – balancing complexity and realism. Make it as simple as possible, but realistic enough so they are not making an artificial choice.
- Next Steps: Talking to stakeholders about their basic understanding of genetic biocontrol technologies.
- Social survey with public and key stakeholders:
 - First, focus groups and interviews to inform survey design.
 - Then survey of: General public (n = 1200); Lakeshore homeowners (n = 1200) – larger number because there are thousands of lakes, fisheries lakes, vested interest, easily activated political group that we need to understand; Anglers (n = 400); Boaters (n = 400).
 - Survey will be web-based to enhance ability to present information to survey respondents; and known decreased response rates from traditional mail surveys. Random and probabilistic respondents are chosen and directed to the online survey. Online will start with larger sample size; non-response; adjust by weighting data.
- Engaging tribal communities:
 - Interviews and focus groups with tribal biologists and community members.
 - Work cooperatively with tribal nations.
 - Building a dialog first, following human dimensions protocols.
 - The University does not have formal guidance for research with tribes.
 - This is not research that would fold into policy – that is a separate conversation between the DNR and tribes.
- Outcomes
 - Develop upstream information about public risk perceptions concerning genetic biocontrol technologies; and risks invasive species pose themselves (social science).

- Provide context for future policy dialogue concerning use of genetic biocontrol technologies (collaborative research).
- Timeline: Focus groups and interviews in fall/winter 2021/2022; Implement survey in spring 2022; tribal engagement summer 2022.
- Survey topics include:
 - Attitudes towards genetic biocontrol technologies and case species.
 - Risk and benefit perceptions of genetic biocontrol technologies.
 - Level of support and/or opposition for the use of genetic biocontrol technologies.
 - Level of trust and confidence in researchers and officials.
 - Knowledge on genetic biocontrol technologies and case species.
 - Start with open ended questions (pilot) to inform matrix tables (constrained statements; final survey).

Discussion on genetic biocontrol project

- **J. Dauphinais** says RNA was mentioned, but given this pandemic, vaccine hesitancy, and misinformation; any concerns how this might impact this survey? Lessons to be learned? **K. Davan** says the trust and confidence piece get at this, asking about trust in government and scientists. Maybe this would be different for research affecting humans vs. zebra mussels. **D. Fulton** adds, can we understand how psychological biases might influence how they perceive genetic biocontrol technologies? It is not a persuasion experiment, but rather where is the public now? They may have mistrust, so knowing that is out there is important in order to build policy.
- **J. Johnson** says at the DNR workshop held a few years ago on this topic, the most supported issues are mosquitos and diseases. Is this study going to be set up to compare to these issues, or just in general? **D. Fulton** says Mike Smanski, a researcher at the University, talked about wiping out things that are huge benefits to humanity (diseases). Yes this study could reference that, but it is all new technology. This thinks about another path and how it works where the stakes are not so high. A balancing act. Would like to run it through this Committee to see if it is working, is it capturing the information needed. **J. Johnson** asks, is it broken down by species, e.g. yellow iris, that's not on people's radar; or zebra mussel vs. round goby? Or overall invasive response? **K. Davan** says it will be broken down by species, specific to zebra mussels and common carp. The McDonald New Zealand study presented different method for each species. This one would maybe compare zebra mussel genetic biocontrol technologies and other controls. **D. Fulton** says it is focused on common carp and zebra mussels. Hope to move to terrestrial environment as well. Species probably does matter, responses may be different depending on what those species are (how noxious or impactful they are).
- **H. Kalbus** asks, the public meetings mentioned, have those happened yet? **D. Fulton** says they are in the near future. Counting this as one of them. **H. Kalbus** asks, will the meetings be with all different types of people together or by specific user groups? Having likeminded people in the room and generally supportive of each other, you may get different feedback if the stakeholders are mixed versus separated by interest. **D. Fulton** says they will be similar interests, to help inform the survey and understand what they do and do not understand. The platform should be as comfortable as possible. We are not conducting the dialogue.
- **K. Taylor** is excited about this project. About tribal governments, the survey in spring of 2022 and then tribal engagement in summer 2022. You should send a letter to the tribes before the survey. Tribes are often

engaged after the project is complete, to avoid this, show intention to engage them individually. **D. Fulton** says yes that is the plan.

- **J. Dauphinais** asks if there is anything you would like to discuss? This Committee is well represented by various tribal nations too. Do other tribal representatives have thoughts?
 - **W. Bement** agrees with the suggestion of a sooner of notice of intent rather than later. Our members get bombarded with a lot of information. Do you have an up to date contact list for the tribes? Want to make sure they are getting to the appropriate contact. **W. Bement** will share. **D. Fulton** would appreciate that. They do not have that list in hand yet; has some through a different chronic wasting disease (CWD) project. Will plan to reach out in the next month. **W. Bement** will share with **T. Fitzgerald** and she will share with **D. Fulton** and **K. Davan**.
 - **D. Fulton** says they will get the open ended questions to this Committee and ask what other questions should be asked. Making sure we are framing the questions right.
 - **W. Bement** says with leeching activities and zebra mussels and faucet snails, they are getting more knowledgeable and more heavily involved and more opinionated now, so it is a good time. Invasives impact treaty rights and livelihood.
- **J. Dauphinais** asks, what is the timeline? **D. Fulton** says the questions are close to done, maybe by end of next week, so within the next couple weeks. He would also like to share the survey in draft form. **K. Davan** adds that the open ended questions are coming from a past study at the University about invasive fish.
- **T. Fitzgerald** suggests they keep in touch through her. We can share material via Basecamp. Helpful to set deadlines and check-in as needed.
- **J. Dauphinais** says we have talked about genetic biocontrol in the past, but she has not seen much movement forward, good to see it taking steps now. Happy to be involved and make time on agendas over the next year or so.
- **H. Wolf** adds that the DNR had a symposium on this and looked at process for permitting. The DNR came to a hard stop, needed to do a process to check in with tribes. The DNR's next step is talking with tribes about genetic biocontrol and if/how it would be permitted in the state.
- **K. Taylor** adds that for the questions for tribes that they should work with her and **W. Bement**, to make sure questions are phrased appropriately. And to make sure management wants to engage. **D. Fulton** found that with the CWD project, having a small community to talk about it was extremely helpful. **K. Taylor** and **W. Bement** could be a core team for understanding.

Control Grants: 2020 and Beyond

Presenter: Jake Walsh, DNR Research and Grants Coordinator

- Program background
 - Support aquatic invasive plant control by local groups such as lake associations, watershed districts, cities, and counties.
 - Funds used for reimbursement of expenses directly related to a control project.
 - Control projects include herbicide treatment, mechanical harvest, or a combination of both.
 - Projects and grants are tied to invasive aquatic plant management (IAPM) permits.
 - Species include Eurasian watermilfoil, curly-leaf pondweed and flowering rush.

- 2021 overview
 - High demand, often not able to fund all.
 - **J. Johnson** sees 2/3 go to lake associations and 1/3 go to tribal/local governments, is that DNR decided? **J. Walsh** says no, that's just how it shook out.
- One-time funds 2022
 - Similar to our program, but one-time funds. 2023 will be 'regular' in terms of funding.
 - All funds must be encumbered in fiscal year 2022 (set aside in our budget). Happens with grant contract execution. Typically done by March or April.
 - **J. Johnson** asks, does it have to be spent? **H. Wolf** says no, it has to be given out. But we can't change it after that. Everything has to be assigned. Money could last two years. But if they decide not to spend it after that, it goes back to the source fund.
 - It's only for lake associations, not like our typical program which includes local governments and tribes.
- What we know about the 2022 one-time funds
 - Could be used for larger, more creative projects.
 - Need to design a program that fits the intent of the 850k.
- Ideas
 - Could distribute more grants, but there is a capacity issue (staff involved in processing grants).
 - Could distribute larger grants.
 - Could use the traditional funds for local governments and tribes. The question is how much can/should be set aside for that.
 - Could broaden target species included in IAPM-permitted grants.
 - Could allow 2023 work before June 30th, aka "season and a half" projects.
- Priority ideas (may or may not fall under one-time funds)
 - Assessment of efficacy and non-target damage (pre and post), but concern with capacity within contractor/government communities.
 - Evaluate and select proposals by how they improve IAPM generally in Minnesota.
 - e.g. managing spread, managing population
 - not sure if these funds can be used for this

Discussion on Control Grants

- **J. Johnson** asks, are the funds just for plants? **J. Walsh** says yes. We will take these ideas to Bob Meier and compare with the intent of the funds. It may have been accidental to leave out local governments and tribes. Only when it gets to us, do we get hyper vigilant about exact language.
- **J. Dauphinais** asks, is this something that would happen again? **H. Wolf** says it is one time funding, then it is gone. Someone would have to resubmit it, in any dollar amount, and get it approved again.
- **J. Johnson** suggests allowing costs for genetic testing of hybrid watermilfoil. It is necessary for delineation. Also suggest reserving funds for newer infestations, typically smaller organizations that do not have the money or experience; but could make a biggest difference with early treatment. He also likes bigger projects so we can learn more; would love to see more of that. He would rather really do an assessment on what works and what does not. Not a lot of data on why control did or did not work. **H. Kalbus** agrees, especially the new infestations. Also, typical treatments do not have follow up as far as monitoring, so we do not know

if it was effective or not. As far as capacity, it depends on the local government's resources and staff. If you need local government support, maybe reach out ahead of time to see what capacity is available to help lake associations too. **J. Walsh** says genetic testing came up in discussion, akin to delineation. For newer infestations, glad to hear support, especially in terms of equity. To get new organizations plugged in, get them funds for new infestations, etc.

- **J. Johnson** asks, are we going to know what is allowed? Or should we make a list to push? **H. Wolf** says we will ask soon and may find out we have no idea what the intent was; then we do have the ability to put on sideboards. For instance, we could put limits on species, time, length, size, etc. Also, there are lots of administrative things that go into each grant by multiple staff. General goals are to make more people happy, get more data, and research efficacy. We will try before the next meeting to have answers from leadership on what we should do with these funds.
- **J. Johnson** asks, is the only choice to increase reimbursements? **H. Wolf** says any of this could happen and the program would be interested in a mix. We could put these in buckets for specific activities or just ask "what do you want?" Already had hours of meetings about this, there are kind of endless options. Boundaries are unclear besides that it must be plants, lake associations, and all in year one.
- **J. Walsh** says what we get from this Committee is valuable and carries a lot of weight. A lot of possibilities.
- **J. Dauphinais** says you might ruffle more feathers for a one-year thing and then "take it away" the next year. Agrees to use it to improve IAPM in Minnesota. Genetic testing, new herbicides, etc. Do not make the buckets too small. Timing is challenge since the cut off is in June; that is too early to have two years of treatment and evaluation but works well for curly-leaf pondweed. Curly-leaf pondweed control is like mowing the lawn. More optimistic on Eurasian watermilfoil control, like with ProcellaCOR. **H. Wolf** clarifies they would have the whole month of June, which might help. **R. Wersal** adds that incentivizing one herbicide over another is not a good idea.
- **H. Wolf** adds we are trying to get more effective. I do not think we can do everything we want, there has to be some "you get more money." Some stakeholders are going to be excited about new opportunities and others do not care.
- **J. Johnson** asks, how was the \$400K value determined in the past? **H. Wolf** says the amount of money has been based off our budget, which ranges from zero to \$990K. **J. Johnson** asks, could those traditional funds work in tandem with one-time funds? **H. Wolf** says the one-time funds are for lake associations only, which means we do not give it to local and tribal governments, which we are against. Traditional funds could go to them though.
- **J. Johnson** asks, the end date can be in 2023? **J. Walsh** says yes, but it could impact how we give out grants in 2023. **H. Wolf** adds that the hardest thing is whiplash, its one-time funding. Applicants range from local government staff doing this as a job to a small lake association. **J. Johnson** says as long as it is communicated as one-time funding, they would understand. Think of it like bonus money, a special thing.
- **K. Taylor** suggests that if they apply for treatment within reservations to require tribal consultation. They have had issues in the past where they do not find out at all or find out after. If the DNR could interfere with that to make sure they follow tribal consultation that would be ideal. **H. Wolf** says they need a permit from the specialist before they are allowed to apply for a grant. She thinks we do not have authority to write a permit for a water body in tribal boundaries. **K. Taylor** says water in tribal land is public water. Big Lake, Carlton County is the example she is bringing up. Tribal notification and consultation before would be very

much appreciated. Should have some simple language in the permit. **J. Johnson** says in his work in tribal areas, Diver Assisted Suction Harvesting or hand pulling options would be helpful, where tribal areas do not have herbicide as a tool. Get money to tribal interests and these groups for these methods that can sometime be expensive. **J. Johnson** asks, is there a good way for me to figure out if I'm on tribal land? **K. Taylor** says MAISRC is adding tribal boundaries to a map, ask **N. Phelps**. You don't know what you don't know – it is not intentional, but they don't realize they are on the reservation or the water body. **J. Johnson** says for permitting filtering level, this is one we have to get additional weigh in. Could use the tool, but in the heat of the field season, those things slip through the cracks; also, sometimes lake groups are not completely up front. **H. Wolf** says we check on a whole bunch of other stuff, so could also check the map when it is available. Then develop an internal process on what happens when it comes up.

- **H. Wolf** says we want to hear your ideas! This is not your only opportunity. Hopefully will have more options to present in the near future.
- **J. Dauphinais** suggests a checkbox with options and adds money the more boxes you check. **J. Walsh** is interested, but also concerned that people would check all the boxes just to get the most funds, and then maybe not follow through.
- **J. Walsh** adds that treatment itself is very expensive. They use all their funds and don't have funds to do any more.
- Send thoughts and ideas to **J. Walsh**.

Update on the DNR's Community-Based Social Marketing Project

- **T. Fitzgerald** says the DNR is wrapping up its CBSM contract. The Last two deliverables are:
 - Community Asset Mapping Report
 - Report has been posted to Basecamp.
 - It is 120+ pages but mostly figures.
 - If you want to review, do so this afternoon so that your suggested changes can be integrated before the end of the month.
 - Aquarium and Water Garden Pond Survey Report
 - Chelsey will talk about this in her later presentations on trade pathways work.
 - Had almost 500 respondents.
 - Vast majority of hobbyists are aware of and care about AIS, take preventative actions, and want to learn more.
- **T. Fitzgerald** says the DNR will want to have discussions with this Committee going forward because there are many recommendations from this project. It is up to the DNR and partners to continue CBSM work and follow through on priority recommendations. It is a lot, but we can take it one piece at a time.

Discussion Time for Committee

- **K. Hagsten**: Cass County had a question about posting mobile unit decontamination stations to the online decontamination map. **H. Wolf** and **T. Fitzgerald** noted that any local government can post locations/hours on the online map. Contact Adam Doll.
- **T. Fitzgerald**: Ann Pierce will be presenting at the next committee meeting on a project to determine future funding sources for DNR and conservation work.

- Terms ending include those of **K. Taylor, B. Gross, E. Johnson, J. Johnson, and J. Dauphinais**. All are welcome to apply for another three-year term when the request for applications comes out.

Wrap up

- The next meeting will be December 2, 2021 and will include:
 - Invasive organisms in trade detailed project updates
 - Continued discussion of invasive species control grants
 - Celebration of members with terms ending in 2021!

Adjournment at 1:43 PM.

Next Meeting to be held online, 10:00am – 2:00pm, December 2, 2021. On the agenda for the next meeting is DNR future funding, DNR’s efforts related to trade pathways for invasive species, invasive species control grants, celebration of members with terms ending.