

Meeting Notes for Aquatic Invasive Species Work Group  
Thursday, October 15, 2015

ATTENDEES

Bruce Michael  
Mike Naylor  
Lisa Eutsler  
Jonathan McKnight  
Jay Kilian  
Matt Ashton  
Kelley Johnson  
Margie Brassil (Delegate Stein's Office)  
Clark Howells  
Jeannine Moaney

Barbara Beelar  
Elliott Campbell  
Jennifer Wazenski  
  
Via Phone  
Carol Jacobs  
Mark Lewandowski  
Julie Bortz  
Seth Metheny

**Work Group Introductions:**

**Power Point Presentation by Baltimore City Reservoir AIS Protection Strategy – Clark Howells, Baltimore City Government**

Clark Howells  
Watershed Section Manager  
Environmental Services Division  
Bureau of Water and Wastewater  
DPW, City of Baltimore  
18514 Prettyboy Dam Road  
Parkton, MD 21120  
Office: [410.396.1586](tel:410.396.1586)  
Fax: [410.357.5904](tel:410.357.5904)  
Cell: [410.206.3804](tel:410.206.3804)

**Update and Discussion from AIS Work Group Committees**

- Mark Talty left DNR, however, all of the Attorney General's information is still available. Jennifer Wazenski will provide legal assessment for report.
- Jonathan stated we need to look at other lakes and body of waters that feed into our lakes/water or what this group is trying to do would be useless, regardless of resources.
  - Barbara commented on Salvage Lake/Big Run State Park – wondering if it was managed by the State.

**Economic Analysis**

- This report has a lot of assumptions at this point.
- The bottom line is that most options are not cost effective
- Best solution from the analysis is to wash the boats between any lakes or body of waters.
- Carol stated that boat cleaning numbers are way too low in this analysis; Bruce stated we can evaluate and revise the numbers if warranted.
- Carol said we need to average the cost from a marina to add to this report, too.
- Seth explained that Deep Creek is not the source of AIS; Rocky Gap ramp has the hydrilla (he referenced the Rothersberger Report). Carol agreed with Seth; Jonathan

stated that is what this group is deciding – we are not at any type of conclusion at this point.

- Bruce stated that with the concerns, that the Economic Analysis would be reviewed.

### **Alternatives Options and Cost Analysis**

- One of the alternative options that came up was the self certification data – no hard data is available for the cost analysis; however, this is still an option at this point.
- Discussion came up about if we are to do a control or eradication for AIS
  - Elliott stated controlling is not economical – control is forever
  - Mark explained eradication of vegetation can be a 5-7 year process, and then, if successful, the need for control is gone.
  - Elliott explained that the analysis is based on future invasion with the current control.
- Mark explained a federal law that goes into effect April of 2017 that could be a financial penalty for AIS so we may need to make a mandatory inspection.
- Yearly passes came up in discussion, to where those folks would just go bypass any inspections.
- Carol stated public outreach is needed; Minnesota has the best program and we need to look at their program.
  - Barbara feels this is not the best approach – would like to see less boaters but mandatory inspections.
  - Mark stated 41 boats came in dirty; the marina cleaned the boats prior to entry into the water

### **Funding Opportunities**

- Barbara has a file folder full of ideas she put together for funding opportunities. She will put together a list to share with the group.

### **Discussion of Report Recommendations and Actions**

- The group feels the Rothensberger study should be referenced in our report the Maryland General Assembly.
- Julie and Mark stated that a NAS database website that tracks invasive plants is getting ready to go live – we need to make sure that Maryland's information gets put into this tracking system. The USGS NAS animal database has been live for years.
- Margie asked if this group needs to continue, even after the report is completed. Bruce explained that this group really is duplicated so much within DNR that he doesn't feel it's necessary.
- Barbara agreed to undertake research on funding options.
- Do we want a tier approach with minimum or no investment, then go down to our “wish” list of what we want?
- Jonathan doesn't feel that the matrix is fully completed yet. We should list everything out, and then whoever makes the final decision knows exactly what needs to happen.
- Mark asked for everybody to make their edits in RED on the matrix that has been started and email him. He will make edits/corrections. We need this within the next two weeks!
  - Comments made on burden on the community, delays on the boat ramp and eliminating any political cost.

- Matt A. (post-meeting comment): It is worth noting that Minnesota DNR has a multi-million dollar invasive species program with over two dozen full-time staff, primarily funded by state general funds and secondarily by a surcharge to watercraft owners via boat registration. This could be used as a model for a similar approach in MD. Minnesota DNR annual reports are available online:  
([http://files.dnr.state.md.us/natural\\_resources/invasives/2014-ais-annual-report.pdf](http://files.dnr.state.md.us/natural_resources/invasives/2014-ais-annual-report.pdf))

Next Meeting:

- Tentative Date – Wednesday, November 4<sup>th</sup>, 1:00-4:00 at DNR