

MINUTES
Approved by the Committee
Invasive Species Working Group
Tuesday, August 30, 2016
9:00 A.M.
EW 42
Boise, Idaho

Co-chair Representative Gestrin called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.; a silent roll call was taken. Members present: Representatives Dayley, Hixon, and Erpelding; Co-chair Senator Rice and Senators Heider, Harris, and Burgoyne; Legislative Services Office staff Katharine Gerrity, Ray Houston, and Jennifer Kish.

Other attendees: Tom Woolf, Lloyd Knight - Idaho State Dept. of Agriculture; Angela Kaufmann - Office of the Attorney General; Richard Turner - US Army Corps of Engineers; Stephen Phillips - Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission; Senator Curt McKenzie - Pacific NorthWest Economic Region; Tammy Kolsky, Steve Martin, Anna Canning - Idaho Parks and Recreation; Jeff Dillon - Idaho Fish and Game; Barry Burnell - Idaho Dept. of Environmental Quality; Rayola Jacobsen - Northwest Power Conservation Council; Russell Westerberg - Rocky Mountain Power; Jeremy Pisca, Emily Patchin - Risch & Pisca; Jesse Taylor, Claudia Cottle, Dave Cottle - Bear Lake Watch; Amy Ferriter; Rialin Flores - Conservation Voters for Idaho; Mitch Whitmill - Jefferson County; Bryce Fowler - Fremont County; Jeffrey Pettingill - Bonneville County Weed Control; Norm Semanko - Idaho Water Users Assoc.; Dennis Tanikuni - Idaho Farm Bureau; Grant Simonds - Idaho Outfitters and Guides Assoc.; Bas Hargrove - Idaho National Laboratory; Nate Fisher - Fisher Public Policy; Betsy Russell - The Spokesman-Review.

NOTE: presentations and handouts provided by the presenters/speakers are posted on the Idaho Legislature website: <http://legislature.idaho.gov/sessioninfo/2016/interim/invasivespecies.htm>; and copies of those items are on file at the Legislative Services Office located in the State Capitol.

Co-chair Gestrin opened the meeting by explaining that the committee was tasked to understand what was being done, what was working, and what could be done better in the effort to halt the spread of zebra and quagga mussels to the western states and, more specifically, Idaho waters. He commented that he had experience with the invasive species Eurasian milfoil in Payette Lake, which was successfully contained but not eradicated. Co-chair Rice emphasized the need for prevention and studying the most effective methods for eradication.

Co-chair Gestrin called Tom Woolf, Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program Manager for the Idaho State Department of Agriculture (ISDA), to the podium for his presentation [Aquatic Invasive Species: Understanding the Threat to Idaho](#). Mr. Woolf explained that zebra mussels were introduced into Lake Michigan by watercraft from the shipping industry through ballast water and adhesion to watercraft. He reported that both quagga and zebra mussels were from the eastern European area near the Black Sea. Mr. Woolf displayed evidence of the mussels reproducing at alarming rates and affecting intake valves for drinking water, irrigation pipes, and hydroelectric facilities, as well as damaging boats and waterfront areas. He estimated that the cost to Idaho, if the mussels were introduced to the state, would be approximately \$94 million. Mr. Woolf explained that the water could be tested for veligers, microscopic indicators of mussel viability. He noted that all Idaho waters were randomly tested for the possibility of the mussels' existence. If a presence was identified, the IISC (Idaho Invasive Species Council) Mussel Rapid Response Plan would be put into action. He reported that the mussels could live outside of water for up to 30 days. Plans for the treatment of contaminated water included the use of potash (100ppm) or copper (1ppm); such methods were detailed in the IISC EDRR (Early Detection Rapid Response) treatment plan. Mr. Woolf reported that there were other types of aquatic invasive species that could be thwarted by inspection,

such as hybrid milfoil, flowering rush, starry stonewort, spiny waterflea, Asian carp, and general fish pathogens.

- Co-chair Rice inquired how the \$94 million cost was determined. Mr. Woolf explained that it was the impact to hydroelectric facilities, recreation areas, fish hatcheries, golf courses, drinking water and irrigation facilities, etc., for Idaho's individual communities.
- Representative Dayley asked what would be the best way to attack the issue, in a biologist's opinion. Mr. Woolf responded that the boats that had been moored would be the best place to begin the attack to perform inspections and then, secondary, making an effort to educate owners of the problem.
- Senator Harris inquired where the funding for the treatment and eradication methods would come from. Mr. Woolf explained that the ISDA had a deficiency warrant and that he assumed such funds would be used for that purpose.
- Co-chair Rice inquired what type of testing was being performed in the water as opposed to performing inspections. Mr. Woolf reported that the department had an active survey program that took samples from major bodies of water throughout the season. He explained that the process required a fine-mesh net being dragged through the water to collect samples. He reported that, to date, no presence had been detected in Idaho, nor in the Columbia River Basin (CRB).
- Co-chair Gestrin inquired what limits were on the deficiency warrant funds. Mr. Woolf deferred the question to Mr. Lloyd Knight, Administrator of the Division of Plant Industries for the Idaho State Dept. of Agriculture. Mr. Knight reported that statute provided for a maximum of \$5 million per fiscal year for control and eradication in emergency situations.
- Senator Burgoyne queried what type of ongoing funds and sources were available to the division. Mr. Knight reported that the division operated on \$1.2 million revenue from the invasive species sticker program, used a small grant from the US Forest Service (USFS) to operate the Redfish Lake inspection program, and had \$800,000 to \$900,000 in General Fund appropriations for the aquatic weeds program. He noted that there was some crossover use of funds at the inspection stations because it was possible to catch either type of invasives during inspections.
- Senator Burgoyne asked whether the division felt the state and federal funds allocated were sufficient in the effort, or whether additional funds were needed to employ additional measures. Mr. Knight responded that the answer was quite subjective. He explained that the division used the \$1.2 million allocated each year. The division had also received an additional \$1 million from the Legislature (\$300,000 for FY 2016 and \$700,000 for FY 2017), for expanding the hours and days of operation. Funds were also used to secure law enforcement support for nighttime operations. Mr. Knight shared that the division made a conscious effort to work within the budget because it recognized that the deficiency warrant was not always going to be available. Mr. Knight also noted that the agreements with local law enforcement were at the mercy of those offices and the hours being offered; some counties did not have any extra manpower to devote to the issue. Additionally, he noted that it was difficult to fully staff the stations during normal hours, let alone staff for expanded hours. He felt there was a shortage of willing employees available in the locations where stations were located.
- Co-chair Rice asked, in regard to the risk, whether the current efforts were enough prevention. Mr. Woolf stated that more could be done, such as better cooperation with other states to identify at-risk boats and to prioritize at-risk areas. Co-chair Rice asked Mr. Woolf to identify specifically what else could be done (more hours, longer season to inspection stations, identify better locations, etc.). Mr. Woolf explained that efforts of watercraft inspection were targeted at high-traffic corridors. He noted that 24-hour stations were effective, but there were difficulties in keeping them open. He suggested working with marinas and boat owners to make both entities aware of the danger and to attain voluntary compliance.

- Representative Dayley inquired what assistance had been requested from, or was being provided by, the federal government in the preventive efforts, since 63% of Idaho's land was managed by federal entities. Mr. Woolf reported that there was a regional level effort to work with the national parks and that the state of Utah had inspections at the national park boat ramps. He explained that the effort was at a state level, funding and manpower, with permission from the national parks.
- Senator Heider inquired whether the decision to expand hours had been implemented, and what had transpired of the \$1 million funds expected from the US Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Woolf reported that the hours of daytime operations had been extended but that nighttime hours had not. Mr. Knight explained that the nighttime hours were not implemented due to the inability to staff those time slots and to contract with local law enforcement entities to ensure security. He also reported that the Corps of Engineers funds were not yet available.
- Representative Erpelding asked Mr. Knight to explain the outside cooperators: were they outside agencies, were they state patrol; and were there other staffing options. Mr. Knight reported that 11 of the 16 inspection stations were operated by local soil and water conservation districts because that agency was familiar with the use of seasonal staff and had facilities and equipment already in place; the remaining five inspection stations were operated by his agency. He expressed that both agencies had difficulty finding enough employees to staff the daytime schedule, let alone the desired nighttime shifts. In addition, his agency had difficulty securing agreements with local law enforcement to assist with the nighttime hours for security. He explained that this compound problem led the agency to forfeit the nighttime schedule.
- Representative Erpelding asked Mr. Knight to identify what agencies of law enforcement had been courted. Mr. Knight stated that county and state law enforcement, as well as fish and game, had been approached. Representative Erpelding then asked if the sheriff of Shoshone County had been approached to provide security services for the inspection station in north Idaho. Mr. Knight replied that he had.
- Senator Rice requested that Mr. Knight provide information to the committee regarding what would need to be done to attract employees and to attain a security presence, whether by local law enforcement or private companies.
- Senator Burgoyne inquired whether any suspect traffic was being missed at night, in comparison to the daytime. Mr. Woolf stated that the division did not know exactly, but could report that traffic certainly trailed off in the evening hours. Senator Burgoyne wondered whether the data collected showed any trend regarding Idaho residents versus nonresidents. Mr. Woolf noted that such data did exist, and that he would provide it to the committee.
- Representative Dayley asked how the agency was working with the federal agencies in regards to the Lacey Act and interstate transportation. Mr. Woolf replied that the agency had a representative on the Invasive Species Council, but that he was not aware of any regional efforts regarding the Lacey Act.

Seeing no further questions, Co-chair Gestrin thanked both gentlemen for their time.

Co-chair Gestrin then called upon Ms. Angela Schaer Kaufmann, Deputy Attorney General for the State of Idaho. Ms. Kaufmann reported that she currently represented the Department of Lands (IDL) and had previously represented the Department of Agriculture, hence she was asked to speak at this meeting. Ms. Kaufmann's presentation was an overview of the [Idaho Invasive Species Act of 2008 \(Title 22, Chapter 19, Idaho Code\) and Administrative Rules Governing Invasive Species \(IDAPA 02.06.09\)](#).

- Representative Dayley asked whether there was any cooperation between IDL and ISDA regarding this issue. Ms. Kaufmann responded that she was unaware of any current efforts but noted that there is broad authority for such cooperation to occur between agencies.

With no further questions, the committee went on break.

At 10:40 a.m., Co-chair Gestrin resumed the meeting by recalling Mr. Lloyd Knight, Division of Plant Industries Administrator for ISDA, to the podium for his presentation [Invasive Species Program Administration](#). Highlights and additional information from the presentation:

- Noted that though the IISC was authorized in 2006, until the invasive species sticker program was established, there was no funding for efforts.
 - Reported that the Redfish Lake inspection station at the boat ramp was supported by a US Forest Service grant.
 - Noted that as a safety measure, staff were not allowed to operate on the water alone.
 - Reported that approximately 800 samples were collected and sent to an outside laboratory.
 - Felt that watercraft inspection was most effective at the source (i.e. takeout ramps).
 - Established inspection stations along busiest routes of watercraft travel with assistance of the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD), which helped in identifying effective signage, safe road width, and traffic patterns/hazards.
 - Commented that the number of inspections also were influenced by factors such as the economy, low water levels, construction projects, etc.
 - Reported that the statute does not allow the agency to enforce a "hotwash"; it requires voluntary compliance by the boat operator.
 - Awarded a \$1 million (\$300,000 for FY 2016 and \$700,000 for FY 2017) deficiency warrant from the Legislature to operate.
- Co-chair Gestrin inquired how many boats traveled through Idaho and were found by another state's inspection to have been infected. Mr. Knight reported that he did not know the exact number, but there were probably some, since boats bypassed the inspection stations or traveled when the stations were closed.
 - Representative Erpelding, in noting that Wyoming had \$1.9 million appropriated for such efforts, asked whether Mr. Knight knew of Wyoming's sources for funding. Mr. Knight noted that Wyoming also had an invasive species sticker program, but he was not aware of its other sources.
 - Representative Dayley asked whether efforts to be preemptive included cooperation with the national park system or other federal agencies. Mr. Knight reported that both the WRP (Wetlands Reserve Program) and the CRV (Conservation Reserve Program) had been the conduits in efforts to work with the federal agencies. He reported that such efforts included letters from the Director and Governor to the federal agencies, support from Congressman Simpson in discourse with federal agencies, and providing input to appropriations for targeted amounts of funds and areas of focus. Mr. Knight stated that efforts to include the cooperation of federal agencies were met with resistance, and he theorized that federal agencies didn't have the big picture of how a single infestation could affect so many downstream. He did note that Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park were quite cooperative. Mr. Knight acknowledged that the federal agencies were limited by budget and authority and, in reality, were more concerned about keeping tourism coming to the waters, not limiting or hindering it. Mr. Knight shared that his agency has returned state share money from the US Fish and Wildlife Service allocated for AIS efforts and requested the funds be put toward inspection and decontamination at Lake Mead and Lake Powell.
 - Representative Dayley wondered why Mr. Knight did not take those state share funds and use them in leverage to force a better agreement. Mr. Knight reported that it was not an effective tactic with such a small amount of money. He felt the best tactic was to emphasize to the federal agency that it was in its best interest and a moral responsibility to take action. Mr. Knight commented that efforts to tie these invasive species to the Lacey Act had been ineffective. He noted that many worthy organizations (WASDA - Western Association of State Departments

of Agriculture; NASDA - National Association of State Departments of Agriculture) had made attempts to stimulate action, but he felt that ultimately it would take efforts of Congress to stimulate the requirements.

- Senator Harris, in regard to Wyoming's mandatory inspection before launching watercraft, asked whether such a mandate could not be instilled in Idaho. Mr. Knight explained that there were challenges to such a mandate, such as securing the support of law enforcement, ensuring the inspection protocol was the same for all stations, and - if required by statute - staffing all 3,000 boat ramps.
- Co-chair Rice requested that the committee send any requests for data from ISDA-AIS to LSO analyst Katharine Gerrity.
- Representative Erpelding asked Mr. Knight to clarify whether funds could be appropriated specifically for the purpose of funding law enforcement for security. Mr. Knight responded that whether the Legislature wished to allocate funds for such was at its decision, but that it would only be one factor of the solution. He explained that the other factor was the need for staff to be assigned to that duty; whether the staff was seasonal, additional law enforcement, or current staff with additional duties, it was still a manpower issue.
- Representative Hixon asked whether Mr. Knight was aware of any requirement or policy in other states that moored watercraft had to be cleaned and inspected at the time of removal from the water. Mr. Knight explained that suspect boats most often were taken from federal impoundment; there was no requirement, only cooperation that allowed the state to clean and inspect. Representative Hixon then inquired whether Mr. Knight was aware of any pending federal legislation to create such a requirement. Mr. Knight responded that there had been attempts to create such a requirement but all had failed; he knew of no federal legislation currently pending.
- Representative Dayley requested that the agency provide additional information on the commingling of funds toward the effort and the details of the annual strategic plan.

Co-chair Gestrin thanked Mr. Knight for his comments and called Ms. Tammy Kolsky, Manager of the Reservation and Registration Program for the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (IDPR), to the podium for her presentation on the [Idaho Invasive Species Sticker Program](#). Ms. Kolsky reported that the IDPR administered the program utilizing 162 retail vendors, 44 county DMV (department of motor vehicles) offices, and 22 parks and recreation locations, as well as online sales. She stated that the revenue collected was paid/distributed to the ISDA on a monthly basis. She acknowledged that sales begin the November prior and run throughout the following year. The sticker was valid from the moment purchased through December 31; this method was often referred to as a "sticker year." Ms. Kolsky reported that (for FY 2016) \$1,215,443 was transferred to the ISDA from sticker sales. Of those funds, she commented that 72% were attributed to registration/sticker sales to Idaho motorized vessels and sailboats, 15% were attributed to out-of-state boat sticker sales, and 13% were attributed to nonmotorized vessels.

- Co-chair Rice observed that boat registration was required using a "sticker year" (i.e. May XX-December 31) method, as was the invasive species sticker. He then inquired whether additional expenses would be incurred if the method was switched to a calendar year (i.e. May XX-May XX), which may be more appealing to owners. Ms. Kolsky responded that she would look at earlier research where the possibility of prorating was considered, and that she would report that information back to the committee.

Seeing no further questions from the committee, Co-chair Gestrin adjourned the meeting for lunch.

At 1:30 p.m., Co-chair Gestrin called the meeting back to order.

Rep. Dayley noted that he had earlier contacted the Weed Control Superintendents for comments to the committee and had received a letter, which was distributed to the members for their review.

Co-chair Gestrin then called upon Richard Turner, Project Manager for the US Army Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District, for his report to the committee. Highlights from his prepared handout [Watercraft Inspection Stations in Columbia River Basin](#):

- WRRDA (Water Resources and Reform Development Act) of 2014, section 39(c), permitted the US Army Corps of Engineers to cost-share watercraft inspection stations in the Pacific Northwest (Idaho, Montana, Washington, and Oregon) within the geographical boundary of the Columbia River Basin (CRB);
 - \$40 million allocated - \$20 million dedicated to watercraft inspection stations and \$20 million to monitoring efforts and contingency planning;
 - The US Army Corps of Engineers was tasked with identifying ideal locations for inspection stations (working with AIS to accomplish this);
 - Funds were not to be used on existing stations but for creating new stations;
 - A recommendation would be included for the addition of stations outside the established geographical boundary of the CRB;
 - The cost-share agreement would operate such that the Corps received an invoice and then reimbursed the stations at 50%; and
 - Funds would be distributed to states according to what was spent (i.e. it is not an even split among the states).
- Co-chair Rice asked whether there was uniformity in the inspection training and standards among the states. Mr. Turner stated that there were regional protocols that would be used by the states and what he reviewed seemed consistent.
 - Senator Harris commented that Franklin County contained a major ingress to the Chesterfield Reservoir, which then fed the Portneuf River, which led to the Snake River. Per his example, Senator Harris asked what efforts were needed to have stations established outside the geographical boundary of the CRB to have these additionally important routes covered. Mr. Turner replied that such a recommendation was to be included in the submitted recommendation letter.
 - Co-chair Rice inquired whether the inspection station had to be located in the geographical limits of the CRB or whether the targeted body of water had to be located within the CRB, and if so, could a station be placed along those routes that the public used most to access that body of water. Mr. Turner commented that the question raises a good point and that it made sense, but currently the grant was limited to the basin. He commented that a proposal to extend the boundary could be included in the report, using such justification.
 - Representative Dayley inquired whether the grant originated through the Corps of Engineers, the federal government, or at the request of the state of Idaho. Mr. Turner replied that he was not sure of its origin and that traditionally such tasks were not in the Corps' purview.
 - Representative Dayley asked whether Mr. Turner's district was in touch with other districts, and what feedback had the other districts provided. Mr. Turner commented that he was not aware of communication with other districts. He acknowledged that an invasive species program already existed within the Corps, which was more focused on invasive weeds and there are other programs that exist in the Great Lakes, the Mississippi Valley region, and other areas of the South for mussels.
 - Representative Dayley commented that there was clearly a federal interest. He asked whether the effort driven was by the 50/50 match or the limit of funds available. Mr. Turner explained that, depending on the appropriations assigned each year, a scope of work would be written to match the available funds; hence, more stations could be added if funds were available.
 - Representative Dayley inquired whether funds added to the effort from the Legislature would be matched and whether limitations would exist on the matched money. Mr. Turner explained

that, if approved as the letter stood, the match was 50% of the cost to establish, operate, and maintain the stations.

- Senator Burgoyne inquired whether the states of Utah, Arizona, California, and Nevada were in the same Corps district. Mr. Turner replied that those states were in multiple Corps districts. Senator Burgoyne then inquired what efforts were being made by those districts. Mr. Turner commented that he was not familiar with the efforts of those states regarding mussels.
- Co-chair Rice requested that the Corps include in its report the request/need for expanded hours of station operations. He also commented that the Legislature was interested in the cost-sharing aspect to ensure that the infestation does not occur. Mr. Turner acknowledged the request and commented that the cost for both normal hours and extended hours of operation were discussed in the report.
- Representative Dayley asked how the Legislature could assist the Corps in achieving these recommendations of expansion - both geographically and in operation. Mr. Turner felt that the letter/report included rather compelling research to defend the requests.

At 2:00 p.m., Co-chair Gestrin called Stephen Phillips, Senior Program Manager for Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission located in Portland, Oregon. Mr. Phillips went through his presentation [Regional Coordination and Prevention Efforts Relating to Quagga and Zebra Mussels](#). Highlights or additional information from the presentation:

- Noted that the commission's efforts were broken into policy and technical teams.
 - Commented that the third version of Watercraft Inspection Training Decontamination Protocols and Standards was available - protocols based on scientific research.
 - Reported that it took approximately 60 hours to "hotwash" a pontoon-sized watercraft.
 - Reported that the National Park Service (NPS) policy was that it did not have the authority to decontaminate fouled watercraft on park property.
 - Reported that the use of potash to eradicate an infestation was still being tested and tried.
 - Noted that efforts for voluntary compliance were all that existed, there were no violation consequences.
- Representative Erpelding inquired how the federal Clean Boating Act of 2008 by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) could be used to enforce prevention efforts. Mr. Phillips stated that it had been reviewed and no viable avenue was identified.
 - Representative Erpelding asked whether a policy could be enacted, either by Congress or as an administrative rule, to give the NPS the authority to enforce inspection efforts for federal waters. Mr. Phillips commented that an administrative solution could be achieved through the Lacey Act (previously an opportunity to do so would have cost the organization its southwest zebra/quagga action plan funds); that there was a process whereby the NPS director could enact a regulation on such a policy; and that there was a process whereby Sally Jewell, in her position as United States Secretary of the Interior, could also enact regulations.
 - Co-chair Rice asked what language existed in the grant to keep funds connected to the CRB even if located outside the CRB (i.e. outside but not too far outside). Mr. Phillips noted that it would be within the language of the report from the US Army Corps of Engineers that Mr. Turner spoke about, and it was important to keep that phrasing of the CRB in the language.
 - Co-chair Rice inquired why the NPS could not simply permit itself the authority. Mr. Phillips reported that it had been attempted, but efforts had failed.
 - Senator Burgoyne summarized that there were some entities that just did not want to see this happen, possibly the park service. Mr. Phillips theorized that it may be beyond the NPS; in reality, parks and states do not want to create any limitation to recreation and tourism.

- Representative Dayley asked when, in regard to a previously mentioned requirement that the NPS study the effects and issues of invasive species, would information from the study be available. Mr. Phillips responded that the NPS study was due July 1 of this year, but he had not yet received it.
- Representative Dayley asked whether there were any other initiatives similar to the NPS required study. Mr. Phillips replied that most were sticking with the WRRDA (Water Resources Reform & Development Act of 2014) plan for the remainder of the year. He noted that the big goal was a rapid response fund, and the federal government was aware now of such a need. Representative Dayley then asked Mr. Phillips to identify the interagency efforts to make such a fund happen. Mr. Phillips explained that there were 30+ respective agencies listed and involved in the proposed rapid-response framework, so he felt good about its chances.
- Representative Erpelding commented that zebra mussels were listed in the Lacey Act but quagga mussels were not; he then asked why there was resistance with so much evidence of the damage that the mussels could cause. Mr. Phillips responded that when Congressional Representative Heck of Arizona introduced the PLAQ (Protecting Lakes Against Quaggas) Act of 2013 there were no exemptions, and so authorities of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California protested loudly and the bill died.
- Co-chair Rice commented that it was important that the language for any exemption of the funds budgeted for the CRB inspections and preventions not be degraded. For example, he said he would rather have a limitation on how far outside the CRB the stations were permitted to be located or a list of what routes the stations should cover, rather than lose funds to another state that had no connection with the CRB because of a language loophole. Mr. Phillips acknowledged the request.

Seeing no further questions, the committee went to the scheduled break.

At 2:55 p.m., the committee reconvened and Co-chair Gestrin called Senator Curt McKenzie, Immediate Past President of PNWER (Pacific Northwest Economic Region), to the podium for his [presentation](#) and [summary report](#) on PNWER's cooperative efforts. Mr. McKenzie summarized the efforts of the PNWER to prevent any infestation by quagga or zebra mussels and shared some PowerPoint visuals that reinforced the damage and negative influence that these mussels can inflict.

- Co-chair Rice inquired whether any discussions had occurred to add western Wyoming, where the headwaters of the Snake River begin, or language to include points of watercraft transportation as necessary locations for inspection stations. Mr. McKenzie acknowledged that the Corps' grant authorized inspection stations only within the CRB but that he could see the merit in having locations as suggested.

Following Mr. McKenzie's presentation, Co-chair Gestrin commented that those wishing to provide public testimony would be heard. Recognizing that no one had signed in for public testimony, Co-chair Gestrin called upon Bryce Fowler, author of the letter from the Weed Control Superintendents distributed by Representative Dayley. Mr. Fowler summarized that all of those contacted in the request for feedback were very eager to provide assistance in the prevention efforts. He noted that his district bordered Wyoming and Montana and shared that he was often able to attend meetings regarding prevention methods those states employed. As an example; he said that in Wyoming, all firefighting vehicles that moved water had to be inspected for invasive species.

- Co-chair Gestrin asked what suggestions Mr. Fowler had for the committee, since he was on the frontline of the issue. Mr. Fowler supported the idea of longer hours for inspection stations because there were reported incidents that watercraft traveled at later hours. He also commented that it was sometimes difficult to reach ISDA staff when necessary to assist with fouled craft.
- Representative Dayley asked Mr. Fowler to expand on some of the issues mentioned in his letter, such as the relationship of terrestrial invasive species and aquatic invasive species. Mr. Fowler shared that some districts deal with both noxious weeds and aquatic invasive species; as such, staff were diligent to report incidents even while working on other areas. He said

that some districts believe funds should be kept separate for each, especially when the district has few or no water bodies; others believe the funds should be put together and distributed according to what needs to be accomplished.

- Co-chair Rice requested that Mr. Fowler identify the route and location of the inspection station that reported having watercraft traveling through during the late hours of the day. Mr. Fowler stated that it was along [US]-20, coming off [I]-15 in Idaho Falls, and continued up into Ennis, Bozeman, and Billings (Montana); the station was located three miles south of the border.
- Representative Erpelding asked how to better communicate the threat that terrestrial plants pose to water resources (such as salt cedar) so that the public could recognize them as equally invasive. Mr. Fowler replied that education was the key to awareness. He felt that showing the public the impact that such invasive species - plant and nonplant - had in other states would effectively motivate folks to take action to prevent incidents.
- Representative Dayley inquired what other ideas Mr. Fowler might have in cooperation with other states to improve the program. Mr. Fowler shared that there existed a Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee Group that met every spring and fall. He reported that the fall meeting had not yet occurred, but that he would report to the committee any topics and ideas discussed at the meeting after it was held.

Co-chair Gestrin once again solicited any public testimony, upon which Mr. Jeffrey Pettingill requested to speak to the committee. Mr. Pettingill, Bonneville County Weed Superintendent, reported that he also served as chair of the Upper Snake River Cooperative Weed Management Area (USRCWMA) and as chair of the Idaho Weed Awareness campaign. His thoughts and observations:

- Suggested that the irrigation community be included in discussions because of the damage these species can have on irrigation products.
- Relayed that he had reports of watercraft owners intentionally waiting until the inspection station (Jackpot area) had closed before transporting their vehicles to avoid the inconvenience of being inspected or out of fear that their watercraft would be impounded.
- Commented that there should be a better cooperative relationship between IDPR, IDL, and ISDA and the local communities in efforts to attack issues.
- Contemplated the involvement of the state universities in studies and manpower to prevent invasive species.
- Suggested that invasive species sticker funds be distributed to the local county weed offices so that educational outreach programs could be accomplished.
- Observed that an invasive species sticker program existed and that leftover funds could be applied to terrestrial needs; and asked whether one all-encompassing sticker could be the ideal solution.
- Reported that Wyoming previously inspected watercraft traffic at points of ingress and egress to the state, but now is concerned only with those coming in; possible to commingle funds, no matter who gets it, to prevent these species from entering.
- Representative Hixon asked Mr. Pettingill to explain how he would use funds for an educational outreach program. Mr. Pettingill suggested that the best method would be to educate users at the boat ramps, much like was done with felt-sole wader education for fishing. He also felt that programs directed to youth - possibly in the schools and at the local parks - would be a great method.
- Representative Dayley inquired whether any universities were involved in the Idaho Invasive Species Council. Mr. Pettingill reported that Christine Moffitt [Professor and Asst. Unit Leader with Idaho Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit] was on the council.

- Representative Dayley questioned whether any of Mr. Pettingill's earlier suggestions could be addressed in the strategic plan provided by the Invasive Species Council. Mr. Pettingill said he believed that it was possible.
- Representative Dayley then inquired whether any other cooperative entities were involved in the strategic plan. Mr. Pettingill responded that anyone interested in the issue was invited to the committee.

Co-chair Gestrin commented that the next meeting would be September 23 at Bear Lake (Idaho side). The committee then determined that its third meeting would be held in Boise on October 17.

Senator Burgoyne stated that he believes that any species, no matter how much planning occurred, would eventually make it to Idaho's borders. He said that he thinks it is unlikely Idaho can be protected from everything, but it is best to attack at the source. He noted the Northwest states need to cooperate in research on how best to attack the problem and federal entities need to see the importance of this issue and to assist the states. He added that he believes we need to aggressively use existing laws to enforce compliance and prevention efforts, to educate Idaho's own citizens about the dangers to accomplish voluntary compliance and to strive for a more unified, scientific attack on the issue among affected states and provinces.

Co-chair Rice commented on the need to further study the use of potash for eradication (possibly by the universities). He also commented that prevention was more effective than treatment; but the core of prevention was education. Co-chair Rice acknowledged that, whatever efforts were engaged, efforts were going to have a cost.

Representative Hixon emphasized the need for public outreach, especially within boating groups and boating organizations.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.