

# INVASIVE SPECIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

May 20-22, 2015

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

1315 East-West Highway

Building SSMC3, Room 4527

Silver Spring, MD 20910

## MEETING MINUTES

### FINAL ACTION ITEMS AND FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The following action items and formal recommendations resulted from the meeting:

#### ACTION ITEMS

##### ***Communications, Education and Outreach***

- Request NISC, for our next meeting, to provide summary reports on current regional and national invasive species outreach campaigns conducted by agencies, including, if available: (1) estimated funding, (2) target audiences, (3) scope, (4) and their effectiveness and evaluation metrics used.

##### ***Prevention***

- Request a speaker from USDA to provide an update at the next ISAC meeting on the Caribbean and Pacific Safeguarding Initiatives and the regulatory structure that underlies them.
- Request a speaker from DOD and/or relevant partners to provide information at the next ISAC meeting on the Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii and how it addresses international and inter-island trade and movement of goods in the region.

##### ***Control and Management / Research***

Request NISC staff to liaise with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to identify and resolve issues that impede the timely and successful completion of Section 7 consultations under the Endangered Species Act for biological control agents.

##### ***Organizational Collaboration***

- Request NISC staff to provide a copy of the most recent signed Charter to the full ISAC.

#### FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO NISC (see attached Recommendation Letter)

##### **Recommendation 1.**

1. The USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS) and the Smithsonian Institution conduct a survey and gap analysis of their Federal systematics collections, associated resources, and capabilities.
2. Survey results should be translated into an ARS 10 Year Systematics Action Plan and a Smithsonian Institution 10 Year Systematics Action Plan.
3. The Plans should be used by agency leaders to improve the systematics capabilities and resources of the agencies in all taxa to strengthen their ability to predict, prevent and manage invasive species.

4. The coordination of federal systematics efforts referenced in the Federal Interagency Committee for Invasive Terrestrial Animals and Pathogens (ITAP) *Situation Report* should be implemented.<sup>1</sup>
5. The ITAP's Systematics Subcommittee should assist the agencies in the Surveys recommended by the Situation Report.

**Recommendation 2.**

ISAC recommends that the NISC member agencies develop an EDRR framework and emergency funding plan called for in the Council on Climate Preparation Priority Agenda, Enhancing the Climate Resilience of America's Natural Resources (October 2014) and that they seek the involvement and advice of non-federal stakeholders, subject matter experts, tribal, state, and local government reps who will be critical partners in the successful implementation of this framework and fund.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal Interagency Committee on Invasive Terrestrial Animals and Pathogens (ITAP) Systematics Subcommittee. 2008. Protecting America's Economy, Environment, Health, and Security against Invasive Species Requires a Strong Federal Program in Systematic Biology.

## GENERAL SESSION PROCEEDINGS

### **DAY 1: Wednesday, May 20, 2015**

#### **ISAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Chair)**  
**ERIC LANE (Vice-Chair)**  
**JERRY COOK (Secretary)**  
CHARLES BARGERON  
JOSEPH BISCHOFF  
PHILIP COWAN  
TAMMY DAVIS  
OTTO DOERING, III  
BONNIE HARPER-LORE  
WILLIAM HYATT  
PHYLLIS JOHNSON  
SUSAN ELLIS  
JANIS McFARLAND  
MARSHALL MEYERS  
EDWARD MILLS  
CAROL OKADA  
STEPHEN PHILLIPS  
DAVID REID  
TIMOTHY SCHAEFFER  
DAVID E. STARLING  
NATHAN STONE  
JOHN PETER THOMPSON  
WILLIAM TOOMEY  
ROBERT VAN STEENWYK  
KENNETH ZIMMERMAN

**Invasive Species Action Network**  
**Colorado Department of Agriculture**  
**Sam Houston State University**  
University of Georgia  
American Nursery and Landscape Association  
Landcare Research  
Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
Purdue University  
Restoration Ecology Consultant  
Connecticut Dept. of Environmental Protection  
University of North Dakota  
California Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.  
Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council  
Cornell University  
Hawai'i Department of Agriculture  
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission  
Invasive Species Consultant  
Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission  
Aqueterinary Services, P.C.  
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff  
Invasive Species Consultant  
The Nature Conservancy  
University of California, Berkeley  
Lone Tree Cattle Company

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT**

PATRICK BURCH  
JOSEPH M. DiTOMASO  
ROLAND QUITIGUA  
DAMON E. WAITT

Dow AgroSciences  
University of California, Davis  
University of Guam  
University of Texas at Austin

#### **NISC STAFF AND POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT**

PHILLIP ANDREOZZI  
KELSEY BRANTLEY  
STAS BURGIEL  
CHRISTOPHER DIONIGI  
MARGARET "Peg" BRADY  
SUSAN PASKO  
JOHN SAGLE  
HILARY SMITH

NISC Staff  
NISC Staff  
NISC Staff  
NISC Acting Executive Director  
U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)  
U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)  
U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
U.S. Department of the Interior

## WELCOMING REMARKS

*Kris Sarri, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior*

- DOI: Lori Williams as a great loss, working towards filling position
- Secretary has created strong priorities: science should support, raise awareness of how climate change will impact. Invasive species intertwines with these areas.
- Focus has been on sage grouse, water supplies, engaging the next generation, renewable energy, indigenous communities: invasive species can impact all these areas.
- Like to hear from ISAC about what the administration can do to help to push the issue forward.

### Questions/Comments:

**Chuck Bargeron:** Money on state plans is focused on aquatic, similar efforts are needed in terrestrial. NISC is working on EDRR framework, needs to be formalized as efforts may shift with new administration.

**Response:** *Want to see EDRR move forward, as efforts have stalled.*

**Tim Schaeffer:** Consider state perspective, budgets should focus on state AIS management plans as these have never been fully funded

**Bill Hyatt:** Echoed Tim concern. Most state funding goes to funding state coordinators – key position  
Janis McFarland: Need a stronger focus on education and raising awareness of the importance of the issue and how to manage

**Bonnie Harper-Lore:** Community Management Areas – need leadership for on the ground activities.

**Ed Mills:** Invasive species is impacted by climate change. Consider multi state initiatives as invasives do not follow jurisdictional boundaries

**Bill Toomey:** Invites to work with TNC as DOI priorities align with their work.

**Dave Reid:** Already have a Regional Plans that work on multi state coordination – however, lack adequate funding.

**Bill Hyatt:** Chuck stated that money was mostly directed towards AIS. Terrestrial need funding as well as structure to the ANSTF

**Carol Okada:** Grateful that DOI supports NISC and allows agencies and NGOs to work together; hopes DOI continues this work.

Ms. Sarri thanked the group for the opportunity to speak, adding that their suggestions will be taken into consideration while DOI is currently working on FY 2017 budget.

## ADDITIONAL REMARKS

Peg Brady, NOAA, welcomed the group to the NOAA facility and reviewed building logistics and access procedures.

Bob Wiltshire, ISAC Chair, provided an overview of the agenda.

**MOTION:** To approve minutes from the November 2014 meeting in San Antonio, Texas, made by Bill Hyatt. Seconded by Bonnie Harper-Lore. ***Approved with technical correction to name of ISAC Secretary (J. Cook vice N. Stone.)***

## NISC STAFF REPORTS AND NISC RESPONSE TO ISAC RECOMMENDATIONS

### Staff Reports

*Chris Dionigi, Acting Executive Director NISC*

- Kelsey is working on coordinating meetings, updating website, hiring NISC Executive Director.

- Working on EDRR framework (already discussed), and Management Plan (to be discussed later)
- Posting for NISC director position has closed, reviewing applications now, may take a couple months to complete process.
- Legislation: Stas covered WRDDA and GAO. Healthy Habitats Bill; had hearing on it last year, but has not gained momentum. Bill W: Bill is intended to structure how federal dollars are spent on invasive species; primary a terrestrial bill, but written for all taxa. E.g., designates 75% control (in many cases do not have tools that are adequate); whereas the bill designates 15% for research and education efforts.

*Phil Andreozzi, Deputy Director for Regional Initiatives*

- Biosecurity plan – complete. Numerous Pacific Islands are contributed funding to its implementations.
- Joint meetings between US and New Zealand – has an invasive species working group. Able to meet with many federal agencies. Term includes developing technologies for control, working on international partnerships.
- Biocontrol strategy – development of plan will facilitate other initiatives and information management.
- Major goals of JCM working group to build plans and efforts focused on invasive ants
- Support of Pacific Invasive Partnership – goal is to get entities to work on issue, build partnerships, raise awareness. Very effective in promoting activities; JCM is supporting
- Pacific Partnerships - to support invasive efforts of World Congress. Next meeting in Hawaii; in September 2016 - invasive species will be a major theme.
- Arctic Issues – invasive species component of implementation plan and Arctic Council. Making sure get the right membership.
- NISAW – working on 2016, trying to expand on past efforts (such as that with National History Museum).

*Stas Burgiel, Deputy Director for Prevention and Budgetary Issues, NISC*

- Omnibus requested that NISC cross cut process be expedited. Request has been made, in progress. Coordinating with GAO assessment to explain differences in numbers. Cross cut should be out next week
- WRDDA – requested ACOE to look at Federal roles
- Pathways – discussions to make used invasive risk assessment are incorporated with in private industry (e.g., fracking)

**NISC Response to ISAC Recommendations**

Dr. Dionigi provided the following update on two recommendations:

1. Recognize importance of JZM, NISC should pursue similar opportunities
  - Response: Phil Andreozzi, and Phil Cowan have been working on this
    - Phil Cowan: Have been meeting with reps in the US about collaborative opportunities, have established numerous connections and identified opportunities.
    - Chris Dionigi: ARS and USFS agencies have been working on various efforts that have been incorporated in management plans and other documents.
2. NISC agencies should continue work on EDRR for EAB in high risk areas. Recommendation directed at USFS and USDA.

- Response: APHIS has eradicated in many areas, still persists in some areas. Range has been successfully reduced, but remains a threat. APHIS is committed to continuing work.
  - Hilda Diaz-Soltero: APHIS is working on improving surveys and models to focus on highest risk areas. Not just doing surveys on areas that are quarantined, but have expanded to other areas.

Bob Wiltshire reminded the group on ISAC products:

- **Recommendations to NISC** are reviewed at the end of each day.
- **Action Items** are issues that are dealt with internally by NISC, and also reviewed at the end of each day
- **White Papers** address specific issues, and are drafted to offer guidance to NISC agencies.

## PRESENTATION

### **NATIONAL EDRR FRAMEWORK AND EMERGENCY FUND UPDATE**

*Hilary Smith, NISC Policy Liaison, U.S. Department of the Interior*

- Number of guidance documents for EDRR that build a framework at the landscape level. Current efforts focus on National level.
- Co-chaired initiative by NISC and DOI. Number of federal and non-federal partners.
- The October 2014 White House Priority Agenda on Climate Resilience and Natural Resources calls upon DOI and NISC agencies (NOAA, EPA, USDA and others) to work with states and tribes to develop these efforts. Output will help support numerous other management plans.
- Defines ED: Activities intended to conduct surveillance and verify the first presence of a non-native species before the species spreads and RR can no longer be effectively implemented.
- Defines RR: Activities intended to eradicate a species from a location before it spreads and response actions can no longer be effectively implemented.
- Two sub-committees: Federal (about 20 members) and Non-Federal (about 40 members - working through ISAC). Bring a variety of expertise
- Parameters: Build on existing efforts; Focus on impacts to natural areas and all taxa; Frame the issue appropriately and put in the context of comprehensive invasive species management and other priorities (e.g., climate change) ; Promote corporation and partnerships; Incorporate scalability, implementability, resource availability (match action with available funding) , and metrics.
- Objective to design a framework that builds from existing efforts, identify key gaps, and coordinate efforts – working to streamline efforts
- EDRR Action Steps: (prioritized based on species and location.)” Preparedness (training, identifying existing efforts), ED (training and monitoring), Rapid Assessment (deciding to respond or not, rapid screening to determining potential impact and available management tools), Rapid Response (actions taken, development of treatment plan, monitoring and evaluation):
- Considerations: value added, what tools are needed, available funding, metrics that can be used.
- Examples of USGS Alters from NAS Database: good tools for scalability: tool to help determine response. Help to determine where is species is on the “invasion curve.”
- Coordination: Figure from Western AFWA, should a complex diagram. Hope to learn from all these components.
- Funding: Identify current and future sources for revenue; Mechanisms (looking at different models - e.g., Superfund); Conditions: needs to be timely and stably.
- Value added to system: Identifying lead federal agencies, coordinating information flow, screening new species, identify national priorities
- Recommendations are being categorized by theme, being prioritized;

- Next Steps: Vet concepts with various audiences, complete gap analysis, complete review of report (due in September)

Questions/Comments:

Q: **Hilda Diaz-Soltero:** Need to be specific about what being requested from ISAC

A: Specific questions were sent out, will go over in a moment.

Q: **Bonnie Harper-Lore:** Invasives do not follow boundaries – has there been any collaboration with Canada and Mexico

A: Focused on US for right now – eventually will expand out. However, will be important to consider for infestations that are on the border areas.

Q: **Dave Starling:** Re: Avian influenza - EDRR framework proposed very similar to work being done. Encourage to compare to these efforts rather than reinvent the wheel

A: Yes, building on other models. Hilda has set up a number of presentations that have help to inform the framework.

Q: **Eric Lane:** What can be done in the next 20 months; what is the size of the accomplishment we can expect a report that is due in September? It is for guidance, or to provide a template on how the federal government should interact with all groups and will be fully funded. Unsure how to answer questions without this information.

**Hilda Diaz-Soltero:** In general, want to provide a meaningful document that offers clear implementation steps. In FY 16 budget there was a request to support these efforts.

**Stas Burgiel:** May be decided at a higher political effort, what to know things that need to be done now. Key is to prioritize what can be done now vs. bigger asks that will need to be pushed through.

**Bill Hyatt:** Past experience has demonstrated that funding and legal authorities are the challenges. Do not put a lot of work into the framework without identifying funding sources.

**Bob Van Steenwyk:** ED portion: fighting two bad pests from China. Limited info is coming from China, so not sure what should be looking for. Other pests are known, but we are not looking for them – by the time they are detected it is too late. RR needs to be done in a timely manner – needs plans and money in place.

**Response:** Agreed and points have been considered in the framework. A focus will be an horizon scanning and risk assessments as well as gathering baseline data.

**Tim Schaeffer:** Great network in Great lakes that work with Asian carp. E/T species often draw attention, connect these efforts to keeping species off state and national list may be beneficial.

**Bob Wiltshire:** Often do not have many options for control; framework may need to address that not all response is control based (e.g., may been to quarantine rather than treat)

**Hilda Diaz-Soltero:** Legal considerations are being considered; committee is working to identify and address all challenges

**Chris Dionigi:** Key question is what is the value of this framework and how much of framework is designed to go after challenging species. Need to find a balance.

**Steven Phillips:** Where do the FY 16 funds come from, what is the intent?

**Response:** Within the Office of Secretary, Intend to move framework into implementation (TBD based in input of report)

**Bill Toomey:** In some case we know what looking for, others we do not. Very unlikely will be able to detect (particularly with diseases – need to look for symptoms). Need to strengthen focus on citizen science.

**Bonnie Harper Lore:** Also need to focus on communicating information across states, a national mapping system should be a priority.

**Response:** Framework recognized that information management is critical.

**Ed Mills:** Once a new species is detected, there is often chaos, often unsure who will take lead. Framework should address.

**Response:** Yes, can be challenging even at a local scale – so hard to determine who should take the lead (federal vs State) in what situations.

**Jerry Cook:** Some parts of the country have well established EDRR plans and networks. How do we establish networks in areas that do not.

**Response:** Yes, need to engage the state and feed into national reporting systems. Identified this as a need, and working to put existing efforts together and find gaps.

**David Starling:** No monitoring systems have ever found a disease, some species cannot be covered by simple monitoring. Need to focus on what we allow in the country, suggest expanding and coordinating with other response (e.g., monitoring livestock mortality, feed sources).

**Eric Lane:** Scalability implies can go to local to national levels; needs to be a standardization. EDRR systems have not been well connected in the past. However, some other models (traffic control) are very standard. Rather than thinking about good examples in EDRR – look more broadly for things that are interconnected. Task of committee is to create these commonalities.

**Phil Cowan:** EDRR reflects failure by prevention. Will the report address this?

**Response:** Yes, concept of invasion curve will be presented. Making the case that emphasis should be on prevention.

**Stas Burgiel:** Looking at how EDRR can be informed by prevention.

**Bonnie Harper-Lore:** Past efforts lacked information on reporting, as hard to connect public or local groups to national databases.

**Response:** This has been identified as a gap, several presentations tomorrow will focus on information management. Also several regional networks have made progress in knitting groups and information together.

**Bob Van Steenwyk:** Look at CA fruit fly monitoring program, it was been very effective. One program that failed was the light brown apple moth – had resistance to treatment options that stopped response.

**Chuck Barger:** Reading comments from phone: Should also connect with tribal communities, Florida EDRR structures are integrated with Incident Command Response.

**Eric Lane:** Challenging to look at all taxa, as often experts work are stovepipes. Few people are knowledgeable about all, rather should be groups that focus on various taxa and/or habitats. Also difficult to prioritize (Disease vs. aquatic species vs. weed). Perhaps each group should determine what are highest prioritizes within own group. Encourage group to think about how to implement EDRR at an all taxa level. Come up with answer that resolves how to determine funding priorities for taxa that have different needs.

**Response:** Framework will address all taxa, but is structured to address different groups differently.  
Bob Wiltshire: Ended discussion; will be resumed during the EDRR Sub-committee meetings.

## **SUBCOMMITTEE BREAKOUT SESSIONS – GROUP 1 (10:45 AM – 12:00 PM)**

*(For proceedings, see SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS section)*

### **ISAC MEMBER UPDATES** *(during working lunch)*

**William Hyatt, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies:** Engaging MOU with PIJAC and FWs on risk screening. Sage grass issue: Western AFWA, document that address needs from invasive species perspective, includes text and recommendations related to NISC and ISAC.

**David Starling, Aqueterinary Services, PC. :** Continue work in certifying livestock that are marked for disease. Also considering international movement where livestock are being shipped, some countries will not allow diagnostic protocols to leave the country.

Nathan Stone: report on grass carp that looks at differences of use and regulations between states, lack of consistency between states and agencies. Calling for a nationally coordinated plan. Encouraged states to contribute to effort.

**Janis McFarland, Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.:** Invasive species priorities: 1) developing technologies when impact agriculture. 2) Protecting endangered species when controlling. 3) Developing pollinator habitat – how to balance with invasive species management. Elected President of Weed

Society, asked ISAC members to help develop a 2017 “invasive species and ecosystems” symposium in Phoenix

**Carol Okada, Hawaii Dept. of Agriculture:** Hawaiian Legislature held large workshop to discuss invasive species management and alternatives to pesticides.

**Marshall Myers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council:** Working on restructuring Habitattitude in make interactive outreach tool.

**John Peter Thompson, Maryland Nursery and Landscape Association:** Proving information to CABI. Also working on assessments for the state of Maryland.

**Ed Mills, Cornell University:** NY is second NISAW and EAB Awareness Week. Working on mute swan management plan. Funding was identified for boating regulations (AIS transport law and prohibited and regulated species laws). Invasive Species Clearinghouse will be out of funding soon, looking for additional funding.

**Otto Doering, Purdue University:** Jeff Dukes has replaced as director. Watching ALB movement, state has many high risk areas.

### **SUBCOMMITTEE BREAKOUT SESSIONS – GROUP 2 (12:45 PM – 2:00 PM)**

*(For proceedings, see SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS section)*

### **NISC MEMBER DEPARTMENT UPDATES**

#### ***Hilda Diaz-Soltero, U.S. Department of Agriculture (APHIS)***

- ERS supported workshops and conducted research on the economics of managing glyphosate-resistant weeds; and provided support to the National Summit. ERS released a Report titled, “The Economics of Glyphosate Resistance Management in Corn and Soybean Production”.
- FY14 USDA Do No Harm report was published. It informs the results of USDA individual agencies invasive species programs.
- The “2015 USDA Grant and Partnership Programs That Can Address Research, Technical Assistance Prevention and Control” was published on November 2014. Most funding has been allocated
- ARS Systematics Funding: FY13 - \$19.1M; FY14 – \$20.5M; and FY estimate – \$20.6M
- APHIS hired in 24 new pest identification personnel to be located at ports of entry and 5 new national taxonomists who will be collocated with major research specimen collections.
- The APHIS Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Pest Detection program strengthens emergency preparedness through the early detection of exotic, harmful, or economically significant plant pests, pathogens, and noxious weeds. 17 new species were detected as new or re-introduced to the U.S. All were significant and listed as reportable/actionable and as quarantine pests where action would be taken if detected.
- Since APHIS developed its predictive weed risk assessment model in 2010, it has evaluated 92 species that represent either new U.S. detections, proposed plant imports, or other species that pose a weed or invasive plant threat.
- PPQ established a new regulatory category called NAPPRA (not authorized pending pest risk analysis) for plants for planting (nursery stock) that pose a quarantine pest risk. These plants may no longer be imported unless PPQ first conducts a pest risk analysis. APHIS has proposed a third group of quarantine pest plants and hosts of quarantine pest candidates for NAPPRA listing.
- In 2014 USDA established 7 regional Climate Hubs and 3 Sub Hubs to develop and deliver science-based, region-specific information and technologies to agricultural and natural resource managers that enable climate-informed decision-making, and to provide access to assistance to implement those decisions. They provide outreach to farmers through existing networks such as Cooperative Extension and the USDA Service Centers and public education. Information

about the risks of climate change, perform climate risks and vulnerability assessments are available.

- ARS Advancing Pest and Disease Modeling workshop identified research needs and approaches for developing models to predict the spread of invasive pests and pathogens under conditions of climate change.
- NRCS developed tools to estimate the amount of carbon stored and GHG emissions reduced at the field and producer level.
- The National Plant Diagnostic Network system (NPDN) is in the process of establishing an accreditation and standards system.
- USDA Progress on ISAC recommendations from the November 2014 meeting:
  - 1) ARS, USFS and APHIS identified research to do in collaboration with New Zealand researchers. Ongoing projects in FY14-16 include work on invasive fruit flies, brown marmorated stink bugs, and various research projects on forest invasive species.
  - 2) The Asian longhorned beetle (ALB) has been successfully eradicated from two states (IL and NJ). Infestations remain in New York, Massachusetts, and Ohio. ALB remains a significant threat. APHIS and Forest Service have developed traps for ALB and discuss how to best deploy the traps including consideration of high risk areas outside of the quarantine. During surveys, people look for ALB in trees in high risk areas. APHIS and FS are working to enhance models to direct survey and eradication efforts. They will continue to collaborate on early detection inside and outside of quarantine areas.
- Emerging Issues: Avian Influenza has spread. To date has not been a jump to humans, but it is possible. APHIS is working to small producers, as no reports in larger facilities.

Invasives causing extinctions: able to identify the species pairs (invasive and endangered/threatened/candidate/proposed for listing). Over 6000 pairs identified, now know specific species impacts. CABI was list of pairs as well as control option.

#### ***Hilary Smith, U.S. Department of the Interior***

- Finalized Action Plan: developed Task Force to implement components of plan.
- EDRR Framework and Emergency Funding
- Federal Lands Policy Options paper for Movement of Aquatic Species onto and off of Federal Lands. Progress delayed as result of staff changes, currently addressing changes from solicitors office, need to make more definitive recommendations. Should be completed Summer 2015
- Secretarial Order 3336: Fire Prevention, Management and Restoration (Put together report to fire management and invasive species (e.g. large scale treatment to manage cheatgrass)
- Arctic Invasive Species Strategy – DOI responsible for Resilience , includes invasives
- Responding to GAO review
- DOI FY 16 Budget: requested \$103.5 million for invasive species activities; \$5.7 million above the 2015 enacted level. Increases would support Prevention (\$2.2 M), Early Detection and Rapid Response (\$1.5 M). Control and Management (\$1 M), Research (\$2.5 M)

#### DOI BUREAUS:

- **Bureau of Indian Affairs:** Funding 29 projects on 28 reservations
- **Bureau of Ocean Energy Management:** Released report on invasive coral species colonizing platforms (New invasive marine species colonizing energy platforms in the Northern Gulf of Mexico - verification and examination of spread)
- **Bureau of Land Management:** Continuing AIS education partnership with Wildlife Forever, Using tools to reduce the introduction and spread of invasive grasses, including biopesticides, as part of research and demonstration projects this summer, Released Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Vegetation Treatments Using Aminopyralid, Fluroxypyr, and Rimsulfuron on BLM lands in 17 Western States. <http://blm.gov/3vkd>
- **Bureau of Reclamation:** Conducts zebra / quagga mussel detection & monitorin. Researches & develops techniques to control invasives, Implements integrated pest management (IPM),

Participates in regional stakeholder committees & task Forces, Participates in public outreach events

- **National Park Service:** Strategic Planning for Service's Invasive Plant Program, Permanent closing of the Upper St. Anthony Falls Lock in Minneapolis on June 10, Conducting Ballast Water Treatment efficacy trials in the Great Lake; Directing \$2 million dollars to quagga and zebra mussel prevention, management and containment in 8 western parks, Developing strategic plan for AIS management in Colorado River parks
- **Office of Insular Affairs:** Reclaimed 300 acres of native forest in American Samoa through the Tamaligi Tree Eradication Project, Working with DOD on the Regional Bio-security Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii, Continuing success with Brown Tree Snake Program in Guam, including Automated Aerial Deployment System for Toxic Bait drops
- **Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement:** New to the task force, trying to set up own invasive species subgroup. Set up an Invasive Species Subgroup across its 3 regions, Works with Green Forest Works to replant legacy or abandoned mine lands with native species, and controls invasive plants as required by the site; Promotes and recommends the use of native hardwoods and succession species through the Appalachian Regional Reforestation Initiative Forestry Advisories
- **Fish and Wildlife Service:** Co-chairs and administers the ANS Task Force (November 2014 and May 2015 meetings held), \$1 million in 2015 is available for State/Interstate Plans, Developing new guidelines for using the SAH! brand on advertising billboards, Working with industry and other partners to redesign the Habitattitude website, Working with the American Boat and Yacht Council on boat design and construction in consideration of AIS, \$930K in FY15 to support Quagga Zebra Mussel Action Plan, In FY15, \$2.0 M base funded add to support efforts to monitor, assess, contain, and control Asian carps, Lacey Act: (risk screening tools for injurious wildlife, Finalized large constrictor snake rule listing 4 additional species, Working to complete the Categorical Exclusion under NEPA, Developing options to address salamander chytrid fungus, Proposed rule expected in mid 2015 for 11 high risk species), n FY13, \$1 million eradication funding to the 575,000-acre fenced Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge (NV) to remove non-native horse and burros, As of Jan. 2015 all horses (~725) and burros (~169) removed (adopted out), Awarded FY 15 eradication funding to Hakalau Forest National Wildlife Refuge (HI) to eradicate feral pigs
- **U.S. Geological Survey:** Added biosecurity issues and fish and wildlife disease research and monitoring to the Invasive Species Program Received increase of \$3.7M in FY2015, Reinstated aquatic plants to the Nonindigenous Aquatic Species Information System (NAS), Conducting research on Asian carp control techniques and eDNA analysis methodologies, Established Invasive Mussel Collaborative with Great Lakes Commission

#### ***David Lodge, U.S. Department of State***

- Working with DOI on the Arctic Council on invasive species issues
- African Great Lakes – trying to bring policy makers and managers on threats that the two regions share. Encouraging information sharing and strengthen policy

#### ***Susan Gitting, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency***

ASTM Standards – site development and planning. ASTM standard are recognized in building codes as well as regulations.

- Creating a list of invasive plants in a defined geographic region to start creating a consistent process for ISPIs for listing invasive plants in a particular region. Moving towards a national mapping program,
- Green building program: there is a need to reference only standards written under a known process. By developing a list as ASTM stands, may be more scientifically credible. Without fall to noxious weed list – may not be adequate as not a proactive list and the goal of green building to go a step beyond what is expected.

- Hoping to be completed in the next 6 months, has received a lot of support, but there are representatives in horticulture industry that have expressed concern.

**1LT Alisha Soper, U.S. Department of Defense (AFPMB)**

Department of Operations – concerns with any pest that may impact operations. Make recommendation to policy. If there are any issues that need recommendations, meetings are open.

**Peg Brady, U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA) / Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANSTF)**

- NOAA does not receive allocated funding for invasive species efforts, rather the Agency's work is reflective of impacts to NOAA's trust resources. For example, the Habitat Blueprint is NOAA's strategy to integrate habitat conservation throughout the agency, focus efforts in priority areas, and leverage internal and external collaborations to achieve measurable benefits within key habitats such as rivers, coral reefs, and wetlands. NOAA has identified state and federal invasive species experts and plans to consider invasive species prevention and management while developing Habitat Blueprint Focus Area Implementation Plans.
- NOAA staff continues to offer Hazard Analysis & Critical Control Point (HACCP) Planning to Prevent the Spread of Invasive Species. A team from NOAA and USFWS have revised manual, forms and teaching materials to better align with natural resource management work. New HACCP website under development and will be hosted by the USFWS National Conservation Training Center. Last training was offered in Santa Cruz, California future workshop in Alaska are under development.
- NOAA had an internal Aquatic Invasive Species Workshop in Santa Cruz, California on March 31 to April 1, 2015. In addition to focusing on developing goals and objectives for the new NOAA Western AIS Team, the workshop had the following objectives:
  - Examine AIS issues that impact NOAA trust resources by region and explore mitigation strategies.
  - Identify ways to use existing NOAA processes, programs, and priorities to advance AIS prevention and control strategies.
  - Examine AIS case studies and issues where NOAA is making progress and those that need greater attention.
  - Establish a prioritized list of objectives for the NOAA AIS Team and a framework for moving forward.
  - The workshop participants made numerous recommendations to strengthen AIS work within NOAA. A final report from the Workshop will be released this summer.
  - The National Marine Sanctuaries Lionfish Response Plan was released in February, 2015 and is available at: <http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/science/conservation/lionfish15.html>. The Plan was drafted to minimize ecosystem degradation in affected sanctuaries so that benthic habitat does not degrade and sanctuaries continue to serve as refuges for native reef fish species. The plan aims to identify critical actions needed to minimize the impact of this unprecedented marine invasion. Four national marine sanctuaries have been invaded by lionfish – Gray's Reef, Florida Keys, Flower Garden Banks, and Monitor. The plan recommends science, service, and stewardship activities for the first three sanctuary sites, as activities at the Monitor are much more limited and will only be discussed briefly. Prior actions by the sanctuaries to deal with lionfish, as well as future activities, rely on collaborations among agency programs and offices, as well as partners outside NOAA, including international collaborations around the wider Caribbean.
  - This response plan summarizes information on the scope and status of the lionfish invasion, the threats posed to national marine sanctuaries, and the challenges to managing the invasion. It also summarizes current activities taking place, as well as calls for actions to be planned, coordinated, and supported nationally or regionally and actions specific to the individual marine sanctuaries within the invaded range. All actions are directed at management measures that will minimize impacts caused by the invasion, specifically in the areas of monitoring, control, research, and education and

outreach. These actions are consistent with those called for in the National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan and other local, regional and national plans specific to the lionfish invasion.

- NOAA continues involvement in the Ballast Water Convention. In 2004 IMO was adopted in 2004 & will enter into force 12 months after ratification by 30 States (currently at 44 – exceeded), representing 35 per cent of world merchant shipping tonnage (currently at 32.6%). NOAA is also involved in the Arctic Council's Arctic Climate Resilience Agenda that is proposing development of improved practices and policies to prevent the introduction of invasive species in marine, coastal, freshwater, and terrestrial ecosystems, and strengthen management of on-going invasions using risk based assessment and management.
- Numerous activities are occurring at the regional level. For example, the Gulf and South Atlantic regional staff are building capacity building for lionfish research and control in the Caribbean. The regional has also assisted with the development of Lionfish Web Portal. NOAA; sGreat Lakes Environmental Research Lab (GLERL) is investigating links between quagga/zebra mussels and harmful algal blooms and continues work on the GLANSIS database and factsheets. The Pacific islands Region is performing monitoring and vessel inspection on Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument and removing Crown-of-Thorns removal in American Samoa and invasive algae from Hawaiian reefs. Staff from the Chesapeake Regional Office is chairing the Invasive Catfish Taskforce. The Western Region is developing an AIS management plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, conducting research on *Watersipora subtorquata* in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, conducting invasive algae removals in southern California, and investigating the impacts on non-native species on ESA listed salmon. In addition, NOAA continues to conduct numerous restoration projects nationwide. Several of these projects are involved in AIS prevention and / or management.
- ANSTF Action and Decision Items:

#### Decisional Items

- The ANSTF made the following decisions:
- ANSTF approved the decision to reaffirm QZAP for another 5 years.
- ANSTF approved the National Snakehead Control and Management Plan.
- ANSTF approved the National Invasive Lionfish Prevention and Management Plan.
- ANSTF recommended approval of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency as an ex-officio member of the ANS Task Force.

#### Action Items

- ANSTF members and panels will review and provide comments on ANSTF charter. Comments should be submitted to Laura Norcutt by May 22, 2015.
- ANSTF members and panels will review ANSTF membership list and provide updated information. Updates should be submitted to Laura Norcutt by May 22, 2015.
- ANSTF Reporting Matrix will be distributed to ANSTF members and Regional Panel for input on timeline and modifications. Schedule follow-up calls for early June 2015.
- Identify individuals (external to ANSTF) that could provide information on the economic impacts from AIS; compile information to assess current work, identify gaps, and potential future needs.
- Identify speakers for the Fall 2015 ANSTF meeting to present information on studies or models regarding AIS and economic assessments and provide a basis for discussion on next steps.
- Draft RTC will be distributed to ANSTF members and panels for final comment. (Two week turnaround for comment)
- Pam Fuller (USGS) will distribute a survey to determine priority aquatic plants to be (first) added into the USGS NAS database.

- Acting ANSTF Exec Sec will work with Jeff Hill (UF) to distribute risk assessment documents to ANSTF members and panels.
- Regional Panel Chairs and Coordinators will continue conversations regarding specific changes that may be warranted for NISA reauthorization
- FWS will inquire if reallocating funds from the SMP to Region Panels is possible.
- ANSTF member agencies will review GLRP grass carp priorities and actions to see what assistance may be possible. GL Panel will identify potential opportunities for agency involvement.
- ANSTF will provide information to GCERC on the ANSTF structure and available assistance for review and development of proposals in relation to the RETORE Act.
- Outreach Committee will assist ABYC (and other partners) in the development of AIS outreach materials for boat dealers and manufactures.
- ANSTF will continue to support ABYC efforts to minimize the spread of AIS through initiatives such as the development of boat standards.
- Next ANSTF meeting will be scheduled for November 4-5, 2015; Silver Spring, MD

***John Sagle, U.S Department of Homeland Security***

Numerous detections of gypsy moths at ports – accomplished through better training.

- International efforts – engaging with other countries to improve inspection process
- As a result of increased interceptions of Khapra Beetle, a Federal Order was issued that increased fumigation standards and subsequently reduced pest presence on host material shipments.
- CBP Agriculture Specialists continue to intercept Mediterranean Fruit Fly. Most recently, outbreaks were confirmed in the Dominican Republic, resulting in significant changes to trade regulations
- Avian Influenza – CBP is working with Veterinary Services to ensure avian products are regulated properly at ports of entry. There were significant changes to poultry regulations for products arriving from Canada.
- Old World Bollworm has been intercepted in produce arriving from South America. Historically, this pest has only thrived in Europe.
- Conducted 22 million passenger inspections last year

**Day 1 Ends at 5:00 PM**

## **DAY 2: Thursday, May 21, 2015**

### **ISAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Chair)**

**ERIC LANE (Vice-Chair)**

**JERRY COOK (Secretary)**

CHARLES BARGERON

PHILIP COWAN

TAMMY DAVIS

OTTO DOERING, III

SUSAN ELLIS

BONNIE HARPER-LORE

WILLIAM HYATT

PHYLLIS JOHNSON

JANIS McFARLAND

MARSHALL MEYERS

EDWARD MILLS

CAROL OKADA

STEPHEN PHILLIPS

DAVID REID

TIMOTHY SCHAEFFER

DAVID E. STARLING

JOHN PETER THOMPSON

WILLIAM TOOMEY

ROBERT VAN STEENWYK

KENNETH ZIMMERMAN

**Invasive Species Action Network**

**Colorado Department of Agriculture**

**Sam Houston State University**

University of Georgia

Landcare Research

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Purdue University

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (ret.)

Minnesota Invasive Species Advisory Council

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

University of North Dakota

Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.

Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council

Cornell University

Hawai'i Department of Agriculture

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Invasive Species Consultant

Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission

Aqueterinary Services, P.C.

Invasive Species Consultant

The Nature Conservancy

University of California, Berkeley

Lone Tree Cattle Company

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT**

JOSEPH BISCHOFF

PATRICK BURCH

JOSEPH M. DITOMASO

ROLAND QUITIGUA

DAMON E. WAITT

American Nursery and Landscape Association

Dow AgroSciences

University of California, Davis

University of Guam

University of Texas at Austin

### **NISC STAFF AND POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT**

PHILLIP ANDREOZZI

KELSEY BRANTLEY

STAS BURGIEL

CHRISTOPHER DIONIGI

MARGARET "Peg" BRADY

HILDA DIAZ-SOLTERO

CAMILLE MITTLEHOLTZ

SUSAN PASKO

HILARY SMITH

NISC Staff

NISC Staff

NISC Staff

NISC Acting Executive Director

U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)

U.S. Department of Agriculture (APHIS)

U.S. Department of Transportation

U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)

U.S. Department of the Interior

## PRESENTATIONS

### **Trade and Biosecurity in the Pacific Region**

*Carol Okada, Hawai'i Department of Agriculture*

- Invasive species – serious threat, there has been declines of numerous species declines, presents a human health risk
- Hawaii – most remote place on earth, ports and airports critical to existence
- Changing as military movements will increase vessels; trans-pacific partnership will also increase risk of invasion
- 75% of invasive species are coming from foreign sources
- Biosecurity – strategic and integrated approach to manage risk. Holistic approach that includes the environment. Looking to be more than a single type of inspection; striving for multiple levels on inspection. (pre-entry, port-of entry, post-entry)
- Implementation – piloted in one airport to see what works, then expanded statewide.
- Trial with Christmas Tree importation; system has improved – but still having problems with wasps.
- Port of Entry – looking at more than plant, as need to protect natural environment, inspecting for all taxa
- Manifest system – communication with transportation to help know what is coming in to speed inspection process.
- Rapid Response and Control – follow ICS. Using Port Management for Control, contract research to work with producers to develop a manage system
- Area wide suppression – very successful when have team put together
- Growing agriculture and import replacement – trying to not rely on importing by growing locally.
- Next Steps: Create buffer zones between agricultural and conservations zones; expand diagnostics, working with Bishop museum and other research institutions for taxonomic expertise and DNA barcoding, develop crop protection programs
- Since 200 found many problems with preemption clause in Plant Protection Act. 2003 changeover from USDA to DHS transferred inspection duties and ceased notification from the state
- Regulatory Conflicts – pest must have the potential to cause harm. Do not have a strong handle on foreign imports.

### Questions/Comments

**Hilda Diaz Solero:** Do you have a recommendations to solve the conflict between USDA and HDOA regulations?

**Response:** Not sure why Hawaii cannot self-regulate foreign shipments, would be easiest way to mitigate.

Hilda Diaz Soltero offered follow up conversation to see if issue could be resolved.

### **Recommendation #137: Inventory and Control of Highway Corridor Vegetation**

*Camille Mittleholtz, Dept. of Transportation (NISC Policy Liaison)*

*Deirdre Remley, Federal Highway Administration*

- US DOT – involved in invasive species issues; Federal Hwy does work with USDA and FWS for inspections.
- Maritime Administration has been involved in research (testing systems, effective hull control, etc.)
- Pollinator Plan was been finalized, actions will have benefits to control of invasive species
- DOT does not own roadsides, state DOT own and have the choice to use federal funds to control noxious weeds or native vegetation. No pot of money specific to invasives. Given to states as a lump sum – up to the states to determine how to use it.

- Provide tools to make it easier to manage invasive species. (guidance document available online)
- State DOTs can partner with state or local government to compete for other funds (grant program) that may support invasive species control
- Things states needs to control invasives: training for field staff (identification, control); Integrated vegetation management decisions for roadside maintenance managers, affordable, good quality native plant material sources (trying to establish native plants, then spot treat for invasive species).
- Numerous tools on website, most recent eBook: *Vegetation Management: An ecosystem Approach*. Includes maps and pictures . Should be available online in about a month. Guide to help understand state / local needs for plantings and maintenance.
- Some research dollars leveraged to develop new types of technology. For example, developed DOTWASH system, (developed by SK Environmental) created mobile seed washer for roadside equipment and vehicles.
- Long term interagency efforts: FICMNEW, Plant Conservation Alliance (developed national seed strategy)
- Information Dissemination: FHWA Vegetation Management website updated for new authorizations and developments.
- Managing for pollinator habitat; driven by decline of key species (monarch declined by 90%, honeybee 40%; managing for increased native vegetation). AASHTO webinar planned for summer 2015 to get message out to DOTs; BMPs for roadside pollinator habitat, three case studies of pollinator case studies – discuss challenges and lessons learned; technical workshops, Monarch Summit planned for Fall 2015.
- Roadside crews are using GPS and smartphones to reports data to EDD Maps; numerous reports of new species in counties where not yet known to exist.

There were no questions or comments after this presentation.

## **Integrating Science and Policy to Reduce the Arrival of Non-Native Forest Insects and Pathogens in the U.S.**

*Gary Lovett, Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies*

- A Forest Pest and pathogen Initiative: produced synthesis paper, communication and outreach pieces (press kit, media roll out, etc).
- Issue: Forest trees are dying as a result of invasives;
- Focused efforts on prevention, listed a range of policy options (range in ease of adoption, stringency); Examples: point of origin (monitor sentinel trees, pre –clearance partnerships); Vectors (phase out / voluntary substitution wood packing material, improve existing packing treatment regulation, strengthen enforcement); Live Plants (phase out import of live plants, certify “pest free” retailers, switch to “white list screening” strengthen enforcement); Prevent Establishment (post entry quarantine, surveillance systems, funding for rapid eradication).
- Science- Policy Linkage: improve quality of inspection data, enhance access to APHIS and CBP data by other agencies, APHIS / CBP to provide regular reports, develop accessible global database and information systems
- Urban Forests – are both sentinels (primary source) and beachheads (promote spread); economic services are higher; high potential for public engagement.
- Strategy for Impact: Use science to build constituency of engaged parties; focus attention to strengthen policies and regulations; urge groups to pursue funding to surveillance and inspection programs in urban forests
- Several of recommendations and policy options link with ISAC subcommittees

### Questions/Comments:

**Bill Hyatt:** What is industry perception of white list suggestion?

**Response:** No industry involved in writing paper, although had discussions. Will start dialogue with them, but expecting push back

**Chris Dionigi:** Suggestions for whom ISAC can reach out to on industry side

**Response:** No too much contact with industry, looking at scale of that invasive may have on home owner values – have economist analyzing data on the issue:

**Eric Lane:** Have correlated data with vectors?

**Response:** Live plant pathway is high concern, but falling. Wood packing material is becoming higher concern

**Eric Lane:** Economic losses did not include ecosystem values / value of urban trees is greater compared to a forest: How did you come to this conclusion?

**Response:** Study included values such as loss of property, not ecosystem value. Although urban, trees still provide valuable habitat (stop over points for migratory birds)

**Bill Toomey:** If USDA / BP data is more accessible – would help with prevention and EDRR. One of the keys is information to pinpoint specific locals where resources can be used. Should pursue this recommendation.

**Response:** Agreed.

**Tim Schaeffer:** Survey state invasive species council and invasive species caucus – good forums to promote recommendations.

**Ed Mills:** Some of the same evaluations done in past led to BW management. Are trying to look at vectors to see similar policy alternatives?

**Response:** Would like to move to recommending specific policies to see change.

### **The Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)**

*John Bowers, U.S. Department of Agriculture (APHIS)*

- Pest Surveillance: looking for preclearance, port inspections, domestic surveys
- Two main missions: keep own agriculture safe, satisfy other countries and convince agriculture is safe.
- Pest detection system is major component to achieving these goals
- ISPM: Guidance for surveillance: 2 major types: General (gathering of information for sources); Specific surveys (target specific pests over a defined period of time in a specific area).
- The verified information – used to determine if a pest is present / absent in a particular location
- Specific Surveys: Detection, Delimiting, and Monitoring. Specific surveys are based on detection surveys. Using multi-pronged approach; structures process to identify pests, develop survey protocols, provide survey materials, conduct the surveys, and report of results, notification process.
- APHIS and state coordinators carry out surveys for high risk pests through the CAPS program.
- Pests – insects, plant pathogens, mollusks, weeds.
- Commodity and taxon based surveys
- Focus on ED of exotic plant pests, not yet present or limited distribution, high impact / possibility of establishment. Do not focus on PPQ program pests (have own funding stream)
- Emphasis on multi pest surveys; concentrate on multiple high priority pests to improve efficiency and economy of survey (higher return on investment). CAPS has a priority pest list; Pest of importance to a state and not an a priority list may also be included.
- Negative data is ideal – basis for whole program / guiding principle. Used to facilitate trade and designate pest free areas.
- Valid negative data – must be targeted at a specific pest, conduct survey using approved methods, samples must be identified by a qualified identifier.
- Website is hosted by Purdue University; stores guidelines, pest lists, taxonomic screen aids, outreach materials, list of state coordinators, etc.
- USDA report: information about performance measures, encourage ISAC to review.

### Questions/Comments:

**Bill Hyatt:** How well do you compete for funding for negative data?

**Response:** Budget has been flat for past several years, cannot lobby. Make best use of what they are allocated.

### **The Art of Detection: Importance of Accurate Diagnosis and Identification in IS Management**

*Carrie Lapaire Harmon, University of Florida*

- UF extension: Take over then pest is detected that outside reach of eradication.
- Early detection: leveraging limited dollars.
- Many samples are obtained from public, observing sick or dying plants.
- Bid deal issues, many samples – sample surge. Clear the negatives and forward the suspects to APHIS- provide support to many programs and networks.
- Tracking at the public level – working with EDD maps. But difficult at the pathogen level, need a voucher specimen to back it up.
- Work together with land grant universities and state departments. Funding received from NPDN has kept labs open. Labs are usually connected to specialists who research and recommend management appropriate for local areas. (Cannot state a quarantine measure, but provide the information that may lead to this event)
- Expanding because of confidentiality agreements and information sharing. Continue to train diagnostic personnel, provide standard up-to-date protocols. STARD accreditation system – means document work, use best science available.
- Labs are in every state, complement to the targeted survey (like CAPS);
- NPDN National Repository database; secure access and confidentiality agreement to protect trade while occurring pest management. All labs in networks must contribute data. Regulatory samples do not go into the database until results are sent to the regulatory agency.
- Data sharing: Online and live training sessions, data on who is trained and in what; make data accessible, information if forwarded to regional hubs, all labs have a communication protocol to communicate data during ICS.
- Challenges – systematics, communication flood – need to improve efficiencies, turnover, aging infrastructure.

There were no questions or comments after this presentation.

### **Need for Accessible IS Distribution Information: A Federal End User Perspective**

*Jon Lane, U.S. Army Corp of Engineers*

- USACE: Like many agencies, Invasive species is not a mission, but a sideline component.
- USACE: Contributions: supplier of hydropower, levee protection, navigation, control, stewardship of public lands, etc.
- Common Operating Platform: able to pull in data from other agencies
- Losing the war against invasive species: Disjointed agencies, lack of communication.
- Consequences: lack of knowledge of what species are around, cannot determine leading edge, prioritization is difficult, difficult to find funding for species we don't know or understand
- What the Corp is doing: Models out there that have had some success, can learn from these. USACE does projects nationwide – so need data to support (EDD Maps – gives map with all invasives in a radius, can see what is present and what is coming towards the project – has been successful in securing funding as can justify the need)
- Common Operating Platform: national database where all research institutions, agencies, and public put data in one area. Shows species distribution, trends, alter systems, treatment data, identification, best management practices.

### Questions/Comments:

**Ken Zimmerman:** Issue may be that data needs vetted for accuracy to give sure correct and species are accurately identified.

**Response:** Yes, agreed – data must be “good” to be useful.

**Janis McFarland:** Is there an outreach component that you do on surrounding lands?

**Response:** Do not have the ability to go outside of lands. Finally have an invasive species policy, but not implemented everywhere. Some places have outreach components, other have none.

**Janice McFarland:** Have a plan on how to connect with Pollinator project?

**Response:** Yes, have a stewardship team that is working on it.

**Phillis Johnson:** Lake Peck has few resources and invasive control is not being implemented. Is this because it is remote, and there is no political pressure

**Response:** Found staff was not informed on invasive species, working with Corps staff to become more aware. Invasive species was not a high priority, very focused on flood control – until invasives start to impact flood control it will not be a priority.

### **Grand Challenges in Pest Management: Systematics**

*Scott Miller, Smithsonian Institute*

- Science progresses, definition of species has evolved over time. New technologies to characterize and understand species. Getting species concepts right is vital to control – especially biological control.
- Good and bad depends on your point of view. May be threatened in one area, invasive in another. Also perception will vary based on interest (industry vs. conservation)
- Climate Change: may change geographic distribution and relationship between species (e.g., parasite and host). May 19<sup>th</sup> – Pollinator strategy released from White House, consequence of these shifts
- Becoming important to prove what a species is. If cannot, makes vulnerable to rules for a large group of organisms. For example, CITES – all corals and orchids are regulated together since difficulty to determine specific species.
- New tools are emerging, yet support is eroding for critical infrastructure (biodiversity collections, expertise).
- Workforce issues: general decline in full time positions in systematics and training since 1980; increase in use of systematics tools in other studies (not helpful when need to make a fast Identification – decline “deep” expertise); tendency to “chemicals will control” – treat without fully understanding the species.
- A DNA barcode is the use of a short gene sequence taken from standardized portions of the genome, used to identify species. Short is important as other DNA samples are degraded. Allows to associated life history stages in particular locations, also apply to mislabeling problems.
- Need to know what is in the U.S. as well as what is in other countries to help with management. Need authorities identification training services, training, targeted research
- Suggestions: support critical collections, DNA barcode library, promote digital access, integrate systematics using multiple character sets with biology and ecology for a holistic view of key taxa.

There were no questions or comments after this presentation.

### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

*Includes any action items or recommendations produced during breakout sessions.*

#### Early Detection and Rapid Response

Discussed components of the framework, how to improve information sharing.

***No action items or recommendations for this meeting.***

## Communication, Education and Outreach (CEO)

Working on white paper draft focused on necessary components for an outreach campaign

**ACTION ITEM:** ISAC recommends that NISC, at the next ISAC meeting, provide summary reports on current regional and national invasive species outreach campaigns and conducted by agencies including, if available, 1) estimated funding, 2) targeted audiences, 3) the scope, and 4) effectiveness and scope of these campaigns and evaluation metrics used.

### Questions/Comments:

**Bonnie Harper Lore:** Not asking for a lot of detail, just a short explanation of what campaigns are used.

**Peg Brady:** The GAO report may shed some light, they did not dive deep into this item, but there may be some info. Performance Measures would not be specific to invasive, as typically not broken down by subject matter.

**Stas Burgiel:** Looking at what is done by agencies themselves, or what is supported by others?

**Chris Dionigi:** Only Federal agencies do not have capacity to go down further.

**Action Item agreed upon by consensus.**

### Control and Management

- Final stages of white paper, two to be completed in 2-3 months
- Starting outline for white paper on conflicting regulations, will be scoping and asking other ISAC members for ideas and case studies

**No action items or recommendations for this meeting.**

### Research

- Hoping to begin conversations with agencies and Smithsonian regarding systematics and collections
- Will begin information scoping to determine whether to pursue a white paper specific to the gas and oil industry

**Research SC produced a formal recommendation to NISC which was approved by ISAC (see FINAL ACTION ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS section above)**

### Questions/Comments:

**Eric Lane:** White paper coming on biocontrol as pertains to federal agencies, why making this recommendation before white paper is released

**Ken Zimmerman:** White paper will generate many recommendations; felt this one is important to get out now.

**Peg Brady:** Not sure all information and analysis of this issue has been presented to support the recommendation

**Otto Doering:** Need a clear explanation of why this recommendation is needed.

**Ken Zimmerman:** Not staying a process does not exist, asking for an expedited process.

**John Peter Thompson:** Understanding that there has been a staff change, and need to push for additional communication. As section 7 reviewers are unsure of their role and this is causing delays.

**Phil Andreozzi:** Was this an issue, before the staffing change? If not, is this the process or staffing issue?

**Janis McFarland:** Researchers are not getting clear information on what is required to complete consultation.

**Susan Ellis:** Can we make this an action item instead, and just as NISC to scope information on the issue?  
ISAC: Agreed. (change made)

**ACTION ITEM:** Request NISC staff to liaise with USFWS and NMFS to identify and resolve issues that impede the timely and successful completion of Section 7 consultations under the ESA for biological control agents.

**Peg Brady:** Need full spectrum of info before know what action is needed, may be a legal issue.

*Action Item agreed upon by consensus.*

Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR):

**EDRR SC produced a formal recommendation to NISC (see FINAL ACTION ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS section above.**

Organizational / Collaboration

- Reviewing and updating bylaws, near complete. Will be sent to other ISAC members for review after meeting
- Charter online has been expired, new charter needs to be posted on NISC website  
NOTE: ISAC's current charter (exp. 2016) is posted on NISC website. Document was relocated to another page for easier access.

Prevention

**ACTION ITEM:** Request a speaker from USDA to provide an update at the next ISAC meeting on the Caribbean and Pacific Safeguarding Initiatives and the regulatory structure that underlies them.

**ACTION ITEM:** Request a speaker from DOD and/or relevant partners at the next ISAC meeting to provide information on the Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii and how it addresses international and inter-island trade and movement of good in the region.

*Both action items agreed upon by consensus.*

**Day 2 Ends at 5:00 PM**

## **DAY 3: Friday, May 22, 2015**

### **ISAC MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Chair)**

**ERIC LANE (Vice-Chair)**

**JERRY COOK (Secretary)**

CHARLES BARGERON

PHILIP COWAN

TAMMY DAVIS

OTTO DOERING, III

SUSAN ELLIS

BONNIE HARPER-LORE

WILLIAM HYATT

PHYLLIS JOHNSON

JANIS McFARLAND

EDWARD MILLS

CAROL OKADA

STEPHEN PHILLIPS

DAVID REID

DAVID E. STARLING

JOHN PETER THOMPSON

WILLIAM TOOMEY

ROBERT VAN STEENWYK

KENNETH ZIMMERMAN

**Invasive Species Action Network**

**Colorado Department of Agriculture**

**Sam Houston State University**

University of Georgia

Landcare Research

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Purdue University

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (ret.)

Minnesota Invasive Species Advisory Council

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

University of North Dakota

Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.

Cornell University

Hawai'i Department of Agriculture

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Invasive Species Consultant

Aqueterinary Services, P.C.

Invasive Species Consultant

The Nature Conservancy

University of California, Berkeley

Lone Tree Cattle Company

### **ISAC MEMBERS ABSENT**

JOSEPH BISCHOFF

PATRICK BURCH

JOSEPH M. DITOMASO

MARSHALL MEYERS

ROLAND QUITIGUA

TIMOTHY SCHAEFFER

DAMON E. WAITT

American Nursery and Landscape Association

Dow AgroSciences

University of California, Davis

Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council

University of Guam

Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission

University of Texas at Austin

### **NISC STAFF AND POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT**

PHILLIP ANDREOZZI

KELSEY BRANTLEY

STAS BURGIEL

CHRISTOPHER DIONIGI

MARGARET "Peg" BRADY

HILDA DIAZ-SOLTERO

NISC Staff

NISC Staff

NISC Staff

NISC Acting Executive Director

U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)

U.S. Department of Agriculture (APHIS)

CAMILLE MITTLEHOLTZ

SUSAN PASKO

HILARY SMITH

U.S. Department of Transportation

U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)

U.S. Department of the Interior

## **PRESENTATION**

### **NISC Management Plan Update**

*Chris Dionigi, Acting NISC Executive Director*

Process to move forward: Plan for federal agencies, written by federal agencies – but seeking outside input. ISAC meetings are public, so materials need cleared for public release. Draft plan was not cleared, but an outline of the plan was provided. Asking ISAC to review for gaps and priority items. Have received numerous comments.

Other side of the process is drafting the plan itself and identifying federal agencies that will assist with implementation. Information will be fed to federal agencies for technical review as well as leadership review. Need to get clearance from OMB, feedback will be incorporated into final version. In 2007 able to release a draft prior to OMB review, however, this year plan cannot be released until OMB review. All actions must be: agencies priorities, done with existing authorities or funding. Plan cannot ask for existing funding lo policy. If recommendations do not fit into this criteria, should be structured as a recommendation to NISC.

## **ISAC HOUSEKEEPING**

- Potential dates for Fall 2015 meeting. Looking at October or November 2015 in DC Metro Area. Hilda Diaz-Soltero has offered to host meeting at NAL in Beltsville, MD. She will research available dates and work with Kelsey to confirm.
- ISAC Leadership: No additional nominations were received. Current officers will remain in place.
  - Bob Wiltshire, Chair
  - Eric Lane, Vice-Chair (Chair of Steering SC)
  - Jerry Cook, Secretary

**Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM**