

## MINUTES

### 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian Initiative – Columbia River Basin Team Meeting

June 3, 2009  
Hilton Hotel  
Vancouver, Washington

#### 1. Attendees:

Stephen Phillips, Chair, PSMFC  
Rick Boatner, ODFW  
Tara Chestnut, PSU  
Glenn Dolphin, OMB  
Kathy Hamel, DOE  
Paul Heimowitz, USFWS  
Rian Hooff, ORDEQ  
Scott Lund, USBR  
Allen Pleus, WDFW  
Eileen Ryce, MDFWP  
Scott Smith, USGS  
Denise Walthers  
Rebecca Weiss, USACE  
Bill Zook, PSMFC  
David Britton, USFWS (phone)

Scott Aikin, BIA  
Steve Bollens, WSU  
Tim Counihan, USGS  
Robyn Draheim, PSU  
Jill Hardiman, USGS  
Randy Henry, OMB  
Jim Irish, BPA  
Pamala Meacham, WDFW  
Jim Ruff, NWPCC  
Beth Sanderson, NOAA  
Mark Sytsma, PSU  
Dave Ward, CBFWA  
Steve Wells, PSU  
Tom Woolf, IDA (phone)

#### 2. Comments and Approval of February 4, 2009 Minutes

Stephen Phillips welcomed the group. There were no additional comments on the February 4, 2009 minutes and they have been posted on the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian web site: <http://www.100thmeridian.org/ColumbiaRT.asp>

#### Quagga Zebra Mussel Action Plan Update

Eileen R. discussed the ***Quagga-Zebra Mussel Action Plan for Western U.S. Waters (QZAP)*** which was submitted to the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force in May of 2009 by the Western Regional Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species. The primary objective is to underscore the highest priority actions and resources needed to minimize impacts of these invasive shellfish to native species, water delivery infrastructure, and other vulnerable resources in the West. The Western Regional Panel is comprised of 19 western states (including Alaska and Hawaii), federal agencies, tribes and other invasive species stakeholders.

The highest priority actions are: 1) Increased funding for state ANS management plans, 2) Quagga/Zebra Mussel Plan implementation, 3) Inspection and Decontamination, and 3) Development and Research.

Eileen R. explained that the rapid response actions needed include the creation and maintenance of a Rapid Response Fund, as well as finalizing the Notification Database. The notification database has been under development for about a year and the Western Regional Panel would like to see it completed.

Eileen R. thanked the steering committee, the writing team, and USFWS for providing funds and staff for the QZAP effort. She indicated the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force is currently reviewing the draft plan.

The group asked why there wasn't more detail in the plan. Eileen R. said that the goal was to keep it short, and that it serves as a document for Senator Feinstein and other members of Congress.

Paul H. thanked Eileen R. and the regional panel for their work on this document. He said there was a need for agencies to review the plan. He noted ongoing interest by Senator Feinstein and other Senators, and explained that parts of the draft QZAP have already been used to inform legislative staff about Western funding needs.

Eileen R. said that exactly *how* the plan should be coordinated needs to be determined.

Stephen P. said that this plan will be in development/implementation for a while. The USFWS program that includes state grants (1204) has remained flat funded over the past several years as more and more plans are approved by the ANSTF. Therefore the USFWS needs to add significant funds to the 1204 program. Hopefully the QZAP will help provide these funds.

Randy H. noted that funds for Oregon decontamination stations are needed.

Paul H. said that the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) has expressed interest in developing a quagga/zebra plan that may overlap with QZAP. He said that Arizona's Larry Riley is heading this up. WAFWA is still in the process of figuring out where they are going with their plan. He recommended that CRB Team members should connect with the WAFWA representatives in their state, if they haven't already.

Paul H. said that one of the main goals of QZAP is to unify and find funding for state plans. The plan also needs an overall coordinator function.

Jim R. asked questions regarding funding amounts for the plan. Who does the money go to? How is the money allocated? Paul H. replied that we still need to figure out those answers, which will be addressed in the next revision. Jim R. asked when the next draft of QZAP will

be available. Eileen R. said that we will wait to get comments back from the ANSTF before deciding what's next. Jim R. said that once the action items are identified, the NWPCC might be able to help move things along.

Scott A. said he has concerns regarding how the QZAP funding will be distributed. The tribes are yet to be engaged as fully as they should be.

Paul H. said that within QZAP, we want to make sure the needs of Western tribes are also addressed, and encouraged BIA and the tribes to become engaged in the plan review/revision process.

### **Watercraft Decontamination Protocols & Standards**

Bill Z. discussed results from the watercraft inspection survey and the draft document *Recommended Protocols and Standards for Watercraft Inspection Programs for Dreissenid Mussels in the Western United States*. He said that there is a need for a more consistent approach to watercraft inspection (from WIP and ANS program managers to the boating public). Boaters get frustrated by different standards in different lakes. Benefits to consistency include increased effectiveness and efficiency, a trust built between implementing entities, as well as demonstrating to policy makers and the public that we can work together on this issue. Boaters need to know the standards so they can ensure they will pass inspection. We'd like to encourage participation and decontamination without being too limiting. Everyone should be using the best available practices. The main issue is to determine if this document reflects the best practices to put into place.

The WIP protocols and standards document for is a living document. It will continue to be updated and changed as new information becomes available.

Stephen P. recommended that the group review the document together and point out any changes, comments or corrections that they would like to see. Then the group could discuss the process issues and how to view these recommendations as a team.

Tom Woolf, IDA, joined the meeting at this time by phone.

Comments by on the document by page numbers are as follow:

Page 2, Allen P. recommended using the word "interception" instead of "intervention" throughout the document. He said the word "intervention" has a negative connotation. Eileen R. agreed.

Bill Z., Allen P. and Eileen R. agreed that they would like to have the focus of the document on preventing zebra and quagga Mussels, but that some of the language could be changed to include the fact that these prevention steps will help protect against a broader range of invasive species.

Allen P. recommended a glossary of terms at the end of the document.

Page 5, Allen P. recommended rewording section # 4 on Decontamination. He said that the killing and removal of adult shells should be done by a trained person or professional. Allen P. also stated that many of the steps referred to the “Clean Drain Dry” Campaign and we need to define what we mean here. Eileen R. added that this document is not aimed at the general public, but is for agencies. Other materials for the public will be more explanatory. Bill Z. said that the public can be aware of these protocols and standards, but that the document is intended for agencies and organizations that want to implement self inspection programs, often with limited funds. We are telling organizations that are already decontaminating how to apply these protocols. Bill Z. agreed that it would be a good idea to define “Clean Drain Dry” activities and Stephen P. said a definition can be added for the “Clean Drain Dry” campaign as an attachment to the document.

Paul H. asked if these definitions include all likely scenarios. He recommended going through several likely scenarios and to make sure they made sense within each situation.

Page 6, Bill Z. said that the definition for a High Risk Waterbody is not intended to be the final definition. Eileen R. suggested taking out the definition box for High Risk Waterbody and instead adding a list of things to consider when defining a High Risk Waterbody. She urged that the states should decide for themselves what a High Risk Waterbody is. Eileen R. also suggested providing a “recommended equipment” list.

Page 11 (Protocols/Inspection Checklist), Eileen R. said that it’s hard to collect names, addresses and phone numbers from watercraft owners and operators in Montana and the information is likely to be inaccurate. We could consider making this part a suggestion.

Stephen P. asked Tom W. what Idaho needed in order to accept another state’s decontamination. Tom W. replied that Idaho was pushing to accept other states’ decontamination standards.

Eileen R. said that it’s too large a risk not to inspect boats that are coming in from other states, nor would she expect other states to take that risk. In Montana, they will still inspect a boat if it has a sticker stating whether it has been decontaminated or not, although the process may be quicker. They will sign on to standardized protocols, but still want to be able to do inspections. Allen P. agreed.

Allen P. said that banding should be viewed as a high level of inspection, but a cursory inspection by the receiving state should still be done to check for shelled adults. Rick B. agreed and said they will continue to do a full inspection.

Tom W. would like to see something regionally available for the boaters who are getting inspected time and again.

Pamala M. cited an instance of a boat that had been professionally cleaned on the outside, but after a brief interview with the boat owner, inspectors learned that the boat still had standing water inside a full water bilge. She said this is a good reason to have at least a brief interaction with the boat owner.

Eileen R. said that it's beneficial to have a standard protocol that everyone agrees to, even if it means getting signatures. It's helpful to have something that can be automatically put into a policy that has been agreed to on a regional level. It also helps to validate what we are doing as we are being scrutinized by the public and other agencies.

Page 13 (#4), Paul H. recommended deleting the word "seeds." The group agreed and Bill Z. said that he would remove the word from the document.

Page 14 (Standard #1), Eileen R. asked if it was necessary to add a safety disclaimer when using 140 degree water to clean a boat. Stephen said that they will put a safety disclaimer at the beginning of the document.

Page 14 (#2), Several people commented on the amount of contact time needed (30 seconds) to effectively remove mussels using hot water. Allen P. said that there are too many variables for this exposure level to be accurate all the time. He recommended adding a note reminding people to have their thermometers checked to ensure high temperatures levels are in fact being reached. Bill Z. will insert a note indicating the amount of time it takes to cover a section of a boat at a certain temperature.

Allen P. said that hot water kills mussels, but does not remove them completely from the boat. He would like to see all shelled adults removed. Allen P., Bill Z. and Stephen P. agreed that even if mussels are dried up and look dead, they can still be a problem. Allen P. would like language on page 14 to urge the removal of *all* visible mussels.

Page 15, The group discussed quarantine and drying times. Bill Z. said that this part may be a bit confusing. There are several ways to quarantine, some cost more time and money than others. Some may choose drying time over other cleaning methods. Many agencies decide to decontaminate as well as quarantine, not trusting either method completely. With regard to #2, the group agreed to change the language to reflect the removal of veligers from trap water and any visible shells.

Page 16, Allen P. asked if the "Maximum Daily Temperature and Days Out of Water" lists were based on lab conditions and had been tested on adult mussels. Bill Z. explained that the lists are based on lab conditions, for practical reasons, and tested on adult mussels. The numbers are based on the only research that is currently available. We recommend using the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian calculator, or the list in the document, if the calculator is not available.

Allen P. would like to change “Days out of Water” to “Minimum Days out of Water.” He also pointed out that weather and humidity could change the number of quarantine days needed. Bill Z. reminded the group that these are minimum requirements and that they impact the boater’s time on the water, as well as help to save our resources.

Allen P. recommended adding scientific citations to the text (Page 14, 140 degree temperatures, for example). Stephen P. agreed.

Page 18, The group discussed Watercraft Certification/Banding. Stephen P. said that banding and tagging seem to be the issues. He asked if it is possible to develop some kind of interstate agreement. Paul H. mentioned past discussion of a decontamination checklist that all agencies should follow.

Stephen P. started a discussion about the “Hello” boat interception. Everyone knows there are boats coming out of Lake Mead area with species attached. Paul H. said that this is happening in more areas than just Lake Mead. Stephen noted that boats leaving Lake Mead after 6pm aren’t being decontaminated. Mark S. suggested closing the boat ramps after a certain hour. Scott S. said that this would be difficult to do, someone would have to patrol the area, it might attract vandalism, and some people drive around the closed gates. Bill Z. said that Lake Mead has a cleaning rule in place for larger boats, but boats are still getting through. There are no funds for containing large boats. Eileen R. would like to see funding go towards prevention.

Stephen P. told Jim R. that more information can be provided to other Northwest Power and Conservation Council members if they want to send a letter to the NPS if they so choose. Jim R. said the more factual information there was the better.

There was discussion about having a quicker notice time about an ANS sighting. Paul H. said that the notification database may be the key, otherwise we’re relying on emails and some people may be left out. The notification database is up and running, but it is password protected and only partially complete. Stephen P. said that we need to get a memo out in the next 48 hours on who gets alerted in a rapid response situation like the “Hello.” Those lead agency people will need to figure out who they will contact with this information. Eileen R. said that it would be helpful to send an email to everyone on the notification database email list. Paul H. expressed concern someone important will be left out of the loop. There is vulnerability in not notifying the right person in time. Stephen said that we will get an email out.

### **Progress from the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian Initiative Early Detection Workshop (Denver)**

Dave Britton joined the meeting by phone and updated the group on progress from the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian Initiative Early Detection Workshop. 53 researchers and managers attended the workshop. The main idea was to review all monitoring and early detection issues in various parts of the West and discuss the pros and cons of all the different methods.

The workshop had 4 primary objectives: (1) Identify the best method for Dreissenid detection; (2) Stimulate consensus building and discussion to lead to a comprehensive regional monitoring system; (3) Delineate a uniform set of facts to determine whether a particular water body had Dreissenid Mussels; and (4) and make recommendations and plans for the 2009 season.

The workshop members actively sought participation from not only the West Coast, but Mexico and Canada as well. They heard presentations on various substrate plankton sampling analyses and had discussions on developing consensus on terminology used to describe water level infestations. It was agreed that further research is necessary for PCR-based detection methods. They discussed quality control in training programs to ensure that everything is well documented. More information can be found at [www.musselmonitoring.com](http://www.musselmonitoring.com).

There is a need for quality control training programs for monitoring. Dave B. said he has a list of places where monitoring occurs and who's doing the analysis. Jim Ruff asked if there was a representative from B.C. Hydro or Environment Canada. Dave B. replied no, but he did speak to someone prior to the meeting who expressed interest and wanted to participate in the future.

Paul H. commented on the double-blind study of veliger detection by PCR and veliger methodologies, as well as the FlowCam system. Limited funding for this work is better than none at all and he's still interested in supporting it. Paul H. asked if the interagency monitoring plan from the workshop was still open for comments. Dave B. said that the deadline for comments has passed, but minor changes might still have a chance to be incorporated.

### **Reporting Notification Database**

Dave B. said that the reporting notification database is still up. It was started as a pilot program and they have recently added some functionality to the database with regard to jurisdiction. They haven't received much feedback. Dave B. encouraged the group to visit the database <http://www.100thmeridian.org/notification> and send feedback and suggestions to himself or Paul Heimowitz.

Paul H. said that the notification database doesn't take a lot of money and that it's in the "to be done" category of QZAP. Anyone with access questions should contact Paul H. or Stephen P.

### **CRB Monitoring for 2009**

Tom W. gave an overview for monitoring activities on the quagga and zebra mussels in Idaho for 2009. The Idaho Department of Agriculture will be examining 85 waterbodies this year. Idaho Fish and Game will be taking care of 22 and BOR agreed to sample 6 in the CRB.

Steve W. provided an overview of sampling in California. The list is pretty consistent from year to year. USGS (Cook Lab) and PSU and are working on a project that prioritizes sites in the Columbia River Basin using variables such as temperature, calcium, and boater use frequency. The list is still in development. Sampling will be done piggyback style in Wyoming's Teton Range. Other agencies are doing sampling, including USACE, EPA, and we are coordinating with them.

Eileen R. will be doing 200 sites throughout the state and will add additional sites that weren't done last year. They will do plankton, substrate and shoreline studies at each site. High priority waters will be hit. Within the Columbia River Basin, she will concentrate on the Flathead Basin area.

Scott L. will be doing 60 reservoirs through the end of the 2010 fiscal year, as part of the federal stimulus funding. In the Pacific Northwest region, the BOR Water Quality Lab will do sampling at 15 reservoirs as part of ongoing water quality program to which help keep the costs down. Monitoring will start this summer. Scott L. said that the Pacific Northwest waterbody list is available for those that want to see it.

Rebecca W. said that they will be adding veliger (plankton) sampling at Bonneville Dam. They are looking for a consistent funding source.

Pamala M. said that they will be sampling 77 sites (primarily in Eastern Washington) and that they've included plankton sampling. WDFW enforcement stations will continue checking boaters this year.

Paul H. presented California's Early Detection Monitoring Manual. The focus of the manual is on voluntary monitoring and it also includes a list of California contacts. He said there is the potential to adapt California's manual into a manual with CRB contacts and information. The publication can be ordered by going to [http://www-csgc.ucsd.edu/BOOKSTORE/FEE%20PUBLICATIONS/fee\\_pub\\_MonitoringGuide.html](http://www-csgc.ucsd.edu/BOOKSTORE/FEE%20PUBLICATIONS/fee_pub_MonitoringGuide.html)

### **Non-native Predatory Fish Workshop Update**

Dave W. gave highlights from the Non-native Predatory Fish Workshop in September and the follow-up meeting in May. The goal of the September workshop was to develop strategies to reduce non-indigenous fish populations. Management strategies, policy considerations and next steps were discussed.

The May meeting focused on: Implementing reservoir draw-downs; excluding the American shad; and implementing direct removals. Next steps include developing hypotheses that can be tested; determining what data are needed to test hypotheses; determining what data already exists; and developing a proposal.

In developing the proposal, everyone agreed that John Day Reservoir would be the focus of the test. It was the reservoir selected years ago for collection of information. USGS and ODFW are taking the lead on this, and the work is to begin in the fall of 2009. It will include: Determining the data needed; obtaining background information; and establishing a further explanation of items. The NOAA Fisheries 2008 FCRPS BiOp and the NWPC's 2009 Fish and Wildlife Program are the justification for this project.

### **Impacts of Non - Indigenous Species of the Pacific Northwest**

Beth S. gave a presentation titled Non-Indigenous Species of the Pacific Northwest: An Overlooked Risk to Salmonids? The presentation included information on spatial distribution of terrestrial and freshwater species (in WA, OR, and ID), impacts on native species, case studies and research needs. The study generated interest in non-native species with respect to salmon in the Pacific Northwest. The results of this study were published in a *BioScience* article. The ISAB report has been very helpful in developing the proposal. She is hoping that the article that came out, and the recent ISAB report (Non-native Species Impacts on Native Salmonids in the Columbia River Basin, <http://www.nwcouncil.org/library/isab/isab2008-4.htm>) will help build momentum and lead to new funding.

### **Review of April's Rapid Response Exercise in Idaho and Future Exercises**

Paul H. explained to the group that this was the third rapid response exercise of the CRB Plan within the last two years. Idaho took this opportunity to develop their internal capacity and coordination. Tom W. gave an overview of the rapid response exercise. The field exercise took place at Lucky Peak Reservoir. They had a decontamination unit on site, divers in the water, a FloCam, and media coverage. USGS and local dive teams worked with the Sheriff's office and the Park Service. It was a good show and tell opportunity that helped elevate awareness. Paul H. said that they worked with local divers on quick basic training. He hopes that, with a little funding through the Fish and Wildlife Service, they'll be able to create a draft manual for ANS dive training.

Scott L. said that, during the second day of the exercise, one of the most beneficial parts was the use of the Idaho communication center for disseminating information.

The draft report is almost finished and they are working to get it out. It will be posted to the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian website. Idaho Emergency Management (Bureau of Homeland Security) was very involved and Paul H. recommended they be kept in the loop for future exercises. Stephen said that they are planning a fourth Rapid Response exercise. They have a spring 2009 exercise tentatively scheduled for Washington, Montana or Oregon. There has been discussion about holding the next exercise at Lake Roosevelt and get the Park Service involved. Jim R. and Allen P. agreed that Lake Roosevelt would be a good location for the next exercise. The opportunity to engage Canada at the provincial and federal level was

noted as another plus. Paul H. suggested a fall notification exercise and then focusing on a larger exercise in the spring.

## **2009 State Legislative Activity**

Tom W. said that House Bill 213 passed and was signed by the Idaho governor on April 1. SB 109 also passed, which allows the Agriculture Director to declare an emergency if Dreissenid mussels show up and funding would then become available. As a result of the emergency declaration, they hope to have 10 inspection stations up and running before July 4<sup>th</sup>. Steve W. asked what constitutes a threat for decontaminating a boat. Tom W. said that a boat would be a threat if it has been in known infested waters during the last 30 days and the boat hadn't been cleaned, drained, and dried. They want to keep traffic and boaters moving.

Eileen R. distributed a handout on new Montana legislation. An invasive species account to receive money will be established. It's modeled after a noxious weed trust fund and will be managed by the Department of Agriculture. It has a section on cooperative agreements to be managed by the Department of Agriculture even though the program is managed by MDFWP. She said the best thing about the new act is that it gives us a broad rulemaking authority which will allow us to fill in the gaps about what we require for boats, e.g., that every vessel has to be drained by law, and that aquatic macrophytes have to be removed. Another interesting section is the invasive species management area. This will be used for those areas that are infested. Penalties in the new law will likely result in mainly warnings but could result in felonies and jail time when actual intentional destruction has occurred.

Rick B. said Oregon HB 2213 signed by the Governor, moves the invasive species council to ODA. HB 2220 is stuck in committee which has to do with controlling the transport of aquatic invasive species into Oregon. HB 2221 creates a crime for buying or selling feral swine hunts. HB 2583 is on the Governor's desk which prohibits launching a boat with aquatic invasive species into Oregon waters.

Rian H. reported that two ballast water bills passed. Bill 105 will increase maximum penalties from \$5,000 to \$25,000/day, for ballast water violations.

## **Scoping Notice for Invasive Aquatic Animal Environmental Impact Statement**

Kathy H. said that the Department of Ecology currently has four general permits: noxious weeds, aquatic plants and algae, mosquito larvae, and irrigation ditch treatment of aquatic plants. Ecology has three individual permits: fish management (rotenone), invasive moth (gypsy moth), and oyster growers (burrowing shrimp). One general permit that is in development is the invasive aquatic species permit. The aquatic invasive species permit will allow the application of pesticides/chemicals to marine and freshwaters for management of invasive species. They started to develop the permit in 2006 and currently the permit and fact sheet are about 90% completed. She said the potential environmental impacts of

management methods need to be explained. They are trying to develop a permit that provides enough tools to deal with this broad spectrum of issues (including hand removal of invasive aquatic species, biological control and application of chemicals). They would like the permit and EIS out and operational by April 2010. Kathy H. asked for help and suggestions from the group for alternative control methods and links to risk assessments and whether anything important has been left out. Mark S. thanked the Department of Ecology for doing this. He said that Oregon has been trying to get something like this in place.

## **Member, Issue Updates**

Jim R. reported that, in February 2009, the Northwest Power and Conservation Council amended its Columbia River Basin Fish & Wildlife Program. Emerging habitat issues in the program include non-native species strategies, such as non-native fish management and aquatic nuisance species. More detailed measures can be found on page 100 in the mainstem section of the program. The program has specific actions to be implemented by federal action agencies on its website [www.nwccouncil.org](http://www.nwccouncil.org) (under Fish & Wildlife). While there are some new sections and initiatives in the Program, there is no new funding or limited funding available from Bonneville Power. The Council is supportive of a number of efforts to secure additional appropriations.

Jim said that at the July meeting in Portland, USBR (Fred Nibling) will brief the Council on their experiences dealing with quagga mussels at Hoover Dam and Lake Mead.

Tara C. from Portland State University discussed her research project "Hull Fouling: Characterizing Magnitude and Risk in the Marine Environment." There are four primary goals: to summarize the number, movements, hull husbandry practices and associated biota. Tara said an updated final report will be available later in the year.

Pamala M. discussed the ballast water rulemaking by the state of Washington. The first part of the rule was about to be adopted by the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission. The second more challenging part will be on ballast water standards.

Steve W. said that PSU is updating the interactive monitoring map. The map is in development and has been funded for California and Nevada.

Steve W. discussed a research project funded by BPA on anti-fouling paint and coatings. Mark S. mentioned the recently funded BPA calcium growth response research project. He also reminded the group about The Sixth International Conference on Marine Bioinvasions will take place August 24-27<sup>th</sup> at PSU. They currently have about 150 abstracts.

Tim C. discussed the sampling of gobies. He noted that their range (currently near Westport, WA, lower Columbia River) has been expanding between February and May 2009. They will be sending samples to Japan for identification.

Stephen P. and Paul H. will be going to Vancouver Canada to talk about rapid response planning in the Columbia River Basin and hope to engage Canada in our efforts. Canada is currently undertaking the development of a rapid response framework for aquatic invasive species.

If you need more “Intruders Among Us!” brochures or posters, please contact Paul H.

Paul H. plans to order about 100 more Prefix zebra and quagga mussel filled PVC pipe tabletop displays. The current design is a cross-section of a PVC pipe with zebra mussels or quagga mussels inside. They are still in the design process and a final design will be ready soon. The cost has increased to \$25-28 per display. Contact Paul H. if you would like to order any displays.

Paul H. brought up the subject of portable water weights. They are used to test the accuracy of mobile, overhead and maritime cranes. Some of the cranes need to be validated once every year. He said some designs don't drain completely, so could potentially spread invasive species. USFWS and USBR will keep looking into it.

Stephen P. informed the group about an ongoing study that Sam Chan has been working on regarding what to do with a classroom pet when they are no longer needed in the classroom. The study asked over 1,000 participants if they currently use (or have used) live plants or animals in their classrooms. He also asked what they did with these plants or animals while they were in the classroom, as well as what they did with them when they were no longer needed. Rick B. recommended the brochure/program titled “Don't turn it loose” by Partners in Amphibian and Reptile Conservation (PARC).

Eileen R. asked the group to save the date for the Western Regional Panel meeting. It will be held in Seattle, Washington on September 8-10<sup>th</sup>, 2009. They plan to have a Rapid Response panel.

Bill Z. said that the draft CRB newsletter has been sent out. The deadline for comments is the end of June. Please send him any comments by Friday if possible.

Stephen P. mentioned the 2010 sports shows, but he was unsure which shows we will attend this year. There will be one in Portland and asked the group to recommend other locations. Eileen R. will see if funding is available to staff the Montana shows. Stephen P. said that the surveys from the Boise and Portland sport shows in 2009 indicated people didn't know whom to contact if they found an aquatic invasive species.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

## **Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting of the CRB Team will be held Wednesday October 14, 2009 in the Portland metro area.