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CHAIRMAN STOCKER: On the record. On behalf of the people who did the heavy lifting, welcome to our meeting in Washington, D.C. I hope everything went well with your travels out here. Everyone has a copy of the agenda. The first item on here after Open Meeting is Welcoming Remarks and Introductions. I just welcomed you.

Let's move to the Introductions. If you look up in front of you, you will see the format today is simply name and affiliation. There's time to reserved later on for Member's Comments so if you would please now your name and your affiliation and we'll go around the ISAC table. We also want to include everyone that is in the room. If you haven't been called upon, please take it upon yourself to do so. I'm Randall Stocker. I'm the Chair of the Invasive Species Advisory Committee. I'm affiliated with the University of Florida.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Lori Williams. Director of the National Invasive Species Council.

MR. WILKINSON: Dean Wilkinson, the liaison from the Department of Commerce.

DR. BECK: George Beck with the Colorado
State University and the Intermountain Noxious Weed Advisory Council.

DR. BEIL: Gary Beil, Minnesota Crop Improvement, St. Paul, Minnesota.

MR. BRIGHT: Ship Bright, Maine Lakes Conservancy Institute.

MR. BUCK: Michael Buck, Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources. To continue a tradition, I provide the chairman --

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I'm ready. I'm always ready.

MR. BUCK: A bag of chocolate covered macadamia nuts which he will distribute when he feels like the committee has done good work.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I don't remember that caveat before but received.

MS. CAMPBELL: Faith Campbell, American Lands Alliance.

MS. COOKSLEY: Barbara Cooksley, a private ranch manager.

MS. COOPER: Diane Cooper, Taylor Shellfish.

MR. CORN: Joe Corn, Shellfish and Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study.

MR. DICKERSON: Bill Dickerson, North
Carolina Department of Agriculture and National Plant Board.

MR. DIPPEL: Donnie Dippel, Texas Department of Agriculture.

DR. ELDREDGE: Ly Eldredge, Bishop Museum, Honolulu.

DR. JACKSON: Jerry Jackson, Florida Gulf Coast University.

MR. LUKENS: Ron Lukens, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

MR. O'NEILL: Chuck O'Neill, New York Sea Grant and National Aquatic Nuisance Species Clearinghouse.


MR. REGELBRUGGE: Craig Regelbrugge, American Nursery and Landscape Association.

MS. SHEEHAN: Linda Sheehan, The Ocean Conservancy.

DR. STONE: Jeff Stone, Oregon State University.


ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: Jim Butler, Department of Agriculture.
MS. UPSTON: Barbara Upston, Management Consulting Association I'll be representing.

MS. BECH: Rebecca Bech, Department of Agriculture.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Nelroy Jackson, Monsanto.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Do we need those on the microphone as well? You can lean into an adjacent microphone if you would like. Once more.

MR. KRAUSE: Rick Krause --

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Anyone who doesn't know Rick Krause is not paying attention.

(Introduction of attendees continued around the room.)

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Anyone we have missed? I'm never intimidated in this job until I realize how many organizations you could turn against me if you chose to. The next item we have is Barbara Upston, our facilitator who will review the meeting materials and codes.

MS. UPSTON: Good morning. I never have a meeting without some objectives. We will ask you ISAC members at the end of the day tomorrow or Wednesday to give us some feedback on how well they were met. You can see that there was a last moment change on the
third one.

One objective is to exchange information and ideas on the top priorities of concern to you ISAC members so that means we'll be hearing from you what those might be. You will see in the agenda when we go through it the many opportunities for that. Also it's to hear from Federal officials and task teams on the progress of implementing the National Management Plan since we met in June in Yellowstone and to discuss and plan for the next steps because this is definitely a forward notion here.

Third and this is the Wednesday field trip, see on-going invasive species research of ballast water and control efforts. That's been slightly amended and more on that as we go. But those are the plans.

The schedule then if you take your agenda please which should be right on the inside left pocket of those quite beautiful folders that you got. A revised agenda was also dropped on your table. Monday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. is our schedule. There will be a catered lunch right next door in the Sphinx Room and later a no-host reception with hors d'oeuvres and a cash bar. That's back in the hotel which is right around the corner in the Franklin Park Room. We
will make sure everybody knows where that is when the time comes and of course the ever popular breaks through the day. As adults, you will go out this door and go left, left and find restrooms but we do have scheduled breaks.

Tuesday, we begin at 8:00 a.m. If you turn the page, you will see that on your schedule. Lunch is on your own. There are plenty of eating places. Those who are around the area will be glad to help make sure that you find a place easily. We close by 5:15 p.m. Once again there will be of course breaks.

Wednesday, the field trip is in the 7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. time and we'll have more about that. A box lunch will be provided. Please sign for the field trip if you intend to go outside at that the registration desk. There is a clipboard for that as well.

To go through the agenda at least in broad sweeps for today, we're going to open with the Officers' Activity and Progress Reports and ISAC Updates and remarks from the principals. You can see the names and follow who is intended to be on the agenda. We hope they are here, Jim Butler and Jim Tate. Then Lori will do the Executive Director's
Then we have the Members Forum. The first part of that I will facilitate and that's where your one question that you might have about the National Management Plan will be and that's what it's focused on. Some people may have sent them in ahead of time which will be helpful so they have been answered the best as they can about that. Then lunch.

Next, Randall is going to facilitate the second part of the Members Forum which is where your activity reports and updates and any general items that you want to talk about as ISAC members. So there is plenty of opportunity for that first objective which is to exchange ideas and information for yourself and then the update on the cross-cut budget. Lois Williams will do that.

Then we're going to have an opportunity for you to provide some advice and guidance to the Council on different types of dispute resolution that you think that they should have responsibility for resolving the regulatory jurisdictional conflict. Tom Bewick is going to talk about some recommendations by the Extension Service on basic plant issues. Then NEPA guidance and then an opportunity for public comment. If you are here representing the public and
wish to make a comment, please sign up so we know if we have allocated enough time. There is a sign-up sheet outside. In fact if you know what it is that you are going to be wanting to speak on, it will be helpful if you can actually write it down and we will provide some paper so that we can understand what it's going to be about. Close the meeting in the 5:00 p.m. to 5:15 p.m. and then the reception is at 6:00 p.m. Is everybody clear about what the agenda is for the day? Yes? Okay, that's fine.

For tomorrow, we begin at 8:00 a.m. This is an opportunity for the task teams to meet. This is on page two of your agenda after we have a quick open. We will have the task teams meeting in various corners of this room. We have two rooms over in the hotel just around the corner and we'll see if we can't find some other spaces maybe that will maybe even be quickly available here. We will make sure that we have the list of names so that in case you have perhaps forgotten which task team you have been working on we'll make sure that you get to the right place and work with the right group. We will have reports from the task teams then.

Following that, the Early Detection and Rapid Response team led by Barbara Cooksley have a
report for us. Lunch on your own. Then House Science Advises Public Policy, Jim Tate and Jim Stone are going to do a brief presentation. Then there's going to be an update on the Analysis of Economic Cost of Invasive Species, Chuck O'Neill, Ship Bright and Marilyn Leland represent that. Lori Williams on the GAO recommendations. NISA reauthorization, we'll have a presentation from you all on that.

Short updates on FICMNEW and ANSTF here and then an opportunity through the members forum which should be here and I apologize it's not for you to add any comments or anything that has occurred to you over the time that somehow didn't get brought up. Nelroy Jackson is going to facilitate that part. Once again, public comment which Randall will facilitate. Then we will close and nail down something about the future meetings and agendas. We will make sure that we have a summary of the agreements that were through this meeting and adjourn by 5:15 p.m.

Everybody okay about tomorrow then? Okay. Of course, agendas are very flexible so if we find some things go faster than intended, we'll move right on to the next. If we need to make room for something that turns up, we'll do that.
I'm just very quickly going to give you the broad picture of what Wednesday is as I understand it. If you are going to attend, please sign up. Meet in front of the hotel between 7:45 a.m. and 8:00 a.m. The intent is to leave by 8:00 a.m. on a bus for Patuxent Wildlife Refuge where you will have approximately a two hour presentation on invasive species and from there, go to have a tour of a ready reserve ship in Baltimore, returning to the hotel by 4:30 p.m. If you intend to go on that and you also intend to leave town, you need to make your plans accordingly since as you know time can sometimes have strange things. On a bus, that means there's something called rush hour.

Some ground rules, we never have a meeting without ground rules or objectives. We quickly just remember that you come from many different places and it helps if you will be respectful of the differences that you quite naturally have. It seems to me that most of these meetings have been like that but of course you're going to look for some common ground.

Don't only look for the things that you disagree about because of your differences. If you want reach consensus on things, you're going to have to look for the things that you agree on. If you are
going to challenge each other's ideas, of course you will want to do that constructively. No calling each other stupid.

Listening. No side conversations. It's very hard once that begins and as the facilitator I will try to remind you and that includes members of the public or the audience sitting on the side. Once the side conversations begin, that's very hard for others to hear. When you speak, be brief and specific if you can so that we have time to get everyone in.

The next one, identify yourself for the recorder Rebecca tells me that it's not absolutely because she has done a chart. In the past we have always asked you to say your name. But the way the microphones are spread around, you are going to have to help each other dragging them or moving them or do something. I'll leave that up to you. But you will need to speak into the microphone. That's obviously going to be an issue.

What we have done in the past in order to recognized is turn your name tag this way. That has helped a lot to make sure that we see you and you don't have to exhaust yourself with your arm in the air. Of course, please keep your sense of humor since life is short and/or long depending on what's going
on. Otherwise all known rules of civilized behavior continue to apply. Please check your cell phones so they are not ring-a-ding. Please come back timely from things. We need to have a quorum so we can make a very ambitious agenda. Any other ground rules we need? Everybody all set? You're on.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: That would be the green button. Any other questions about the format of what we're going to do for two days? Seeing none, we introduced ourselves but if you came into the room after you would have found out who we are, would you please stand and say just simply your name and affiliation so we know who you are. We'll start over here in the corner.

MS. MAYS: Nicole Mays, Northeast Midwest Institute.

MR. CHAMPION: I'm Jonathan Champion, research assistant with Northeast Midwest Institute.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Someone else came in right here in the corner. Elizabeth snuck in.

MS. SKLAD: I snuck in. Elizabeth Sklad, USGS.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: If you are working for Ann Bartuska, you will be involved. Anybody back here that's not been introduced yet? Over in the corner.
MS. HAYES: Deb Hayes, USDA.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Anyone else?

MR. JOHNSON: Gary Johnson, National Park Services.

MR. BOWERS: Michael Bowers, NSF.

MS. LYONS: Libby Lyons, NSF.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Oh, yes. Jim, do you want to? You didn't exactly sneak in but do you want to tell us who you are?

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: I'm Jim Tate, the Secretary's Science Advisor at the Department of Interior.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Good to see you here. Anyone else that we've missed? Chris came in late. Tell them who you are.

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: Chris Dionigi. I'm the Assistant Director for Domestic stuff at the National Invasive Species Council.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And Kelsey has been going in and out of the room. This is Kelsey Passe. If you do not know her, I'll be very surprised. Does that take care of introductions? Everyone knows what we're doing and we're ahead of schedule. I should retire right now. We are now going to have an update by the ISAC officers on what we've been doing since
the last meeting. I'll start just be simply saying at
the Yellowstone meeting which still ranks as one of my
favorite all-time meetings, I'd go to more if they
were all like that.

Two issues came up. We agreed to send
letters and those letters have been sent. One was on
the cross-cut budget issue supporting those Federal
efforts. The second was more focused on some problems
that we were seeing at Yellowstone and how they were
handling some of the invasive pests issues
specifically related to boats coming in from all over
and bringing in who knows what. Those letters went
out and I trust you have seen copies of them. I will
then turn it over to Nelroy who is going to summarize
the general activities of your steering group.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Nelroy Jackson. The
steering group met by teleconference on July --
September 13, and October 17 to review the June
meeting and plan the agenda for the November meeting.
In the meantime, we tracked the progress of letter
writing and kept in contact with NISC's staff. I made
a trip in September when I touched bases with some of
the ISAC members but probably more importantly had the
opportunity sometimes with other people to visit the
with Dr. Tate and Dr. Butler, two of the principals
and to emphasize the desire of ISAC to get some administrative support within this in place with this staff and also to get the necessary staff for it and to get real progress on implementation of National Management Planning. The sixteen returning members of ISAC had a very strong desire to leave a lasting legacy since there were at that time only 17 months left in our tenure.

I also had the opportunity to visit with Scott Cameron on progress in the cross-cut budget issues. Faith Campbell and myself met with Jason Freihage and Gary Reisner of the Office of Management and Budget to get a better appreciation of their priorities in relation to invasive species. We did keep in touch with a number of ISAC members.

Sometimes I feel as if I work for Lori Williams. But one of the things as steering group chair that I would like to ask is, for future meetings when Kelsey sends out a request and say are you coming or have you made airline and hotel reservations, please respond in a very timely manner. If we all respond in a timely manner, she can get it done efficiently and quickly. If she has to touch things about six different times, it takes a lot of time and that is time which she could be devoting to other
duties. So on behalf of Kelsey and she didn't ask me to do this commercial but it's an important issue.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Very good. Anything from other officers? Ann (Bartuska) is going to be a few minutes late so we won't have her contribution. Any questions then from the group on what your officers did since the last meeting? Anyone not understand why Nelroy remains the most dangerous person in North America?

MS. ADLER: Will there be an opportunity for Nelroy to tell us in more detail about the meetings with OMB and with Jim Tate and others?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: You could do that either privately or if you want to we could do it on one of the member's report.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Frankly, you have time to do it right now if you want to spend a few minutes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Which one do you want first? The one with OMB, it's a little bit difficult because there were other reports that will coming up in more detail but with OMB, the take-home message I think that we got is that from their perspective the implementation of a cross-cut budget initiative was critical to getting better focus and funding both within the Executive and Legislative
branches.

The efforts the ISAC Budget Committee will talk in more detail about but it was very clear that we made an impression on Jason at the Yellowstone meeting. In fact after that meeting, there was a letter from the director of OMB that went out to all the NISC Council members saying that the cross-cut budget process is supported by OMB. Unfortunately we heard afterwards -- No. Back up. That letter went out to all the member agencies. Am I correct? The message that Faith and I got very clearly was that the cross-cut budget process was the mechanism to get a better focus on the invasive species issue and for more funding. Faith, did I capture that correctly?

MS. CAMPBELL: Yes.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: My meetings with Dr. Tate and Dr. Butler were both very positive because it showed the support of both the departments and the Administration as a whole on the invasive species issue. We were very pleased that at that point in time they were getting together all the principals had been named including the one from Commerce, Tim Keeney.

MS. BECH: That's right.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: I think at that time
the three principals were beginning a schedule of meetings. That was from our perspective critical to again bringing focus to the issue and moving forward.

I was very impressed with the personal commitment of Dr. Butler and Dr. Tate to the issue of the invasive species. I think that for us maybe unfortunately since then Dr. Butler has already changed assignments but he assures me that he will still keep an interest in invasive species. To my knowledge, the USDA has not named a lead person yet but that will be forthcoming. Anything else that I missed?

MS. ADLER: Yes, just a follow-up question. In the meeting with OMB, the indication that this the Administration approach to bringing focus to the issue, was that at the exclusion of other approaches that may be out there such as legislation?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: I don't think so.

MS. CAMPBELL: Allegra, neither Nelroy nor I particularly focused on legislation. We certainly didn't -- so I can't even answer that.

MS. ADLER: Okay.

MS. CAMPBELL: But the focus is definitely on cross-cut budget issue. One issue we did with that or discussed to some extent was the feasibility actually of coming with measure of it.
VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Measurable goals.

MS. CAMPBELL: Measurable goals that agencies can look at. I expressed my skepticism.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: I want to make it very clear. We did not discuss any numbers but just the principals and the measurable goals. Our understanding of this is that it's a pilot for where the whole government is going to be going sometime in the future.

MS. ADLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Any other questions or comments? Let's move to the next agenda which is the remarks from the principals. I would like to start by saying how much again we appreciate the direct involvement. It dramatically changes what we can respond to when we have that kind of access and thank you. Have you flipped a coin yet? Do you know who starts?

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: Jim just nodded in my direction. This is Jim Tate. He said I should get started first I guess. You are correct, Nelroy. We're interested in a renewed commitment. The renewed commitment comes from two important sources. One of course is the GAO report and its results in all the commitments that are required and recommended and
suggested in that report. It's going to be the focus of much of our on-going discussions in the next few weeks.

The second source of renewed commitment on our part is the need frankly to look at the staffing plan, fill vacant positions that have already been approved and to make sure that we have the team in place that can do the job and meet some of the commitments in the GAO report and other places.

Most importantly as I'm sure you know is we have the vacancy at the deputy director of the Invasive Species Council for International Affairs. If there is anything I can say about the last two weeks is that I have a new appreciation for the need to work on the international end of things. I just returned on Friday from two weeks in Santiago, Chile at the CITES meeting which I consider a considerable success. We had some of the NGOs state that this was a new era for CITES commitment and involvement by U.S. Government.

I'm very pleased to say that I think also we succeeded very well in some very tough issues from Ivory Trade, Patagonian toothfish, the whales that Japan wanted to move from Appendix I to Appendix II. We made several successes there. Mahogany can't be
left out. Thank you, Faith. I knew you'd shake your head at me if I didn't mention Mahogany. If I have one message from the Department of Interior, we have renewed interest and emphasis here.

ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: Thank you. Jim Butler with USDA. I'll just make a few general comments and it's already been shared by the Chairman, Secretary Veneman asked me to become the Deputy Under Secretary for the Farm and Foreign Agriculture Service about two weeks ago which I obviously accepted.

In the conversation, I asked for about a couple of my departmental responsibilities and invasive species was one of the issues that I brought up. Her comment was the issue is very important. You need to visit with Under Secretary Hawkes about what his wishes are but please do not let that issue "fall through the cracks" and stay involved to be sure the transition goes smoothly which I intend to do both from a personal interest and with our departmental liaison.

Some general things I've really learned are that I've enjoyed the relationship with the committee and the staff and all of those in the room who have helped me come "up to speed" with this issue. It is very important, no question about that.
think the ISAC Committee, the new members, are still maturing. I think you are developing some great strategies to help lead and to help direct us in our decisions. At the same time, I would encourage you to gain some focus.

Dr. Tate talked about a staffing plan. Lori and I discussed the staffing plan. One thing that I think you desperately need is a communication plan. You'll have the opportunity with recent elections to communicate to some folks who maybe aren't familiar with issue the way that all of you in this room are. So I would just ask you to consider that. I know that is a key staff position and ask you to consider that as a committee in the future.

There have been two hearings, one of which I was involved with as well as Dr. Tate a few months ago. The Chairman of the Agriculture Sub-committee, Mr. Goodlatte, chaired that committee and there were various members of Congress in attendance. Many of you in the room provided us with some great visual aids for that hearing. I think it was very well received. I have heard very positive comments from people on the Hill about what they learned at the hearing not only in the oral testimony about watching us get the answers to some difficult questions and be
"embarrassed in public" which is always fun but more importantly from the exhibits that were there and the enthusiasm that was shared by the NGOs, the government agencies, that were in and around those exhibits. I heard numerous comments from staff on the committee about the progress. Again that is one form of communication that I was hearing just last week that I'm sure could be discussed in more detail throughout the meeting.

I have visited with Dr. Tate and with Lori about a suggestion that I am going to offer the committee and that is for one of the three departments to have a general counsel representation at the future committees. At times, I think the committee tends to drift "out of bounds" and does not quite have the focus that you need to stay within the playing field. In my past life in roles where I've served on USDA advisory committees, it was quite often custom to have a general counsel member there to say excuse me we think you're off the playing field. I think that might help you maintain some focus with the committee.

I think it might help you set a crisp agenda.

You have a great facilitator that's helping us get through the activities but as you look at the issues that are important, you vacillate
between what I consider to be policy questions and policy roles and the implementation plan and the tasks that have been set out before you. I think we, the Federal Government, are asking you to assist us with those direct tasks.

I'll have comments about the OMB report and the cross-cut budget a little later in the day. It's been my pleasure to be involved with you. I'll be here through about middle afternoon today and look forward to interacting with you individually. The three agencies that I'll be representing in the Department of Agriculture are closely akin to invasive species: the Farm Service Agency which as you know has offices in almost all the counties across the United States and they deal with such things as conservation, reserve programs, etc.; the Foreign Agricultural Service and in my mind invasive species certainly deals with trade and with the international issues that Dr. Tate just referenced; and the Risk Management Agency which in some ways also deals with invasive species.

As we look at my background in nature and the ranching business, how do we help alleviate the risk of those people that are out there trying to make a living in agriculture and an associate of that might
be crop insurance? That might be some risk management tool. I do think that invasives and the weed issue, etc. could be dealt with through the Risk Management Agency. Even though I may have primary responsibility with the department or invasive species, I'll be very closely associated with it in my new role.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Very good and thank you. Questions for either Dr. Butler or Dr. Tate? Some things came up there in that discussion. Anybody want to ask a question or respond to that?

MR. DICKERSON: Bill Dickerson. You mentioned about general counsel attending the meetings and try to help us focused. Do you have any idea which agency that might come from or is there one here at this meeting or is that just a suggestion?

ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: I don't think there's one here at the meeting but in our principals meeting, Dr. Tate and I have generally talked about that. Again that's not to be threatening in nature but I do think it helps keep focused. Just having had experience in past committees, it did help us keep the focus. It isn't a requirement I think in any of the three departments and in fact all three of the departments if in fact this suggestion comes into play should rotate. I don't think one department should
always have the counsel present.

MR. DICKERSON: And I don't perceive it as a threat. I perceive it as a very constructive act.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Since the issue of focus has come up many times, anything that could help shape focus has to be a good thing until we don't like it one day of course. Any other questions? Comments?

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: If I could comment on that question. The Executive Order requires the Department of Interior to play a role in staffing and supporting physically the presence of National Invasive Species Council and also makes similar references to the ISAC. We of course depend upon and greatly appreciate the participation of the other two co-chair agencies. Personally I'm inclined to look for that kind of a rotating general counsel if that's the way we decide to go.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: He wants to hire one of your attorneys. Do we have any kind of an update on the international position since that came up? The answer is no. Yes.

MR. LUKENS: Just a question about the focus of the ISAC. It was my impression that we were indeed but not necessarily expected to but not expected not to comment on policy issues. Is policy
in terms of making recommendations for agency policy
off the table for ISAC at this point?

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: Once again I won
the coin toss here. This is Jim Tate. Agency policy
is not off the table in the form of advice from
Invasive Species Advisory Council. After all, you are
an advisory Council. We would be foolish to ignore
your advice. The procedure by which each of our
individual departments however takes in advice and
puts it to work undoubtedly varies bureaucratically
among us. I think that sometimes we need to make sure
that the individual charge of our individual
departments is properly addressed. I think that's the
direction we're heading.

ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: I don't believe I
can add anything to that, Ron. Again I think that's
another reason to possibly have a counsel
representative from the agencies at the meetings in
the future.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Does that answer your
question, Ron?

MR. LUKENS: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Ship.

MR. BRIGHT: Ship Bright. Jim knows a
great suggestion regarding communications director.
Is there a communications director slotted within the ISAC, within this Council and is that a position that's open and is absolutely you're getting out a message critical?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Maybe the most efficient thing for me to do is I'm up next with the Executive Director's report. I'll just go through a little bit where we are in terms of some of the staffing questions quickly before I move into that and then I'll just handle them all at once. I think that will be good and then Jim can comment also.

I did have one comment on this. I think what Dr. Butler is referring and not to put words in his mouth but my feeling is ISAC is most efficient and helpful to us when it stays on what we all put in quotes "big picture issue." I think the times when it might lose focus and maybe I should jump in and I don't always is starting to zero on particular issues that are primarily within a single agency. Not that those can't be relevant and that we shouldn't discuss them but the Council is a coordinating body. We have a plan to implement that's primarily cross-departmental and cross-agency.

Sometimes you can get mired in or anyone can mired in what's going on in a particular issue and
it goes over into the oversight realm. I don't think we should get fixated on it but it's just to keep us focused on the big picture where I think you all have so much to contribute and where the Council is most effective or not really that effective dealing with a single issue, a single agency, very detailed implementation issues. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Allegra.

MS. ADLER: Those comments all make sense to me except that I think that ISAC can also contribute by identifying where the limiting factors may be and focusing on those and bringing some pressure on them. So I hope that that isn't going to be excluded as an opportunity for us to provide advice and contribute to the process.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Other comments and questions? Jim.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: Allegra, would you giving an example what you consider a limiting factor?

MS. ADLER: Well for example if there is a particular agency that isn't performing its role in a concerted effort and that agency's actions or inactions therefore becomes a limiting factor to the overarching objective being achieved. Then I believe it is in the purview of ISAC to point that out and try
to find ways to break the log jam that may exist there. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Other comments? Questions? Once again thank you very much for participating and Jim Tate, will you be around longer than Jim Butler?

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: I'll be around.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Okay. What we are going to do is we're going to change the schedule just a little bit and I didn't mean that in any big sense.

I was thinking hours not careers. The break was scheduled but we're going to let Lori go ahead and start with the Executive Director's discussion and then we'll break at some more appropriate time in the middle of that. Lori.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Maybe what I'll do is go through some of the general issues on the staff and then before we get into implementation and the plan issues, that might be a good time for a break. First of all as many of you know, we've had a pretty busy number of months since Yellowstone. One of those things is we've moved to a new location. It's very near here, just a couple of blocks. I think in the end this is going to be a very positive move for us.
If you have worked for the government for any period of time, you rarely get new building, new furniture and new everything. Everything is new in this building. We also have room for three detailees/interns at all times. We have some additional meeting space that can be made available. It's all going to be very positive.

It's been very disruptive since September 9th when we moved. As you know if you tried to call us, we had problems forwarding the phones. We won't go through it all. So we really apologize. We have always had problems with e-mail and of course we had additional problems with e-mail.

It looks like all of those things are worked out and we're going to move towards getting everyone here an update on the list service every two weeks of our activities because we do a lot of regular reports now for the Secretary of Interior and others. I'm assuming you don't want all of that but we can boil those down about every two weeks. So the first report you should receive is the first week of December. Again if you are not receiving, we really are trying to figure out how our list service is working so we may do one more test on that.

All of that is preceding a pace. We are
short staffed right now. We have a number of vacancies, all the vacancies that we had June. We are taking this opportunity to look at a full staffing plan which Dr. Tate talked about. I think in the end again this is going to be a good thing because we're looking at in the immediate term filling our vacancies and that would be our Assistant Director for International and including enhancing those activities. What we are looking at is making the Assistant Director for International also coordinate the prevention issues since they are so closely associated. I think that will be a good fit and spread the workload more evenly.

We're going to fill a long vacant secretary's position so that will enable Kelsey besides trying to three jobs, she'll only have two jobs. One of her major focus of course will be organizing these meetings but that will make her time more available to do some other work for you all during the year because we'll have a secretary for the first time. We're hoping that will be approved very soon.

Then the third position will be a program analyst position which was Stephanie's position because this is just vital to getting out all the
reports. What we're looking at is to approve several more positions. This is something like Dr. Tate commented on what one possible position would be an education outreach partnership person who would be in charge of the communications aspects. That's fairly strongly supported by the three co-chairs. We think it's a very important position. Then the one additional position that we are considering is a chief scientist for the Council staff who would specialize in research and those types of issues.

One thing that is coming along right now is because we have this additional room for detailees is that we're bringing on a detailee from APHIS USDA. He's here if he wouldn't mind standing up, Dr. Jim White. He's worked with APHIS for a number of years in the extremely complicated area of biotechnology. He knows a lot about plants and many other issues and is going to help us out on information management issues, possibly some screening, risk assessment issues and definitely help lead our research group which needs some support. He's going to be on board for about the next eight months. I encourage you to get to know him because he's helping to fill a number of vital needs at this very moment and he's just coming on board this week.
We're also thanks to Dr. Butler starting to bring on several interns from sequentially in time from Texas A&M. They have a really good program down there. Chris Dionigi if you want to talk to him on the break went down there and selected a spring intern and a summer intern. This will be really positive for us.

I also want Phil Andreozzi to just stand up because he helped us during the summer and early fall on our cross-cut budget as Presidential Management intern from USGS. He was absolutely critical as those of you know who have received an e-mail lately on the cross-cut budget. He's really helpful to us on those efforts. So even with our staff shortages we are taking advantage of a number of possibilities.

Wendy Jastremski, is she here? She's been helping us, a Presidential Management intern from EPA on our NEPA issues and that was terrific this summer. You'll be hearing her give a short presentation on NEPA later today. So that is where we are on some of the staffing issues and how we are dealing in the near term with moving to fill a number of these vacancies and we have a vital staff in the longer term.

I continue to think that it will be really
important to have detailees from the other departments. They are a really strong link. It's a way for us to not throw the staff very much and still deal with some of these critical issues.

One of the things that I think will continue to be the case is that the staff is going to be providing key coordination. We are increasingly going to try to get leadership on the various sub-committees from ISAC members, from members of the agencies, from ANSTF and FICMNEW to take the lead on actually getting the implementation plan meetings going and on track because you are the people who will be providing the key recommendations and the agencies are the people who will be them out and we are going to hopefully providing some excellent coordination.

But the more things fall back on us, a small staff, the more they can get delayed and we're going to try to move increasingly away from that. So I'll make a couple remarks about that when I talk about the progress under the plan. But I just wanted to mention that. As we move forward and staff up, we'll still be looking at what our roles should be and getting other people to step up to the plate on these critical issues because you're the ones that are really going to make it happen. Do you want to take a
break now?

MS. PASSE: The break won't be here until ten.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: We can put the break in.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Do you want to break for questions? We can break for questions. We won't break now.

MR. BUCK: Lori, could you talk about the combination of the international position with the prevention function? Those are two pretty huge areas for one staff member to carry.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Yes, it is. But right now the way the issues were divided, technically the Assistant Director for Domestic Policy had every issue except for international. So I think you have to realize that this is a very small staff. At least with this, you would have the international assistant director deal with prevention, coordinate not do all, but coordinate prevention issues and international cooperation issues.

That would still leave Chris with responsibility over controlling management, early detection, rapid response. Right now unless we get a science person, research, information management, you
can go down the list. Right now we don't also until we got a communications person, he would technically be also coordinating education outreach. We just have to have a way on the bigger policy issues to divide up a pretty large workload more efficiently. I also think international aspects of prevention are so critical that it's a good thing.

MR. BUCK: Just from a state perspective (Inaudible.)

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Nelroy.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Lori, could you confirm please that a portion of staff's time is going to be devoted to ISAC? There are a couple of things. I looked at David Lodge and the fiasco we had last fall of just getting letters out. Similarly this year with things like getting letters out and setting up teleconferences and just being able to help the work of the task teams. Could you just confirm that one of the positions is going to be partially assigned to that?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: First of all, I think that it's important to realize Kelsey already does spend a tremendous amount of time dealing with the ISAC meeting. It's just that the logistics of the meetings, the travel and all of those things have come
first.

One of the things that I think is going to be the responsibility of all of the coordinators is to help ISAC with setting up conference calls and all that. That's not ever going to fall on just one person. If we get our secretary's position approved which we are hoping to very soon, then that will free up additional time for Kelsey and frankly all the staff to spend more time dealing with some of the conference calls. One of the things I think we could discuss in the breakout sessions is how to deal with conference call costs and those types of things.

Increasingly I think it would be more efficient for the Council to just take on that role. But it is something to discuss and one thing that has been suggested is just to have a particular conference line that's available to the Council and then we can farm that out to all the different groups. So I think there are some ways to make that more efficient without even necessarily devoting our staff time to it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Yes, and we need a little sequence here because I don't know if Chris is trying to respond to a specific issue or something in general. Should we try Jim and then Chris? Gary, is
that okay with you or are you trying to respond to something earlier?

DR. BEIL: (Off microphone.)

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: We trust you to hold that thought the longest.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: Just to say that one of the things that Nelroy and I talked about was exactly the need for ISAC to have some one person that they could respond to on the staff that would respond to them and would be their main contact. We agree on that. It's a question of whether that person is the education outreach person, the policy analyst, secretarial staff, where it goes. We don't know yet. But yes, you have our commitment.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Chris.

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: Just a quick comment. While this is no substitute for a full time communication and outreach person, the two interns that we are getting one in spring and one in summer both have backgrounds in communication and can help us out at least for that time period.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Gary.

DR. BEIL: Gary Beil. Going back to your comments about the international position and other areas that the ISAC is working are extremely critical
and so on but I think we do need to turn up the heat on the international side, so I'm curious as to how quickly you expect to be filling that position. What's the time line for it? Any comments along how soon we can see that happening?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I think I can say it's our first priority but it's still pending before the Department of Interior for approval.

DR. BEIL: One quick question. How long does that normally take? Are we talking days, weeks, months, or years?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I certainly hope not. I certainly hope weeks or at least a month.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: Gary, it's not fair of us to demand that of Lori when it sits firmly on my desk. The answer is I have broached it with the powers that be, the staffing plan and we're getting comments back right now. It's just the matter of how quickly we can make the wheels of bureaucracy move.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: At least we found the lap. Other questions or comments in this particular area? We have deemed now a very good time for us to take a break. We will reconfigure in 15 minutes. Just for your information, Nelroy meant fiasco in a loving, warm sense. Off the record.
(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 9:58 a.m. and went back on the record at 10:16 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: On the record. We will pick up a bit where we left off. Lori is going to continue with her Executive Director's report. Lori.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: All right. We're going to move away from some of the staffing issues. Anyone who has further questions on that can catch up with myself or Dr. Tate later. Dr. Tate has to go to a meeting and he'll be back in a couple of hours.

I'm going to move towards progress on the Management Plan. What I'm going to do today is I can't possibly cover all of the actions items and we're going to have a lot of the reports from almost all the task teams are going to have a break-out and report. We're going to have specific agenda items on early detection and rapid response and a number of different issues like that.

So I'm going to do two things with this report. I'm going to do a very broad overview and you have a handout that can help you with this that Chris prepared. He can explain that if there are questions. It was a handout, not in your books. It's this
confusing but actually very simple chart. It should be in your little pile that was at your desk. What it does is list the action item number and the Plan sections. L&C is Leadership and Coordination. It's fairly obvious.

Then what Chris said and he can explain this a little bit if there are questions but I think it's a good idea. He divided up the action items into a couple other categories discreet and on-going. There are a number of different action items that even after we've completed, they don't really end. They are on-going responsibilities. This complicates things a little bit but it's a good thing to remember in terms of workload and how the Plan sets up a dynamic process.

An example of this would be one action we have completed but it's not a discreet action is establishing a website steering committee. That website steering committee has been established. It's met several times. In fact, I think some people from the National Agricultural Library (NAL) are going to be here a little bit later with some flyers about that or tomorrow to talk about the website steering committee help guide with NAL a redesign of the home page to make the "www.invasivespecies.gov" easier to
navigate. They have completed that but the website steering committee still exists. So it's an on-going activity that doesn't end. So that's the discreet versus on-going column.

Then we just have four items done, completed, established. That's for the on-going items. It could be completed but it's on-going. Started and not started. What we've done, GAO did this somewhat in the report but didn't do it for all of their categories but we've also split all the 57 action items. Many of them have subparts. So you actually end up with 86 separate actions under the Plan. All 86 are represented on this chart so it does give you a brief snapshot to look at.

Obviously I'm not going to through all these. What I'm going to do is talk a little bit about an overview where we are and then concentrate on some of the leadership and coordination issues some of which have not been started or just been started. There have been a questions and urgency by some of the ISAC members and others on making some progress on those. So I'm going to go over some of those in a little more detail. Then if questions come up for the breakout sessions we can also deal with any of the other ones that you're interested in. There are a
number of departmental representatives here too so I won't have to ask all the questions.

Of the 57 action items as I've said with subparts, you end up with 86. Of these about 14 percent can be said either completed or established for the on-going. About almost 70 percent have been started or begun and 20 percent have not yet been begun. This does give you a useful snapshot I think that's hard to follow I know on those launder charts that we provided in the past.

In terms of leadership and coordination, I'm going to cover three of those items. The first is the oversight mechanism, Action Item No. 1. I don't think these action items were done in order of importance but this certainly is one that is important and we have just begun in the last month and a half to move on this. The oversight mechanism is to oversight of coordination and implementation of the Plan. I stress this but it's not necessarily oversight of individual agency actions again that I talked about earlier but oversight of how departments and agencies are doing in complying with the Executive Order and completing actions under the Plan.

What we have done on this is at least the initial draft of an oversight mechanism is going to be
handled by the policy liaison group. That's the level of Rebecca and Dean and others from other departments. A number of the people are here. We think this should be a fairly high level group from all the departments who are involved in determining what the oversight mechanism should be.

We have Gordon Brown with DOI who took a shot at putting together a strawman document. We discussed this at our policy liaison meeting and that has been distributed. So we do have a draft and that's significant progress. It needs to be revised, circulated. This will probably have to go through legal review in the various departments but our goal is to finish this up and have either a draft to present to ISAC for comment or if we can distribute that between meetings something that's approved by the March ISAC meeting. I think this is achievable. So we'll be moving towards that.

Action Item No. 2, the dispute resolution mechanism, there will be some discussion of this later today. I think this is a slightly more difficult and complicated one to come up with but again we've adopted a similar procedure and to the extent that we can move it on a similar timeline for the dispute resolution mechanism. The policy liaisons will take
the first shot and then it will go through a broader group, the legal review and the Council. There is not strawman document.

What we are doing right now is coming up with a list of parameters, what disputes. Some of the terms in this section are very broad. Whatever dispute resolution mechanism we come up with has to be within the power granted to the Council under the Executive Order. So we need to lay out exactly what types of disputes we're going to be looking at, what the mechanism is going to be to resolve those disputes, maybe even mentioning particular objective environmental resolution firms that we might be working with. So we're in the process of putting that together and that is probably in a slightly slower timeframe. We're still hoping to complete by the next ISAC meeting or at least have a draft for you by the next ISAC meeting in early March.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Do you want some questions now or later?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: It doesn't matter.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Let me ask you a question then. Randall Stocker. You are mentioning dispute resolution and something that would have to be within the mandate of the Council for it to be
effective. Aren't there already models? Don't agency already solve jurisdictional disputes under some other mechanism? Couldn't this piggyback on something that was already in place? Doesn't the President decide some of that?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: That's very true. I mean that's some of the things that we'll be looking at. One of the things that a lot of agencies have done work with alternative dispute resolution. Some departments already have a person that's devoted to that. The Interior Department does. I'll be working with that person and some of the other alternative dispute resolution people in the other departments. Again I think there are models out there. Whether there's an interdepartmental model that again jurisdictional disputes are usually solved by OMB, CEQ or the President. That is something that we'll need to look at.

I think the other thing that the policy liaison discussion brought up is when is it efficient and effective for the Council to get involved in a dispute. I'll just say that one of the things that we're going to shy away from is disputes already in litigation. We're really going to shy away if not completely avoid disputes that are already in
litigation.

I think one of the challenges will be to identify disputes before they get to that state where it's already in formal litigation or some other adjudicatory process. Where we can come in and create a forum and have some objective discussion and a report from the Council on where the different parties are and have that help move things to a solution before you get into litigations.

What I am a little concerned about is people expecting this particular vehicle to solve the kind of problems that we are hearing about that are literally already in litigation. So those are some of the parameters we're going to lay out so that people are clear on what disputes we're going to try to deal with and what we are not. This is productive and doesn't take a tremendous amount of time from the Council and it's still possible to reach a resolution because it hasn't gone into the courts or to Congress or to something else.

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: I'd like to make a comment at the end.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Tell us when we've gone just past that.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Any more questions on
that? One thing this afternoon that would be helpful to us to hear what the expectations of the advisory committee are for the dispute and jurisdictional resolution process. Then we can factor those in as we develop it.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON:: Nelroy. Lori, that begs the question though of who deals with disputes that have already gone through litigation and also can't we learn from some of these to set the mechanism to prevent them in the future.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I think definitely. They won't be discussed but I just think that for the Council to come in and take up a dispute that's already in litigation and people expect it to solve that issue, that might be a faulty expectation. Of course we can look at disputes that have reached that point and say okay how could they have been dealt with earlier in the process or where are some similar issues coming up that aren't yet to that extent that we can deal with in a proactive way which I think is where the Council would be more effective.

Another items that I have always considered extremely important and we've had some staffing issues dealing with it is to look at doing analysis of the regulatory and legislation that's out
there on invasive species to identify possible gaps to
look at some enforcement issues things that are
slipping through the cracks. What we are doing at
this point is the National Agricultural Library hooked
me up with the National Center for Agricultural Legal
Research and Information, a very long name, but
Christopher Kelly heads that up. They are going to be
providing at the end of the year and the beginning of
next year what they are going to do is look at what's
already out there in terms of analysis and do a
complete search of a lot of the articles and
everything that we can find where analysis occurred on
invasive species laws and regulations and gaps and
provide that to a small drafting committee that we are
going to put together to draft the analysis of
invasive species authorities. So we are really going
to move towards trying to get this done by the end of
the summer.

The final item that I wanted to mention
and then I'll just highlight where I think some of the
task teams have been moving ahead and why I think some
of them have been effective in picking up standards
and some of them are still lagging behind. One is by
January 2003 we're going to have out a report, a
fairly extensive report with a lot of appendices on
where we are on the Plan.

A lot of it will model what we are talking about today, where we are on individual action items but we'll also have an overview under each section, leadership coordination, research or whatever, a bigger picture of review on where we think the Council is and a little bit on where it needs to go. I think this is going to be the backdrop for the update of the Plan.

Believe it or not, we do need to start thinking about that and looking towards an update of the Plan and getting ISAC's views on that. One of the things we don't have to do is completely reinvent the wheel in terms of the Plan but there are many areas we might want to look at as we move towards implementation on this action item is working and is worded correctly and this one isn't. Or these deadlines are realistic and we need to stick to them and these simply aren't. I think as the task teams work, it's not too soon to start identifying areas of where the Plan needs to go and also we'll be responding to the GAO recommendations on the Plan and getting their input on those. Those are the major areas that -- I'm sorry. Question. He wanted to comment on the very end so go ahead.
ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: Well thanks, Lori, I really appreciate the comment about the regulatory and legislative process and that analysis and one suggestion I'd have is obviously that's ongoing all the time through all the departments and again you may want to get general counsel to come in and just walk through the differences and the likenesses of the regulatory processes between the three primary departments that are involved here. That's really critical in my opinion.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Okay, the cross-cut of course is another item under Leadership and Coordination. You are going to hear a whole hour on that so I won't say a lot about that. I will say that it's been very exciting to start working on this but it's also been an education as to how much time and effort it takes both in terms of trying to get ISAC input and staff time and coordination time to put one of these things together. It's a real eye opener in terms of how much time it takes to complete some of the actions in this Plan. It was a little bit of a shock to our staff on how much time.

Phil Andreozzi really helped out but one of the things that we're going to be doing is starting much earlier in terms of the budget process and
getting in sync with the budget process because that was a tremendous problem. There was nothing we could do about it this year other than not do a 2004 cross-cut which we didn't want to do.

But it's going to be really important to move in a more deliberate way, in a way that's more in sync with all the agency departmental budget processes so that this works better. It's less painful to people. It's more consistent with the way their budget process works. So you are going to be hearing about a smoothing towards a cross-cut budget for 2005 almost immediately. We're going to start working on that in December. So just a warning but that's not going away after you hear the report today.

Just a couple of things on the task teams and the sub-committees and how they are functioning, one observation not shocking for those teams who have had really consistent participation and leadership from both ISAC and the agency, they are moving forward and they're moving forward at a pretty nice clip given everyone's schedules. I did want to highlight just a couple of those.

On early detection/rapid response, Barbara Cooksley has been very consistent, very flexible in terms of meetings and that's been really helpful. Of
course, Chris Dionigi has put a tremendous amount of work on that one. Pathways, again we've had a lot of participation from USDA, Jim Smith, Penny Creech. Faith Campbell has been very active from the ISAC side. Actually it runs quite a good meeting. So that group has really moved forward.

Information management, the departments and agencies are really interested and excited about this. It's just keeping track of what everybody's doing. Elizabeth Sklad has provided critical coordination on that. In our time of staff shortages, Tom Muir from USGS, Susan McCarthy, the National Agricultural Library people have been very active on that group. So that one has really functioned quite well. Dana Roth from the Department of State has taken leadership on the Federal team on the North American Strategy. So that's moving forward. That will report to the overall international committee from ISAC on their progress.

I just wanted to highlight a couple of those accomplishments of those teams. It's really important as you get e-mails from us, we got very prompt and detailed response on our cross-cut input from the budget committee in very short timeframes. But we haven't done as well in some of the other
requests for information and input.

I want to stress that if we can we need to get the baseline work in the committees. That's going to feed into the cross-cut. It's going to be really important to have that early detection/rapid response system set up before we can tell OMB exactly what we're going to do to fund it. So those things are really important. I hope we can get a little more input from both the Federal agencies and ISAC. I know that you have a million things to do but some of these things are moving along thanks to Allegra Cangelosi and others who are working the Hill very aggressively. Some of these things are moving along in Congress. To the extent that the Council wants to have input on them, we need to really get moving and of course I say that to our staff as well.

I think that really covers most of what I want to say and make some progress in the next year and frankly it probably will be after we staff up a little bit on improving our liaison and coordination with states. We just haven't done enough on that. Identifying and removing barriers to coordination among agencies or between agencies including sharing funding.

Again more and regular updates to the
ISAC. We put out a lot of reports now. It would be fairly easy. We'll probably be asking you to tell us when we are sending you too much this next year but we're going to be getting you more regular reports and activities as I said starting here in about two weeks. That's a very brief snapshot of where we are and mostly on the leadership and coordination issues. I will take questions on anything in the report. There will be an opportunity at a number of members' forums in the breakout sessions to deal with some of the individual issues. I didn't want to take much more of your time than that. Chris, you said you have something.

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: Chris Dionigi. Just a quick comment back on this chart that you have. Please consider that draft. It's simply my view of where those X's go in each of those columns. It's certainly nothing that's carved in stone and I would look for people to give me their advice whether things are characterized correctly or not.

However it's part of a larger effort I think which is developing some appropriate methods around this whole issue and how well we're doing. I think one way of doing it is this way. My feeling is in a complex issue like this no single metric is going
to be the gold standard. We're going to have to look at a number of different things to see if we don't get a reinforcing message around that. So any advice that you would be able to give us concerning how to develop appropriate metrics for how well the Council is doing or how well they are implementing the Plan, things like that would be very helpful.

Just one little tidbit in compiling some of the lists around people involved in the various task things just to give you an idea of volume, if you look at name by task team as a participation event, whatever you want to call that, we have about 275 of those. A lot of those people are the same so we're talking about not necessarily 275 individuals. But right now the total list of people by task team adds up to about 275. If you have advice on this chart in particular or other ways of measure in progress, I would be very happy to listen. Thank you.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: We are going to distribute that chart tomorrow morning. If you have forgotten which task team you are on, you'll be reminded.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Or if you haven't signed up yet, there will be opportunity to find a task team that you would like to participate with. We
don't want you standing lonely in the lobby while the rest of us are working diligently. Is your question about the chart? Very good. Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: Ann Bartuska. Just a little feedback, Chris, on your suggestion for measures. It seems like we already have a starting point with all the GPRA goals that are out there, some of which I think speak directly to the activities in the Plan but some others are probably soft. At least you could start there and use that as the basics for what you could hardwire for a measurement.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: If you don't know what GPRA is, you have to leave right now.

MS. BARTUSKA: The Government Performances Results Act. Some of us have this emblazoned on our brains.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Just for the fun of it because it's all going so swimmingly this morning, I'm guessing that when you had to decide whether to mark a box, let's look at number 27 for the fun of it, Detection - Taxonomy Experts, did you use is there anything that is now going on or you could have used the preponderance of evidence is that the whole process has moved forward? Just so we can know how you thought through this and recognizing that we all
might come up with slightly different things, how did you do it?

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: What I did was first I went through and tried to get a feeling whether the particular action item was an on-going thing or whether it called for a discreet final product. If it was a discreet final product, I simply said can I lay my hand on it. If I could, then it fits in the done category. If I knew of meetings that had been held, that there are task teams addressing it, if there are groups of people that were moving it forward, I might put it in the started category.

For the on-going things like steering committee if it had been established, then I put it in there. If I knew that there had been some progress whether directly instigated by the Council or not, I would put it in the started column. If I was just not aware of anything that had been started or if I knew that something had been tabled for a while, I put in the not started yet category. So that was just my way of dividing these things up as just a first flush on how to do that.

I think the other thing that's very true when you look down through this list is that all action items are not created equal. Some are very
straight forward and fairly easy to accomplish and others are very complex. So a simple counting of started and not started and whatever is not fully adequate.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Just one more thing. What Chris did is he just didn't just do this in the last two days. We prepared a lot of this information for the GAO. All the GAO ended up talking about was what had been completed. They asked us to say what had been started, where we made progress so we have that information and we updated that. But we haven't had a chance to send it out to everybody and get input on it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Diane.

MS. COOPER: Diane Cooper. Chris, how did you determine if there were programs on-going maybe not involving the Council but other groups and other states or regions? Did you solicit comments from folks? Did you send out notice? How did you determine that?

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: The way I determined it if I knew of something going on. I have not sent this out for comment or review at all. That's why I'm saying this is very much a draft document that is just my first stab at trying to get a handle on that. We
would look for input on that. I think once we do that we're going to see things shift around. I also think that it's important that there is progress. Whether Council staff made that progress happen or whatever doesn't matter. If I was aware of progress in a particular area, I would put it under work has begun.

MS. COOPER: I mean we do have all the charts that we prepared that we handed out. We do have detailed charts and what the departments and agencies have submitted to us that they've done under the Plan. We would have much more of an idea of Federal progress than we would individual states and we probably wouldn't have recorded that as progress.

Not because that's not but because it's a Federal Council and unless the Federal agencies are also involved, then it wouldn't be progress under the Plan if just one state was doing it. We wouldn't consider that progress for the Council. It's Federal. States may be involved but it reflects Federal progress.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Any other questions? Comments? Everybody happy with the progress to date? Did you happen to tally how many of these may have slipped a targeted completion date?

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: No, I hadn't. I think
one thing too that we have to remember when we look at the targetted completion dates that are in the Plan is that a completion date is not necessarily a priority indication. As the Plan was being developed, things that seemed more successful, things that were closer to being done, things that we thought we could get done in a near timeframe versus further out got a quicker date. Somethings where we had gotten advice that needed to do things more quickly got a quicker date. Things that we figured were more complex, needed a whole lot of work, would take a long time got a longer date but that doesn't necessarily indicate that.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Nelroy.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Chris, I'd like to disagree with you slightly in that I think that in some instances some of the ISAC input from the dates was very deliberate because we wanted to force and focus priority and activity on some of those issues. One of the concerns I have right now is that since a lot of the deadlines have been missed and that's due to a number of reasons.

I'm not pointing fingers in terms of deadlines that we missed. Maybe we should have at some point a discussion within ISAC as advice to the
Council as to how much effort should be given to rewriting the Plan versus implementing things that we've already been identified. This is also in response to some of the things that Lori has said and in my discussions with my friend, Dr. Tate. We have limited resources, limited times. What is the best way of focusing that? Is it in continuing implementation of what we have already identified or is it in spending time rewriting a plan? I remember some of the painful episodes in that process.

It's a proposal that needs to be discussed because Lori raised the issue of revision and I think it's something that ISAC needs to discuss and come to some kind of ISAC agreement anyway as a proposal to NISC. NISC determines what NISC is going to do.

MS. UPSTON: So would you put that in "flipchartese" please?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Without using "fiasco."

MS. UPSTON: I can't spell it anyway.

ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: Or the word "painful."

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Do I have time to think about this?

MS. UPSTON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: You have two days.
Everyone understands what we are after here.

MR. LUKENS: I could offer a suggestion. As I understand it, you are saying pretty much a revision of Plan versus continued Plan implementation or some combination.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: But we also want to include something about focus I think.

MS. BECH: A revision to focus not to start from the beginning is what we're talking about.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Allegra.

MS. ADLER: Another suggestion for flipchartese on that would be a review of Management Plan priorities including whether or not to undertake revision. It sounds like whether or not one of these deadlines represented a priority or a simple task is a question perhaps in the minds of some of the agencies. It might be useful for ISAC to review and indicate the priority items.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Is that in lieu of a revision or a type of revision?

MS. ADLER: I think whether or not to revise is one of those questions. How high a priority is that relative to some of the other things? At least that's what I'm getting from what Nelroy said.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: I think we're in
little bit of a Catch-22. I don't remember the
details but the Executive Order mandates certain
things. I think one of the issues is do we accept
work according to the mandates or do we ask for a
revision of the mandates.

MS. BECH: It's actually in the Executive
Order. It calls for an evaluation and review of the
Management Plan and to then reassess and revise
accordingly.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Other comments?
Questions? If we have none, then we can move directly
to the Members Forum. I want to pause though one more
time. This is fertile grounds. I'm a little
surprised no one has used the word "deck chairs" for
instances. But that's fine and you'll have other
opportunities to come to this topic I'm sure. Then we
will after that pause move into the members forum.

As you recall, we sent a message out
asking you to submit questions you had ahead of time
promising you a prize if you did so. One of us I
repeat has chosen to take advantage of that
opportunity. Gary Beil has submitted a question and
is guaranteed therefore the answer not only a yes or
no answer to his question but the answer he wanted.
You have a choice. Either the answer you wanted or a
chocolate-covered macadamia nut. Sent that over to him. I know what the answer to that is. Gary.

DR. BEIL: Gary Beil. My question that I had has to do with the efforts that are happening across the U.S. in various states and other government entities on invasive species. I was concerned and questioning what efforts are being made to coordinate those activities. What I'm seeing in my efforts through the seed industry and the seed trade is that there are a lot of issues that are coming.

There is a lot of redundancy that's happening. Some of that may be fine but there also appears to me to be a inefficient utilization of resources that are available to address a lot of these issues. Coordination could be very helpful. The view of a number of folks that there are times when some of these other groups and agencies have gone in directions that are not in the same direction as the ISAC and of the Executive Order. That is a concern. So my question was what is being done about that. What coordination is happening? How is that being implemented? What role can we play to assist in making that happen more effectively?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I'm going to let you answer that and remember that's a yes or no.
DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Okay. Gary, when I read your question on the e-mail, it also seemed to zero in on the list of invasive species that were being put out by a number of groups. So part of my answer goes to that. I think you heard that I don't think the Council is doing a good enough job in terms of coordination with the states. We had our hands full coordinating with Federal agency activities if you hadn't noticed. But this is an area especially in early detection/rapid response and in control issues we just need to do a better of.

I think one thing that's going to aid is that now over 26 states I think has some type of coordinating Council. It may just be for plants and aquatics that we may have to deal with a couple of different Councils but we're going to be developing and we have been developing something that Chris and others have been working on key contacts in each of the states that are doing coordination work in the states.

The idea would be that once a year to have a meeting of Councils and this is a frightening thought. I think we can do a lot more on that. In my meeting in Chicago and know Craig Regelbrugge was there and he might have some comments with that but I
know that the state EPCEES (PH) are cognizant of some
of the controversy around some of the lists that they
are putting out in terms of invasive plants. They
almost all seem to be working towards criteria,
issuing at least criteria on how they are naming these
different species because obviously even if they don't
have regulatory effect but it could have a chilling
effect on the species of the area.

The Council doesn't really control any of
the state activities in most of these areas but it is
something that we could consider looking at whether we
should put out some very general guidelines that I
think would have to be voluntary on behalf of other
groups on what would good criteria be for designating
invasive species and whether that would have to be
different for aquatic versus plant.

That's something I would open up to the
floor. But I know some others had a comment. I don't
know if there are some people from USDA that have
looked at some of the issues of this state list as
well and want to comment.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Ron.

MR. LUKENS: I can wait if there are some
other Federal agency responses to that but what I
wanted to say was that Michael and I have actually
talked about this quite a lot in terms of what states are doing and how better to coordinate state activities with regards to the National Plan and realizing that the Council is really focusing on the Federal agencies. That's fine but I think our concern is that without really good, strong coordination you do get the potential as Gary was pointing out for fragmentation and perhaps things being done redundantly. So we haven't really pursued it very much but Michael and I have gotten together and talked about this whole issue.

The other thing that goes along with that is a recognition that having regional capabilities is a very strong asset because very little of these things happen totally within the confines of a single jurisdiction. I guess I used the model of the regional panels under the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force as a really nice way to try to avoid fragmentation and bring the relevant state agencies together to try to address some of these issues.

What we talked about what our major interests were early on in ISAC, this was the one that I brought up from my perspective because I'm a state-based person. So I'm pleased to see that we still have the opportunity to talk about that particular
issue. I haven't resolved how we need to move forward on it. I actually talked to Lori a little bit about it as well. I just wanted to lay my concern on the table.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Donnie and then Dean and then Diane.

MR. DIPPEL: I think Ron hit a lot of the issues that I was going to talk about. Is there a possibility that we could do more involved surveys to the states? Is that allowed?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Not by us. The paperwork. We wanted to do this earlier and that's why we want to develop a state contact list and then we started working with the State Plant Board because we found out that Federal entities under the Paperwork Reduction Act are not allowed to do a survey that takes over three minutes or something. It's an interesting law. But we might be able to have to ISAC do a survey or one of the organizations represented here to do the survey. Otherwise we have to get special approval from OMB and do a Federal Registry notice. I don't want to go into it. It's just too frightening.

MR. DIPPEL: I know. We run into that all the time at the EPA also. Is there money somewhere or
a grant where we could possibly pay somebody to do the survey for us like under ISAC or something? It would be nice to build a website where you could identify all these different plants, whatever problems they are having their states. You could go to that state and see what this state is fighting instead of not knowing what we're up against in each one of the states.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I'm going to jump in real briefly and only touch on part of that. If you search you shall find. You can find much of that information then you can find people who have gathered it from many different states. So it's starting to evolve into some bit of a super structure. So I think much of what you just asked about you actually can find available now.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: One of the things we're going to get out to everyone, I couldn't order it in time for this meeting, is a copy of the Environmental Law Institute report. It goes state by state summarizing what laws and regulations are on the books. There's some contact information there. It's a really good resource. We will be mailing copies to everyone along with a hard copy of the GAO report if you didn't get that.

MS. UPSTON: What is that called again?
DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: The ELI report.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: All right. Dean.

MR. WILKINSON: I'd like to expand on something that Ron said that we've had the opportunity to do in the aquatic side by setting up our regional panels so that there is state representation on each of the panels as well as outside stakeholders I might say. Those regional panels have had the opportunity to operate semi-independently so that the Great Lakes Regional Panel when the states discovered that their laws didn't quite match, they actually got together as a state regional panel and set up model state laws for the people in the Great Lakes region.

There has been a little bit of follow-up in a couple of the state legislatures. Our Western Regional Panel just has developed a rapid response protocol. There are regional things that are actually happening in some of the aquatic areas. I'm not as familiar with the plant side of things.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Diane.

MS. COOPER: Diane Cooper. I think an important element of coordination is communication. So I just want to state that and it supports what we were talking about early in how important that communication and outreach person will be, that staff
person we were talking about.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Thank you. Allegra.

MS. ADLER: I would just back up Dean's comments and offer Northeast Midwest Institute resources to help implement a survey that's useful.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Do you have the money that goes along with that?

MS. ADLER: We would probably have some of it. It depends on what you are looking for but it is certainly consistent with what we're doing anyway with the organization around the legislation.

MS. UPSTON: So it that an offer, Allegra, that your group might support or underwrite a survey? Help? What would be the best verb?

MS. ADLER: We would offer to assist but we need to obviously know what the length and breadth of the task is before I can commit to doing it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And I'm assuming so correct me if I'm wrong that the leadership and coordination group probably will be discussing these types of things during their breakout session including state participation in some of these activities.

MS. UPSTON: Other questions? Are we ready to move on?
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Yes, Mike.

MR. BUCK: Your leadership and coordination group will be looking at the model for some draft legislation for a state cost-share program which I think will be the good vehicle to provide the kind of coordination and input of what we have been talking about. Hopefully we might be able to bring that forward to the full Council tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Okay, David.

DR. LODGE: I just wanted to offer a piece of information relevant to the discussion about a survey. If I understood the early comments correctly, the interest is in surveying what different states currently regulate or list by way of non-indigenous species. A good portion of the time of two people in my lab in the last two years has been devoted such a survey for aquatic species on both the plant and animal. We're in the final stages of getting feedback from all the states to make sure we have our data accurate. So we don't have anything to show you yet for that but it would be a shame to have redundant efforts starting up. So if there's interest, I can talk more about that.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Anticipated release, Dave, for that?
DR. LODGE: Can I take the fifth? I don't know.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: My calendar doesn't have an "um" on it.

DR. LODGE: I hope within the next months so what we compiled out to all the states, we followed up with phone calls and whatever so that we are trying to get some feedback from every state to make sure that what we've compiled is accurate. I think we have gotten the feedback from all of them now so we're in the position where we can actually start finalizing it. So I hope within the next six months or so.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Very good. Bill.

MR. DICKERSON: In preparation for a meeting last Friday, I did a survey of all 50 states just on the tasks that they had commissioned. Some states had submitted very comprehensive lists and some did not. But I suspect just like Lois had mentioned that parts of those lists are already available. It's a matter of coordination. The National Plant Board has taken the initiative to do some of that. I would say if maybe we had two or three organizations to work together and I think we could do something to get a pretty comprehensive list in short order. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Gary.
DR. BEIL: Just an additional comment. I know from conversations with other folks that are on the ISAC that many of us serve on our state invasive species types of activities. In Minnesota, we know have a committee and it's now a Council. But in my reports to them and they graciously give me time to report on the ISAC every time, that group was not even aware that there was a Management Plan. They were not even aware that this group existed and that there was a national effort to address that. So I think one good vehicle is through ISAC itself to get that information out of course but if there could be some kind of a communication that there is in fact an ISAC and that there is in fact a Plan because I know our group from Minnesota wanted to embrace it very quickly and support it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: All right. He wiggled faster than you did but I'll get there next. Chuck.

MR. O'NEILL: I think piggybacking on what that statement was and something Dean had said earlier and that is the aquatic nuisance regional panels that are established. In the Northeast and in the Great Lakes region what I'm not seeing is something equivalent to them to look at other invasive species. The ANS panels for the most part are doing a pretty
good job. There is some tension between freshwater and marine which direction should they be heading the strongest.

But I'm hitting the same type of thing. I've worked with both the Great Lakes panel and now I'm on the steering committee for the Northeast ANS panel. They for the most part were totally unaware that NISC existed let alone ISAC, let alone the Plan.

I was lucky enough to be able to for the next meeting of the Northeast panel get on to the agenda to talk about what's going on here but I really think we need to have a lot more outreach to those types of panels so that they know that there's a whole world out there besides the aquatic nuisances.

They are tasked specifically with aquatic nuisance species but we need to consider someplace down the road some way of being able to bring terrestrials and pathogens and everything to the same kind of table to get some coordination with those panels. I think we would find them receptive.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Let me interrupt for just a second. I've seen several of your talks in the last three months so I know many of us are using a slide that says "invasivespecies.gov" national plan and those nouns and adjectives to try to increase
awareness. I'm also guessing that we can make copies of that slide available to anybody who wanted it. We could do it if you don't have it yourself. Yes, throw it in the middle of your talk and do what we can as individuals to spread some part of the word.

MS. UPSTON: What's this slide called?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Mine just lists the "invasivespecies.gov." It just has a copy of the banner at that top of the webpage and then it has National Management Plan and NISC and ISAC or something just to remind me to tell the room. Actually what I do is ask them. My last meeting was a marine conference in Tampa for large aquarium type people and there were four people in the room who raised their hands every time I asked a question. Unfortunately it was Ron Lukens and Ship Bright. Chris.

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: Just a quick follow-up on that very point. While we don't luxuriate in a huge number of plans, we have some. So if you need a modest number of them for some meetings that you are going to you know very targeted sorts of things we can help you out with that. The other thing is that we do have some talks that we give when we go out and give a talk about the Management Plan and elements thereof.
So if you are doing things like that and there are some slides or PowerPoint presentations, we can help you with that. Let us know and we can e-mail it out to give you some of those resources because our ability to get to all of these meetings that you are talking about is pretty limited. We do quite a number of them but obviously there are gaps.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Ron.

MR. LUKENS: It's a good opportunity for me to thank Lori and her staff. We had a recent regional panel meeting for the Gulf Regional Panel under the task force and they provided me with a full PowerPoint presentation that I was able to provide to the regional panel. So that's another resource that if you are going to be talking about you may try to tap. It was very useful and everybody was real supportive of it. It is better if you can have an actual official person from the Council staff but in lieu of that it's nice to have that resource. Thank you, Lori.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Gordon.

MR. BROWN: Thanks, I'll try to be brief. When we began the Executive Order endeavor, we contemplated the idea of regional panels. At the time, the Council on Environmental Quality advised
against it and suggested instead that it be an item that would be reevaluated during the life of this whole effort and that it be reconsidered perhaps in some later form. In particular what they were looking for was an expression of interest from those regional entities in having the direct involvement of the Federal agencies in such efforts.

So one of the things that the advisory committee can do obviously is provide this linkage to stakeholders at that level, not only the state but also the regional levels. One of the ways that I think that we've under exploited it's been mentioned several times by Dean over the years is the use of access through the media which I think Jerry Jackson has exploited well and others too which basically is a statement in your local press of your involvement in this effort and emphasizing the broad reach and scope of it.

Then the other thing would be to utilize the scientific societies, the other professional entities that you're involved with separate from this group as a means of either publishing an article about this endeavor or at least communicating to them the way that we've talked about so that they know the existence of the Council and the advisory committee.
and access to the plan. I think you can hear that one of the items that we dealt with upfront in the writing of this was the policy overarching issue of leadership and coordination. How do you get everybody working on the full array of species?

We were quite differential to the pre-existence of strong groups, the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force, the FICMNEW and on the research side, the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources at OSTV. We wanted to utilize to provide an energizing opportunity for those groups to flourish and further their work. I think that the avenue for the Council that perhaps has not been exploited quite so much and could be emphasized in your deliberations would be working with the states in a way that could lead to these sort of regional entities.

We've signed an agreement with National Governors Association. We have not pushed them but the very thing that we wanted to work on with the National Governors Association was creating a network that would bring together the state level people who are interested in not only plants and aquatic species but also in emerging wildlife diseases, mammals and others that don't get top drawer treatment in the invasive issue.
So we were thinking upfront and we would like to continue the thing across the board, top down, bottom up connection point that would be utilizing the energy of the advisory committee not only in leadership and coordination obviously but on education and outreach and also on the information and data side by using the web as a way of providing lists with appropriate caveats so that people rather than being afraid of these things can see what they are, see what they are used for, see whether they are regulatory or not regulatory and whether they are merely for informational purposes. That really does get back to what Diane mentioned, this issue of communicating. I think that's the highest order of challenge of this whole endeavor which is how to communicate on a range of topic areas and utilize the connection points that we have to do that.

Long talk but I just wanted to say that if we get more resources from the Federal agencies to help you do communicating on your own, we'll be sure to let you know. I think the PowerPoint presentations and efforts of the website are opportunities that are so far under exploited.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Linda.

MS. SHEEHAN: I had a new question if
that's all right.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Absolutely. Although since we're at a breaking point, thank you for submitting it in writing and look how much attention you get to your issue when you send it in ahead of time and one macadamia nut. Linda.

MS. SHEEHAN: Craig said he wants to go before me.

MS. UPSTON: Is this your question, Craig?

MR. REGELBRUGGE: Craig Regelbrugge. Only because it closes on the last subject either than moving to another one. I just wanted to support what Chuck and I think Gordon said. Processing all of what Gordon just said is a bit like drinking out of a fire hose so I need a little bit more time on that.

One practical example of an area or a region where moving beyond the aquatics would be very helpful is the northeast. First of all, most of the states up there are the size of counties out west. Secondly, we're seeing just the greatest conflict and the greatest diversity and response in the states up there in the terrestrial plant area at least.

A case in point, New Hampshire has passed a very far-reaching law probably unenforceable but bands the number of plants that are in every one of
your grandmother's backyard. By the same token you have Massachusetts developing elaborate criteria for evaluating plants and deciding what should or shouldn't be considered invasive. These very different approaches are co-existing in a very small geographic region and not co-existing well from an industry perspective.

So I just want to add a little bit of support to the idea of figuring out a way to develop linkages among these state Councils. Coordinating those activities in the northeast is perhaps a very good place to try to do that.

MS. SHEEHAN: I wanted to get back to your comment about deck chairs for a second and Rebecca's reference to the Executive Order. I was just glancing at it again and it does say that it's supposed to be reviewed and updated bi-annually, the Management Plan. I think to have a process and a structure for incorporating a lot of these issues and comments and especially what came out of the GAO report, I was wondering is there schedule for reviewing that. I know it's not tomorrow that it needs to be updated but it is coming up.

MS. UPSTON: So the question is what's the schedule for the review.
MS. SHEEHAN: Yes.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: This is something that we've been discussing with the principals because obviously it is going to come up. We got some feedback from ISAC and the Federal departments that this was one deadline we didn't want to miss. Ideally we would have a new Management Plan come out in January 2003. That's two years after the plan was put in place.

I think there's a real sense that it was important to have some more progress on implementation. The date we were talking about in the principals' meeting that we decided on was not letting that flip over a year and that means January 2004. It means starting quite soon on revision of the plan.

Now one of the things if you look at the language in the Executive Order, it does not say rewrite the plan. It says revise and update. I do think that given the recommendations in the GAO report, given some of the difficulties that we've had meeting some of the deadlines, given the need to prioritize in a more realistic fashion, given the resources we have to work with, I've come around to it's time to look at that.

Also in the implementation team meetings,
if they have views that one or other action items are not workable, they can provide that input. Then we can start collecting input on the revision and update now while we're moving forward on implementation of the plan. So I think we need to come up with a schedule where those two things dovetail. That's my view and I think the view of the other principals. Dr. Butler is here from the USDA and Dean is here from Commerce if they want comment.

MS. SHEEHAN: Can I follow up? So is this something that you think we will be formally talking about at the next ISAC meeting in March?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I'm going to propose that, yes.

MS. SHEEHAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: You now have an opportunity to bring up the issue that you would like to and have the group reflect upon it. Are there any questions, suggestions, contributions, debates?

MS. CAMPBELL: I'm prepared to go in some logical order if people want to do it that way.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And the logic would be?

MS. CAMPBELL: By seats around the table.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: You've already been selected by the forces that be.
MS. CAMPBELL: Okay. Keeping in mind the discussion earlier about broad overarching, I am very concerned about what appears to me to be lack of enforcement. APHIS I know has a number of regulations. The Coast Guard has some regulations dealing with ballast water and other issues. There are probably other agencies. The Fish and Wildlife Service with -- species listed with the injurious wildlife.

In the APHIS case at least, I have been unable to find any information that they are rigorously enforcing the regulations that they have now in the case of wood packaging material anyway. I think that it may be an overlooked way of improving our prevention efforts. So my question would be is there a way that the Council staff can work with the agencies to get some data on the number of violations that they have detected in recent years, maybe five years, and the number of those violators who have actually faced a penalty, civil or criminal. I do not mean fumigating the shipment to kill the pests. I mean a penalty imposed on the violator and that would be for all the agencies that have mandatory restrictions on them.

MS. UPSTON: So let me sure I have it
correctly. Your interest is could the Council staff work with the agencies to identify the number of violations and --

MS. CAMPBELL: The number of those violators who have been penalized, civil or criminal. If we don't enforce the regulations, there's no incentive for people to comply with them. We're fooling ourselves if we think we're actually deterring introductions.

MS. UPSTON: Who can respond?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I probably would like USDA to respond since you specifically named USDA. This brings up a question. The staff could work with the agencies to put together this list of information. I might suggest that the problem is that means something else is not going to get done. That's the way things are right now. If enforcement I agree is not actually emphasized in the plan.

Maybe it's something we need to look at in terms of update of the plan. I'll look to the departments if they could put this information together fairly easily, then it may not be an issue. But again, where does it rank in the priorities of all the other things that we're being asked to do? That would be my question in terms of just a staff
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Jim, do you want to respond to that?

ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: Sure. I think it's a great point, Faith. I appreciate you're bringing it up. I do think we can compile some data on this through APHIS and our office of general counsel, etc. I'm sure Rebecca will follow up on that. You're actually drifting in some of my comments about the cross-cut budget this afternoon because I think you're thinking more on the international scene about solid wood packing material. Some of my comments this afternoon are going to be how our states are working with us and forest regulations and the shortfalls that are occurring in the states and things like that. But it's an excellent point. We will be happy to provide some data.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: What have we written up there? What I'm wondering is we now have USDA agreeing to look and see if they can get some data. Do we need to broaden that out a little bit if this is relatively easy to obtain?

MS. UPSTON: You mean to other agencies as well.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Yes. Is that what you
have?

MS. UPSTON: No, what I got is Jim's offer and Lori's suggestion that we might want to update the plan to focus more on enforcement and that it's not the focus now but it's a staffing issue for the Council. Then Jim Butler offered that he with Rebecca could comply through APHIS through USDA but no one else has from the other agencies.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: That's what Lori is whispering here. We can certainly send out the request and see what we can get. Gordon, any feel for Department of Interior?

MR. BROWN: I was smiling at Sharon but she's just fresh back from OIA so she didn't see my smile.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: She just didn't react.

MR. BROWN: She did what she professionally knew she should do. Look the other way. In the Fish and Wildlife Service, I don't think it would be a major big deal to do it. But again we have to run the channels because if it's injurious wildlife --

MS. GROSS: The Fish and Wildlife Service enforces several laws including the injurious wildlife provisions of the Lacey Act, CITES and a whole bunch
of other things. What may be difficult is to separate the effort that it takes to enforce one law from another. I can certainly find out. What I can get is the number of violations. I'm pretty sure I can get violations and activities done. But when you inspect a shipment, you inspect everything. How many of those are for CITES and how many of those are for injurious wildlife? It would be difficult if not impossible to separate that effort. So that I may have trouble coming up with.

MR. BROWN: But we'll keep it simple and just ask them for violations under the injurious wildlife provisions because that's really where Faith's intention was which was to focus on that.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And Dean, within Commerce do we have the equivalent Coast Guard situation?

MR. WILKINSON: Actually we do not have any regulatory authority. We do have enforcement officers which sometimes cooperate not so much on this as on some other things. In terms of invasive species, we do not have the regulatory authority.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: All right. Thanks. Sorry I just moved the Coast Guard around. I'm old. I used to be there I swear. Then I would suggest that
one possible agenda item for our March meeting could be a bit of an update and at least it would be some education for the rest of us on what the enforcement picture is for those like I who knows absolutely nothing about what we do or do not do with the Lacey Act. It's never been used against me so I assume we're all safe.

MS. UPSTON: So, Randall, March agenda item, and I'll separate these out, is an update on where they stand with enforcement in the various agencies.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Assuming we've collected something. Okay, anything else that's a follow-up on this particular issue right now raise your hand. Diane and then I'll jump over here I promise.

MS. COOPER: Diane Cooper. I think if we look to revising the Management Plan or doing the update and we look at these issues of enforcement and additional regulations perhaps, I think it's also important that we look other incentives or opportunities for incentives for industries to comply with regulations, help for instances in developing models, best management programs and the like.

MR. MEYERS: With respect to the request of the Fish and Wildlife Service do not use the broad term Lacey Act. Just do a injurious wildlife or you will get lots of information that's useless.

MR. BROWN: That's a good point just for everybody's help in dealing with this. There are two Lacey Acts is the easy way of thinking about it. The focus should always be on injurious wildlife provisions which is a subset. It doesn't go near the other part that's large and broad and big. So if you can just learn when you say Lacey Act in your mind that you want immediately to say injurious wildlife provisions. That tacks it right now to this invasive's issue.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Good. Jerry.

DR. JACKSON: In view of our review of regulatory materials from the departments, I think that it would be very good for the education committee to have a nice summary of where the teeth are. I don't know where the teeth are in terms of regulation.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: That information is summarized in the National Management Plan to a certain extent at least as an appendix I'm learning right now. Dean, jump in.

MR. WILKINSON: In response and I should
clarify what I said. I think Faith's question went only to the issue of importation, etc. But there is for instance regulatory authority that we have which is not often used. I mean she asked about inspectors but whether or not you dump something in a National Marine sanctuary that type of thing. So there are and actually if you go back and you look at the National Management Plan, we made an effort to identify existing legislative authorities. You may want to look at that.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Okay. Now staying on this issue, Bill.

MR. DICKERSON: I'd like to make sure that included in this is survey process if we do this is the fact that "stop sales" which are not really a court action but an internal authority penalty are usually often very extreme. The issue of Clementines last year, I'm saying when there's an import or a domestic movement of a pest is detected, often the first thing is the "stop sale" which can have major impact and really get the attention of industry people who are shipping stuff. So it's not only the laws and whether it be a civil penalty or a different type of penalty, the stop sale action needs to be included because that's the first line and maybe the biggest
hammer regulatory agencies have.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Linda.

MS. SHEEHAN: I think I'm feeling the same as Faith a little bit in terms of a frustration with the Management Plan right now and this is something to consider for later. It lets the Federal agencies off the hook a little bit with respect to their duties under the Executive Order in section two. Enforcement is just one piece of it but there are a lot of other elements of the program that the Federal agencies are supposed to be taking on and we don't really see that related in the Management Plan or in reality. I'm hoping that our discussion in March on the enforcement issues will help jump start a discussion more on section two generally in making sure that the next Management Plan has that Federal agencies not only just list what their duties are and their legal authorities are but also commit to making sure they actually implement those.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Okay. Anything else on this issue? Thank you. That was a good question. Are you back up with that? We will move to a new question with George. Thank you for your patience.

DR. BECK: Certainly. Actually my question overarches all the things we've been
discussing so far. We all recognize that invasive species sometimes at least can be controversial. The example is one person's weed is the next person's flower and with reference to lists, it doesn't matter if we talk about regulation or what have. We tend to think that the public has embraced this and I don't think that's true. I'm an educator by design. It's always amazing to me to find that people really don't know about this and they're shocked. My question is should ISAC then recommend that the Extension Service will make invasive species a national program.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Lori is going to say something but I'll preface it a little bit. Tom Bewick will be here this afternoon to probably answer that very question. If it doesn't get answered then it's because we didn't ask it correctly.

MS. UPSTON: Could you finish the sentence "the Extension Service"?

DR. BECK: Should the Extension Service make invasive species a national program?

MS. UPSTON: A national program.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I think Tom will be discussing that. He's going to be talking about the Extension Service and their role. I don't know if they literally made it a program as you said but I
know that it's moved it has moved up in terms of
priorities at CSREES but I think he's the best person
to discuss that this afternoon.

MS. UPSTON: So is that question going to
be held until Tom comes this afternoon? Is that okay?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: There is nothing wrong
with discussing aspects of that that you want to and
inform each other before Tom gets here but he is going
to be addressing specifically that question.

DR. BECK: What I see on Dr. Bewick's
place in the schedule is he's to talk about invasive
plants. Of course, that's near and dear to my heart
because that's what I do. But the issue is larger
than that. Whether they make it a higher priority or
a national program, I mean I work for the Extension
and that's a huge difference.

If we make a national program, it will
change how we deal with this. You'll have every
Extension Office in every county of the country
dealing with this rather than gee, I'd like to but I
can't because of other conflicting priorities. That's
the key issue. Of course, I look at that agency upon
its arrival as being a conflicting priority. To a
large degree that's progress but now we need to pass
it.
MS. UPSTON: And I need to point out that the way you phrase the question ultimately is an ISAC answer if I understood it. It was should ISAC. So the question is for ISAC. I mean Tom has something to say about it but you just phrased this as an ISAC issue.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I also just want to mention because if Tom is not here at this time but CSREES was very active in the cross-cut budget and I think showed their commitment to their moving forward on this issue at the Extension level.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Ron.

MR. LUKENS: Thank you. I did want to mention that on the aquatic side of Extension, we looked particularly in the coastal areas at Sea Grant. And Sea Grant has embraced invasive species very highly as a national issue. It is very helpful, George, to have that recognition because it brings the forces, not only education outreach aspects of the Extension and the advisory services under Sea Grant but also the research programs that those entities carry forward. I'm not saying that it's all done on the aquatic side but I'm saying we have a really nice recognition on the part of Sea Grant that this is an important issue and we're working very closely with
them on the aquatic side.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Randall Stocker. That's a very important point and all of Sea Grant's funding comes from different place than CSREES funding, right? Every single nickel. That's an important issue. Right now, there are weeds in natural area education materials being funded out of Sea Grant, maybe even more than is currently being funded out of Federal Extension dollars. So when Tom comes this afternoon, let's not forget that we are looking at one part of a bigger puzzle. At some point maybe that's something should be bridged better than it is right now. Jim.

ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: I can give you the one answer to that question which I think is an excellent one and it's not yes but it's absolutely yes. I think that it needs to be breached at the highest level and I would be happy to help communicate that to encourage Lori and Council members to communicate that. Again you have your counties, your states and your Federal partners involve in this effort. So just because we say at the Federal level because you know quite well, George, how does that drift down into an important county. No matter where is a different set of priorities but absolutely.
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Thank you. Nelroy.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: I'd like to suggest adding a third leg on this and that's NRCS. If we could get the three, Sea Grant, CSREES and NRCS focused, that's my kind of idea of a cross-cut budget kind of initiative. That would magnify the power of the Federal agencies and the dollars on this issue and have them all working together to accomplish a common goal.

MS. UPSTON: So you're including then in the national program --

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: I would say it as the national program has a particular meaning in terms of the Federal system. What I'm saying is that if it's an area of focus for those three groups would be very important and would be synergistic.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Rebecca.

MS. BECH: Within USDA of course we have key agencies that have major responsibilities in invasive species and NRCS is one of those and CSREES is also included in that. We have regular meetings within the department to talk about these issues and I just wanted to talk briefly about CSREES and where they are now. Tom may give you more information this afternoon. But they have identified this as a
priority area. They have briefed their under secretary. Their administrator is fully aware of this. They have formed a team within CSREES that is made up of some of the national program leaders that they have. They have been talking about this for some time.

They are actually trying to develop a training program right now that would be a "Train the Trainer" that some of you may have been involved in that would move out and would target Extension agents and the regional agents that they have to talk about invasive species and to provide more information to them. So they are trying to right now reach out to those agents.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: This is good. We'll steal all Tom's thunder before he gets here. Chuck.

MR. O'NEILL: I think one thing that we have to look at too though if CSREES were to make this a national initiative is being able to funnel some funding to the state and county Extension. I don't know how it is in other states but in New York State right now, Extension is in a crisis.

There are at least 30 county Extension Associations that are facing severe budget cuts, three of which have been zeroed out for this year. One of
those was put back in just the other night but they were put back in with comments like we'll refund the agricultural portion and you can stop doing nutrition and 4-H and natural resources. Other counties it's the opposite. One county is saying fund 4-H and cut everything else. While I know that the agents on the ground would probably love to get involved in this issue because they are already dealing with Asian long-horned beetles and what have you. They aren't going to be able to do it if it becomes another unfunded mandate basically.

I see it happening in New York closely because in New York, Sea Grant also happens to be part of the state extension service. But I think that's something we have to bear in mind when we are looking at these types of things which is that the states are really hurting right now as is the Federal budget.

But if we are going to move invasive species up further on the list of things we expect people to do particularly Extension, somehow we have to be able to trigger a little bit of funding for them to be able to do that. I think they are receptive but I don't know how many of them have money to do anything with it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I want to pause just
for a second and do a little bookkeeping. Allegra has a new question to bring up. Raise your hand if you have another new issue to bring up during this session. Okay. I have three hands up and we're going to split that time. If you have a comment on this particular session that we're talking about, make it very brief and we're moving on. Chris.

DIRECTOR DIONIGI: In addition, I think that the 3400 I believe county extension offices are seen as a major point of insertion and early detection and rapid response. CSREES has been very involved in ED&RR effort and Barb will talk more about that.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: George, related to this. Are you borrowing George? You're just pretending to be George. Gary's on the floor down here.

DR. BEIL: I just wanted to make a comment and follow-up to what else has been said. Extension services in many states are in a really severe crisis. In the ones I'm aware of there's been tremendous consolidation where they had four or five agents for one county. Now one agent has four or five counties. So it may be a very difficult vehicle to accomplish what we want to accomplish in some states. That was my only comment.
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Anything else on this issue? If not, Allegra bring us to the next one.

MS. ADLER: Okay and hopefully this one won't take too much time. A couple of questions that are sort of on the order of housekeeping but very important housekeeping and that is every year, February, budget numbers come out from the various agencies relating to the programs that they have that may advance progress under the National Management Plan. Congress obviously, the Congressmen that are interested in helping that to happen need to know what those authorization levels, what those programs are and what the proposed budget level will be regardless of whether or not it's part of the cross-cut. Obviously the cross-cut should help here.

Very embarrassingly sometimes we have to go back to the Congressmen and say the agencies don't know what those programs are and what their authorized level is and how much were they funded last year. Is there a way that we can get a headstart on that this year and have at least the baseline information comprehensively compiled and then obviously when the budget comes out, we can add the additional information of the budget requests as quickly as possible? That's the first part. The second part is
just what role will the Homeland Security Department in the NISC? Will they be incorporated as another? Thank you.

MS. UPSTON: I'm going to need a little quick help when we get going on exactly flip charting all this.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Okay, I will bump the second question to Dr. Butler if he doesn't mind on Homeland Security. On the first question as you know, the first cross-cut that you got from us was an informational cross-cut. We called it that for a reason. It was just information about what all the different agencies were spending on invasive species. That information the first time was very hard to get. There are still going to be some areas where the information is simply not collected.

For instances military installations can't tell you by looking at their budget how much they spend on invasive species control. It would be a huge report. We continue to work on that with DOD but they just don't collect the information that way. It's buried in their management/maintenance accounts. So we can't get it.

But other than that for us, we could start immediately but we don't have a program analyst right
now. That's big problem. That's what I'm trying to work on first to get a program analyst. I agree we could start immediately. It's a little complicated now because people don't even have their 2003 budget numbers. That's going to be a difficulty but I agree.

We could start as soon as we get a program analyst to collect just general information across the government on what we're spending on invasive species. The cross-cut itself is going to be targeted. It's not going to cover every area. So I agree that that's a separate exercise. But we're going to need to fill some staff proposals to do it. It should be easier this time because we have the chart and format to just send out. Second question Dr. Butler.

ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: Well, you're already robbing again additional comments from remarks this afternoon. The short answer is yes. I think this is a topic that needs to be revisited in March. By that time possibly we'll know the final resolution possibly of Homeland Security.

MS. UPSTON: On the agenda for March.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Any other questions, comments on this particular area? If not, then -- Sorry Ann. Of course.

MS. BARTUSKA: Ann Bartuska. I keep
getting lost in his peripheral vision there. Just a follow-up to the budget question. In Yellowstone, I raised the point that what would be really helpful if it's not this year then maybe we could work towards next year is to know what are the real needs out there for invasive species. I think we're always going to be arguing against what the previous year's budget is and where we would like to be but we really don't know what does it really cost to do that job so that you can be seeing the differential and making your case on why we should be supporting a healthy budget in order to make up that differential. So I again request that we try to do that.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Sure. Dean.

MR. WILKINSON: I think you're going to have to get at that last question a little bit indirectly because anything like that that we would be providing to you would have to go through OMB clearance. And so there are ways of talking about to take a piece of something and say what would it take to do 3400 extension agents. That's not to say that it is a proposal, that type of thing but we do have to be very careful about anybody from the Federal agency saying we need X amount of dollars next year. It would have to be cleared through OMB.
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Let me jump in real quick and then Allegra, I promise. On the academic side, the economists have turned their attention to the economic cost of invasive. Has anybody heard of a group that is looking at the dollar figure of what it would take to solve the existing invasives problems? David.

DR. LODGE: I can give a very partial answer to that. A group that I lead just got a fairly substantial NSF grant to focus on Great Lakes issues with just that question in mind. As everyone would know right off the bat, that there's the important geographic scale and the resolution with which one wants to answer that question to determine how much effort that would take. A nationwide detailed survey would be enormous but we have $3 million in five years to work on the Great Lakes. So we'll getting some answers for the Great Lakes.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I would think.

DR. LODGE: Some very good answers. I think Chris is planning to distribute a publication that I gave him directly on this issue for the zebra mussels in the Great Lakes as an example.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Michael.

MS. UPSTON: Is this a new issue?
MR. BUCK: No, it's just a follow-up. We did run through a process for the State of Hawaii to do just that. I have a process that might work that the Federal people would be able to participate on these about a conceptual approach about how you would come up what would be the capacity needed in the funds to have a comprehensive invasive species program.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I'm going to suggest then that this is a good placeholder. We’re not going to solve it this morning obviously. Some good things have come up. If you have to say something dramatic about it, raise your hand right now. Otherwise I'll move on to the next issue. Ann.

MS. ADLER: I just have a follow-up on my initial question. It occurred to me that I should point out that information on the baseline funding levels of the existing programs from which we make our proposals and our additional capacity needs, that baseline information really is needed by January but within January timeframe for the members of Congress that are interested in helping to support continued funding or the budget levels that OMB blesses for them to have that baseline. Is that possible? Do you think you'll have someone on board who can do that by then?
DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: What we'll do is that we'll have something. It may not be as detailed as we'd like. But we will have something. Now the complication is when the agencies figure out what they get in 2003. I mean it's just when the budget comes out is my only caveat to that.

MS. ADLER: I'm sorry -- for 2003?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Right. As confused as that is, why don't you continue discussing that even at lunch if you want to. We're then going to move to Michael's next -- I'm sorry. After we hear from Ann with a very dramatic contribution to make this discussion.

MS. ADLER: I don't know if it's dramatic but also just to help moderate the expectations of my colleagues on ISAC, I do know that over the last several years because of recommendations from Congress the collapsing of budgetline items within the Federal agencies is going to make it even more difficult than historically to pull some of these numbers out. So let's not task Lori's group to be giving us stuff that really may not be possible in the short run.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: All right. Bill, is yours up for your separate issue? Good, Michael.

MR. BUCK: A simple question. I'm
curious. What's the last time the full Council met and are there other plans for the full Council to meet in the future especially in regard to response to GAO report?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: In May. Randall, you were there. The Council has last met in May which was before your June meeting. I think what the principals are talking about is possibly December but more likely a January meeting of the next Council meeting and possibly follow it up fairly quickly with something that we haven't talked a lot about but a joint meeting or a meeting very near the date of your March meeting.

We need to have a meeting of the Council to discuss cross-cut budget for 2005 to get the ground rules more understood about that, to respond to the GAO report and deal with several other items. So there's a need to schedule and as you know, those meetings are not easy to schedule but we're going to start working on that.

We have a principals' meeting to discuss that scheduled for November 25. It's a little up in the air because of Dr. Butler's schedule but that's the next meeting of the principals. We should be able to report back to you before the end of the month when the next Council meeting is.
MS. UPSTON: Does that answer your question, Michael?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: We suggested that it just be the first Tuesday of every month and that didn't go over very big. George.

DR. BECK: That's really what I was getting at. Does the Council meet regularly at specified time intervals or when it kind of boils up its skirt?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Okay, George. Let's flipchartese on that. It's something that we are discussing with the principals and a number of people. One of the problems with the Council meetings has been that Council members as you know are at the secretarial level. A question especially in this administration whether we want to continue to attempt to have meetings where the secretary or very high level people are expected to attend all those meetings.

The first thing that we've done is schedule regular meetings of the principals. That is starting to happen every six weeks. We had one in early October and then as I said we have one coming up on November 25. But it is going to be a policy question I think. The policy question is if we are
going to have more regular Council meetings which I think all of us think are very important, we probably will need to have an understanding to kick that down to a little bit lower level because of scheduling conflicts and the difficult of secretaries dropping everything and attending a lot of Council meetings. That's something that we can talk about in the future but that would be what would make more regular Council meetings possible which is an understanding that there would be slightly different level. For most cases we would not have the secretaries there for every Council meeting.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I can't pad my resume if the secretaries aren't there. Dean.

MR. WILKINSON: One thing I think Lori may have forgotten about is that we do have policy liaisons for each of the ten departments, several of whom are in the room. I see Rick. I see Mike Slimak from EPA. We have scheduled a fairly regular meetings of the policy liaisons to take up issues as they come up. So even though there has not been formal Council meetings every four or five weeks I would say we've had meetings where we've had members from each of the agencies involved discussing issues as they arise.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Dean. I
mentioned the policy liaisons earlier today in my summary as the group that's dealing with the leadership and coordination issues. Frankly, a lot of work can be done at that level. We don't have to have Council meetings at any level every other month even. But I do think despite how efficiently those work, it would probably be a good idea to have Council meetings three or four times a year. We do need to hit that target. That is actually difficult if you're demanding the secretarial level at all the meetings.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: All right. We're going to shift to the last question. Bill, we'll at least give you time to get it on the table. I can't guarantee that we will get much discussion.

MR. DICKERSON: This really goes back and it's perhaps maybe a part of an earlier survey question about who has the authority, which organizations are doing things, etc. But there's an aspect to that that I think is absolutely crucial that we urge maybe the Council to help coordinate. That is we need to know not only at the Federal level but at the state level who has legal authority to do what and make sure that in our zeal a new program that we implement that we respect that current authority unless the legislative bodies at the state and Federal level change it.
I'll tell you from a personal point of view. We have the authority in the State of North Carolina within my division to take plant/pest regulatory activity. That's where the authority is. Other people have opinions. It is difficult when we find out from press releases by other organizations of a major find in our state. We would like to be notified first before the press is.

So I would say in this whole process, I'm not sure exactly how it can be done whether the Council can cause it to be done at the Federal level and then invite the coordination at the state level so that we make sure that this is well coordinated machine and not somebody out there, one agency stepping on top of the other. I would encourage that that be done and call it to the Council's attention that it needs to be done.

MS. UPSTON: So it's a statement or a question.

MR. DICKERSON: It's a statement and a question how we're going to do it.

MS. UPSTON: How to identify who is --

MR. DICKERSON: No, how are we going to accomplish this? How would we accomplish Federal and state coordination to make sure that we utilize our
resources efficiently but we don't end up with wasted energy because of competition between agencies to do things? Inefficient organizational competition between the agencies.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And let me add again, I assume this is an issue for the leadership and coordination group to be discussing as well involving as it does Federal and state agencies. Kelsey, how are we for lunch? We're on time. We have 23 seconds for this.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: All right. The luncheon will be provided for committee members and policy liaisons. Those are the people that we have confirmed that we are providing lunch for. I apologize to any other observers. There are excellent restaurants in the area. We look forward to your participation this afternoon but we're only authorized to provide luncheon for the actual committee members and the policy liaisons from the departments and my staff.

MR. BROWN: Five second announcement. I'm going to put at your place if I can figure out where it is while you're gone, three pictures from Yellowstone which Bruce Taubert graciously offer via digital. No picture of Craig. No picture of Michael.
We were actually going make a cover out of this but we're not ingenious enough to figure out how to do it. I just made reproductions that you each take home of a memento of Yellowstone.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Thank you very much for a very good session. I'm going to let Kelsey what to do. Is it safe to leave bookcases and purses and things in this room? Apparently she thinks so. What do we do now? Everybody got that? The Sphinx Dining Room is right through that doorway. We'll see you back here promptly. We'll be starting at 1:00 p.m. Hope you can join us. Off the record.

(Whereupon, at 12:01 p.m., the above-entitled matter recessed to reconvene at 1:00 p.m. the same day.)
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: On the record. This is getting to be like Christmas. We have cool pictures, trading cards. I have chocolate-covered macadamia nuts. Beautiful.

MS. UPSTON: You know what, Randall? When I saw them, I thought they were prunes.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: If you have seen the poster that Ship was just holding up with the bird eyes, that's spectacular. My vision has never been that clear. What we are going to do in this session is provide an opportunity for each of you to give us a bit of an update on what you are doing these days.

This is an opportunity. Do not feel compelled if you choose not to but do take advantage of it if you wish. There are many of us and there's 45 minutes. If everyone spoke, you would have a couple minutes. I suspect some will choose not to so maybe you would have two or three minutes but you do not have a long time.

My job is to estimate how it's going as it's going and ask you to act accordingly. The only way I can do that is use either grunts or small English declarative sentences. So I'll do my best.
We've never done it quite like this before so we'll have to see how this goes. Ann, would you like to start us off?

MS. BARTUSKA: I'm sorry. I'm sorting pictures here. I have some great pictures here.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Didn't see that coming?

MS. BARTUSKA: No, I didn't see that coming. A quick update. Can you come back to me?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I certainly can. I just bought two minutes there. Allegra.

MS. ADLER: Actually we'll cover a lot of what both of us have been up to in the afternoon tomorrow with the National Invasive Species Act so I'll reserve my comments until then.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: This isn't going to turn out to be the deal where when we actually make the time for you to take advantage of all the things you want to tell us about, no one does. This is the reverse of the available closet space area I think. George.

DR. BECK: Yes, I not only represent Colorado State University but that Intermountain Noxious Weed Advisory Council. We've been back here for about 17 years. I suspect there will be another 17 years until I retire that we'll continue to do so.
I'll let it go at that.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Gary.

DR. BEIL: I've had a couple of opportunities here recently to use some communication about ISAC to the seed industry. I was asked to write an editorial for one of the seed industry journals on the work of the invasive species, ISAC and what we are doing. Then the American Seed Trade met about two weeks ago. Both Rebecca and myself were there at those meetings and had an opportunity to talk to the seed trade about the work of ISAC and really the Plan. The whole purpose was to try to promote the concept of what's happening in the Plan.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Ship.

MR. BRIGHT: Thank you. Ship Bright from Maine. I just want to let you know that I serve on the state's Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force and we just put together a state Management Plan that was approved at the ANS meeting in Hawaii which I think we ought to go because obviously a lot of productive things happen there. So I'd like to throw that out. I'm also thrilled that Michael has handed out these new cards because my double chin looks a lot better than this one right here on this card. And the free cards for soda, you have to go to Hawaii to get so I'm
flying out in a little while.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Did you say a state-wide plan or a regional?

MR. BRIGHT: It is a state-wide plan for Maine.


MR. BUCK: Our frogs from Puerto Rico are still out of control and are spreading. I think our EPA approval to use caffeine has lapsed as well so that's a train wreck that's getting bigger. We've been working hard keeping West Nile disease out of Hawaii. Our Departments of Health and Ag were on the position that was inevitable that we would have West Nile but because of our migratory birds the risk is not as great and I think we have a full import of all pet birds now coming into Hawaii. So we think we will be able to keep West Nile out.

We did with Bishop Museum a co-hosted Austro-Pacific Global Invasive Species meeting in Hawaii and I think we did send some communications to both Australia and the Department of Agriculture concerning the red import fire ant. We had every single Pacific Island country as well as the State of Hawaii. It were nice for them to consider us a country but they realized if it got to Hawaii it was
going to get to them. That was a very successful meeting.

Then we have our first Republican governor that we've ever had in the State of Hawaii. We do have an executive order that was passed by the last Democratic governor with an invasive species Council so one of my jobs will be trying to convince the new governor that we should continue that executive order. It sounds somewhat familiar. We've been there before.

MS. CAMPBELL: Faith Campbell. My most recent activities have focused on a publication on forest pests that you all should have received. I mailed them out. APHIS is now in a rule making on wood packaging material. Four of us have gotten together and drafted a letter for ISAC members for consideration. Craig is going to make some minor changes to it and we'll circulate it to you tomorrow.

Jeff Stone and I did most of it. Craig has worked on it and Ann Bartuska endorsed it in concept. Is that fair, Ann? Okay.

MS. COOKSLEY: Barb Cooksley and I wanted to emphasize that the invasive species issue is getting out to the people. It's not that we don't need the information education efforts to continue to
emphasize. Within the beef industry at the national level, we've given testimony to the Ag Sub-committee on environmental and economic threats posed by weed species. So just by having invasive species and having our industry go get testimony on that, we are getting the word out within our industry the importance of the impacts there.

A lot of you are aware that I do work for a Congressman out in Nebraska part-time so I got the schedule for this week. Friday, GAO is giving a briefing to our staff here in Washington on the Invasive Species Report.

I'm going to get to spend Wednesday in our office with our Deputy Chief of Staff. She has allowed the briefing to go for a whole hour on Friday which any of you that visit on the Hill, an hour is a very long time to have a Congressman staff's ear. So I'm anxious to inform her prior to the briefing that we met this week. I thought the timing was great.

MS. COOPER: I'm Diane Cooper. You'll have to excuse me. I just put a candy in my mouth before we had to do this. I also had the opportunity in the last several months to provide update and information on ISAC and the National Management Plan. I have also found that there are a lot of folks out
there especially in the aquatic industries that are unaware of the National Management Plan or even a national strategy for dealing with invasive species. So it's been good to be able to get out there with the folks that are on the ground or in the field and talk about invasive species. That's on a professional level. On a personal level, I became a grandmother for the first time.

(Applause.)

DR. CORN: Joe Corn. Three things. We've been working for a number of years on the movement of diseases and parasites in wildlife moved around between ecosystems in North America. Most recently, we've been working on elk where elk are being translocated into the Eastern United States and looking at potential movement of diseases and whether it was actually occurring. We may have found one form of a tick that was moved from the west into the southeast.

We are working with exotic tick tropical bond tick in the Caribbean and the role of wildlife in the maintenance and spread of the tick in the region and how do you eradicate and also the potential for its introduction in the United States or the mainland. Also I'm working on a wildlife manual for USDA and a
wildlife response in the event of a foreign animal disease getting into wildlife populations in the country.

MR. DICKERSON: Bill Dickerson, North Carolina Department of Agriculture and National Plant Board. From the National Plant Board side, I have a couple of things that have been going on and are going on now and we're not sure exactly where they are going to take us. But essentially National Plant Board members states and APHIS PPQ have had a long term understanding and working relationship. What we are dealing with now is what will that relationship be with the remnants of APHIS PPQ that are left in Agriculture and then what will be our new relationship and role with Homeland Security including that portion of PPQ that has been moved over to Homeland Security. We are looking at that as an opportunity to do things better than we've ever done. But quite frankly, there's a lot of uncharted territory there that provides some anxiety levels that we have to negotiate.

Also from a more optimistic aspect in many ways both as representing North Carolina and the National Plant Board, I was invited to participate and a number of other people in this room also
participated in that meeting. The National Research Council Board of Agriculture and Natural Resources held a meeting last Friday on eradication control programs for diseases in pests of animals and plants.

In essence they were looking at the whole big picture and trying to see if there was a role for the National Academy of the Natural Research Council perhaps maybe to take action that would strengthen the process or to better understand the process. I don't know how many of you all --

Let's put it like this. Thirty years ago, it would have been hard to get five people together much less the National Academy of Sciences Research Council together to even talk about eradication. They couldn't have uttered the words but we had a thorough discussion on it Friday.

In essence at least the two things that they decided that were extremely important were if we could facilitate the more effective coordination of activities from the Federal level. The second thing is they could focus on the things that could be done and not unnecessarily waste our time or at least devote too much time on what we couldn't do. There was enough we could do that we would be able to proceed.
I'm not sure activities on Friday that would be taken back internally but I think there will be at least two position papers written based on the meeting on Friday, maybe three. I see all of these things as positive opportunities. We just need to coordinate things so they end up being positive and not just potential positive.

MR. DIPPEL: Donnie Dippel. The Texas Invasive Species Task Force is working on its state plan. We should have that finished very soon. We're also working on two river plans right now, one for the Rio Grande River and one for the Colorado River for the treatment of salt cedar. Just in case 2868 would be passed we will have our plans in place ready to go.

We've treated about 100 miles of the Pecos River for saltcedar. About 6300 acres has been treated. The Extension has done a great job of doing a monitoring on this and we've sent this all back to NM and they have put the statistics to it. It looks like after three years worth of work, we have recovered about 36,000 acres feed of water from the treatment of the saltcedar. That's about 12 billion gallons of water. That's enough water for the City of Lubbock to use. We're just getting started on it.

It's really strange. Every two trees you
kill is enough for a person annually of water. The best part of that is right now we're right on cost and that's for $4.00. If we kill two trees, we have enough water for two people for $4.00. We're down to right now recovering water at approximately $8.00 an acre foot. It's looking real good. The project is looking good.

If we have a minute sometime today or anytime, I have a DVD that's really interesting. The Extension just finished it. It's in draft of the project on the Pecos River. You'll see some of the work and some of the things they've done. So if we have a second during a break or sometime, we'll stick it in and let it run. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: So you're telling me that if they keep killing trees Lubbock is going to have 3.5 million people one day.

MR. DIPPEL: Well, we have to get enough water for Midland, Odessa, Abilene because they are running out quick.

DR. ELDREDGE: Lu Eldredge from Hawaii. The cards I passed out are part of a whole series of an Hawaii biological survey. This is the third set of a series. We've also done some bookmarks. If anybody didn't get cards, let me know and I'll try to find
some more or I'll mail you some cards. We have a major effort to do invasive species programs.

The state has also recently established an Alien Aquatic Organism Task Force which is meeting tomorrow for the second time to work with the development of an Aquatic Nuisance Species State Management Plan that's being worked through with Nature Conservancy and the Division of the Aquatic Resources has hired a person to look into developing a following ballast water program that goes along with the State Aquatic Nuisance Species.

Last week's Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force, the Hawaii group was invited to develop a Pacific Island Regional Panel for ANS. This would be the U.S. affiliated island territories for a single panel. About a month ago, the Global Invasive Species Program brought a group of people to Honolulu to design and assess biological socio-economic impacts of alien species on island ecosystems including the marine environments.

The experts came out with a conclusion and I'll quote it for you. "While ballast waters now widely recognized as a means by which IAS are moved around the world, the following marine organisms on ships and other mobile structures is also a
significant pathway for invasion and must be considered as high priority by policymakers where a natural resource manager's relevant industry has been investigated. In the islands, we all feel the following is far more dangerous pathway than ballast water." I have copies of this with some background materials and so forth if people would like a copy of this statement from GISP.

DR. JACKSON: I'm Jerry Jackson from Florida Gulf Coast University. My research focus is on plant/animal interactions. I'm primarily an ornithologist but I work with other species as well. Perhaps my more important work in recent months, in recent years is that I do a daily radio program on public radio in southwest Florida called "With the Wild Things." About one-third of the program is focused on invasive and exotic species.

DR. LODGE: Hear, hear. That's pretty exciting. It's hard to follow up. I want to mention three things that I've been involved in recently. I had the opportunity along with several other folks to testify before a House sub-committee regarding research components of the NISA bill. I'm looking forward to getting an update on that tomorrow from Allegra and Ann. I'm sorry. I'm David Lodge from the
University of Notre Dame.

The second thing is as I mentioned earlier a group of us are working on, just launching really a five project to combine ecological and economic forecasting for non-indigenous species. I think we're hearing a lot more from lots of us on this committee and elsewhere about the importance of documenting the economic impact. So that's the spirit in which we are moving forward and especially trying to highlight the value of prevention as opposed to waiting around and seeing what happens and then spending a lot of money on reaction.

Finally I had the opportunity a couple of weeks ago to speak to a gathering of about 50 Great Lake city majors. This was a meeting that was organized by Major Daly in Chicago. The majors of Toronto, Milwaukee, Chicago and Cleveland for example were there. In that course of a half day meeting, that's all it was, fifteen minutes was devoted to science issues on the Great Lakes. Given that was my charge, you can bet that I took the opportunity to talk about non-indigenous species a bit.

What was interesting and perhaps we're noting by this group is that the mayors are really interested in having some say in the kind of
discussions that are going on nationally and regionally on non-indigenous species. They recognize that they don't have a place at any of the tables of policymaking on non-indigenous species. They are potentially very strong allies.

MR. LUKENS: Thank you. I'm Ron Lukens with the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. There's a couple of things I wanted to mention pursuant to involvement with aquatic side of the house. We recently reformed the Gulf of Mexico Regional Panel under the ANS Task Force. In addition to that, our Commission took over the administrative responsibility of managing that Regional Panel.

We had our first meeting the first part of October. I referenced it earlier this morning. I'm very encouraged that we are moving forward. I think we have an enthusiastic bunch of people on that Regional Panel and we plan to have at least two meetings a year to try to bring a focus to aquatic nuisance species in the Gulf of Mexico region.

As a part of that and it goes along with my overall interest in the information management side of the house is that we, our Commission, is housing a regional database for aquatic nuisance species in the Gulf of Mexico. We are planning a fairly
comprehensive website to encompass invasive species in general, the regional panel under the ANS Task Force and then we'll have an access to the database. As a part of that, we're very excited about collaboration with U.S. Geological Survey and SERC as well as NatureServe which has been proposed to collaborate with all of our databases and be able to provide users with a single query opportunity that will go out to all these databases and provide results in a standardized format that will enhance people's ability to access individual databases.

We think very strongly that this is a good menu to satisfy the information management from the data side on species. The information management requirements of the plan, we're looking forward to continuing working in this area. Hopefully some other entities will step forward with the desire to house some regional approaches to the database.

One of the things that we want to do that's going to be a little unique is that we will be producing factsheets, information sheets, for individual species that will be available on our website. People who are interested in getting specific information about nutria or other invasive species or non-native species rather in the Gulf of
Mexico can get those things from our website. Hopefully we'll have made quite a bit of progress toward the end of this coming year in that regard.

MR. O'NEILL: Chuck O'Neill, New York Sea Grant. One of the things that I'm doing is trying to continue to grow the National Aquatic Nuisance Species Clearinghouse. What we've recently done is, well you never complete them, have set up a hot links section on our website dealing specifically with invasive species rather than just aquatic nuisance species in trying to provide those kinds of links to our audiences that they would also be getting off of the NISC website and that's going to be one of our primary hot links. We're trying to get a program down to our top page in fact so that we will know that's it there and won't have to dig for it.

I'm also the co-chair of the Communications, Education and Outreach Committee of the Northeast Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species and constantly trying to keep them aware that there are other invasive species other than just aquatic nuisance species. They'll be meeting again in December and I'm on the agenda to give them an update of what ISAC is doing.

I'm working with our State Department of
Environmental Conservation. They are in the process right now of doing an update revision to our State Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan. We're working with them on that. I'm also working as the Outreach Education Coordinator for a Great Lakes multi-university research project on toxic algal blooms. It turns out that a lot of this bacteria that are causing these problems are not indigenous to the Great Lakes. It's a five year project. I think it's the first fresh water project that NOAA has funded under the MIRHAB (PH) program.

Then I'm finally having the chance to work with our State Aquatic Extension Service which I work for doing something in New York instead of outside of New York. We've quite a bit of education programs going on right now on avian botulism which has turned up to be a problem in Lake Erie and is spreading into Lake Ontario. Again it's not indigenous to those lakes.

West Nile Virus has hit New York particularly hard and folks are recognizing what an invader like that can do particularly in the horse arena. We are seeing quite a few horses in New York State being affected by West Nile more so than in most of the states around us as well as the impact of
invasive species and pathogens on commercial horticultural. So finally our state extension service is getting a chance to see me in New York for a change.

MR. MEYERS: Marshall Meyers with Pet Industry. Several months ago at the Western Regional Panel Meeting of ANSTF, I was asked to give a paper updating them on the screening and pathways processes.

It was interesting having to do a screening process of the different screening processes that are being talked about. So what I did was a comparison of what was called for from the Management Plan, what's called for under ANSTF and how they are doing their operations and how they are restructuring their group to parallel more what we're doing here and also what's being called for in NISA and trying to show the similarities or dissimilarities.

There's a lot of interest at the state level to have some quick assessment type processes that they can go through, risk assessment type processes. There's a lot of interest from the states to not go off on a frolic of their own to try to create a bunch of different types of processes that could be in conflict. So I think it's important that through all the different mechanisms that this be made
clear. It is also clear that we have to try to somehow harmonize between the Management Plan, ANSTF and NISA what we're going to do when it comes to pathway analysis and screening.

The other area I believe I mentioned in Yellowstone that we were working about putting out more about don't release your aquatic organisms into the waters of the U.S. Since then we were approached by several of the Sea Grant offices to put a proposal in for a grant to come up with a whole wide scale cooperative industry/government education program for the pet industry and the aquatic arena.

We passed the prescreening portion and now have to put in a final proposal. So it means we have to get to work. That's a very exciting project. Part of that will involve David Lodge and my co-authoring a paper. He'll do all the work and my name will go on it.

DR. LODGE: This is indeed a scary prospect. I wanted to talk to you more about that, Marshall, before you made it public.

MR. MEYERS: We'll be able to get those types of articles into the Consumer, Aquatic, Hobbyist magazines which will be very important. Also one of the retailers of the pet industry does mailings
to 32 million households every month. That's 48 percent of the pet-owning households in the country. So not only can we cover the aquatic aspect but we'll be able to put in some things on terrestrial and other animals. I think by the time of the March meeting hopefully we'll have some really good news about how fast that process may be moving.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Are you add any kind of a measuring component to that? That's a huge undertaking.

MR. MEYERS: I'm glad you raised that because one of the problems, and I know there's some Sea Grant people around the table, is sometimes academics don't always understand how public relations people measure things.

DR. LODGE: You see where the problems begin.

MR. MEYERS: One of the things that the ANSTF is asking for is we're building into the process by using some outside consulting firms to measure not just go out and do a broad base and spend a lot of money on something that won't work but test different messages, test different mediums for getting the message out. That was one of the things that ANSTF was really very serious about. Then also part of it
will be doing a separate webpage like the one they have for "Protect Our Waters" that would focus on the aquarium hobbyists. Every one of these they want to have a way of measuring success and test messages.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: This is an interesting collaboration. I'm not sure whether I'm more concerned about the pet industry or Notre Dame at this point. Best of luck.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I think Joe Starincheck with ANSTF and Fish and Wildlife Services is going to talk a little bit more about this tomorrow because he called me and was pretty excited about this project. So you might hear about this tomorrow.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: Craig Regelbrugge, American Nursery and Landscape Association. I'm following another tough act. I wanted to mention a couple of things. First of all in December 2001, the Missouri Botanical Garden hosted an international workshop, I'm wearing Sarah Reichard's hat right now as well, that brought together various sectors, commercial and noncommercial, of horticultural to talk about voluntary codes of conduct associated with horticultural activities.

The nursery industry at that meeting as well as these other sectors all adopted codes of
conduct. We have been working over the course of the ensuing year to get those codes communicated out and to seek endorsement from various national, regional and state groups and local groups.

Also we just had a meeting at the Chicago Botanical Garden, one year after meeting. It was held for several purposes. One was to report on progress. Who has endorsed the codes? How were they putting them to use? They talked a little bit about needs and obstacles for implementation. Finally we focused in break-out sessions on two fairly broad issues, one of them being criteria for the development of alternative plant recommendations for suspected or known invasive species.

The other is how to deal with regionally in the implementation of these kinds of activities. I don't have a whole lot to share with you today because the data dumps out of those meetings just got put on paper and are just now being submitted for comment. But we expect to have some documents that we can share very shortly.

From a nursery industry perspective, our organization has endorsed the nursery codes of conduct. A couple of other national groups like the Perennial Plan Association have as well. A number of
state groups, Florida and Massachusetts were among the first and even some local groups like the Tampa Bay Wholesale Growers have endorsed the codes of conduct.

One of the things we're trying to do on the implementation front which might be of some shared interest in this room is there are a number of assessment schemes that have been created for various purposes. Each of those assessment schemes have its strengths and its weaknesses in terms of the ability for the commercial industry to voluntarily apply the scheme in their own business activities. So we're looking at possibly funding a collaborative project that would do a comparative analysis of those schemes and try to come up with something that finds that sweet spot between accuracy and efficiency and usefulness out in the field and to essentially equip our people with a road map, those who are introducing new species into North America equip them with a road map on how to try to do a reasonable evaluation of their invasive potential.

Another thing that's going to happen in February 2003 by invitation only is a workshop that's going to be held down in Research Triangle Park that's looking at biotech applications in terms of forestry and landscape plants to deal with invasiveness.
concerns and pollen production concerns. It's going to be a wide array of disciplines involved in the workshop and I think it would be interesting.

Another area where we're spending a lot of time is in the whole question of international movement of plant propagative materials and how might we get to a better and safer place in that regard. A recent meeting between the U.S., Canada and Mexico of the North American Plant Protection Organization we collectively the industry groups who were present and Faith Campbell, the lone NGO outside the industry groups, put forth a paper that was urging NAPPO to study this issue and come up with a concept paper on harmonizing activities in this area, coordinating efforts. So that might fit in a context of regional North American strategy.

The final thing I wanted to comment on which isn't anything we're doing is but I think it fits under Item 24, Campaign for Travelers to Reduce Risks which shows on the matrix as nothing happened. I opened up Delta's in-flight magazine on a trip the other day and saw for the first time ever a quarter page ad by APHIS that was raising awareness of the risks of failing to meet our quarantine laws. That was a nice thing. I guess once I see it in the
security video, I know we've hit a homerun. That's enough.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Craig, are you not going to mention your most unique opportunity of the last few months?

MR. REGELBRUGGE: I would remiss if I didn't mention the fact that Randall Stocker is making me famous. He invited me down to speak to the Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council. I escaped with my life intact.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: We greatly appreciate your attending. My question is are your industry buddies aware that you were the keynote speaker at the Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: Not yet. Is my secret safe with you?

MS. SHEEHAN: I think it's going in the record, Craig. Linda Sheehan with the Ocean Conservancy. A couple of state and a couple of Federal initiatives going on. One is the reauthorization of the State Ballast Water Law. It sunsets at the end of next year so there's a bill that needs to be introduced in January which I'm busily writing right now. That's going on. It'll be expanded a bit and changed a bit.
There is a law that was passed last fall to set up an Interagency Aquatic Invasive Species Council in California. We don't have an invasive species management plan. So that sets up the structure for us to be able to do that. That will be done at the end of the 2003. At the same time, I'm also working on funding for that plan in anticipation of that being done. We passed in California in November an almost $3.5 billion water bond, a good portion of those funds hypothetically to be used for invasive species issues.

I'm on that task force to dole out the money and make sure that some of that goes to invasive species in California, especially with this new plan getting implemented hopefully in 2004. At the Federal level, I'm still tracking the NISA reauthorization efforts and our friendly litigation with our good friends at EPA is still on-going. There was an AMECIS (PH) brief filed by the Attorney General for Great Lakes Estates in the case in the last week. So that's interesting and hopefully that will wrap up.

I'm also wondering while I have the mike why the chocolate-covered macadamia nuts are still sitting with Randall and haven't made their way around the table because I'm anxious to get one or two. That
was 45 minutes ago. Thanks.

DR. STONE: Jeff Stone, Oregon State University. I'm peripherally involved in a couple of projects involving forestry diseases, forestry pathogens in Oregon. The Port Orford cedar is a conifer with a limited endemic distribution in Oregon. It's a fairly localized plant but it's also a very widely used cultivar for ornamental plantings and *Phytophthora lateralis* is a pathogen of apparently exotic origin.

There is quite a good range of apparently natural resistance to the disease in the Port Orford cedar so there's a cooperative project between the Forest Service and Oregon State University to attempt to get a multiple gene resistance in the Port Orford cedar that will enable the nursery industry to have disease resistant cultivars and possibly to be able to reforest areas where Port Orford cedars is native. There is some good success with that project.

In late summer of 2001, *Phytophthora ramorum*, the organism that causes sudden oak death, was found in southern Oregon in a few isolated sites. The Oregon Department of Agriculture aggressively sought to attempt to do what it could to control and perhaps eradicate the disease from those sites. The
forest fires of last summer in southern Oregon also helped to eliminate some of those sites where the disease was present but there has been some limited success.

The Oregon Department of Agriculture negotiated with private landowners to get some of the acreage and they aggressively sought the infected trees and cut buffer zones and burned all the debris. The report is from this year there were some limited discoveries of trees that were missed but for the most part the pathogen had not recovered. *Phytophthora ramorum* continues to be a very serious concern on the west coast and I'm sure one of an increasing anxiety on the east coast.

One really important thing that happened recently in the news the report of Douglas fir and perhaps other conifers of being hosts for this pathogen has among other people the fairly large Christmas tree industry in Oregon very nervous because of the potential for quarantines to be imposed so a great deal of public awareness of that organism.

MS. LELAND: I'm Marilyn Leland. I have three things to talk about today. First the draft Alaska ANS Management Plan came out in late August and it had a pretty short comment period but they did get
a few comments. The final Plan came out in October and I wasn't there in Hawaii but I understand that it was approved by the Task Force as Dean tells me and probably a few others of you approved it.

The second item is our organization has just begun a project putting together a clearinghouse of NIS related subjects. Our mission is pretty limited because of the source of our funding. So right now, we're only looking at issues related to tank or ballast. What we are hoping to have is a database that would have information on it with respect to the NIS that have already been identified to have been arriving in the ballast water, NIS that are potential invaders from the ports where we received our ballast water and then also looking at the various technologies that could be used to treat the NIS that are coming in in the ballast water.

At some time in the future after we get this pilot project going, I'd like to see it broadened but that would be dependent upon us getting some additional funding to do that. A few of you may have already heard about this because I know we've sent out a few letters and e-mails but I have a handout here with some information on it and I'll just pass that around.
The third thing is that last week I was in Seattle for the better part of the week for Fish Expo which is a large commercial fishing trade show. Our organization always has a booth there. There was a lot of curiosity about NIS. A lot of people were asking questions. We gave out the little Chinese mitten crab ID cards. But about midway through the show, a couple of friends from Western Regional Panel presented me with a little visual aid which I'll pass around and show you too. Once we got this, I can tell you we got a lot more interest. It's a female Chinese mitten crab. I'm told that the male is a little larger and has furrier claws. You couldn't prove it by me.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: We have three and a half minutes left.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: I just have a couple of things. One is that is the Santana River from controlling arundo using funds from Mitigation as well as the State Water Bottom we found that the recovery of Leesspell furrier (PH) which is an endangered bird species has been quite dramatic and it makes us feel good that that's what we're here for which is doing things like that and restoring recreational as well as reducing firefighting costs and water recovery.
For next year, I'm involved in a number of different society meetings, planning programs on invasive species. The two most significant ones are the Weed Science Society of America in Jacksonville in February where we have a symposium that's going to highlight action item two of the Management Plan which is resolution of regulatory and jurisdictional conflicts. We hope to provide a platform for NISC to talk about the successes in this area.

The other one we have is in November. We are planning a week long Invasive Plants in Natural and Management Systems Conference which is North American wide and in fact it will be international. It's going to consist of a series of symposia, workshops, roundtables and poster sessions that will deal with everything from prevention to restoration of invasive plant species. A number of people in this room are going to be heavily involved including officers as plenary speakers.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: One minute left.

MS. BARTUSKA: Plenty of time. Many of you received the Invasive Species Initiative Final Charter when I got it approved in September. So I'm actually official and we actually have a plan which is allowing the Conservancy to move forward on a whole
number of fronts. On the communications area, we have a lot of work going on including a greater web presence. So for all of you who would like to have links to the Conservancy website dealing with invasive species, let me know because I think it would be great to have a lot of that network going.

We're also trying to establish a network of the key contacts within the Conservancy distributed around our divisions and chapters. This is global people so that we can actually be networking among ourselves as well as reaching out beyond the Conservancy. One good part of that is that we got the information on the ELI report to everyone and several of our local offices are now taking that, carrying to their state legislators and are trying to develop a strategy of developing a comprehensive approach to state regulations. So they are actively using the ELI report. It's also allowing us to establish a formal MOU with GISP. That should be taken care of here in the next couple of months.

The other thing is the Conservancy has a group called the International Leadership Council made up of corporate vice presidents, things like Toyota, International Paper, Monsanto and a whole long list. They have formed an invasive species sub-committee.
They are going to be working with me to help bring the corporate bodies to and use their corporate influence on the invasive species effort. So that's very exciting. We haven't met yet but at least we have a group of people who are very interested in that arena.

The last thing I want to mention is we were able to influence a group called the National Commission on the Science of Sustainable Forestry. It's a foundation funded group to fund research. One of their initiatives this year is on invasive species. There's going to be a workshop held at NISC early next year to identify what is the role of invasive species in sustainable forestry with some emphasis on biodiversity. That will lead to a request for proposals to be funded by this Commission next year. So that was a really nice piece of work and that's building off of several of the things that many of you have been involved in, David included and Sarah Reichard and others. It's been a busy time.

I also testified in the same PALSAC (PH) committee that Barbara had mentioned. I'll say one last comment on this for we who are former Feds. It was terrific to be able to right to testimony to say what I wanted to say. Enough said.

(Laughter.)
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Is your next job at OMB? And I will confirm your suspicions. I did absolutely nothing. We are now going to move to the next item on the agenda which is an update on the cross-cut budget. A group has been working on this diligently and Scott Cameron is going to initiate this discussion.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much. I'm really pleased to be with you. As was just indicated, it's been a group project at multiple levels in our respective organizations. Jim Butler, Jim Tate, Stephanie Bailenson and I have all been involved at that political level as is Tim Keeney and a cast of dozens which sometimes feels like hundreds at the career level have also been engaged.

I invite any and all of my colleagues to interrupt me at any point or to add to my comments. I thought what I'd do is give you a quick overview of how we got started, what comes next immediately in terms of the 2004 process and what comes next somewhat longer term, longer term meaning around two months out quite that far.

In the late winter, early spring of 2002, the co-chair agencies, Interior, Ag and Commerce, started talking about putting together an FY04
interagency performance budget cross-cut on the invasive species topic. As you know that notion of the cross-cut is in the Management Plan. While individual agencies have from time to time over the last several years at least kept track of their invasive species funding, there has never been an effort to achieve interagency coordination from the very beginning and to collectively try to develop topics of focus either at the geographic level or the subject area level and to actually try to organize our budget requests so that we can collectively accomplish things.

At any rate in the late winter, early spring, we started down that path conversations among the three co-chair agencies. We decided that we wanted to go ahead and try and do this. In July, OMB director, Mitch Daniels, sent all the members of the National Invasive Species Council, all the agencies heads, a letter essentially endorsing what the co-chairs had proposed to do and I think most significantly implying very strongly and in talking with career staff over at OMB I confirmed this that the 04 exercise would be just the first year. I think we can look forward with OMB's blessing to pursuing this in a number of years in a row.
This effort is different from most agency budget cross-cuts in a rather significant way, namely that we are making a very strong effort to make this a performance budget. For those of you who are not schooled in the niceties of the Government Performance and Results Act, be grateful that you're not. For those of you who are not, the Government Performance and Results Act since 1993 has been pushing agencies to define outcomes and results associated with the budget dollars that they receive.

What we have the co-chair agencies have taken on the unprecedented task of not trying to do just that but to do it on an interagency basis. We would collectively agree on goals if you will for and invasive species budget initiative. We would agree on definitions. We would agree on strategies. We would agree on performance measures for those strategies. We would agree on priority actions perhaps not all of which can be funded in a particular year. Then also we would agree on performance measures for those actions.

So as far as I know, no one in the Federal establishment has ever attempted to do this on any topic on an interagency basis. The capability to do this sort of work is something that the President is
emphasizing through his President's Management Agenda and the Budget and Performance Integration piece of the President's Management Agenda in particular.

In August-September timeframe, the three co-chair agencies did in fact make a decision about topical and geographic areas of focus that we would like to pursue for the FY04 budget process. One thing I need to tell you right up front is that there is nothing in Washington that can end one's career faster than disclosing the contents of the President's budget before it actually comes out in February.

So I'm going to have to be and my colleagues as well necessarily vague and not forthcoming with you about the details of what we've been thinking about, what we've submitted to OMB. That's just the rules of the game. I hope you'll be able to accept that.

Having said that, we did indeed make decisions about topical and geographic areas of focus. We got the staff moving down a very aggressive trail of coming up with common definitions, common goals, common strategy statements and common performance measures. We came up with a product at the tail end of September. Frankly one of our challenges here is that each of the three co-chair agencies turns out its
own internal budget process in a slightly different timeframe.

So Stephanie and Tim for instances over at NOAA were getting decisions from their secretary's office about a month before Interior was telling its Bureau directors what our secretary wanted to do which was at least three weeks before Secretary Veneman was having similar conversations with her folks. One of the real challenges here is the internal challenge of process coordinating internally so that we end up with a rational outcome when we have three different cabinet officers each independently making decisions.

We at the tailend of September have a product which we presented to the Office of Management and Budget, career staff over there. They were budget examiners representing a number of the different agencies of the Council who participated in that. We've had I would say at least weekly if not more than weekly conversations with the career staff at OMB since that. They want more information. They want clarification. They want the information that we did give them organized a bit differently, formatted a bit differently, sliced and diced a bit differently.

I think it is fair to point out that since we got involved in the FY04 process in a really heavy
way in July for a number of Federal agencies, we started way out of sync with their internal budget processes. Therefore EPA for instance could not start playing in July in a way they could have if we started the process in January. The EPA experience was not unique at all.

Director Daniels at OMB holds a series typically of three or four hour meetings with the staff where they go over the budget requests of each of the agencies. It's called directors' review. Interior where these directors' meetings the key decisions are made with respect to the agency's budget. Interior had its directors' review on Halloween. I'm not sure what to make of that. I assume by now both Agriculture and Commerce have had their directors' review although I'm not certain of that. In any case, we will all simultaneously hear back from OMB on December 2. So December 2 is the first time that the agencies will know what OMB wants to do with our '04 budget in the context of invasive species in general and the passback in particular.

The President's budget itself comes out on or about February 4, very early in February. We are to a large extent ignorant of what is going to be in passback at this point. Even if we weren't, we
couldn't tell you for pain of excommunication, decapitation, God knows what else. The White House holds these matters very close to its vest. Any leaks about budget are usually purposeful leaks that the White House orchestrates. So I'm afraid you will all need to just hang loose and see what comes out in February.

FY05, believe it or not even though most of our agencies don't even have an enacted '03 Appropriations Bill, we need to start thinking about the FY05 process. We're going to starting discussions among the co-chair agencies over the next month I think about how to engage the Council in very early calendar '03 to get the ball rolling, to get the discussions rolling on '05.

In terms of tasks, immediately in front of us I indicated that we put together a performance structure if you will for the '04 budget. We consciously narrowed our scope so we would not be overwhelmed by the size of the task and narrowed it so that we were really only addressing early detection and rapid response, control of management and prevention. We will I expect in the next several weeks at the staff level or my relatively low political level have a closure on what that
performance package ought to look like. I would stress that we ought to have the Council formally bless that in some way, shape or form as early as possible in '03.

The second task would be for the Council to have some discussions about what FY05 priorities are. So rather than the three co-chair agencies again at a level considerably below the cabinet officer making some decisions on the fly in an August-September timeframe. We can have a considered discussion amongst senior policy level folks from the Council to make some decisions very early in calendar '03 about what the FY04 budget emphases ought to be topically or geographically for invasive species.

Having that discussion and having conclusions that come out of that discussion would allow us to go back to the individual bureau directors or assistant administrators at the agencies and say okay this is what the Council has identified as priorities for FY05. It is now very early in the '05 process for your agencies, somebody could say in January for instance. So incorporate the Council's priorities from the get-go.

The goal here in terms of the '05 process I suppose I could best explain by comparing the annual
budget cycle to a moon launch. Essentially what we did in the FY04 process was to start designing this launch vehicle when we were halfway to the moon. What we would like to be able to do is get everybody on board in the architectural and engineering design phase of the budget process very early on so everybody has the same frame of reference, so everybody is on board and we literally don't have to do this on the fly. That's pretty much the range of things that I wanted to throw out and I invite Jim Butler or Jim Tate or Stephanie to add or correct or make any comments that they would like to add.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: If I may respond on one thing. I told you this morning that I'm especially interested in making sure that we follow through with the GAO report on invasive species, recommending a clearer focus and greater commitment. I just merely bring to your attention that on page 61 of that report they repeat a fairly consistent mantra that they have developed in this report on describing the costs and risks associated with invasive species.

They encourage us on page 61 in their conclusions that the cross-cut budget itself that we are currently working on help the Federal agencies not just three co-chairs better allocate the resources
that are available to them through the budgetary process in such a way that risk assessment, the likelihood that a species might become established, might spread or might cause harm to the particular charge of the member agency. That is one of the conclusions that they have reached here and that they want us to pay special attention to among others.

MS. BAILENSON: I'd really like to thank Scott for his perseverance on this. At times, this seemed like a pretty daunting process to be undertaking so late in the game. If it were not for his complete conviction that we could do something meaningful with the '04 budget, we probably would have failed because the timing was so mismatched on this. In the end I think we have a good product. It's a good first step.

Rather than approaching it with the previous mindset which is these are the types of things my agency does and is responsible for and this is what we want to do next year, we looked at it as what does the nation need and what should our next steps be. There was give and take among the agencies as to what our budgets would allow so that we could stick with overall priorities.

That in and of itself is a huge benefit
and will have shape things to come. We started now talking on other areas where we have similar overlapping missions and mandates where we need to pull this same process into play. I'll be really pleased to see what comes back from OMB. We've gotten some very good comments back, some constructive criticism and we'll take it forward.

ASS'T SECRETARY BUTLER: Let me first just say that I'm not being vague. I still don't understand the process. I'm not sure I'll be in Washington long enough to ever understand where this is '03 and we don't have a budget. We've just done '04 and we're already talking about '05. I was never real good in math anyway.

Let me first thank Deb Hayes who I really think did a fine job of pulling our program leaders together, program coordinators, within the Department of Agriculture to work on this. As Scott said, we were about half way to the moon when we really grabbed this ball. They did a fine job in particular I think definitions, etc.

Our process at USDA is significantly different than the process at Interior. The timing and the passbacks as Scott has outlined also had an impact. However I do think the exercise has been
worthy. I think we've learned a great deal from this. As was pointed out earlier this morning, there may be a new actor in this as we move this down the road. As we look at the Department of Homeland Security and its creation and what entails on that in the next few months, they're going to be involved.

Within APHIS for instance a number of our dollars that are generated to work on invasive issues come through fees that you pay as airline passengers, etc. We also work on emergency issues through our CCC funds that we have available. Where all those tear lines occur and what happens in the next few months were yet uncertain. So I think it's rather interesting.

At the same time coming from a very strong state background and for those of you that work with state Departments of Ag or Natural Resources, I'm not sure how much real success we're going to have in this effort until we have a conversation that involves the states. From our side in APHIS, there is a constant battle going on with OMB about what is the Federal share and what is the state share of a dollar's resources program activity to deal with a variety of emergency issues and that's going to continue to occur.
Outside of this discussion with cross-cut budgets, we've been engaged now for almost a year with OMB about where is that fine line. For those of you that reside in Florida and heard of a disease like citrus canker and all the things that have occurred there, that's very significant. So we're yet to have resolution to that and I'm not sure when that will occur.

We're too anxious to receive our comments back from OMB in early December. I will say internally as we passed our budget back and forth from the secretary's office to the program areas within USDA, there were some dollars that we quoted a field to work on the invasive issues within our department. Again thank our staff. There's a number of them in the room that went through this exercise. We'll be better, Scott, in the future I think. All of us have learned a lot. We do value your input and your comments but it's been an exercise that's been worthy.

MR. CAMERON: Thank you all. I can give you just one example though I won't be specific because I don't want to get excommunicated and decapitated. I can give you one example. Our friends in NOAA didn't get all they wanted out of their cabin officer and we had some quiet communications behind
the scenes. The money that they didn't get Jim and I were able to put someplace in the Interior Department budget. So as a whole at least it went over to OMB. We had intact package notwithstanding the fact that we had cabin officers making some independent decisions.

These are the sorts of discussions that frankly have never happened before not just on this topic but hardly any topic. So we are paving new ground here and we are achieving levels of coordination I think that are unprecedented at least in terms of the budget process.

MS. BAILENSON: And hopefully if our friends over at OMB give us their blessing on this that will never have to happen again.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Budget decisions based upon the allocations made without turf battles. I'm only 54 years old. It's a wonderful day. I get asked this question every so often as chair of this group. The question is simply this. You have a cross-cut budget effort and if we then try to explain what that is. The follow-up question is is that because of ISAC. How do I answer that?

MR. CAMERON: I think we should all take credit for making this happen. So I'd invite ISAC to
take credit for making it happen. I'd invite ISAC to keep our feet to the fire and to keep on giving us salvos of good ideas on priorities and also on what makes or a good way to evaluate success or failure in these programs.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And are these then spreading? Are these types of assessments moving off into other programs beyond invasive plants?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, they are. An example would be in the wildland fire area where the Forest Service and about a half dozen Interior bureaus have come to an agreement on common goals, performance measures, definitions, monitoring a tracking system. There are nascent similar efforts I think going on across the Federal Government but I think it's certainly true that we in the invasive species area have the boldest and most aggressive even though perhaps our reach has slightly exceeded our grasp at least for '04.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: We're used to that.

MS. BAILENSON: In some cases, we're still struggling to do the things within our own agencies. You'll see more of that happening within NOAA also as NOAA reaches out to other agencies.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: When you were young,
did you all take a class called how to do cross-cut budgets? Does that exist? Nobody at the University of Florida knows how to do one.

MR. CAMERON: I worked at OMB six budget seasons and I presided over two or three of these during that period. But what we're trying to do here is much more elegant intellectually than anything that I saw in the 1980's or 1990's. And it isn't that pretty. It's an order of magnitude or more elegant than wherever's been tried before.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And "elegant intellectually" you can only aspire to periodically. Yes, give them a macadamia nut. We have to reward somehow for a job well done.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I saw they took some earlier without even being invited to so this won't be their first macadamia nut. We have time to ask some questions. Bill also has a wrap-up that he wants to present and then he has an actual document that he wants to talk to you about. How do you want to handle that sequence? Questions first or do you want your document out there now?

MR. DICKERSON: I don't anticipate that the document will create for any questions so let's
separate the two. Although it might. If there are any questions, let's go ahead with those for the gentleman over here and then we can complete with a wrap-with.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Very good. I see some cards up. Ron.

MR. LUKENS: Thank you. I guess this is probably for Scott. We all know that appropriations rarely resemble the President's budget requests when it happens. Given that now with a real cross-cut that's built from the beginning and one agency's ability to a job somewhat relying on another agency, what is the upshot of a disproportionately appropriated cross-cut budget? Given that it's being built the way it is, is there any sense that I won't say full appropriation but at least proportionate appropriation might be a higher priority? Has there any thought been given to that?

MR. CAMERON: I'll take a stab at that and others can add. Frankly most of our concern has been getting something to OMB and getting something out of OMB but you raise an excellent point. There are at least in terms of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee which also appropriates dollars for the Forest Service. There are some signals that they are
excited about the notion of a cross-cut budget. There was something in the report on the as-yet non-existent '03 Appropriations Bill for Interior and related agencies where the Interior appropriators in the Forest Service section of the Bill in fact indicate their pleasure at least on the House that this effort is taking place.

I think to the extent that we can show the appropriators anticipated results associated with an effort and demonstrate that by working collectively together on a project we can maximize the odds of success that they are likely to be more responsive than what otherwise would be the case. In Interior for instance we have a similar problem. Our Bureau of Reclamation gets its dollars out of the Energy and Water Appropriations Sub-committee whereas the rest of the department gets its dollars out of the Interior Sub-committee.

So we are going to have to be explaining to the Energy and Water appropriators assuming OMB gives us what we ask for that the X dollars that we requested for Y project in the BOR in fact relate to the ten X dollars that we're requesting for five other bureaus and the Interior bill for the same topic and that bad things would happen if we didn't get the BOR
piece. So I can anticipate us perhaps having some sort of traveling roadshow with the appropriators in a February-March timeframe trying to show how these pieces really are linked together.

MR. LUKENS: If I could follow up just quickly. That was really part of my point. Are we maybe worse off if we don't get some proportionate appropriations such that one agency can't carry a critical ball in a multi-agency effort? Has any thought been given to how that might play out given the appropriations process? Could we be worse off than we are now?

MR. CAMERON: Well, I guess it's always possibly worse off but the safest thing to do is never get out of bed in the morning. So we decided to get out of bed and make a run at this because at least we have a chance of succeeding if we make a run at it. We know we will fail if we don't.

MS. BAILENSON: And it's always challenging to make our case to the appropriators and I think you'll see a united front presented on this. This would be an administration initiative presented with all of the agencies. That's something we haven't done before. I think that sends a very strong signal. It also puts them to some extent on the hook. The
success or failure of this is now in their hands.

MR. CAMERON: I'd also add that if in fact we do get some dollars coming out of OMB on this and it does show up in the President's budget, it would help a whole bunch if the folks around this room would do a little bit of lobbying in support of the President's budget.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And I assume that as more information becomes available on specific pieces of it, that individuals of course are free to take that information and move with it as they see fit. Faith.

MS. CAMPBELL: Thank you. Scott, I know you can't share the dollars. Can you share the performance measurement guidelines or whatever?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can. OMB explicitly said we could do that and I think Bill is going to be talking about that in just a few minutes.

MR. DICKERSON: If you'd like to go ahead and give them generally, you can.

MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think we've internally developed something that is in the order of a 15 or 16 page document in these three broad areas: early detection/rapid response, control and management, and prevention. There are probably about
15 to 16 strategies which are served by something in order of 50 actions. Frankly there are many more actions than we could possibly fund in '04. The idea here was to put together an intellectually coherent package that related to these three areas and then the budget process would have to do its thing in terms of deciding what could be funded and what priorities were. It's probably easier to look at, Faith, than it is to try to describe.

MS. CAMPBELL: And those would include some measurements.

MR. CAMERON: Performance measurements.

MS. CAMPBELL: I continue to wonder how you are going to measure this so I'm eager to see it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Michael.

MR. BUCK: Scott, just to reinforce for us who do want to support the budget and work the Hill, we're going to need some pretty specific talking points so we pull together the pieces of the budget that you want supported. I know at least within the agency they are still uncertain of what the cross-cut looks like in relation to their whole budget. How do we go up on the Hill and support that? So as you get the things back we need some sort of approach that you can provide us would be very helpful to support the
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Ship.

MR. BRIGHT: Thank you. Hi Scott. Ship Bright. I want to follow up with a question that I asked him on TANF since budget is policy. Prevention is a national priority. Has OMB accepted avoided costs as a legitimate measure of performance?

MR. CAMERON: I guess the short answer is I think so. Although to be honest with you, I've not had extensive discussions in a group on precisely that topic. I think they have bought off on the notion that things happen both ecologically and economically when invasive species run amuck. I think they've bought off on the notion that preventing those bad things from happening is a good idea economically and ecologically.

MS. BAILENSON: While not specific to this effort, a lot of the questions that we have gotten back from OMB on a number of other things is how much is it going to cost not to do something you're proposing. So I think they are definitely heading in that direction.

MR. CAMERON: One of the things that I have on my wish list is being able to have something like a GIS system that can tell us for X number of
river miles or X number of acres where we start off with the economic damage because that leads the dollar signs on easily. But we know what the economic damage is associated with a particular organism.

What happens if the organism doubles its range? It would be at least a fun tool to be able to visually show on a map a linkage between the expansion in range of an organism and be able to predict dollar impact associated with that spread. That would be neat to have. You could do a similar analysis with regards to the ecological value or the esthetic value of various organisms that cause damage. That might not be very easy to quantify economically.

MR. BRIGHT: If I can say we had the North American Lake Management Society meeting up in Anchorage. We went through a build-out scenario basically of what would happen if this lake would raise more mill flow to take over and we know what the economic impact is to the average property owner if it were to take over. So we did a build-out scenario if you will of what the costs would be without prevention. That is an impressive argument to make at least on a local and state level. That gets decision-makers attention on it.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Just a follow-up on
that. It was one of our struggles in putting this together on the performance measures. One of the things that we found I think was useful about this exercise but it'll take a couple of years to put it into place is that it was okay to say that there just wasn't the baseline data available because some of these are very good arguments to make.

When the baseline data is not available to where the species are or what's the economic impacts are especially on a very broad scale, we were left with we know what a good performance measure might be. Well, we can't put it in because we don't have baseline data. So there is a number of things that are proposed for the cross-cut that look at building that baseline data both for management needs and for the measurement needs which I think should go hand-in-hand.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Allegra.

MS. ADLER: Thanks. Hi Scott. This is really a great exercise and I'm going back to Ron's question as to whether it can hurt. I don't really think that it can because already these programs require interagency collaboration. We already know that no one agency can accomplish most of these objectives. So we were already suffering from that
vulnerability that one agency could tie things up but now we have the Administration saying this concerted effort is important as a whole where before maybe it wasn't. So that has to help us.

I have a couple questions. One is in relation to performance goals. Most of the outcomes that we are looking at some years hence and also I think in some of the versions that we saw early on, it projected several years forward in terms of what the performance objectives might be. How does that work when the appropriations or budget year is strictly 2004 with that?

The second question, the fact that we will have the budget and OMB and several agencies speaking in favor of a cross-cut budget is great. However you prefaced your remarked stating that this was a subset of what needs to be done. We're just starting with what we can start with. Will preparatory statement also be made to folks on the Hill that may have control over the purse strings for other types of programs that aren't yet part of this process? Thank you.

MR. CAMERON: To answer that first question first, you typically need long term goals so I would anticipate a lot of situations where our goal
might be by FY05, FY06 having accomplished this for that particular thing. But even in GPRA, there are things called annual performance plans where you are supposed to indicate what the budget year's down payment is if you will with respect to that long term goal. So there are a series of milestones if you will that lay out the long term path.

It's a very real question though that appropriations may fluctuate from one year to the next. If they do, then they do. But it poses a certain amount of discipline on the process if you say by a certain year we want to have cleared X million acres of habitat of a particular plant or reduce the population of a certain aquatic nuisance species by some percent. At that time you are making a budget decision, it has to be in that context. That imposes a certain discipline on the budgetary process.

And frankly you can go to the Hill and say okay with that budget cut you gave us our FY06 bill is now going to be delayed to FY07. Is that what you really want to do? So it can be somewhat helpful in terms of dealing with the Hill.

On your second point, my hope is with the FY05 process that we would start soon enough so that we could be as expansive and complete as we think we
ought to be. I think unnecessarily in our communications with the Hill in terms of '04 we'll let them know that '04 was the first year and we were only able to take on a certain piece of the universe because of time constraints.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: I thought Jeff was responding. I did have a couple of comments for Scott in particular. First I'd just like to mention that I think we really have made some progress. I'm really looking forward to the subsequent years where we can refine the process. I do want to validate your comment about House appropriations. I had a chance to talk with some staff last week on a couple of other issues. But I asked the question well what about invasive. It was very clear to me that the comment was that we are looking forward to a cross-cut budget. We want one that is clear, concise and coordinated. So I think we got our marching orders from that. But the fact that they are interested and excited about seeing it to me was a real positive step forward.

The other comment, Scott, you specifically were talking about a GIS example. I think you could look at the "slow to spread for gypsy moth." That was a good math-based economic analysis, ecological
analysis product that did result in an increase in budget for the agencies involved. That might be the most loyal one that you could put in your back pocket and carry forward.

But I do have a question. A few years back, we had the ability to have two year authority for the expenditure of appropriations in -- related agencies and I don't think we use that very much anymore if at all. What is the potential for '05, '06 to really have no year dollars when we are talking about emergency authorities for invasive species?

MR. CAMERON: The honest answer is I have no idea because to my knowledge we haven't specifically addressed that question internally.

MS. BARTUSKA: Is that something that ISAC could bring forward as part of our budget sub-committee budget team that maybe this is way to look in the future?

MR. CAMERON: Yes, we certainly could. We'd be happy to consider that. As a practical matter, it's awfully close to the wire because of the '04 process to come up with a totally new idea but certainly in terms of '05 there is plenty of time. That specific question might be something that the Council might want to consider as part as its
discussion which I'm posing might be a good idea to have in terms of what the '05 process ought to look at and what priorities might be in '05.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Lori.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: My card has been up so long that I think I've forgotten what I was going to say. But I did want to remark on what Scott said earlier that all the agencies put in a tremendous amount of time and it's to compliment them. But it's also to say that we and the Council staff as well need to come with a more efficient process. A lot of that is because we didn't get started early enough. But I think we do need to develop a process that's more friendly to the agencies' specific budgets. When we do that we'll get even more buy-in.

We had weekly two to three to four hour meetings for 10 to 12 agencies throughout the summer into August. We had excellent attendance almost all the meetings. That's hundreds of hours of staff time. So I think people really did take this seriously and gave a lot of effort despite the crunch timeframe. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Nelroy.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON:: Scott, I just wanted to say thanks for your efforts. This is one area that
intrigued me but it's also the first part of involvement in this whole ISAC where somebody said you need to have a cross-cut budget in order to get anything done. I didn't even understand what a cross-cut budget was.

Then you came and said you wanted to lead this effort and a lot of people thought you were a little crazy because it seemed like one of the more difficult items identified and to me it's personally fulfilling that with all the efforts that went in that the payoff was somebody saying nothing would happen until OMB gives its blessing. Because of all the different directions, OMB came out in Mitch Daniel's letter I think was a landmark. So it's interesting that we came a full circle. I just wish we could use for a lot of other action items.

In terms of documenting the economic costs of an issue, I would give you a candidate of giant salvinia which if we had everything coordinated could have actually been eradicated in the North Colorado River soon after it was discovered. But because of a whole suite of issues, it became a bigger problem. It's cost money. Now it's gone over down the river into Mexico so it's actually become an international problem for the government. So it's become more
costly. That could be a case study if you can get somebody to say what does it cost and maybe project what it's going to cost us in the future.

MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Nelroy. I'd be extremely remiss if I didn't point out that while it's true that I may be a little bit crazy. It's also true that if Jim Butler and Jim Tate and Stephanie and Tim weren't willing to share in my craziness we would not be collectively making progress either. It's because we had people at a number of different agencies that were willing to go where no man or woman had gone before. In fact we seem to be teetering on the edge of some sort of success here.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: It must be comforting to know that the harder you work the better Nelroy feels. All right, we're going to turn if over to Bill now. We have about another 12 minutes for this.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you very much. I would like to say as a result of the optimism and the procedure that has been shown by Stephanie and Scott and Jim Tate and Jim Butler since our meeting at Yellowstone this advisory committee was essentially to provide input into that process. As a way of doing that really on the bus ride the last day of the Yellowstone meeting, we came up with a proposal for
the organization to provide some input. That was essentially a sub-committee to provide cross-cut budget information back. I would like to officially say thanks to the members of that committee.

On the early detection, Ann Bartuska was identified as the lead. Michael Buck, Faith Campbell and Ship Bright worked with her. On the prevention Linda Sheehan was the lead in that organization with Allegra, Ken DeLosi, Joe Corn and Bruce Taubert served on that group. On the management and control, Nelroy headed up that effort. Donnie Dippel, George Beck and Sarah Reichard worked on that. Personally from my perspective as being the overall coordinator of this effort, I want to say thank you.

As Scott has very carefully expressed, the schedule for providing input not only from our part but from their part to try to organize this herd of cats, it was a very short turn around task. So every time we requested information from you we received excellent information but it was in sometimes the request for turn around within 24 hours. At the very least, it was request for turn around in just matter of a few days. That was a luxury. But I would like to say to the members of the committee thank you.

I would also like to say at Yellowstone if
you did not attend Yellowstone and you are interested in participating in this process if you raise your hand or let Randall know or Nelroy or myself know, we have a list of psychiatrists. We will refer you to one. But we'd be delighted to have you participate in the process.

The opportunity that has been provided to this advisory committee is really a unique situation. It's like walking the fine line because as Scott has mentioned until the draft budget comes out of the President's office in February it's an inside document. So what we can do is very carefully hopefully respond constructively to providing additional information for them as they construct this budget. I think we've done that. Hopefully constructively.

This coming process this coming year, we are optimistic that there will be more time. It will be more organized and will give us a greater opportunity to provide more less urgent input. I'll put it like that. But we plan to continue to do this. I'd like to also especially say thanks to Lori, Gordon and Chris and Lori's staff for helping in every way possible. We worked hand in glove on this. Every time they would bend over backwards to facilitate our
input and together we worked this thing out.

Now what I need your help on specifically is the latest request for input provided by the advisory committee. We have a document that I sent out to members of the committee on Friday afternoon summarizing the fairly voluminous input which you all have provided to Lori and to me on some related requests. If you did not receive it on Friday or have not seen it, I have about 30 or 40 copies with me. That specifically is to members of these three working groups. That's to the 12 to 15 people I've identified. However I would like for those members of the committee to look at it and if you have any input please provide it back to me.

Larger than that, it needs to be approved by this whole advisory committee. What I'd also appreciate your indulgence here is I have copies for all of you here if you would like to see me afterwards. You can get a copy. If you have access to e-mail, you can get a copy off of e-mail.

But the truth of the matter is I'd like for you to trust me a little bit on this. I've talked with Nelroy and Randall about it. They didn't say no. So here's what I'm proposing. If you give conditional approval of this because timing is so urgent as an
advisory committee if you will conditionally approve of this document that I have copies of it if you would like to look at or you can access it on the Internet if you do not provide me feedback by tomorrow afternoon, essentially it will be approved as I submit it to you and as it now is.

If you provide comments back to me that are more than just editorial in nature, I will revise the document and submit it to you again by e-mail and let you approve it that way. But in order for it to not let something keep on dragging out, I would appreciate if you would conditionally approve of this based on your review and approval.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: To get this process started, how many have seen the document that Bill is talking about? Raise your hand. So half of us have seen it.

MR. DICKERSON: Just members of the committee have received it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I understand. The half that have not seen it, you have copies right now. Frankly Bill, I would hand those out to the people right now that don't have it.

MR. DICKERSON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: The rest of you among
you, are you willing to look at it this evening and come back tomorrow and at least be able to tell us no way? Yes, maybe there are some minor things that you want to work on. That's fine. But are you willing -- Yes, there are some typos and a few minor things. But are you willing to do that? Is there anyone that will not have the opportunity to look at it tonight? It's only a couple of pages and to at least let us know if there are serious problems by noon tomorrow.

MR. DICKERSON: And no news is positive news.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: We'll check on that part, Bill. David.

DR. LODGE: Just a little bit of clarification. Maybe I wasn't paying sufficient attention. What's the import of saying yes or no to this? What's the next step for this document? Where is it going?

MR. DICKERSON: Essentially we've already provided it informally. It's a draft document. Now what we need to do is all documents that leave this group for it to be a representative of this committee needs to have your stamp of approval. But quite frankly because of the time limits, we haven't had the chance to do that.
CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Who is the document going to? The Councils through the staff to NISC?

MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Other questions?

MS. UPSTON: (Off microphone.)

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: The question was whether we have an agreement on coming back and so far we don't have anybody that's opposed to taking a look at it this evening if they have not seen it and letting us know by noon tomorrow if there are serious problems with it. Ron.

MR. LUKENS: Thank you. The assumption then is, Bill, that in subsequent years we would have sufficient time to review something like this prior to.

MR. DICKERSON: That's certainly my intent.

MR. LUKENS: I certainly have no problem with trying to rush it along given the situation.

MR. DICKERSON: I guess what I'd like to say is I'm not sure I need for it to be brought back and it consume a lot of time unless someone brings an issue.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: My inclination is to at least touch the base tomorrow and everybody gets a nod
so the no one feels like we may have simply forgotten to bring the issue up. So far I think everyone is willing to look at it this evening that's not seen it yet. Then we will add an item somewhere on the agenda tomorrow to bring it up for concurrence.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay, now there's one piece of information that I -- Let me see if I can find it. Lori, I had it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Speed readers are probably already done.

MR. DICKERSON: On the first introductory paragraph, the last four lines there were some typos involved in that. So let me read you the way that should read and if you get your pencil ready to make some insert words. "Further changes are being considered..." After "considered" insert the word "for the draft cross-cut..." There are some typos there. "Further changes are being considered for the draft cross-cut proposal over the next several weeks."

Then it starts off "ISAC may review, revise, approve and follow as recommendations on the '04 cross-cut budget to the Council." Wait a minute. There's a word missing there. Lori, you may help me. "ISAC may review, revise, approve and follow as recommendations on the '04 cross-cut budget to the
Council." Delete "as." "...recommendations on the '04 cross-cut budget to the Council."

"The summary and comments of the budget task team are provided for your consideration and approval."

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: We can revise that this evening and pass it out.

MR. DICKERSON: Yes, we can provide you another copy but there are some words missing there from a typo. Other than that, that's it.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Any other questions or comments on this? We're going to talk a little bit about this probably during the break about whether we need a formal motion, something to be entered into the record. We're going to need something in that says "everyone nodded in consent." Again since we will be back to this, I suggest that we do that tomorrow. I don't think it will need to take a long time. I would suggest that we do that then. Is there anything illegal about us revising the agenda accordingly? Very well.

No more comments on this? Thank you all very much for this section. Bill, thanks for the good work. Thank you guys especially for the efforts that you have put forward for us. You may now have in
addition to your chocolate-covered macadamia nuts two and a half pound cookies in the corner. We are taking a break and we will be back here promptly at 3:00 p.m.

Off the record.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 2:46 p.m. and went back on the record at 3:01 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: On the record. All right. If you take a look at your agendas, the next item is "Resolving Regulatory and Jurisdictional Conflict." What we want to do is to use the next half hour to pull information out of ISAC. As it says we want to know what advice and guidance should ISAC provide the Council including examples of types of disputes that could be addressed. This issue has popped up several times over the past years, "Resolving Regulatory and Jurisdictional Conflict."

We know individual agencies are doing different things. We know multiple agencies are at cross purpose in terms of some of their recommendations and their practices. To make sure that everyone feels that they have the opportunity to give the input that they want to, we are going to take fine advantage of Facilitator Barbara.
MS. UPSTON: Thank you. We need people to come in and not talk or go out and talk but not both. Specifically this is Item Two on the National Management Plan and I started to put it on the flip chart and realized just how long it was. So I have the beginning of it on. If you have your copy or somebody's copy of the Plan, it would be helpful. It's on page 27. I hate to read to grown-ups but I think that we need to do that quickly for those of you who don't have access to it so that you can hear what it says and then target your comments and your guidance to what's being asked here.

It says that "By July 2001 the Council will ensure that a clearly defined process will be developed and procedures will be in place to help resolve jurisdictional and other disputes regarding invasive species issues. The goals will be resolve the disputes at the most effective and least formal level possible in an unbiased manner and to involve only those parties with an interest in the dispute. The process will use unbiased third party mediators if appropriate. When requested by a state, the process may apply to disputes between Federal and state entities."

Lori spoke to this item remember in her
Executive briefing this morning. One of the things that she did say was that they would not take on disputes which were already in litigation. Is that right?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: That's the direction.

MS. UPSTON: So that's the item. Share if you need to with each other to hearing it and seeing it are not always the same. The item here that we have is for you all to come up in a non-consensus way exactly for advice and guidance from ISAC that could provide the Council including examples of the types of disputes that could be addressed given some of the constraints.

There's no requirement you have to be in agreement. It's looking for all the ideas you might come up with. We can sift them at some point afterwards. If you need more boundaries or constraints, Lori and others can describe what those might be. It probably needs no more staffing resources that have to be involved and there are some other things I think I heard when they had a meeting. So what advice on this do you have for the Council as it moves forward to develop a process? Ron.

MR. LUKENS: I have no advice. I have a question. I understand I think what we are talking
about in terms of conflict resolution but it would be very helpful to me if Lori or someone perhaps could give an example of an existing one that we're talking about such that it would set the stage for a little bit more thought process. I'm not real clear on it.

MS. UPSTON: Who has some examples?

MS. BARTUSKA: I'll try. This is Ann Bartuska. It won't be Buffalo grass. We've gone through that once before. That is a good example though. We all read our notes from last time. A more recent one which I think hits the issue of when an invasive species issue is emerging as opposed to a all ready in conflict. How do we address it across agencies?

Specifically Cactoblastis, the cactus moth and the potential impacts on the Opuntia. It's in Florida and I may ask John to help me with this if I'm off-base. But it's in Florida. It has the potential to move west. It has the potential to move into both economic and ecological impacts. There's a strong support within ARS to do work on it. But when ARS got stakeholder input from APHIS, APHIS told them that was a low priority because it does not have significant economic impact except over the border so it's not a priority for us of yet. It doesn't fit as a priority
because of ecological concerns.

Here we have an emerging insect or emerging invasive potentially moving across two countries but we have an agency conflict. We don't have a forum. This is lower level staff people. I have a very good sense if we brought to this forum and the people here that we work with Washington, we'd get a fair amount of support.

But you have people at lower parts of the organization who have not been aware or probably are not aware of the Management Plan and the direction that we are all going. How do we engage that level of the organizations of the agencies to help address an issue especially as it's emerging? Was that clear?

MS. UPSTON: What would the role of the Council be to help that?

MR. LUKENS: So it can be inter or intra agency.

MS. BARTUSKA: Correct. Well the Council, I guess, just the first cut at this. Two things. The Council could try to make sure that as much of the organizations are aware of the common goals we all have on dealing with invasive species because I don't believe that's the case. Maybe the leadership are but not at the staff level. The second thing is by
putting in place a dispute resolution process then when a third party or even another agency but a third party comes in and says we have this issue, we're getting two different views from two different agencies and yet we're all supposed to be working together, there's a mechanism to address it. Right now, I don't see that mechanism in place.

MS. UPSTON: Others?

MR. DICKERSON: Yes, I have a question that will follow up with Ann. If it's in the same department, who would bring the issue forward since it's not between departments? I would think if it were to come to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture, she would solve the problem without having to involve anyone else.

MS. BARTUSKA: How would you bring before the Secretary of Agriculture?

MR. DICKERSON: If I were in ARS or APHIS, I certainly wouldn't carry it outside. I would think that would make the Secretary very unhappy.

MS. BLANCHARD: Nelroy, do you have a comment?

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Yes, I have a general one that's specifically to Bill. One of the intra-departmental issues is in Fish and Wildlife
Service where you have Ecological Services Branch that has a completely different regulatory role versus the other branch of Refugees. I don't think there's necessarily a good mechanism there for resolving conflict.

My overall issue is this. You could have the science, the funding, the permission, lots of things all in place and you have your very clear goals of what you want to do in terms of turning back an invasive species. Then you could get totally frustrated as a land or aquatics manager because somebody comes in and says you can't do this because of endangered species or for full permit or some other kind of permit. We do not have a mechanism that works very well talking across agencies and sometimes within an agency. The other thing that could be very frustrating is you could have a policy that's set in Washington and it's totally frustrating on the ground at a regional or district level and they don't even know.

MS. UPSTON: Okay Dean and Jim.

MR. DICKERSON: I'm sorry.

MS. UPSTON: Follow-up, Bill.

MR. DICKERSON: I was almost thinking that Nelroy and I would have a conversation.
MS. UPSTON: Yes.

MR. DICKERSON: I would respond to that and say if the Council perceived it to be a problem and wanted a solution to it, they could refer issues like that to us as an organization, as an unbiased third party and we could provide them some input at least from our perspective on how to solve that. I think the Council has to recommend and embrace a solution and then we could help them implement it if that's what they would like for us to do. But I think we could do it. We could certainly provide some outside input into it based on hopefully science and just intra-departmental squabbling.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Bill, I can also give you a couple more analogies. Right now, some issues have to go -- Sometimes I look at two agencies as two skyscrapers. The only time issues get dealt with is they have to go all the way up the ladder to the very top and then you get to the secretaries or heads of agencies talking. There are not windows or walkways across this way.

I would like to see facilitation both to raise some of these issues that are necessary to go at a high enough level quickly that there can be discussion and resolution and also somewhere in time
to have to build bridges and walkways at the lower levels. If you can get conflict resolved at the lowest common level, you often can do it more quickly, more efficiently and at less cost. You can accomplish the objectives because we all have objectives in what we are doing in terms of invasive species.

MR. DICKERSON: I agree with you 100 percent.

MS. UPSTON: Jim.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: This is Jim Tate speaking. At the Department of Interior we have a young woman named Elena Gonzales who runs the Alternative Dispute Resolution group. She is at the departmental level so all of the individual bureaus have their own Alternative Dispute Resolution person. These people all of them work at this subject because there is a Federal law and perhaps you can tell me the name of it. Perhaps someone here could.

MS. UPSTON: Or perhaps not.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: I'll just note for the record that within each department we are responding to a Federal law that's in place that requires alternative dispute resolution. What is it?

MS. UPSTON: I think it may have numbers but that's it. All of the enforcement agencies in
particular are required to have alternative dispute resolution at the lowest level.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: Now whether the Council has ever considered such a thing, I suspect we haven't.

MS. UPSTON: It's item two.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I think what we are doing right now is looking at the different elements of this action items and deciding whether it would be useful to use alternative dispute resolution or something like that. We're not going to reinvent the wheel. I do think though that brings up something where if an internal department or agency has a mechanism in place to resolve disputes, it's probably going to be less likely that the Council is going to want to jump in.

That doesn't mean we can't do some of the things that Nelroy was describing and building bridges and allowing for discussion of these issues which might be what we intend to do more than try to jump in and say we're going resolve a dispute. What we're going to do is bring the parties together, have a full discussion, do a report, maybe bring in alternative dispute resolution if the parties agree. That way we're not casting ourselves as an enforcement
mechanism or a judge over these departments of agencies that might have their own internal procedures. But we're just saying this is forum to discuss invasive species issues and bring them to resolution if possible.

MS. UPSTON: I think one thing that needs to be made clear is that in the way this is written it's the Council's responsibility to do develop this, not ISAC. So you can separate yourself from having to be the ones resolving the dispute but rather what advice do you have for the Council in how they might go about developing this process including for instance alternative dispute resolution and helping them think through the kinds of disputes that the Council should get involved in and those that they might want to avoid. That's what this section is intended to be about. Dean, you were next and then we'll capture anybody else.

MR. WILKINSON: I wanted to make two comments in terms of what Nelroy said, one of which was to agree and one of which was to disagree with him. Having been in the Federal Government long enough that on Wednesday I at least reached the first retirement threshold. One of the things that I found is that the farther something gets elevated, what you
have is the people who are beneath you almost set in stone. It's a situation where they begin to defend their position against whatever the other position is. So often elevating something has reached the point where it really is difficult to deal with.

I'll give a short example. In Colorado, there was a weed growing on a NOAA facility. We have weed management on our facilities but somebody reported it to somebody higher up and they wanted to do a whole NEPA analysis on whether we could get rid of the invasive weed when we already did weed management. So if you can deal with something and if we can have these crossovers early in a process and at a fairly low process and if there's a way we can encourage that, I think it really will work.

The second thing, Lori talked about parameters earlier this morning. Actually one of the parameters that I was instructed to talk about when the principals met was this issue of the Endangered Species Act. I worked on the Endangered Species Act for a number of years. What we as a Council cannot do and I don't think what any agency can do is to say we're going to advocate our responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act. So we have to operate within the constraints of existing law.
MS. UPSTON: Can I go with David and then come back? David.

DR. LODGE: I wanted to bring up a specific thing. Perhaps it may be a tangential issue. I don't know whether there was a thread of conversation going on already. This is an issue that brings into conflict goals in the Management Plan that pathway analysis with existing regulatory practice. It has to do with permitting a research in pathways analysis. So in the Management Plan, it's mandated that we get a better handle on pathways and document what's coming in and set priorities for pathways and so forth.

On the ground in the research community, it's very difficult if not impossible to actually get a permit to do that research because the potential exists that a researcher would be in possession of species that are listed and may be in a position of acquiring those from a vendor. The permitting agencies are unwilling to give permits except under the condition that researchers turn in sources of listed species. This may seem trivial but it's not trivial at all. It means that we can't get reliable data of the sort that are required by the Management Plan.
MS. UPSTON: So that's an example of the kind of dispute that --

DR. LODGE: This is an example and I'm not sure whether it's really so that's why I said it might be a bit tangential. It's not exactly agencies in conflict with each other. It's agencies in conflict with the goal of the Management Plan.

MS. UPSTON: So researchers can't get permit?

DR. LODGE: Researchers can't get permits to do pathway analysis studies.

MS. UPSTON: Okay, thank you. Who's next? Faith.

MS. CAMPBELL: Thank you. My interest would be in an early detection/rapid response strategy for finding out about friction or conflicts between agencies or between Plan goals or whatever or between agency priorities and the general concept of what we're about and trying to resolve them at the earliest level. I think there are probably a lot of models for the dispute resolution as long as the parties agree to participate which is another tricky issue. Would the chief of branch something or other of agency Y agree to have some kind of dispute resolution with agency Z from some other department or not? That might be
tricky. The other tricky thing is finding out about these things early enough to do the kind of resolution that --

MS. UPSTON: Any advice for the Council on that?

MS. CAMPBELL: I don't know that I have advice. I'm just saying that maybe there needs to be some sort of an anonymous tip-off type of system because often I think that one of the people in this dispute or whatever you want to call might be eager to get something happening but he's afraid to go through channels.

MS. UPSTON: George.

DR. BECK: George Beck. I guess my comments are largely philosophical. I've noticed over a long period of time that when we were addressing this issue, we'd come back here and talk to various Federal various agencies and members of Congress about weeds. I started noticing all the different groups that were essentially affected by it. There seemed like a common thread.

I guess maybe it's advice or maybe it's not advice but it seems to me that we should take advantage that on the issue of invasive species, we're just going to create a lot of disputes. Maybe this is
nothing more than a model for the future and how we get past all that is to think about things collectively whatever the issue may be and how it may affect the next agency, their operation or other facets of society. I guess I'd like to suggest it up front that we advice the Council to look at this as an opportunity to use it as a model of how agency tasks can be coordinated.

MS. UPSTON: Allegra.

MS. ADLER: Thank you. I'm going to suggest that the ISAC role would be most productively utilized as a group that can identify these conflicts ranging from intra-agency to interagency, between regulatory and research and the objectives of the Plan. That we are diverse enough that if we devoted some time on an agenda of one of our meetings to creating a list that could be then periodically revisited and revised that we could probably give NISC the high sign about something that are coming their way. Maybe they've been around a long time and haven't been noticed except by those that are directly affected. Maybe they're things that are looming on the horizon and if we don't get on with resolving them we're going to be in deep trouble soon.

In both cases the ISAC role could then be
extended beyond simply identifying those conflicts to ourselves proposing some ways forward. The substantive role is probably more appropriate and universal for this group than trying to devise a process which would need to fit into existing processes within agencies and departments already. So rather than trying to set up an infrastructure of dispute resolution which we would assume already exists in some myriad forms, we would be providing substantive input on those areas that require resolution and our recommendations with respect to them. Thank you.

MS. UPSTON: Thank you. Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: I do have a recommendation or a thought for the Council. Since we don't want a lot of these issues to come to the Council and I would agree with that, are there alternative ways to do that? As one example, several of the different regions of the country have all the leaders of natural resources come together on a regular basis to solve problems locally.

The Southwest Region is one that I'm thinking of in particular. So that group meets on a regular basis. Issues are brought forward by one or the other and they agree to solve them at that level.
and not have them come into Washington. Perhaps it's time as now that the Council has begun maturing and have been in place for a while that's an opportunity to encourage that kind of a structure, some kind of collaboration at a more regional level rather than just at the national level.

MS. UPSTON: Thank you, Nelroy.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: It just struck me that in looking at the language in Action Item Two that maybe some people construe this as the Council becoming the supreme court of contract resolution. I'm not sure that's the input that we give when the Management Plan was being developed. If there are systems already in place, can the Council serve to highlight them and sort of grease the wheels and do an education both what Ann was saying of promoting collaborative efforts.

But I think a lot of people who were working out in the field don't realize that some of these things exist and in the field level, it's becoming more and more frustrating. The whole situation becomes more and more onerous. I think if we think more in terms of unearthing and highlighting the systems and mechanisms that already exist or maybe we can look at the suite of them and distill the best
features of all of them. I still think this is a really very important. If we don't get it running smoothly, we can frustrate a lot of the other efforts.

MS. UPSTON: Gordon and then Ron and then I'll take one more if there is such. Then we're closed on this time.

MR. BROWN: What I hear being discussed more than dispute resolution is actually the setting of policy priorities that have not been read broadly or at that right levels in the agencies. One of the things that I'm struggling with is to try to figure out a mechanism that the Advisory Committee could use to bring to the attention of the Council alerts, early detection and rapid response really on the policy side.

These are issues that are not being dealt with perhaps at local-regional levels because they are not fitting within the set of priorities that exist at those levels. They may be difficult to appraise at local-regional levels. The Cactoblastis is an example. If it's in Florida, the southwest folks may not be tuned into it yet. If its distribution is expanding rapidly, it may that Ecological Services and Fish and Wildlife are not yet tuned into the potential impact on rare Opuntia series in the southwest.
In other words, you may have access to particular information which enough in advanced of general knowledge on topic areas that we need to come up with some way to communicate to people who can bring it back to the proper level in their agencies. It's not so much an issue of dispute as it is communicating early on about something that would allow facilitation of getting parties together to work on something rather than actually treating it as something that's gone wrong up front.

I don't have a concrete suggestion on how to do that. I think we'll have to work with it because the Council could be a good mechanism to bring back to agencies from the Advisory Committee a consensus view of cutting edge policy concern that need to be addressed.

The one that David mentioned is of a particular kind that's not necessarily going to be obvious to the people giving the permits. They're just reading the permit issue and its criteria and trying to do the best job they can. They're not looking in the broader context though of potential impact of frustrating the longer term goals under section 2 of the Order. They can't do that. It's not fair to expect them to be able to do the whole thing.
So what I think we're trying to feed back to is through the Advisory Committee and the Council a mechanism back to the agencies that allows this to be done earlier rather than later to avoid the need for dispute resolution. I don't know if that clarifies anything but I don't want people to get hung up on the fact that we don't necessarily have a dispute.

MS. UPSTON: Ron and then Jim

MR. LUKENS: Thank you. Allegra and then Gordon really said what I was wanting to say. However I would like to emphasize one point in that ISAC can serve which of course is a unique opportunity since we're made up of a broad constituency which is in the context of raising issues to the agencies or to the Council, we be diligent to the extent that we can to indicate to them the impact that we perceive if we don't resolve that conflict.

In other words, it will have on the ground consequences to solve any issue being paramount or a good example. If we don't do it and we don't do in a timely manner, we're going to see some economic and environmental consequences to that. I think the agencies see the constituency raising the issue in the context of impact directly to them, perhaps it will convey a bit more urgency. I just wanted to
emphasized that. I know you all meant that and touched on that but I wanted to emphasize it.

MS. UPSTON: And it's the impacts?

MR. LUKENS: Indicate the impacts or potential impacts of not resolving the conflict in a timely manner.

MS. UPSTON: Bill.

MR. DICKERSON: I've listened all of this. I just wonder maybe a lot of these comments are related to other things about input and how we can provide meaningful input back to the Council on sensitive issues as well as maybe conflict. Jim, I was wondering based on your participation with the Council if a request like this might be helpful.

If the Council were to request to us that based on this dispute resolution or other issues that we as a committee or as members of a committee as we understood there were issues that perhaps maybe the Council should consider if we just provided a list of those at each meeting we had back to the Council. Then the Council could choose to identify them or throw them in the trash can or whatever. We would then have a way of providing to the Council highlighting issues that we saw that may be dispute issues or maybe inconsistencies of policies or
implementation of policies between Federal agencies that are related to invasive species issues.

If the Council were receptive to this, this could be a way that we could provide input on a broad spectrum of inputs and concerns that we may be aware of that might be very helpful to them. It would be up to them if they took any action or not. Jim, does this have any merit or not?

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: This is Jim Tate. To understand you correctly, Invasive Species Council Advisory Committee would act as a screen of potential conflicts that have brought to your attention that you recommend to the Council to act further on or take no further action on. Is that it?

MR. DICKERSON: Really what I was thinking of rather than acting as a screen, I don't think we ought to go and investigate lots of things and come back with issues. But to the extent that we are aware of issues, we don't turn into a bunch of deputies, at each meeting that we have of this advisory committee we list them as a group sanitize them and say yes we think these are worthy of providing to the Council for you to bring increased awareness of the Council of this issues.

I suggest we only do that if the Council
would like us to because I think it would be presumptive if the Council didn't request it. I'm saying is it something that you think maybe the Council might think would be helpful or not? If it is, I think we could respond to it. It could be dispute resolution or other issues.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: I would turn to the staff and ask them if this is what is already happening in the sense that we are asking our advisory committee to provide advice on which issues are at our attention. I think the answer is going to be yes to that. But specifically you're asking on the alternative dispute resolution action item no. 2 here if you could play a role there as well as what you are already doing is the way I would interpret your question.

MR. DICKERSON: Well, I perceive that would be the basis for initiating a conversation. In order to address this issue if you like as the advisory committee, we would be glad to provide you any advanced warnings of issues that may come to your attention later or may have already come to your attention.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: Barbara, would that be something that could be one of your points?
MS. UPSTON: It seems to me, yes. It sounds like it but Lori needs to answer the question would it go on the action item for this group to consider. Do they want to embed in the agendas an opportunity, if I understood Bill, to list areas not just potential disputes, you were broadening it I think, to issues that the Council might want to have a heads-up on or be aware of as you become aware of them as committee members?

MR. DICKERSON: If I had an advisory committee, I'd like the advisory committee to be helpful in any way I could in implementing my duties. So that's all I was doing. I was saying anything else that we know might be helpful let us know.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Well I think you all are coming around to this is really helpful because we're sitting down right now trying to figure out what this action item should look like. What should the Council do on this? The first thing we need to do is set some parameters. This will help us do that.

Once the departments have set some parameters of what kind of disputes or conflicts or issues, I think it would be useful to get involved in within those parameters to bring to our attention things that we should look at. Obviously it would be
up to the Council whether they wanted to invest the
time and energy to do that.

But to bring issues up is definitely what
you already do on an informal basis and I would
definitely welcome it as long it wasn't done with the
expectations that every single issue that was brought
up of course would be dealt with. I don't think
that's how it work. However it would provide some of
the early warning that I think have all come to
understand that if we are going to be useful in this
process, the dispute can't be 10 years down the road
and in litigation for us to deal with it.

MS. UPSTON: I just want to synchronize
watches. By my watch, we're almost 10 minutes over
where we were going to stop and I'm concerned about
Tom. I see some other cards up. How do you want to
proceed?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And you were about to
get input but I'm going to make a suggestion. Let's
stop this right now. It's a very good discussion but
we have a social opportunity this evening and breaks
tomorrow to talk about it. Obviously it isn't going
to go away. We have some visitors here that are time
constrained by travel arrangements and things. So
with your understanding, let's move ahead to that. I
want to emphasize the issue I hope won't go away and it's on our list somewhere.

The next agenda item you will see is on "Recommendations by Extension Service." Tom Bewick is working with CSREES which is Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service for a long time now and is going to talk to us about some of the unique conflicts within that organization and how he has resolved those. Tom Bewick. Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service.

MR. BEWICK: Thanks. The title of this particular presentation that I'm going to make has changed several times. It all started as a series of e-mails going back and forth and a lot of you are familiar with what those e-mails were about. One of the things that struck me was that there is a lot of confusion among people as to what Extension is and how it's connected to USDA and how it's connected through us, the Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service. Most of us in the agency have a hard time with saying that without slipping up. It's quite a mouth full. Congress did that to us so we thank them for that.

A lot of people say CSREES. We prefer C-S-R-E-E-S. One of the things that I thought might be
a little bit helpful today is I'm going to go through the legislative authorities that created the Cooperative Extension System and those agencies in USDA that actually administer the land grant system. It happened such a long time ago that a lot of us have forgotten how it came about and was created.

USDA was founded in 1862 by President Abraham Lincoln. It wasn't given Cabinet status until 1880. In 1862 also, the first Moral Act was passed and this is what established the land grant college system. Each state was given 30,000 acres for every senator and 30,000 acres for every representative. That Federal land was granted to the state to create agricultural colleges that would then promote knowledge for agriculture.

In 1887, the Hatch Act was passed and that established the Cooperative State Research Service. The Hatch Act provides funds on a formula basis to the states and territories for the state experiment station systems. It's those experiment station systems that are charged with generating new knowledge for agriculture. In 1887, that was the thing with USDA. As you will see in a little bit we changed our mission to to a certain degree.

In 1890, the second Moral Act was passed.
That created what we call the 1890 Institution. It's another tier of land grant partners for the Federal system. They are also called the historically black institutions. Not every state has one but there are 20 I think or so.

In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act was passed. This established the Cooperative Extension Service. The Smith-Level funds are distributed to the states in a similar matter as the Hatch Act funds. So there has been a formula that's been established. The formula is really complex. It's rural population, percent of a state's population that's rurally based, number of farms, number of production units. There are all sorts of things that go into the formula. So some states get more support for their experiment stations and their Cooperative Extension Service than other states do.

In 1994, the State Experiment Station System and the Cooperative Extension System was reorganized along with the higher education programs into a single agency that deals with the land grant university system. So rather than having three agencies or four agencies separately administering the Federal funds that go into the land grant university system, it was all put under one agency. We didn't do
away with any people. We just took them all and shoved them into one building. Then they took us and spread us all over. Now they brought us back into one building again. But it put us under one administrator. So we eliminated some of the upper administration and the program leaders then are the ones that oversee the programs within both the experiment station and cooperative extension.

I told you that we have changed our mission. I wanted to put this up. I sent this out in one of the e-mails that I responded to. The mission of CSREES is "to advance knowledge for agriculture, the environment, human health and well-being and communities." If that doesn't cover it all, let me know and I'll put another word on there.

But we can do anything that people want. We're not constricted to doing just things for agriculture, the environment, human health and well-being and communities. So we have a very broad charge and given the availability of funds we can do anything that people want us to do.

Now I say that. I don't really do anything. I administer funds that go out to the states. It's people like George Beck at the land grant universities and others that actually do the
work on the ground. We help distribute those funds and then we help support their efforts in any way we can at the national level.

This formula-based funding has not been very popular in Washington for a long time. A lot of people that aren't in the agricultural community see these formula-based funds as pork for agriculture. We're subsidizing our agriculture industry by subsidizing the land grant universities and therefore we don't want to give them any more formula funds.

The total dollar amount of Hatch Act money and Smith-Lever money has remained flat for about 14 years. So in spending terms obviously the power of that money has gone down. There is an initiative in the Senate Budget so hopefully when we get the conference sometime around August of next year, this will be sorted out but actually the Senate has recommended a four percent increase in Hatch dollars and a four percent increase in Smith-Lever dollars. This would be the first real increase in funding for these programs in a long time.

I want to talk a little bit about how the Cooperative Extension System is organized and how it sets priorities and how it's funded. Almost every county in the U.S. has an Extension Office. I say
almost every county because if the county doesn't put any money into the mix, they lose their Extension Office. For each office, there's a county director. So you might have some number of agents in a county and then again depending on the importance of extension within a particular state, I know North Carolina to me is one of the most progressive states in the United States because of their commitment to the Extension Service. So for every county there is some number of Extension agents and for that county there will be a county director.

Counties within a state are organized into districts. Some districts have directors in many states. In other states, the districts don't have individual directors. Then in most states the Cooperative Extension System is administered through the land grant campus at the level of the dean. So the dean of the college of agriculture, ag and life sciences or whatever they call at that particular campus is also the extension director for that state. He may pass all the real workload on to an associate dean or assistant dean or some combination of that but that person is the actual director of the Cooperative Extension System in that state.

Normally they are also the director of the
experiment station. So you have one person who wears the hat of the director of the experiment station and also the director of extension. That's not true in all states. We don't tell every state how they have to run their system but that's generally how it works.

After I did this and as I was looking at my notes, I realized that I did this in an egocentrical way because this is the level in which I interact with the Cooperative Extension Service. So I'm looking at it from my point of view coming from the Federal system down. But in large measure, priorities are set within Extension from the county level up. Then we get to this meeting with the NASULGC and we coalesce all of that information that's been brought from the county up to the top.

The Extension Committee for Operations and Policy we have the COPs. We have SCOP which is experiment station, ECOP which is the Extension Service and ACOP which is the academic programs. So we call them just the COPs. They have protocols for establishing national priorities for various things.

About 12 months ago or so, I had a meeting with my deputy administrator and I said we have to get ECOP to look at invasive species as a national priority, get it on their agenda because what's going
to happen is there is going to be this ground swell of interest of having Extension deal with invasive species. Then there's going to be all these unfunded mandates. Within about two months of that meeting, they established and not because of what I said they were already doing it. It was on their radar screen. They have these protocols for creating what they call National Extension Initiatives. They have done that for invasive species at this time.

This is the level where CSREES, our deputy administrators, our associate administrators and our administrators as well as certain selected national program leaders become involved in helping set priority for the Extension System as a whole. However as I said this is really a bottom up process. So let's start down here at the bottom of the slide rather than at the top of the slide.

County Extension directors are responsible for assuring that state and national priorities are addressed at the county level. Almost without fail, a county director will have an advisory committee. This is a group of people throughout the county. If you wanted to be on a county director's advisory committee, if you volunteered once he picked himself off the floor with some smelling salts, they probably
would welcome your involvement. It's very rare that county directors actually get people to volunteer to do this. So they set county priorities with input from the local citizens. The county directors meet with the district directors and they plan their local programming. They also go over broader priorities.

For example again I'm using the North Carolina model. Over in the northwest part of the state, there is a big initiative to create some vineyards for wine production. So the county directors get together and talk about how they can work on that on a regional basis within the state of North Carolina. They talk about a slightly larger geographic scale.

The state directors then who are the deans or associate deans meet with the district directors to get their input and then the deans carry that back to NASULGC and that's how the national priorities get set. I have this going in the other direction but really that's how it works. It's all these advisory committees at the county, the district and the state levels feeding information into these Extension directors and then they bring it to the national meeting. This year it's going to be in Chicago. That is where the priority is set through the ECOP. Then
we get our orders from that.

We can talk about funding of the Cooperative Extension System. Smith-Lever funds as I mentioned are in a lot of the states based on a formula. So some states have more dollars for Extension than others. States submit plans of work to us, CSREES, for approval. Once their plans of work are approved, those funds are distributed. It doesn't say you don't need really need all the money that you are supposed to get out of this formula to do this plan. But as long as they have a plan of work that addresses national priority issues and addresses the needs within that state and the plan is approved, then the funds are distributed.

State legislatures also provide funding to the Cooperative Extension System. So it's important as citizens of states that if you think Extension needs to be doing more in your state that you let your representatives know that. Because what's been happening as Federal dollars got smaller, every state is in budget crisis. If you are only going to suffer 20 percent deficit this year, you are doing real good.

I know the State of Wisconsin has a $1.5 billion deficit in their budget. What are they going to cut? You know Cooperative Extension has for years
and years been associated with the agricultural community. That represents one percent of the population. In Wisconsin, it's slightly more than one percent. But even in Wisconsin, everybody thinks oh those cheeseheads up there. It's only five percent of the people who are actually involved in farming.

So as the base for Extension goes away, then the dollars at the state level go away. Now you have a shrinking Federal pool. You have shrinking state pool. Then it's left to the counties to cover the deficit. What county is in better shape than the state or the Federal system? Not too many. That's what happens.

There are some counties that had to make the tough choice that they're not going to have a county office anymore. I think in the State of Massachusetts where I was before coming back down here, there's only nine counties in the whole state but there's only two of them that have an Extension office. Barnstable which is out on the Cape and Plymouth County are the only two counties in Massachusetts that have an Extension office. So as resources have shrunk, that's what we see. We've seen a retraction of the Extension System.

One of the things that I'm responsible for
at that national level is to try to identify initiatives that can help support the Extension System. We've been doing that. I'll take Scott's lead here. I don't want to be decapitated either. I can't be excommunicated but I could be decapitated. We have at CSREES that's one of our missions as the agency that supports Extension. We also try to create budget initiatives that will help provide additional resources for Extension so that they can operate more functionally on these new national initiatives.

One of the things since September 11, 2001, there have been additional dollars going into Extension but specifically for homeland security. We had a thing called the Extension Disaster Education Network (EDEN). They have been getting additional dollars through the budget process in order to response to the threat of possible bioterrorism.

EDEN was set up initially to respond to natural disasters like floods or tornados or things like that because people tend to go we see county extension agents or we call them educators as being one of the first responders in any emergency at all. So we have created this network and we provide training and funding so that county specialists can respond to some sort of a crisis. That funding has
been going up but it's only because of the Federal will to provide funds along those lines.

I wanted to make a point about recommendations. I've heard it said that Extension is recommending the use of invasive plants. I got this from Webster's Extension is "to bring forward for consideration." If it's not on the noxious weed list which is that list of plants that is under Federal regulation. It's not against the law.

It's tell somebody that a certain plant grows acceptably in their landscape. They are not saying that you should go right out and buy this plant and put it in your landscape. They're just saying that under the environmental conditions that exist in this area you can grow these plants. It gives them a whole list of plants not all of which are invasive.

People then are allowed to make choices. Extension does not advocate one legal thing above another legal thing as long as they are equal. So for example I'm a weak scientist. We have five herbicide options to produce string beans in any particular state. All five of those options are equally effective in controlling weeds in string beans without damaging the crop and making the same amount of money using any of those five options. We won't promote one
over the other.

But if there's the chance that a crop could be damaged so you might make less money by using one versus another, then we'll tell that. You have to make a choice. You may get a little bit grass control with this product but you stand to lose some yield. So we still just give them options. That's what an Extension recommendation is. It's a laying out of what the options that are available with as much information as is known and allowing people to make choices.

I'll just put this back up there again and hopefully if you have some questions or you want to make some comments but this is our mission. We really do take this mission very seriously. So does the Cooperative Extension System. So does the Cooperative State Research and the state experiment station people. We advance knowledge for agriculture, the environment, human health and well-being and the community. Questions?


DIRECTOR DIONIGI: Chris Dionigi. Tom, could you just comment a little bit about Extension Service work through the volunteer network like the
Master Gardener's Program?

MR. BEWICK: I'm trying to remember the date. I think it was 1972 that The Master Gardener Program was founded through the University of Washington Cooperative Extension System. It led to the development of a whole series of what we call Master Volunteer Programs. We have Master Naturalists down in Texas. We have Master Tree Stewards up in New York. We have Master Homeowners. We have Master Tailors. We have Master everything. If you want to have a program, you can have it.

Those volunteer programs have expanded the ability of Extension to meet the needs of people through the time that they volunteer. So what we did is we give them training and I say we in really the legal sense. These are county people, state people, state coordinators. They develop these training modules and they train local people to do certain tasks.

Then in return from the training, this is really great, we train to do them a task that we can no longer do and then in return for that we make them volunteer 40 hours. In the State of Texas in 2001, they had almost 1500 volunteers. They volunteered about 275,000 hours of time. It was worth $4.2
million. Those are hours that Extension people would have to spend answering phones, answering questions from homeowners and others and even some growers that was taken over by trained volunteers. It's a very effective way of expanding the impact of Extension.

DR. BECK: Tom, where do we stand on the opportunity for Extension to assume invasive species as a national program? I have two other things associated with that. One is dovetailed on Chris's comments. If we do so, can we take advantage of the Master Gardener Program? The last part is perhaps we should change some recommendations to suggestions.

MR. BEWICK: Yes, we probably should bring that up at the ECOP meeting because when I looked in Webster's, there are probably 20 different definitions for recommendations, some of them more stronger than others. As far as where do we stand, we have promoting the use of volunteers in invasive species efforts. That's one of the things that we've been promoting.

And talking with other agencies, APHIS, Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, there are a lot of other agencies that want to use volunteers. Since we have had such a great amounts even the USGS is interested in looking at developing some volunteer
training programs. That program has been really successful. In the United States, CSREES has a million volunteers doing different things for different people. So it has been very successful.

I think we're on the cusp. The NISC has been very instrumental in getting all together and getting us talking, working with FICMNEW and Aquatic Invasive Species Task Force has also been instrumental in getting us talking and saying how can we make the best use of this. Right after September 11th, ECOP put out a document that said for Extensions to respond to the national emergency on agricultural security would cost about $220 million. It's not in the budget for '03. It's not going to be in the budget for a long time. But that's the kind of money that we're talking about. We can do specific programs obviously for a lot less. But to fully respond to this new national need or this new national awareness of a need would be about $220 million first estimate.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Faith.

MS. CAMPBELL: Thank you. Tom, when you say the recommendations consist of a list and you don't promote one over the other and then you also said that you provide information and options, can you tell us what is the information that you provide about
plants that are considered invasive but are not on the noxious weed lists of Federal or state that says anything about the fact that EPPC or somebody else might consider this plant invasive and you might want to think it something else?

MR. BEWICK: Not in all cases. That's something that as the national program we have for horticultural, that's one of my responsibilities and one of my roles which is to try to make the quality of that information as uniform as possible across the board. It's not as good in all cases as it is in others.

How soon can we do that? Do you have $10 million? We could do it tomorrow. It's a matter of resources. That's one of the things that I was thinking about when Ann said that on Cactusblastis, ARS went to APHIS and APHIS said well that's not as big of a deal for us. It's a matter of resources. You can't do everything all at one time so you have to make some decisions. But that's definitely something that we're looking at ways of partnering with other people that might have resources that we don't have in working to make sure that the quality of information that's going out is the highest possible.

MS. CAMPBELL: Could you distribute EPPC
lists for a specific region? That's information.

MR. BEWICK: Well it's information but we advance knowledge. Not all EPPC lists are based on knowledge. That's a real philosophical debate.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Let me jump in for just a second. Those of us who have been having this discussion for 11 years now, number one there's a whole range and each state is different. If you go to Florida since we've been the nasty end of this battle for so long, I think almost all of our publications now say yes it's presented that yes, it's Brazilian pepper and it's pretty but it does do the following things. You might want to take that into consideration before you purchase it or some environmental horticultural have found it easier to remove it.

Other states maybe haven't done that. So there's a whole range out there. When you ask is Extension taking the steps necessary when you have thousands of people doing thousands of things then it will never be very quickly. The other issue about EPPC lists we're going to leave until later on. It's interesting discussion but it's actually more fun when you've been drinking a little bit so it could possibly be this afternoon. Now I just have bailed
you out and we only have a minute left. So, Chuck, last question.

MR. O'NEILL: Thank you. Tom, what does it take to actually get a new Federal initiative going? I know that in our state it's mostly horticulture educators and natural resource educators who are doing any kind of invasive species work. But I think that the situation is ripe for them to do a lot more. Would it take a full Federal initiative or is there something below the level of having a nationwide initiative that can help the states out without requiring as big an infusion of funding?

MR. BEWICK: I think that short of having Federal dollars to put into a program if we by educating our people in ECOP and this again comes from the bottom up. If it's real important in your county and it's real important in your state then that information should be fed back to the extension director. Then as they make decisions on how to allocate resources, they can allocate resources to one thing over another.

What that does then is as the Extension directors get the feeling that this really important, that elevates it up to the national level. So when my administrator hears from ECOP that this is an issue
that we are really concerned about. Then when I come forward with a budget initiative for new money or allocation of resources within our budget, it makes it easier for me to sell the idea.

MR. O'NEILL: So the more state directors and deans you hear from the faster it's going to get on.

MR. BEWICK: Exactly, because we really are a bottom up priority setting organization. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Very good. Thank you very much, Tom. I appreciate it. This is sort of on the spot but are you available this evening. Are you sticking around for the social?

MR. BEWICK: No, I have to go home and can applesauce.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Because all the EPPC members here would be happy to buy you a drink at the social.

MR. BEWICK: I'm sure but they would have to taste it first. One thing I did want to say is I do have things that could be made into handout if anyone would be interested. I'll just leave them with you.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: In fact, we were going
to end with that. Raise your hands if you would like a copy of this presentation for whatever reasons. Somebody count. That's enough that we're going to distribute to everyone. Thank you again. The next issue we're going to move into is we're going to turn it over to Lori for our continuing discussion about NEPA Guidance.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: And you're only going to hear from me for a second. Fortunately I'm very happy to say that Horst Greczmiel is here from the Council on Environmental Quality and he is going to be presenting you a brief overview of what NEPA Guidance is supposed to be so we just have an idea of what we are shooting at in terms of invasive species NEPA guidance.

Then we're going to have a short presentation from Wendy Jastremski. I introduced her this morning. She's been Presidential Management intern with the Environmental Protection Agency who was detailed to us this summer to help move along the NEPA Guidance. She has worked very closely with CEQ and a number of our working groups on NEPA Guidance that she put together this summer.

What we've done is significantly advanced an early draft. What you have in your notebooks is an
outline. There is a draft in place, much more extensive than the outline but it's not been through sufficient agency review. What you have is an outline of the structure of what we're looking at in terms of the NEPA Guidance and where we are going with that NEPA guidance and Wendy will cover that.

First I want to vacate my seat so Horst can come and sit here and just give you a few minutes on what NEPA Guidance is for and how it can be utilized by the Federal agencies and what we should be shooting for.

MR. GRECZMIEL: Thank you, Lori. I just wanted to take a few moments. I look around the room and I see a lot of faces that I am familiar with so some of you are familiar with the NEPA process. I'm not going to go into a long explanation of that is but just very briefly for some of you I don't know who may not be that familiar with what NEPA does, why it's important, I think it's important because it's part of my job but how we can use it as part of the initiative and moving forward with the invasive species program.

The National Environmental Policy Act applies to all the Federal agencies that either fund or undertake Federal actions or approve them or permit them. So whenever a Federal agency is taking an
action where it has to make that kind of decision, it has to go through some kind of environmental planning process. Underneath though that process can be very simple. It can be what's called a categorical exclusion where the agency says we do this thing all the time. There are no environmental effects. That's the end of the questioning. Or it can be an environmental assessment where they have to take a look at alternatives and what the environmental effects of those are. Or it can be an environmental impact statement.

For those of you who have followed the latest media coverage that we've been receiving over the Council of Environmental Quality, there's a lot of concern over the direction that the National Environmental Policy Act is going in the current Administration. There are a lot of questions about whether or not we mean it when we say that we are going to continue to have Federal agencies go through that process and make it work well. Well, the answer is we are going to make it work well.

The invasive species gives us another opportunity to educate the NEPA practitioners and the decision makers out there about invasive species. I don't mean that facetiously. I mean that very
seriously. There are so many environmental issues that require these days a depth of knowledge that not all of us have. So this guidance piece is an important opportunity for us to be able to reach out to the community of NEPA practitioners and let them know what they need to start thinking about when they go through that environmental planning process and especially what they need to know with regards to invasive species.

The guidance that's being prepared is obviously going to focus on those Federal activities that agencies undertake where there may be an intentional or unintentional introduction of a species or some effect on a pathway. It will also address those types of programs which are specifically addressed as invasive species whether in control programs or some type of a natural restoration program.

So it will cover the broad scope of activities that agencies undertake. It gives us an opportunity to make sure that not only the NEPA practitioners but then the product that they produce to goes to the agency decision makers will educate those decision makers on what exactly are some of invasive species of the patients of the actions that
they are undertaking.

Examples, some of you may be familiar with CEQ's involvement in quite a contentious issue if you will in Hawaii at the airports there with invasive species and what types of programs needed to be put into the place so that they would not basically have Federal agencies facilitate the spread of those species. Those are the types of things that are getting a lot of visibility but there are hundreds and thousands of daily activities that agencies undertake which can benefit from knowing what the impacts may be with regards to invasives.

So this guidance gives us an opportunity as I said earlier and I'll wrap up saying to educate not only the NEPA practitioners but then also the decision makers who receive those analyses and take them into account when they make their decisions. That's the big picture.

MR. BUCK: The issue was extending the runway and the impact. I know that EIS was withdrawn I think a lot of it at the request of the airlines that did not want to set a precedent of having to do any IS for any type of those things. Has the issue come up anywhere else or that still hasn't been dealt with yet?
MR. GRECZMIEL: The way it was dealt with was to put together a team that's going to take a look at those issues as they come along. It has not to my knowledge come up at other places. That doesn't mean that it hasn't. I have to be quite blunt. There are a lot of agencies out there and a lot of NEPA processes that are on-going and I'm not familiar with each and every one of them. So it's helpful to me in this audience that you're aware of some. Call those out to my attention and we can use those as we develop this guidance to give us some additional food for thought.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: This is Jim Tate. I notice that National Management Plan item number 12 asks for NEPA guidance. It also says in the outline provided here that there's a section of the Executive Order as well that requests NEPA guidance. My question to you is do other bureaus or departments have similar notebooks or guidance and how do they compare to what we've done. This is merely an outline, these two pages, but how well does it compare to what our bureaus or departments are doing?

MR. GRECZMIEL: The guidance that we are preparing is the guidance that will be sent out to all those other departments and bureaus for their use in
the NEPA process. Right now what governs the way agencies conduct that process are the regulations that are issued by CEQ as well as agency specific NEPA procedures. Now those agency procedures can be supplemented and amended by the agencies as time goes on and new issues come up. The guidance that we are preparing here is a tool that we give to the agencies for their use and they can decide to incorporate it specifically into their procedures or they can simply use it as a tool to assess them in going through their process.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: That causes me to ask a follow-up question then. If there is NEPA guidance in the bureau that deals with invasive species already, is there a process for us to see whether they have incorporated this or whether they have chosen to replace what they have with this or what? IS there anything like that in place?

MR. GRECZMIEL: There is no program in place that I'm aware of that's monitoring how the agencies are wrapping the invasives issue into their own agency procedures. Again as I said they don't specifically have to revise the procedures and a few of them I know for a fact are waiting on the guidance that we are putting together here so they can be
consistent with that before they decide whether they are going to either supplement or simply defer to that as a tool for their folks to use.

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: When will this be complete?

MR. GRECZMIEL: The projection is spring. Is that right?

ASS'T SECRETARY TATE: In a presentation yet to come. Thank you.

MS. BARTUSKA: Horst, over the last decade the Forest Service and BLM have increasingly been held to higher standard in terms of NEPA implementation and especially if you look at those agencies anything outside of Interior related agencies to other agencies it seems like there's highly uneven treatment of NEPA and how agency actions are dictated. Is CEQ looking at that at all as we move forward on invasive species?

MR. GRECZMIEL: Are we looking at the harmonization?

MS. BARTUSKA: The harmonization across agencies.

MR. GRECZMIEL: That's one of the reasons why we wanted to issue this guidance and make it applicable or available to all the agencies rather than just one or two. You're absolutely right. There
are certain agencies as time goes on that get more attention than others because they are undertaking projects that are very much in the public eye right now.

You are absolutely right. The Forest Service and BML after this last wildfire season have taken a lot of criticism over the procedures that they use. They're in the process of being held very tightly accountable by the public. Other agencies have escaped that kind of review. I would hazard to say that that is not always the case over the long run.

Highways has its day. Corps of Engineers has its day. They all come up at one point or another but those are the big agencies that undertake a lot of actions. The good part about this guidance is that it will speak not only to those major big agencies but to all the smaller agencies as well.

MS. BARTUSKA: Just one last comment. I think that some of the agencies have given up because of poor challenges, the use of categorical exclusions for other practices. It would be great if in invasive species, CEQ would reinforce the fact that CE is a viable NEPA alternative and is something that maybe we should be going back to in our practices.
MR. GRECZMIEL: Categorical exclusion is going to be discussed, you are absolutely right. I would say that some agencies very few have stopped using categorical exclusions because of lawsuits. I can only think of two or three of those. The Forest Service is one of them in their harvesting. That is no secret. It's out there. So the other agencies are right now along with a task force looking at the question of how agencies can reinstitute or establish new categorical exclusions. So it's definitely something that needs to be looked at.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Allegra.

MS. ADLER: Thank you. I have a couple of questions. It seems like the invasive issues when related to Federal actions take a couple different forms. Sometimes they are incidental to what the agency may want to do. The Corps of Engineers wants to create an interbasin connection and are they thinking about invasive species transfers? I assume that your guidance is designed specifically to help with those instances.

But sometimes the NEPA process may be triggered by an action directly related to invasive species management. For example, when the Coast Guard when and if they approve a treatment for a ship to use
to prevent movement of species, they may be looking at a chemical that may have trade-off ramifications for the environment. Do you provide guidance relative to those potential conflicts within the process of attempting to prevent or control invasive species?

Thanks.

MR. GRECZMIEL: Let me just clarify if I misspoke earlier but the guidance is going to address both of those types of activities, both those where an invasive species may be intentionally or unintentionally introduced as well as those types of activities that are specifically focused on invasive species such as control programs. When the Coast Guard gets to the point of deciding it has to make a decision on what type of treatment it is going to require, under the NEPA process they would be taking a look at alternatives for that type of treatment.

So for example irradiation or the x-ray treatments, chemical treatments would be on the table if they are reasonable and meet the needs of the proposal which is to control the impact of those invasive species. Under NEPA if your purpose is to prevent for example the pathway vector of ballast water, then the alternatives you look at in that NEPA analysis would have to be able to meet that need. It
wouldn't be some other way or some other fashion to say turn to airplanes or trains instead of using ships. So it does have to address the specific need but then it has to be reasonable and they would have to take a look at those.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Right now, Wendy is going to do a presentation on where we are in the process and timeline. I really want to thank Horst. We really impacts the work on this item with the Council of Environmental Quality and it would have been impossible for us to move forward without his help. Thank you, Horst, for coming today and your work the last couple of months. Wendy.

MS. JASTREMSKI: At this point in the discussion, perhaps this presentation will serve as a summary of what we just talked about and also help to clarify any issues that we also discussed. Basically as Dr. Tate pointed out earlier, the project is specifically mentioned in the Executive Order, the same order that created the Invasive Species Council as well as ISAC, the group that you are in.

The phrase in the Order itself is something you can read and it's also in your management plan which talks about the fact that the Council is charged with writing this guidance along
with Council agency CHIP (PH). The National Environmental Policy Act itself as Horst mentioned involves having agencies look over their own actions and filing environmental impact statements and involving assessments.

So the point of this guidance would be to focus on invasive species impact that they would have to review and propose alternatives for. The audience of the guidance for this project would be Federal agencies because that is regulated community when it comes to NEPA. Also a lot of times agencies hire consultants to actually write the impact statements or the environmental assessments. This guidance might be helpful to those people as well.

But as we hope that this guidance is widely distributed, perhaps state and local stakeholders may use it as a guide to educate themselves because a lot of different experts are going to be contributing to writing different ideas for when something should come to your attention as it may cause an impact and also how to mitigate some of those impacts so it prevents them entirely. So we're hoping this guidance has a wider impact than the targeted audience.

Client contributors of the guidance
include someone from each of the agencies that is represented on the Invasive Species Council. The way that we located those people for the most part was to work through our policy liaisons to find someone who had expertise in both NEPA as well as Invasive Species. So people have been generously donating their time to attend meetings and to help with writing different part of this guidance.

CEQ is also a player in actually advising us along the way which should help to make sure that our guidance is success and also the staff of course. We are hoping that we can get some input also from ISAC as well especially when it comes to the appendices because we'd like to have some references for people who would like more information than is contained in the guidance because we do have a limited scope. Hopefully you'll be able to provide information for those appendices.

As Horst mentioned, there are different aspects discussed as far as intentional and unintentional pathways. A lot of the impact statements that I've had a chance to review through EPA have been about people trying to control or mitigate invasive species problems by wanting to kill the invasive species whether it be with chemicals or
clearing them. So they go over the different alternatives.

That's not the only type of activity that this guidance is pertaining to but it certainly will be a part of that. We also not only want to provide specific strategies to deal with these other intentional/unintentional pathways but hopefully bring them to some people's awareness because unlike all of you not everyone spends so much time thinking about invasive species.

That's one of the best reasons this guidance is needed because there are a lot of people who have to deal with NEPA in all those Federal agencies but they are not invasive species experts. Maybe they have heard of the issue but they aren't aware of all of the pathways as you all are. So this guidance should be a concise way to quickly bring them up to speed. It's also going to hopefully educate some invasive species experts on NEPA. The guidance will discuss triggers for when NEPA might be involved. So a project that an agency might have done in the past where they didn't realize it had an invasive species problem, now maybe they have to file an impact statement because maybe there will be some big environmental impacts.
Lori asked me to present an example of where this guidance could be helpful to an agency. One of the biggest ones that came up in a lot of the discussions as we were brainstorming about this guidance was the issue of rapid response. So I just want to briefly mention that this has been a possible concern for projects of what Federal agencies do. Let's take some people in the Forest Service for example. Perhaps they are out in Oregon and there are these big beautiful forests out there and they notice they are starting to have an invasive species problem.

The best way of things to fall into place would be you detect the problem early, you realize the species is there and you already know the type of response method you need. This isn't a new species. It's been dealt with somewhere else. So you know what you have to do. You even have the resources to do it. You have the money. You have the people. You are ready to go. The Forest Service wants to irrigate this species to save this forest from the impact.

In the past and maybe even still today, there's a lot of anxiety with some people but not necessarily the Forest Service. That's not why I chose them as an example but it was good for the rapid response idea. But different agencies feel as though
NEPA can actually serve to be a road block because of the time that it takes to file an EIS.

If you have ever seen one, I'm not kidding you they can be this thick just about one simple action that they want to do exactly because the problem of lawsuits. A lot of these agencies are afraid because they've had so many problems in the past. They want to cover every possible angle. By the time they do that, it's too late. You don't have any opportunity for rapid response. So what we want to try to do in this guidance is help agencies solve those problems so they can still comply with NEPA with invasive species but also eradicate the problems that happen.

So you have all seen an annotated outline and if not, we have it. Basically the introduction of the outline would be something that could bring you quickly up to speed if you don't know very much about invasive species. It will have examples of some problems and also talk about the scope of the guidance and what the purpose is and who are intended audience is. We present some highlights from the Executive Order including the assignment for this guidance as well as reaffirming the duties of the Federal agency that is reading the guidance.
Then we go through some key invasive species terms that you all recognize and we can explain to the agency how these can be translated into their activities. The guidance goes on to take that NEPA practitioner through their NEPA process that they already know that's a highlight along the way when they should be thinking about invasive species in terms of the words that I have just presented. So you can imagine where in here prevention comes in, where control comes in, where research might come in. These types of invasive species terms they may not have already been familiar with.

Then there are some sections that we've included based on comparing our draft to a similar type of guidance on Environmental Justice. That was published by CEQ in 1997. There were some sections in there that we're also going to include which would be when an agency does have a categorical exclusion. We would like them to use this guidance in their planning purposes even if they don't officially write it all up as in the EIS or EA. There's a section on regulatory changes which basically is asking the agency to review its regulations and make sure that they are all in compliance with the ideas put forth in this guidance.

Then the effect of this guidance basically
lets the reader know that no, I'm sorry, this guidance does not get you standing in a court to sue an agency because it didn't do something in this guidance the way you interpret it when reading it because it's not a regulation. It's just guidance.

Then we have appendices and I would like to talk about a few of those and we hope you can contribute. One of them will be to offer some additional resources. Mostly we'll go through each agency that's represented on the Council and try to find and identify in that agency where someone would call to get some expertise on invasive species issues. If it's prevention and control, they find out where to go and get that information.

We'd also be interested in including some other types of information from stakeholders such as perhaps your organizations if you have expertise to offer to someone who might be doing an action and trying to prevent an invasive species introduction. This would give them some places to look. Then there is a need to include some other relevant guidance that we can't exactly fit in with the flow because we want to keep the main part concise. But CEQ does acknowledge in some of their guidance that our scientific information isn't complete and that in the
future we may learn more things and that this isn't a reason to punish an agency with a lawsuit. Some of those types of guidance and information will be included in the appendix.

There has been a debate about including lists, undesirable invasive species, injurious wildlife from the Lacey Act for example. At this point the decision is not to include these lists because we wouldn't want the reader to think that if it wasn't on this list that we're okay. These lists are going to be updated I'm sure in the future. So instead we will reference the reader to the lists. If you know of any sources were people can get information, I would also like to make an effort to include state regulated species because certainly something could be invasive where it's not in other states due to temperature or other conditions specific to the region.

Lastly for the appendices, there are some agencies that already have their own internal guidance on invasive species. They may have some protocols and best management practices that would be useful to share. So we would like to include those as well.

As Lori mentioned I do have a timeline to show you. This is what we've done to date since June.
Before I came to work with the Council in June, there had been two other drafts created. The main difference between this process and the other two processes is that it's not just the Invasive Species Council or a very smart person writing the guidance pretty much on their own to propose it to the agencies.

Instead we've taken on a process of trying to include someone from all of the agencies to sit on the Council. For example with the Department of Agriculture, that representative is from the Forest Service as well as APHIS. The Department of Interior has several different bureaus within that come to these meetings. So there are many different view being shared and many people literally writing different parts of the guidance which I'm trying to put all together into one document. That's why we hope this time it will be accepted because all these agencies have their hand in writing it instead of just having it presented to them.

The projected timeline is to try to get back from all the assignments sent out to the volunteers at the agencies and put them together in a final document. Then in accordance with CEQ, there is a public comment period and we have to get
finalization with them. All the agencies will also have a final review session in that revision part. So we hope that in 2003 this guidance will be finished.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Wendy. I think that's it. I know it's late in the day and people are tired but do you have additional questions? Do we have a minute, Randall? Where are we on time? Randall is my agenda police.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I'm everyone's agenda police. Questions? I have one if you don't. I had to step over the room briefly and straighten Tom Bewick outside so I was gone for a couple of minutes. You probably talked about this when I was gone. Are there agencies stepping forward with NEPA documentation to cover what might happen in the next 10 years so that they already have things on the shelf and when yes it's on that list and it's a bug and it showed up we can go ahead and do this?

MR. WILKINSON: I can say from NOAA's perspective we've actually had a general guidance. Invasive species should be looked at in the context of NEPA actually before the Council was established.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: That's a good start. What I'm wondering is I know in the State of California when I left in 1995 was in the midst of
developing all the documentation they would need for the next 200 years or the next infestation of hydrilla or Salvinia molesta interestingly enough. I hope they use it. So I know that there are some states that are trying to provide that kind of documentation so it's on the shelf instead of in the development phase when the things that you kind of know are coming actually do show up. So what I'm asking is are Federal agencies allowed legally to do that. If so, are there agencies moving in that direction?

MS. JASTREMSKI: I've had some contact with people in APHIS and they are trying to do exactly that in writing up documents that comply with NEPA specifically and EIS that wouldn't be just for one situation and it could have a longer applicability. It's still in the draft phases but when that's finished it might serve as a great example to other Federal agencies that do similar actions over and over again how to do the EIS once and then just modify it. That would help move things faster.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: And my follow-up question before you get away from the microphone, will a paragraph to that effect, because you just stated in very eloquent terms how important that could be, be in this overall general NEPA guidance document?
MS. JASTREMSKI: Absolutely. That's exactly what we were trying to get at with the rapid response. So when you take the NEPA practitioner through the section that goes through each step of the way we're going to talk about how to look at ways where you make this standard and have this ahead of time and think about all your alternatives and try to plan ahead with this action.

In the past, there have been introductions. You may not know what species is going to be introduced but that shouldn't matter because you only have a certain arsenal of ways to deal with it so plan for all of them ahead. So when you get approval for the project in essence you already have approval to respond if there's an invasive species introduction.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Thank you.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: One thing that's been an issue and I think we're still discussing it is you can anticipate that something is going to spread but you don't exactly where it's going to spread. A lot of NEPA needs to be site-specific. You need to talk about the particular area that you are dealing. So we're looking at planning documents in ways to build either into the guidance that use examples of agencies
that have done this successfully on how you anticipate the spread of some of these species which would help a lot with some of the on-going control efforts. I'm not sure we settled that issue but that's something that a couple of agencies are working developing some guidance for our guidance.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: Sort of follow up on that, there had been a regionwide EIS for Southern pine beetle that allowed rapid response when you had any site-specific outbreak. That allowed you to very rapidly go in and treat it with very little additional work. I know there was some problems with that but is that idea of having a regionwide EIS more broadly applied still on the table? And it may be when you answered yes but I wasn't quite sure.

MS. JASTREMSKI: Yes.

MS. ADLER: I am struggling with the relationship that the NEPA process might have especially when it's tuned into the invasives problem. Having the screening guidelines that National Management Plan calls for to be the extent that under existing law and possibly under future law, agencies will be approving the importation of organisms that are being intentionally introduced. Is NEPA aware of
where those guidelines are ultimately going to be nested? Will they be duplicative of the NEPA process?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I think that screening depending on what screening processes are set up is probably going to have to be particular either legislative or regulatory authority within particular agencies to carry out the screening if it's done on a regulatory and not a voluntary basis. I think the NEPA question will be somewhat separate but you're going to be looking at the same type of issues. Can you approve things based on evaluating the whole screening system under NEPA and not have to evaluate each time to do a particular screening exercise? I think that's what we will be looking at but it's a good question.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Faith.

MS. CAMPBELL: Michael keeps thinking I'm eight feet tall. Mine goes to the pathway side of it. Under World Trade Organizations rules for example, APHIS and maybe other agencies go to international standard-setting bodies and develop international standards or guidelines or get guidance that they then come home and say they have to adopt or pretty much have to adopt. It's at the later stage when they issue the EIS but the decision was made years before
when they took a negotiating position to standard-setting body. If the NEPA guidance can address this, how does this relate to the other EO dealing with international trade agreements?

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: You've just identified an area that we really need to get some more of the international agencies. The State Department has been participating but we haven't been dealing with enough of the people that are involved in some of the trade issues. We talked to APHIS about this. We just haven't come up with a way to handle this issue effectively in the guidance.

Initially we even thought about having guidance that didn't deal with international issues and international trade. We just decided that was a non-starter under invasive species. So we are still looking at that, getting USTR and some of the other international playing agencies involved in helping us deal with that specific issue.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Other comments, questions? Michael.

MR. BUCK: Maybe in the review process the states could participate some time because this just deals with all the state cost-sharing programs as well. Based on risk analysis and the lack of science,
there's a huge range of programs that haven't been put through this invasive species filter that now could be well held up so it's a nightmare. This smells like a nightmare to me. I think it needs some interim reviews and give the states a little more time than the one month of the public reviews that I saw on your schedule.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Duly noted. Now would be a good time actually to let this wind down for a second or two. Is there a final comment on the NEPA compliance side? All the Federal agencies are very happy I trust. They've been wanting this for years.

MS. UPSTON: Is there a request in there of ISAC that needs to go up as a potential action item or an agenda item?

MS. JASTREMSKI: I think Lori and I have discussed bringing it to your awareness with this presentation and then perhaps following up with an e-mail where we can more specifically detail the type of information that we would love for you to contribute.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Okay. Very good timing and thank you very much. It was a good presentation and lots of very interesting information. The path is not going to be smooth I am sure but at least we have some assistance in getting down the path. Every state
will be going through something equivalent I suspect at the state level and it always gets more interesting.

We now have the time set for public comment. We have an interesting situation. I have one piece of paper and we have one speaker and apparently Peter Jennings is here. I find that quite coincidental. Peter Jenkins is the author of this interesting discussion on "Paying for Protection from Invasive Species" but I swear to God it says Peter Jennings is here this evening to discuss this with us.

MS. PASSE: My fault.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Assuming that may be it's Peter Jenkins, we will now turn the floor over to him. Peter.

MR. JENKINS: I wish I were Peter Jennings. Thank you. I'm going to talk about that comment and it is Jenkins, J-E-N-K-I-N-S. Thank you.

"Paying for Protection from Invasive Species." I wrote an article that was recently published in the National Academy of Sciences, Issues in Science and Technology and that's what I'm going to talk about today. I understand it was included in the packet so thank you very much. I appreciate that.

I should introduce myself a little bit.
I'm a policy analyst and attorney with the Center for Technology Assessment, a non-profit enviro group. We deal with invasives and biotech issues and things like that. I've been working on invasives policy issues for about 12 years now and the comments read that I keep hearing over and over again and Nelroy's story about giant salvinia and Mike's talking about coqui frog in Hawaii is money for rapid response and early detection which has come up from all the people who has followed this issues for years and years. This is the big gaping hole in this problem and we need to figure out some way to address having adequate money in hand to deal with it.

I think if ISAC and ISTOM (PH) takes some bold policy leaps into this topic, it's just going to continue to be a big gaping hole. It's a fun policy issues to think about and you could make a real difference here and I would encourage you to take it on.

I was listening interestingly to all the budget discussion of cross-cut but with the deficits and budget shortages at the state, Federal, local levels do you really think that the appropriations process is going to provide the money that's needed to have extra additional funding in hand to deal with
rapid response to new invasions? I wish it did. I hope it will but I don't have confidence that it will.

So I think that you need to seriously think about some more proactive approaches to funding rapid response. That's what I set forth in my proposal. It's a "polluter pay" sort of approach. It's moving toward a proactive, polluter pay sort of approach where through fees assessed on the industry sectors that are utilizing world trade and bringing potentially invasive species into this country whether through trade, travel what have you that those industries sectors should be responsible for paying fees up front to fund the needed trust fund that would be available to deal with paying for these problems.

The analogy that often gets thrown into this debate is look what you did with oil spill response times. Back in the 1970's you had a lot of oil spill problems and there wasn't enough money to clean them up. Someone I don't know who I think spurred on by states said by God I think we ought to have a trust fund to deal with this and we ought to tax the industry and that's what happened. There were special fees imposed on bulk oil shipments. It's been done both at the Federal level and at states levels. Those fees go into funds that are available to clean
up these problems.

I encourage you to think about invasives as a form of biological pollution which many of us do and to think that there are ways that we can address biological pollution by making the polluter pay up front to solve them. So that's what I tried to do in the paper. I refer on the fact that it is affecting in this Management Plan. I can't tell you what number the article is. I think it's under rapid response and early detection somewhere under miscellaneous legislative things.

But the Management Plan says that NISC should consider recommending to the President alternative permanent funding sources for rapid response. I don't think the Council has done that yet. I hope that you do that. I'm not suggesting that my paper is the ultimate answer to being able to do that but it's a start. I note also in the Management Plan that such an approach is supposed to be developed in consultation with the states. So it seems logical that the next step is to try to workshop with the states and really formally consult with the states some approaches that might work to develop permanent funding sources.

I have extra copies. If you are
interested in talking to me further about it, I'll be
glad to talk about it. Along with this proposal, I
should say that the article in this issue's magazine
is a popularized version of a much more technical and
well annotated and bibliographed version that has all
kinds of sites, etc. It also has sample proposed
legislation attached and that's up on our website
actually at www.icta.org. It includes not only the
paper but also the sample proposed legislation which
could be suitable for states and could be suitable at
the Federal level too. So there are more resources
associated with this proposal and good luck. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Thank you very much.
I assume you have your e-mail address on here. I
assume you are available if people had questions and
wanted to follow up with you on individual discussions
as well. Are there other members of the general
public that would like to make comment at this time?
I hear none. So we will hand it back to Barbara and
she will review the day's activities and maybe talk
briefly about tomorrow.

MS. UPSTON: Yes, and also what to do with
your things in the room this evening, etc. If you can
find your agenda that would be helpful just as a quick
review because I want to know what's working well,
what particularly stands out for you about today and then let's quickly review the agenda for tomorrow. There are a couple of additions and some things we will decide this evening and let you know about tomorrow morning.

Just to refresh you so that you can answer the question. We have the update from various ISAC people. We had remarks from the principals. Lori spoke about the progress of the Management Plan and you had the metrics that allowed you to see where things were. Then the member's forum.

I have the flip charts and will work on those this evening to try to extract in a way that will be helpful to you, action items and potential agenda items and that sort of things and redo them so you will have them to reflect on tomorrow because that's one of the things that has to happen before we close. It's to identify where you are some of these things.

So the member's forum including your activities and then there was the update on the cross-cut budget from Scott and some of the items there. Then your input to the resolving of the regulatory and jurisdictional conflict. Tom's presentation on the Extension Service. Just now the NEPA guidance.
That's where we are for the day. Any off-the-cuff reactions to preferably what you particularly appreciate about today on what's being done. It's called a dipstick. How are we?

MR. BRIGHT: Ship here. Just a quick suggestion for tomorrow. Anybody who says an acronym ought to say what it stands for. When I was in the Navy, they gave us the Dic Nav Ab, the Dictionary of Naval Abbreviations, but we don't have one of these for here though.

MS. UPSTON: This has come up before and we always say you're absolutely right and then promptly forget because we have I think it's called --

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: I say they buy us lunch.

MS. UPSTON: Now we remember it but of course we can't remember. Thank you. So we'll try for tomorrow. Any other impressions from today other than we use too many acronyms and don't explain them.

PARTICIPANT: I'd like to say that I appreciate the opportunity for us to systematically express individual opinions about various things.

MS. UPSTON: Linda.

MS. SHEEHAN: And of course Randall did a great job in moving the meeting along. Thank you.
MS. UPSTON: Notice we are actually early.

MR. LUKENS: Unfortunately I'm on the steering group and unfortunately I had to miss at least one and two of the conferences calls.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Three.

MR. LUKENS: Oh, shut up.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Do you really want that announced?

MR. LUKENS: I didn't mean for this part of my comment to go that far. Actually what I was asking was do people feel like the agenda suffered from or benefitted from that process of my absence. I know the answer to that question because I thought it flowed pretty well. I thought everything went very nicely today. I just wondered if everybody felt comfortable with the steering group doing that and did it seem to work out okay.

DIRECTOR WILLIAMS: I just think it's great having Nelroy work for me and I think he's doing a great job.

MS. UPSTON: Allegra.

MS. ADLER: That was going to be my comment, Ron, that I thought that was very well structured and that it worked very well.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Thank you.
MS. UPSTON: Yes, Nelroy, you really put time into that. Okay, for tomorrow. Let me finish for tonight. The hotel staff will need to change the tablecloths so please gather your papers together. Now this is work for people so you don't want to get in the way of their having jobs. Gather your papers together, put your nametags on top of them and put them under your chair when you leave if you are not going to take them out of the room. That way they can put fresh cloths up which probably would be a good thing.

The no-host reception for tonight is back in the hotel which is just around the corner if you haven't been there. You can't miss the entrance. Just turn right when you go out here and go right-right. It's in the Franklin Park Room.

MS. PASSE: When you go in the lobby, you pass the front desk on the left. Just after the front desk in the hallway on the left.

MS. UPSTON: Can't miss it. It's hors d'oeuvres and a cash bar so bring your wallet. Tomorrow morning bright and early on your agenda at 8:00 a.m. in this room please, we'll open the meeting and then you will break again. You will go immediately from here if your team is assigned into
your task team discussions.

We'll provide instructions for you to take with you. We have two rooms in the hotel. We have this room and I'm going to see if we can get some others and also we're talk about exactly how many teams we're talking about. The two largest task teams probably should be the ones to leave so we need to figure out what those are and give you the room with some privacy.

You will be talking about the progress you made, the challenges you face, your next steps and anything else that you think the rest of group will find important and interesting from you. That's just to give you some guidance. Obviously if there is something else you think of but that's to bring some consistencies to it. Those are the things that the steering committee felt would be the most helpful and interesting. Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: Could we get a list of who -- Never mind.

MS. UPSTON: Absolutely, that's one of the things Chris is going to help me do tonight is to put together the list of who is where and then if you're in overlapping places, you're going to have to decide. Once again if the team is short and you can move over
there to help it actually have a meeting, that's probably it. Then we will post that tomorrow.

MS. BARTUSKA: Thank you.

MS. UPSTON: Nelroy.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON:: I think there may be a couple of people who were not at Yellowstone who needs to indicate to Chris or Barbara which task team to go on.

MS. UPSTON: Yes, Chris told me that there were about nine people. I don't know if they are still here, if they made this meeting who are not actually on a team so you'll have to decide tomorrow morning where you are going to go so that everybody is part of a task team at least participating in the meeting.

Then we will have the reports from the task teams and then early detection/rapid response. Barbara is going to do her presentation. Remember lunch is on your own. If anybody has some really great places that are fairly quick, we tried to add a little bit more time to the lunch schedule and there are some right around the corner where you can go. Of course you are welcome to get things and bring them back here if you wish in terms of take-out and eat here.
Then the science and public policy. Jim Tate will be back. Ship and Chuck and company will do the update on the analysis of the economic costs, GAO recommendations, NISA reauthorization, the short updates. Again the members forum so there's an opportunity for closing thoughts, public comments and then wrap up including what are the action items and what are some possible next agenda items, etc. In there probably before lunch, Bill's budget paper has to be approved so you have an assignment. It is if you have not reviewed it please do it so you can give intelligent response to it tomorrow. Michael.

MR. BUCK: Just a comment, that's a pretty tight agenda tomorrow. We had some issues that came up. Task teams may be coming up with issues for ISAC action. So I would play it by ear but we might need some actual time built in so we can actually talk, discuss and make final recommendations.

MS. UPSTON: We'll be looking for places and remind people to be as crisp and specific when they speak so we can keep to the agenda.

VICE CHAIR JACKSON: Barbara, on that note, we have an hour allocation for reports from task teams. If the reports are short that would leave time at the end of it to accommodate some discussion on
these issues.

MS. UPSTON: Yes, they shouldn't be more than 10 minutes. People can't really listen for longer than that. Five, oops. Then close by 5:15 p.m. and if you are intending to go on the field trip please sign up if you haven't done so already. Please be sure to sign-in so we know who was here today. Here comes Kelsey. I mispoke.

MS. PASSE: I already know who from ISAC is going on the field trip. These are policy liaisons who are interested in attending.

MS. UPSTON: Okay. Everybody all set?

MS. CAMPBELL: Excuse me. One point. Faith Campbell. This morning I announced that several of us had been working on a letter to Secretary Veneman dealing with the wood packaging material issue. Craig has revised it to some extent and we'll pass it around now for people to look at it overnight. Craig.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: Just a couple of quick comments. For one I made as a New Year's Resolution that Faith and I would find at least one substantive of agreement at each ISAC meeting. So that's the spirit in which I'm part of this team. We're at a point in time where USDA has just finished its EIS
associated with solid wood packing materials and they will be in rule-making fairly soon but yet there's a sense that the rule-making is taking a snapshot-in-time approach rather than both-that-end-a-long-term-view approach. I guess there are reasons why we have that sense based on the EIS and past conversations.

So there's an opportunity, a point in time, for ISAC to take a look at and perhaps to advise in this area. Obviously for many stakeholders, the risks and impacts associated with solid wood packing material are huge. It represents an area that's inherently difficult to handle through traditional inspection, etc.

So I guess we would ask you to look at this letter with two filters in mind. Number one, is it appropriate for ISAC to be advising in this type of way? Is it an appropriate use and if not, do we need to scale back and do this as individual groups? Number two, are there specific statements, wording, in the draft letter that represent a deal-killer from your perspective? Is there anything in there you can't live with? If the general sense of the group is that this is an appropriate area for ISAC to file a letter. So with that, we'll pass the draft. Thanks.

MS. UPSTON: So you have two assignments
overnight if you haven't had a chance to look at the budget paper. It's that and this letter. We'll try to put them in together at the same point so the decisions are made. David.

DR. LODGE: Perhaps I missed some communication but to that Wednesday it's killing me. For those of us that signed up for Wednesday but still don't have any idea what we signed up for, can we get a little bit of preview? Did I miss something?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Trust us. That would be page three in the handout. It's on the original version.

MS. UPSTON: I'm sure there is someone here who can be more specific as we get closer to Wednesday. Gordon. Is he here? Now we're just asking you to ask also of those who remain. Is there anyone who has a burning issue that they don't see either was addressed today or on the agenda for tomorrow that they think they would like a little bit of time. So that we don't get caught by surprise. If you know you're going to want bring something up that might actually take some time, you need to either huddle with us now at the close so that we can really try to give it adequate time or figure out a way to deal with it in some other fashion so we don't get

MR. MEYERS: I have a question for clarification. There was a document sitting here called the Invasive Species Protection Act. It's a wonderful title if that's what we are going to do. But is this to be discussed tomorrow? Overnight why don't you change it to Invasive Species Control Assistance Act? I don't think we want to protect invasive species. But I didn't know if this is to be discussed tomorrow or what?

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Just for the input you wanted, right?

MS. UPSTON: Going once, going twice. Meeting adjourned.

CHAIRMAN STOCKER: Thank you all very much. See you at 6:00 p.m. this evening, 8:00 a.m. or both. Off the record.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter concluded at 5:05 p.m.)
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DR. STOCKER: Good morning. I'm glad that you are all here ready for day two, and let me start by thanking you very much for how smoothly yesterday went. Yesterday was the easiest agenda that I have ever had to try to maintain in all my life.

And in part it is congratulations to Nelroy and his group's efforts to have a reasonable agenda that we actually can get through, and I just want to remind you of how that works in case you might have already forgotten.

We had a few e-mails among Nelroy and myself, and Lori, and her staff to take pick some conference call dates and times. And about three times between meetings we started drafting out an agenda, and I listen to that process, and Nelroy and Lori are the ones that drive it, and it is a wonderful arrangement.

You ought to consider using that in many of your own meetings.

As a Chair, there is nothing better than somebody saying, well, here is the rules, and as long as you get them implemented we are in good shape.

With that, I am going to turn it over to Barbara, who
will talk about this morning's activities.

MS. UPSTON:  Good morning everybody.

Okay. Today, we begin with the task teams, and you will go off into discussions. Nelroy is going to explain to you how the task teams have been configured or proposed in some version of that in a minute.

And then you will come back and do reports, which by collapsing the task teams from the mighty 10 to a mightier four means that you will have longer to do your reports, which probably will be helpful in discussion.

Then the Early Detection and Rapid Response Team has a presentation, this all by the way begins on page 2 of your agenda, and moves over to page 3 if you are tracking on your own agenda.

And then Jim Tate and Jim Stone are going to talk with you about science advisors public policy. And then Chuck O'Neill and company will do the update on the analysis of economic costs.

Lori will talk about the GAO recommendations, and Kathy and Allegra have the NISA reauthorization. Then short updates on FICMNEW and ANSTF. The members forum, which is the sort of final of this process, or this meeting, is an opportunity for you to just discuss anything that needs to be
talked about.

And before we break, public comment, and anyone here -- and just reminding people that if you are going to -- if you are a member of the public and wish to make a comment, please sign up outside so that we know about.

And then Randall is going to review the future meetings, the dates, and we will talk about other issues, the agenda items. What I did last night was take the foot charts and rewrite and extract things that had been called agenda items for March. They are over here.

And you may need to look at them if you are not seated in a good location, as the walls are not very conducive. And then additional action items which we will talk about later as part of the close. And next steps, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

And then of course tomorrow is the field trip, and so that will also be talked about and any details of that that people need. At the break, or at least when I left yesterday the plan for the paper and the letters that Craig and Faith wanted comments on, the idea that I heard was that Bill would go to Corner A at the break, and Craig and Faith would go to Corner B.
And anyone who had any concerns, comments, or something that they wanted to talk with him about, the letter or the paper, would go and have that discussion then so that just before we broke for lunch that we would be able to poll the group and have some sense of where things stood with the papers and the letter.

Does everybody understand that?

And I will remind you at the break. We have the ever popular breaks and lunch, and restrooms are left-left still. Lunch is on your own today, and there are lots and lots of places all around McPherson Square, and anyone who would like some help looking for something, we will be glad to do so. Also about the agenda for today -- yes, Ship?

Kelsey, will we getting the expense reimbursement forms or something later on today? I mean, stuff for like the parking, and the mileage to get down here, and all that sort of stuff?

MS. PASSE: You don't need any forms.

MS. UPSTON: The answer is "huh"? How about if you need time to think about it before you haul off and answer, we will get the answer to you.

MS. PASSE: If you already filled out your direct deposit forms, there aren't any other forms
that you need to fill out, per se. You would need to
do a summary of your trip, and then on your summary,
on your office letterhead, then you just say how many
miles you drove to the airport, et cetera.

MS. UPSTON: But there are no forms. Just
write it down on your letterhead.

MS. PASSE: And your original receipts.

MS. UPSTON: Okay. Cool. I realized
yesterday that we had some folks come in a little bit
late, and so I just wanted to restate some of the
ground rules, and piggy back on something that Ship
had mentioned.

Again, continuing to respect the
differences, and looking for common ground, and
challenging other's ideas constructively, we had
limited side conversations that were helpful
yesterday, and continue to do that, please.

Again, be brief, and be as specific as you
can so that people understand what it is that you are
talking about. And if you use acronyms, please
explain them, Lucy, so that we all understand what
they mean and help each other.

If you don't, and somebody slips and uses
the acronym, and you don't know what it is, feel free
to ask and we will all try to help. And I am sure
that it helps the recorder as well.

And of course continue to keep that fine sense of humor that you have been working with. Cell phones were off and I didn't hear any major ringing. Did anybody else? Very good. And continue to come back timely. That also helps the agenda stay on time.

There are a lot of ground rules and adhering to them helped the meeting go so quickly and so smoothly yesterday. We have a few new faces today, which I think would be helpful if you would just introduce yourself and your affiliation. Kathy.

MS. METCALF: I am Kathy Metcalf, the Chamber of Shipping of America. I apologize for missing yesterday. Lori, I don't know if you got my e-mail, but three o'clock on Monday morning, my fly bug decided to take the best of me. So I am not singing in aria today.

MR. ORR: Richard Orr, from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Sorry about missing yesterday. I flew in late, or early on the red-eye on Monday from Hawaii. And of course the Leonid meteor shower was last night which was pretty impressive if you happened to be up at between 1:00 and 5:00 in the morning.

MS. UPSTON: Yes, I think I see some folks
from yesterday who came in a little later. Thank you.

MS. MCCARTHY: Susan McCarthy, United States Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Library.

MS. UPSTON: Welcome.

MS. LIEBERG: Katie Lieberg with the State Department (off-microphone, inaudible).

MS. ROTH: Dana Roth with the U.S. Department of State.

MS. UPSTON: Have we captured everybody, so to speaker? Okay. And on your places should have been an additional handout, which was Tom Bewick's remarks, and overheads from yesterday, that people had requested.

Was there anything else dropped on people's spots that they may have any questions about?

DR. ELDREDGE: Yes, the Impact of Invasive Alien Species on Island Ecosystems, and the results of the Global Invasive Species Program held in Honolulu a month ago.

MS. UPSTON: Is there anything that people should do about it, or it is just for information?

DR. ELDREDGE: For information for the background for the statement that I read yesterday on the following pathway.
MS. UPSTON: Okay. Thank you. Nelroy is going to talk to you then about the teams, and how the steering committee would like to divide them up. On the wall are the flip charts from the e-mail that Chris sent me last night, and as he understood the way that the teams are formed.

DR. JACKSON: Good morning. The steering group tried to do a good job. We listed the eight task teams and forgot one, but we got it back. When we looked at the average number of people and the teams, almost everybody is listed on more than one task team.

So we physically can't meet in two places at the same time. So what we have done is that we have looked for where the greatest or where people have the greatest interests.

So we have collapsed it into four task teams to meet this morning. What that also means is that we had an hour scheduled for reports from task teams. So it means that we only need 20 minutes.

In fact, 15 minutes, because early detection and rapid response has its own time period after that. So we really only need 15 minutes for reports. That means that we pick up 4 to 5 minutes.

And in that time we can discuss how we are
going to proceed in between meetings and taskings, and how the other task teams that are not meeting today will get together, and also how the budget tasking is going to operate.

So we are going to change the agenda in that way. The other thing that has come up is that international is critical. Right now it is a gap, and so what Lori is proposing is that anybody who can meet with her and who have an interest in international, meet with her for lunch and have an international task team during lunch.

So just meet outside and we will all decide where to go. Any questions? So what we have done is that up here we have got the leadership and coordination task team with Mike as chair, and that would be Gary, myself, Kathy.

Oh, Diane, I forgot to ask you which one you want to do.

MS. COOPER: The Pathways.

DR. JACKSON: Because you are listed in more than one. You are listed under leadership, as well as pathways. Which one?

MS. COOPER: The Pathways.

DR. JACKSON: Okay.

MS. COOPER: Thank you.
DR. JACKSON: So, Donnie, George, and I think you are listed on two. Do you want to do communication or leadership? And Ron. This task team will meet in this room, and pathways and screening, Allegra and Faith, I think, are co-chairs. Is that right?

MS. CANGELOSI: I am the chair and Faith is in charge of the pathways part.

DR. JACKSON: Well, I am assuming that this is a total committee meeting.

MS. CANGELOSI: It is.

DR. JACKSON: Okay. Allegra, Craig, Marsha -- I am assuming that you are going to stay here. Diane, Jeff, Faith, Joe, Linda, Myron, and David, and Lu. Sorry. And that task committee also meets here, right, Kelsey? We can have two?

MS. PASSE: Yes.

DR. JACKSON: The other two taskings will meet in the main hotel in which room?

MS. UPSTON: Farragut and McPherson, and I think probably those teams that are largest should go on over there.

DR. JACKSON: Well, we will switch there. The first two teams will go over there.

MS. UPSTON: Okay. Because you will have
a room to yourself, and not be disturbing other people.

DR. JACKSON: Which one was the first one?

MS. UPSTON: Farragut, and there are flip charts and easels, and I will give you instructions and pens to take with you. And McPherson.

DR. JACKSON: Subway stops. Metro stops. Communication, education, outreach, Chuck is Chair, and will include Ship, Bill, Marilyn. Oh, Marilyn, you are listed twice, too.

MS. METCALF: I will take that one.

DR. JACKSON: Okay. We tried to do this before, but we obviously missed a few people. George, Jerry, and communication and education outreach, and early detection and rapid response would be Barb as the Chair, and what do we want to do then? That is smaller than I thought.

MS. BARTUSKA: Well, there are some people who aren't on the list.

DR. JACKSON: No. Everybody should be here.

MS. BARTUSKA: Is there anybody who wants to switch?

DR. JACKSON: Do you want to stay, must the two of you, or --
MS. BARTUSKA: I don't think it will be -- that is a pretty important area.

MS. CANGELOSI: That would be an area that I would be interested in also, and I wondered if we could make that one sequential to the rest of them. Does that make sense? A lunch meeting, for example.

DR. JACKSON: Except that Ann's involved as the International Chair.

MS. BARTUSKA: does anybody want to switch to early detection, or should we just leave it as it is now. Barbara, what is your feeling? Do we have actions that we need to be working on today?

MRS. COOKSLEY: We had a couple of things to go over, and they could wait until March until we get more of our committee members, or we take care of it over conference calls. We know that we are on the agenda for an update, and maybe that is enough. Today we have or on a schedule to tell why we have done what we have done, and where we are at.

DR. CAMPBELL: Well, surely you can have --

MS. BARTUSKA: We have had a couple already and we could have more.

MS. BARTUSKA: Well, my only concern is in waiting until March is that early detection and rapid
response is coming up as a high priority everywhere you look, almost the same as pathways.

But even more aggressive actions from agencies, and so it seems like if there is a dialogue to take place, we ought to do it now, especially in preparation for the budget season.

DR. STOCKER: Can I suggest that you start off as your own separate group, and when you get tired of staring at each other, just join one or the other groups?

MS. BARTUSKA: Well, we could do that.

DR. JACKSON: There are still four, and Lori, and how about the Federal people?

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, we could have Federal people go to those, but I think the purpose of this discussion is really to get an idea of ISAC thinks. We have been having minutes that Barbara has been attending.

I guess I would say -- and this is of course up to you guys, but by spreading yourselves out a little bit more evenly among the groups and interact, we have to keep these things going.

Just like Ann said, this one is going, and we have to move this because NISC is coming up and a number of other things. So, people are interested in
having input into this, and the pathways group is very large, and so I just feel like they are kind of double-teaming certain teams, and not on others, but obviously it is up to you.

MS. BARTUSKA: Actually, I would like to make a request. There is a lot of the aquatic folks that are in the pathways for some very good reasons, but we both have been having a lot of conversations on that with regard to NISC already.

And if there are a couple of the aquatics people who could move from pathways to Early Detection and Rapid Response, especially since we are talking with NOAA right now about some activities, it seems like it would be a good move.

MS. CANGELOSI: The Pathways and Screening Group is probably going to focus on screening today, because we have not had an opportunity to get that group together yet. Is Rebecca here? And I guess a this goes on that she will be.

With respect to Federal participation, at least in the Pathways and Screenings Subcommittee, we would like that. That would be helpful, and we expect that Faith will summarize what has been happening on the Pathway side and that we need to do some deliberating on the Screening side, and pick a chair,
and that sort of thing.

So if that helps in the decision making. On the other hand, I personally have a strong interest in Early Detection and Rapid Response, and so if there is a way to accommodate people who have joint interests in both things, I think that that would be the very best.

DR. JACKSON: Well, Allegra, would it help if you went to ED&RR and let Faith run the Pathways and Screening as mostly Screening?

MS. CANGELOSI: Faith certainly can do that, but the idea with the screening is to initiate a separate group from what Faith is running right now. This is sort of two task teams under a common subcommittee.

So what we are going to try and do is get the chairs picked, but I suppose if Faith is willing that can work out.

DR. JACKSON: I agree with Ann that to me ED&RR is too important not to have a task team meeting this morning.

DR. CAMPBELL: My question is that ED&RR meet, and I agree that it is extremely important. I will start the joint Screening and Pathways Team. I hope someone will volunteer quickly to chair the
screening thing, because I have got a couple of Pathways people here that are normally at the other end of the continent that I would like to have a little consultation with myself. But we will see how that goes.

But you go ahead and do ED&RR and I am sure that we won't die.

DR. JACKSON: Okay. Allegra. Larry, would you be willing to go to ED&RR? Ann, you have got another.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay.

DR. JACKSON: Is that okay, Lori?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.

DR. JACKSON: So you have got four, which is better. And, Lori, we haven't talked about this, but I am assuming that the liaison -- that you are going to go to Leadership, right, Lori? Is that your decision?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, we are going to split up between Liaison and the Staff.

DR. JACKSON: Now do we invite the other people to sit in?

MS. WILLIAMS: What I have told them is that they could go to what group that they wanted. But it was -- I have to do the sorting out.
DR. JACKSON: I understand that, and that I understand that everybody who is here is free to go into any one of the taskings and participate. Any questions? Yes, Marshall.

MR. MEYERS: I would like a clarification of the status of the International Committee or task team, because when I read the report in here, it says one thing, and up there it says that you have got a chart with some names of people.

And I am just wondering what is the status and who is on it. There used to be three of us who used to be on it, and which were excised at one point, and I see two of us are back up, but not a third one. So what is happening?

MS. WILLIAMS: I think we talked last night, Marshall, and I think there was confusion about the decision that came out of Yellowstone. I was not in that particular group, and so Jamie told me about she thought the decision was at Yellowstone.

I think that there is an issue there, and so I would just invite anyone who is interested in being on the International to join us to meet in the lobby, and we will go for a quick lunch and discuss it, because I think there is some confusion, and because Jamie is no longer with us, I can't clear it
up at this point.

And so we just need to make a decision and bring it to the full ISAC.

DR. JACKSON: Lori, I don't remember, but was Gaby a chair of that?

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes Gaby and Kirk, and so the key people that were involved in that group are now gone; Jamie, Gaby, and Kirk. So we just have to kind of regroup and discuss what we want to do with the International Committee.

DR. JACKSON: Marshall, what I would suggest is that since the International Group is going to meet with Lori at lunch, that that task team, whoever is there -- I am a part of it, but I can't be at that meeting -- choose a new chair, and then report back when we come back at one o'clock.

George, you were down for both Leadership and Coordination, as well as Communication and Outreach, and you have to choose.

DR. BECK: Okay.

DR. JACKSON: Which one?

DR. BECK: Leadership.

DR. JACKSON: Okay.

MS. UPSTON: While George is deciding, here are the instructions for the task teams, and I am
very interested in you getting time to move on so that
you have an adequate amount of time or better than you
would have to talk about some of these things.

These are guidelines, suggested guidelines
to the extent that you can at least touch on these
points, there will be some consistency in the report
outs, which is helpful in knowing where things stand.

Your chairs also have a copy of these --
of the overhead so that if you get out of this room
particularly and can't remember what it was, that you
will have a way of doing so.

Progress challenges and next steps, and
anything else that you need to talk about and will
think will be of use, it is very helpful in terms of
being able to keep the record going if you will flip
chart the key things that you talk about.

Obviously it isn't absolutely everything
that everybody says, but it is what you agree on and
believe should be reported back to the group, and come
into some kind of very quick record, particularly
action items, agenda items, that sort of thing, will
be important.

So you will want to select a recorder,
someone whose handwriting can be read perhaps and
doesn't mind doing it. Remember that they are a full
member of the group, and you are not just recording people's ideas. It is your ideas as well, and I encourage you to use the words that your colleagues say, rather than editing them if you are the recorder. That doesn't help.

Please put the key ideas on the flip chart, and select somebody to report back to the whole group. And if you need a timekeeper so that you can figure out, or if you are going to talk about 4 or 5 things, we need 10 minutes for each, or something like that.

And be back here by 10 o'clock, and the break will be here if you look on your agenda at 9:45. So if you come back at 9:45, there should be a break here and you should be ready to report by 10 o'clock.

For Farragut and McPherson, go out the door and turn right, and go into the hotel, and it is through the lobby. Kelsey, the rooms are on the first floor; is that right?

MS. PASSE: Yes.

MS. UPSTON: Right, on the first floor. And there are flip chart pads and easels in there for you. Does at least one person in each group know what you are doing? Excellent.

And we will come by to make sure that if
anybody needs anything that you get it. The teams
meeting in this room should select opposite corners,
and we will put up easels and flip charts for you, and
all that sort of thing. Thanks.

(Whereupon, at 8:29 p.m., the meeting was
recessed and resumed at 10:01 p.m.)

DR. STOCKER: Thank you for joining us. I
hope that your breakout sessions were good. The Pick-
6 number that will win you $86 million tomorrow is
653102. Did everybody get that? I know all the
tricks. Want to know what your ex-wife said about you
last night? Keep talking. Wow, that worked. He
doesn't know what I said, but he is afraid.

I did have an opportunity to visit each
one of your groups and I will say that you were
discussing -- and not disgusting. I said that you
were discussing and that is a good thing.

We are now going to find out where your
discussions went, and Nelroy, if you have revised it a
little bit, why don't you go ahead and tell them.

DR. JACKSON: What we are going to do with
the approval of the DFO is have the first three task
teams do their reports, and followed by the ED&RR
tasking report, and then the ED&RR presentation.

Then we will have questions, because it
looked from going around the groups that there is some commonalities. So this gives us the opportunity to see how things are related.

Then we have a discussion of where do we go from here on the task teams, as well as the two letters before lunch.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. What we are asking is that if you will bring your flip charts over here, we have looked around the room, and nobody can see all the parts of the room from where you are sitting.

But we think that maybe this is the most central location, and where we have them temporarily is fine. But if we can -- and we will help you. We will bring them over to a central location for reporting. We think it will at least help those of us who are sitting up close to see what it is that you are talking about.

So the first group to report will be leadership fittings, of course, Leadership and Coordination will start off.

MR. BUCK: The Leadership Group consists of myself, Kathy, Gary, George, Donnie, Lori.

MR. LUKENS: What about me?

MR. BUCK: Oh, Ron. Yes. And basically the focus is on how do we facilitate non-Federal
action in deliberating an evasive species program on the ground. And tried to look at the roles and what are the roles of both the Federal Government and then the State Government, and the entities down there, and looking at also opportunities for multi-State and regional approaches as well.

We believe that in certain aspects of the Evasive Species Programs the Federal roll is maybe not to be delivering programs on the ground, but helping to build State or multi-State capacity to deliver those programs on the ground.

And to be able to see that the States need programs, and not projects, and that there is other existing models in the Agricultural Department and the Fisheries, and of the States actually receiving money and being able to deliver programs on the ground.

We understand that there is a uniqueness of various needs, and there is lots of different ways of dealing with it. There is different jurisdictions, vectors, and species that are constantly in this approach, because invasives are so complex.

Everybody retreats to their own area of what they know about, and then we lose kind of the overall vision of how maybe we can develop a model to be able to involve more States.
One of the assumptions, and another footnote, and we will let it go at that, is that without State political support we will never get the level of appropriations that we are going to need for invasive species programs. It is absolutely critical.

And also an example, or at least I know from the forest land, that the National Forests are only 19 percent of the Nation's forest lands. So many, many acres of lands are either under State or private ownership, and specifically let's say for a Rapid Response Program, Federal Agencies may not be well positioned or the best agency to have access on private lands within States or State lands. That is just an example.

But there is a lot of other examples, and also for sure there is existing models of multi-regional State associations that now are very effective in invasive species and just work it in with what they are already doing.

So we understood, and what the challenge was is how do we engage, and what is the entry point within the States to be able to develop that type of capacity at each State to understand what it is.

And we talked about probably the National Governors Association, and their regional Governors
Association groups is really the best entry point that we could begin to have that dialogue about from their perspective, because States are all over the place, both on the marine side, and the aquatic side, and terrestrial side.

Some States have good plans, and they are operational, and they might not need any money. Other States have not even begun to embrace that. And some of the problems are -- it is obviously certain evasive species issues, and the most cost effective approach is at a multi-State regional approach.

And from what we have learned is that those tend to be built up from the bottom up, rather than the top down. So looking at it, we have a national management plan, but how do we actually deliver the program on the ground.

Okay. So here is where the handwriting starts to deteriorate eventually. We didn't write anything, and Barbara kept bringing in more and more sheets on the walls, and eventually we had about 10 empty sheets and so we figured the last five minutes we had better write something. Kathy, or anybody in my group, please jump in.

MS. METCALF: Yes, the last bullet on that thing that we just took away is important, too. That
is to develop criteria for the funding of programs. I just wanted to throw that in before we got to the next slide.

MS. UPSTON: To encourage multi-State to regional

MR. BUCK: Actually, I think it is on the third one, but thanks, Kathy, and keep me in line. I believe we said that without State political support that we will never get to the level of Congressional appropriations that we will need for evasive species.

So engagement of the State as a local building block is absolutely critical. We understand that there is always going to be competing needs, not only for other issues outside the basis, but invasive groups as well; marine versus aquatic, versus terrestrial. We understand that issue.

What we decided as the best way to take the next approach is that as Kathy said, we need to develop criteria and guidelines for Federal and State partnerships, and that is what the group is going to be working on and looking for entry points, probably with the Governor's Association.

And issues that we would deal with of these criterion guidelines are what kind of minimum type State capacity is needed. What kind of plans are
going on, and what type of existing operations are
going on.

You know, criteria for how do we identify
programs of national importance. An example might be
the Asian long-horned beetle, where it is obvious if
we don't stop it immediately that it is going to
spread to a lot of States.

And then on the flip-side of individual
State actions where can we look at multi-State and
regional approaches that are cost effective. So the
group decided over the next three months that we are
going to be looking at trying to flush out those
criteria and guidelines, and start approaching the NGA
about this is the type of models that you might look
for some sort of Federal or State partnerships.

And this could be added on or included and
help drive some of the existing dialogue with NISC and
other laws that are going on. But we wanted to focus
on really facilitating non-Federal actions for evasive
species, understanding that it is not only at the
State level.

There is County entities and things, but
we did believe that the States would be the individual
building blocks. Is there any other -- did I miss
anything, or any other thing that my group wants to
MR. LUKENS: Just to emphasize one point that you made, is that there are -- we would be looking at not just one model for regional approaches, but a number of them, and I say that because on the aquatic side there are already some regional approaches that are being used rather effectively, and so you don't want to -- and they may not work on the terrestrial side for weeds and things like that.

So I just wanted to emphasize that we probably would have several options for dealing with different aspects of the problem, whether it be aquatic or weed, or animal, or what it might be.

MR. BUCK: Any other group? Mr. Chair, thank you.

DR. STOCKER: Next is Pathways and Screening.

MS. CANGELOSI: Okay. Well, I wound up spending the whole time in this group, and it was probably appropriate because a lot of the discussion was about the interaction between the two task teams. So just to remind, there was a construction of the Prevention Subcommittee is to have two task teams, each one active and semi-independent.

So we would have occasional meetings of
the whole group to talk about the areas in which there may be interaction, and yet these groups would be pursuing their own independent action items in the national management plan as well.

One of the chief challenges then is trying to understand what management efficiencies may be gained by lumping tasks into either screening or pathways management. And the example that kept coming up were hitchhikers that may accompany a certain organism, and the organism itself could be subject to screening for invasiveness.

But the medium in which it is transported and the parasites, and pathogens, you know, are considered another story. And our resolution for the time being is to include this issue in both -- in discussions that both these groups are going to take on.

And while that sounds like a redundancy, it is probably a useful one because then after we have each had a chance to explore how it may relate to the management concerns in each task team, we can get together and talk about what is the most efficient way.

Another area for us of challenges and coordination, effective coordination with ongoing
efforts, and in particular the ANS Task Force, has a
prevention committee with a Pathways screening and a
risk analysis working group.

    And they are getting right down into the
nitty-gritty and designing processes that are relevant
to the aquatics arena. So we had some discussion
about to what extent are those discussions
generalizable enough that it would render what ISAC is
doing redundant in toto.

    And the resolution there was that it may
or may not be generalizable, and one of the things
that the ISAC can do is actually have the role of
testing that assumption and looking for the instances
in which there may need to be differences.

    And then on top of that, it just adds
another vantage on a similar set of issues. So this
group comprises different sorts of interest groups
than the ANS task force does.

    So it offers a check on -- a useful check
on that thought system. Was that the last thing up
there?

    MS. UPSTON: Yes.

    MS. CANGELOSI: Okay. A challenge that
the screening side has had is in -- let me go here,
but is in scheduling and identifying an ISAC co-chair.
So Rebecca came in and we successfully nailed down two meeting dates for the screening task team.

The first one is November 22nd between 1100 and 12:23 that there will be phone hook-ups, and at that meeting the terms of reference in the membership, and the ISAC co-chair, and a summary of the Federal team's work to date will be undertaken.

And then on December 5th, from 1:00 until 3:00 p.m., and here they will get more into the details of the terms and tasks and who the key contacts should be for working on those different tasks.

Okay. Both task teams would like to have broad input on what is already happening out there, and what kinds of systems have been proposed or published, and we generally need to have within the membership people who are experienced in developing those systems that are out there so far.

There is also a question about terrestrial weeds. The ANS task force is one thing, but then the counterpart has not necessarily been constructed by law, and FICMNEW plays a very important role, and the question is to what extent and how can we interact successfully with FICMNEW on both the screening and the pathways, as well as ANS. So does anybody on the
team want to fill in?

MS. BECH: I have one thing. Rebecca Bech, USDA. Anyone who was not in our working group just now that would like to be hooked up for the meetings, I need your name and information.

Well, I think I would have your information, but I need to know who else would like to be involved in this group. That's it.

MS. CANGELOSI: Anybody else have input?

Also, Faith went over what had been accomplished at the pathway meeting so far, which was very useful in getting us to focus on what the actual work is of the task teams. And, Faith, do you want to summarize?

DR. CAMPBELL: Here I go again. Yes, the pathway task team does have terms of reference, and we have begun collecting everyone's suggestions for pathways. We are still not complete with that.

And we have agreed on a number of criteria to use in both the first tier and the second tier. The distinctions between, quote, significant and less significant pathways. I am not going to attempt to do that again right now.

DR. JACKSON: I wouldn't give you time either.

DR. CAMPBELL: Thanks. If you want that
information, I can get it to you.

DR. JACKSON: Thanks, Faith. Next up is Communications and Outreach.

MR. O'NEILL: Okay. The first thing we did was try to identify the goals for the subcommittee. The overarching goal is to work on providing constituencies for NISC and ISAC, constituencies who will both support what we are doing and be able to take the kind of information and get out there in the real world and do something with it.

And so the goals that we came up with were to educate the public, and that would be the broad public, on invasive species issues, to educate the public on the existence of NISC and ISAC, and to educate the public as to the management plan, and what those national goals are.

And to be able to support those goals. I think that right now one of the biggest best kept secrets out in the great unwashed is the existence of NISC and ISAC.

People have heard much more about the ANS task force. Yes, they have been around for a lot longer, but they have also been out in front a lot more, and what we feel is that we have got to be able
to move this forum out in front also so that there is 
people out there that are going to be able to work 
toward that.

In support of some of this one of the 
things that we are making a very strong recommendation 
on is that there be movement towards hiring a 
communications and outreach staff member for NISC to 
work on that.

And some of the actions that we thought of 
to work towards these educational goals, one is 
preparing a flyer, or a brochure, or some sort of a 
handout that explains NISC, and that explains ISAC.

That was one of the first moves that the 
Great Lakes Panel did for the ANS task force. It was 
something that could be handed out. A number of us 
have noted that we have been at meetings recently and 
we have been talking to people about the existence of 
ISAC and NISC, and the one question you get is can you 
leave something behind, and we don't have anything to 
leave behind.

So we are talking about some sort of 
simple brochure that gets across the idea of 
invasives, and what they are and what the problem is, 
and NISC and ISAC, and what we are doing about it.

Another is the preparation of a news
release template that could be gotten out to let the
world know that we have all been appointed to ISAC. I
know that some of us --- that local papers may have
picked up on when we did this, and some of our
agencies may have put out press releases.

But in general the people in our areas
don't know that we exist, and don't know that they can
come to us and be able to bring in some of their
concerns and get them Fed back into this level.

Looking at the meetings of this panel,
possible not when we are here in D.C., but when we are
meeting out in the hinter lands the publicity in the
areas that we are going to be meeting so that the
press knows that ISAC is coming out.

We are doing a tour tomorrow, and we did
the thing in Yellowstone. The media loves these kinds
of things, and when the ANS task force goes out and
does a tour, there is usually some members of the
media trailing along.

And not only do they get educated about
aquatic nuisance species, they get educated about he
agency. We could have the same thing being done here,
and be using the media to get a lot of our word out.

Something along with that would be the
possibility of some members of ISAC being able to come
into an area a day a head of the meetings and have with one of the local school districts or something some sort of an educational outreach program in the schools with the media present, with kids present, which the media loves.

Again, a way of getting the message out in front of a larger audience. A display that could be prepared to go along with the flyer and brochure that could be set up at major meetings, at the major International ANS meetings, at the Bio Invasions meetings, and other facilities like that.

Again, just to bring the awareness of the existence of the management plan and the body up in front. We had Susan from the National Ag Library with us talking about the website and the changes to the website.

We decided that it probably makes a lot of sense to put the website under the CEO subcommittee and to start publicizing and pushing that website out in front of people.

The website is going to be probably one of the strongest tools we have to educate people and give them information about invasive species and what is being done about it.

Also, building a library of power point
presentations. I know that Chris has one that is specifically for NISC, but probably all of us have in some for or other a power point presentation or some power point slides talking about invasive species.

We would like to be able to provide a clearing house of those that would be available to the members for use while we are out at different meetings, where we could slip in a couple of slides and talk about NISC, and ISAC, and also the possibility of putting the better ones up on the website and be able to run them off of the website. Am I missing anything?

MR. BRIGHT: Chuck, my only question would be that you mentioned right off the bat that we felt very strongly about getting a communications person on board and we took a vote.

And, Lori, would it be helpful to you if the full ISAC were to vote on this or make a motion on this? I am looking to move the ball forward here, and I am not sure what he most effective way to do it is. I think that we have Jim Butler who is on board to help with the whole thing.

MS. WILLIAMS: I don't know if you want to get into the details of the staffing decision, but I think you could include in a letter or a
recommendation to move the ball forward that you need some staffing and additional attention paid by the council staff on communications and outreach.

And that position has already been envisioned in the staffing plan. So I think that is all that it would take, in terms of your recommendation.

MR. O'NEIL: And the final thing is using an economic impact study as a tool to be able to -- I hate to use the word lobby, but to educate various constituencies as to why this is important to everyone, and not just to our agencies. And we will be talking about that after lunch.

DR. JACKSON: Thank you, Chuck. Diane.

MS. COOPER: One of the things that we recognize in industry that is really important is identifiable symbols, branding, and so forth. And I am wondering does ISAC have a logo that goes out on letterhead that is on the brochures that you are talking about Something that identifies ISAC has ISAC

MR. WILKINSON: Something a little less complex than the eyes peering out through the vine?

MS. WILLIAMS: Something different than that is what you are saying, because we have different vines. We do have thanks to Dean and to Noah, we have
an artist that has been working with us and doing a number of designs, and not just the kudzu, and not just the water-milfoil that you have here.

We have a mitten crab, and what we could do is we could -- it wouldn't be that difficult for us to come up with something. We have the usual taxa problem. Which taxa do we choose.

But she is very talented, and it would not be that difficult for us to come up with something, and utilize her talents I think.

MS. COOPER: Just a follow-up. I was thinking more in terms of just a small logo that would go on letterhead.

MR. WILKINSON: Actually, if I can put a plug in here. If somebody has ideas as to what they think would be appropriate, I know that the individual who has done the covers, and this is the fourth cover, I think, is really interested in doing this type of graphics.

So if somebody has some ideas as to what we should be playing with. And I might also say that if people have ideas in terms of what you would like on the next cover, we have tried to -- we have had an insect, and we have had a crab, and we have had now water hyacinth, and kudzu.
Ginnie actually likes to work with this stuff, and I have a bias towards aquatic things. So if somebody has some others that they would like, please let me know.

DR. JACKSON: I think you have a volunteer in Diane. I can help her. Where are you?

DR. STOCKER: Barbara.

MRS. COOKSLEY: I am going to be up here for a while.

DR. STOCKER: And Barbara, just before you start, let me remind us that we have combined these now, and so there will not be a separate ED&RR discussion. That time is available now.

So this is the one that we have chosen to focus on for this particular meeting, and so now is your time.

MRS. COOKSLEY: Okay. Thank you. We are going to do our task team report first, and then we will go and do the presentation, which will build the foundation of what we are working on, and why we are working on it.

The progress that we have made in the early detection and rapid response is that we had developed a set of draft guidelines, and we have agreed on a writing team to flush out those
Tom Bewick is going to be the chairman of that writing team. The challenges that were identified during the task team -- and I am glad that we are doing these all together, because I am seeing a lot of similarities that we can build on, because we, too, said we have to build partnerships, and work across jurisdictions.

And this is again in Early Detection and Rapid Response, but we are seeing this across all of our issues. We need to have the dollars available at the time that we need them.

We do need to have a clearinghouse of the information that is out there, because there are activities going on out there with various groups across taxa right now.

One of our tasks was in the management plan is to coordinate those activities, and communicate that it is an emergency, and we identified some next steps following the guidelines that they gave us for the taskings.

And this is where we are asking our budget team to identify a budget target for an emergency response fund. In the past we have come up with a figure of $50 million, because we said that 50 States
and $50 million.

    We got to talking about what fire emergencies would cost, and looking at things, and perhaps we should be looking at a much larger number. And this again is for just an emergency fund.

    But as you are fighting an invasive species, it costs a lot of money, and if we go ask for funds, and any of us who have spent time on the Hill, you go with a small number. they are going to take less than that anyway.

    So we are asking the budget team to work on that, and we also identified an audience that we need to influence with the budget numbers, and an invasive species is an emergency situation, and here again we came up also with our Governor's Associations, and the national or regional.

    We get our private landowners, the tribal extension, and we also said mayors. That there are a lot of mayors across the country in some of the larger cities, too, who want to buy into this system.

    So here is another commonality of working with our governors. Our message that we want to get to this influential audience is that invasive can and are an emergency, just like fire, and just like floods.
You don't see the results of it as quickly, but again when we get our dollar figures of what it cost, and have our examples of what different invasions have cost us in the past. We have lots of those examples.

And we direct the writing team to draft a product, and this is where I bring this back up, I believe, the elements that we would like to see in that.

The writing team in December, so that we have something for the budget process, and for '05, and get something done by December to have input into the 2005 budget, and these elements to look at, and detect the rare events, because again we are early detection.

We are not going to have a large number using our trained professionals. Our volunteers will have lots of eyes out there, and we have to have a system in place where we can communicate the information rapidly.

We have to have the professionals on the ground to validate what has been found. Again, our incentives for action gets back to that dollar figure that we need for that emergency fund.

How much is it going to cost me if I am a
We asked the writing team to do that, and identify how we do that, and somewhat of what we discussed yesterday, streamlining environmental regulations, be it the NEPA, the Clean Water Act, FIFRA, when you are in an emergency situation, because it was discussed that if you have a species out there, and there is a herbicide ready and waiting, and labeled to do it, but in that particular situation maybe you have an endangered species.

And how do we bridge that in an emergency situation. How can we streamline some of this permitting process, and not to -- we don't want to come up with another system. It is to harmonize the systems that are out there, and again that gets back to one of our charges, which is to coordinate what is out there, and there is a lot of information out there, a lot of systems.

We closed with ISAC recommend that we have an early detection and rapid response system because, one, it is identified in the management plan. And we as a committee have identified that it is a priority.
And we had some agency folks there that said that they need that identified from us. This is a priority, and this is one of the top three priorities, or whatever, and we need to know that so that we can then begin to focus on that. Help me out here on the NISC and the OMB.

MS. BARTUSKA: That's the audience for the documentation.

MRS. COOKSLEY: All right. That is the audience for the documentation. Thank you. Then a second project would be then when it goes to the agencies, we get into the details that the writing team is putting together. They follow those.

So we have a broader task here, and a more detailed task there. Anything from the group that I didn't cover? Now you are going to find out what early detection and rapid response is. Now we will -- the reason that we are producing these guidelines and coming up with a proposal, basically it gets down to why are we spending time on this, is that it is called for in the management plan.

Guidelines are needed for funding, and we are located in the management plan in Action Items 23 and 24. Action Item 23 looks at developing regulator guidance, and these are paraphrased out of the
management plan.

Item 24 is looking at permanent funding for the invasions. ISAC recommended that ED&RR needs to be a high priority for the council. That is another reason why we are working on this as a subcommittee.

ED&RR is mentioned in pending legislation.

I think this afternoon there will be more on NISA reauthorization. We see the importance of it. Bill was talking about it in the draft budget. I believe there were 16 items within the draft budget that discussed ED&RR. Okay. We covered that one.

All right. Agencies and groups are already moving forward on ED&RR. Just for you, Randall. A Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service on "Train the Trainer" that we have to make sure that they know which system they are training them for.

On the Fish and Wildlife, there is a Forest Health Protection Program that has been funded, and beginning to move forward. The Forest Service. Thank you. We will correct that.

And from Chris' research, things that are -- that committee members have brought to the table, there have been lots of efforts, ongoing efforts out
there, a lot of reports and proposals, but there is still no one comprehensive summary.

And this is just an example of some of the work that we have been involved in as a committee. Meetings across the country and experience with snakehead, Caulerpa, Giant salvinia, the Asian swamp eels, and the Asian long-horned beetle, takes care of our other acronym.

Some of the workings with various evasive species are different, and if my reading is correct, and please help me with -- that those of you involved on the snake head, did I read that the aquatic nuisance task force, USGS, and APHIS, had a risk assessment available before the detection.

That approach is a little different on snake head, is that correct, Richard?

MR. ORR: Fish and Wildlife has already aware that the snakehead was coming in the live food fish pathway, and the assessment for the snake head had already been initiated about -- oh, I would say close to 6 to 8 months before the find in Maryland.

And therefore the assessment was basically completed. So as soon as the find was done, it had not been analyzed, but we were able to provide all of the information to the State people for making their
decision.

MRS. COOKSLEY: So the action could move along much quicker?

MR. ORR: Yes. The action -- the proof was there, and they had a couple of committees in Annapolis on this, and we brought in the -- well, the State brought in the people that had actually done the assessment, Walter Courtney, and some of the others from Florida.

And it was during those decisions, and because all the information was already present on the risk involved, they were able to present to the State, and they were able to move forward much faster than they would have been able to had we not had the information.

MRS. COOKSLEY: That is an ideal situation, if there is such a one with an invasive species, to have so much of the leg work, the communications, the bridge is built already before it happened, and then action could be taken.

These are just some of the many examples that are out there. Jim Worrell from the Forest Service has ED&RR; and FICMNEW has a draft with aquatics. And of course our management plan is out there. The Western Regional Panel -- and Chris and I
needed to ask you this. Is this still in draft, or is there a final format? Do we know?

PARTICIPANT: The Great Lakes Panel and the Western Regional.

MRS. COOKSLEY: So the Great Lakes Panel and the Western Regional. And this is just what we put together for this, but there are many, many products out there. This is just to let you know from the beginning where we came from and what we have been able to accomplish with that.

The management plan was finalized and there are several action items within the plan, and 23 and 24 are the items, and then we have some sub-items in there.

At the scoping meeting in November a year ago, it was identified that the group for ED&RR needed to be as inclusive as possible, which means that our local, State, Federal, the regional groups, need to be involved in developing this, but it also gets cumbersome when you get too large, which today was no problem. They were not too large.

But it is vital that we have non-Federal input needed when we develop these guidelines, because it is on the ground where this is going to be implemented most useful. We have got to have their
input in the makeup of the guidelines and the review, because they are the ones that have to deal with it.

Again, we began with the all-taxa approach, because there were already aquatic and terrestrial groups out there working on early detection. And there was a Federal co-chair identified.

And then in June in Chico, Hot Springs, we identified our terms of reference, and what rolls and responsibilities that we had, and that was to focus on the action items 23 and 24.

In Chico, we had Sarah, Allegra, Jeff Stone, and myself. I can remember that because the shade of our tree kept moving, and we kept moving our chairs. And we have had a couple of conference calls on putting the information together into a summary, and getting expert input and updated information that we had.

We had a lot of professionals join our conference calls, agency folks. We had a set of draft guidelines completed in October, and then we had a second conference call, and that is in Tab 4 of your book.

Again, there is still draft guidelines in Tab 4, and we would like to have any input from the
other ISAC committee members, and additional members, with this writing team.

The writing team itself is fairly well organized as a team, but we would like additional reviewers, and names of reviewers at the State and local levels to look this over again, because the closer to the ground for the people who will be using it, the better.

So if you could get to either Chris or I the names of the reviewers for the guidelines. And again a task team will start in November, and I believe, Chris, that you were saying that he was thinking of maybe four meetings or conference calls on Buick?

MR. DIONIGI: Yes, I think that Tom's approach would be to figure out what his due date is, and I think we saw that in your previous comments of that December time frame, at least for the piece of this that would feed into the budget process.

So I would imagine what he would do is pick a consistent set of meeting dates, like say 3 or 4, and get those established in order to produce that product on time.

I don't know the exact number of meetings that he will feel that he will need, but I would
imagine 3 to 4 maybe.

MRS. COOKSLEY: Okay. And then we have given them some additional guidance with that flip chart that we had. By February, we hope to have something that we can send out to you prior to our March meeting, and make those revisions, and then have ED&RR section up for consideration for the March meeting. Any questions on that?

DR. STOCKER: Okay. Barbara, do you want to throw it up for general discussion now?

MRS. COOKSLEY: Yes.

DR. STOCKER: All right. Your opportunity is here and cards are being raised as I speak. Faith.

DR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. Barbara, I apologize, because I have not read the material in the booklet yet, but is Jim Worrell involved in your team?

MR. DIONIGI: I will answer that. The question was is Jim Worrell involved in the team? In case you don't know, Jim Worrell had a detail assignment, and he is a Forest Service employee, and he and another person, whose name escapes me at the moment, put together a very nice detailed evaluation and summary of a number of model systems for early detection and rapid response.

And it is actually a very excellent
document if you haven't seen it, and it is something that we passed out before. My view is what I think Jim would be -- and I am volunteering him without his permission here, but I think he would be an excellent reviewer of the draft.

And I think that he would be a very good person to come in and say, okay, a lot of what we are doing here has been taken from your work, and give us some insights back on it.

DR. CAMPBELL: Well, that still doesn't address the intent of my question, which is shouldn't he be involved with the team per se.

MS. HAYES: All right. As Chris said, this was a detail for him, and he is back at his regular job. So it probably would be reasonable to ask him to review.

But unless we get permission from his supervisor, I don't think he could be intimately involved with it. We will have to check with that, but everybody has got a separate job to do.

DR. JACKSON: But, Deb, you have great powers of persuasion.

DR. STOCKER: George.

DR. BECK: My question is if we are going to treat invasive species in a early detection and
rapid response perspective as an emergency, should we or could we take advantage of FEMA, which is what, the Federal Emergency something or other. Whatever they are.

Is that something that we could tap into or is that just a bad idea?

MRS. COOKSLEY: We could certainly look at how they are organized, because we would also look at that National Interagency Fire Center, because I think there are a lot of models out there that have shown that they can work at a decentralized location.

DR. STOCKER: Just for the fun of it, does anybody here have a lot of experience with FEMA? I don't. Did you raise your hand? Can you answer our question? Is that an appropriate group for us to be talking to?

MS. DURHAM: Hi. I am Emily Durham, and I am with Tandem Technologies, but I spent several years in emergency management working with the American Red Cross and the State Emergency Management Agency of the State of Missouri, where you are all acquainted with the fact that we have a flood issue in Missouri, and we became the sixth Great Lake.

Anyway, yes, FEMA has done a phenomenal job of advancing their structures and their systems,
and everything that you are speaking about here dealing with coordination of multi-jurisdiction, they have excellent models.

DR. STOCKER: Thank you. I am going to go to Ann first, unless you are going to talk about that very thing. You are going to talk about that very thing? Kathy.

MS. METCALF: I will be real short and sweet. I think FEMA may be a good model to look at, but the concept of actually using the agency somehow as an infrastructure, remember that FEMA works on the jurisdictional basis that disasters are Federalized, and I think what we are talking about here is a decentralization in a program that will provide adequate and timely rapid response and detection.

So use it as a model, and that's fine, but understand that FEMA pushes towards the top, and we are trying to get it down to the level where it can respond quickly.

DR. STOCKER: I like it because if you stack enough sandbags you can cure most evasive pest problems. Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: Well, I have two comments, and I am going to first reinforce what Kathy just said. We did have experience in the Forest Service
with FEMA and jurisdictional problems when the target of response did not have people involved.

And this had to do with blow down damage in the Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York areas. We could not get them to respond to it because of the limitations in their authority. So it is just something that is -- it is a model, and we ought to look at those models.

But my real comment was following up on Faith's, if Jim is not available, because that is very possible given his responsibilities. But I think the underlying point is that there are early detection and rapid response activities going on in government, and we ought to make sure that those experts are on this writing team, and twisting the arms of the agencies to get them to do it.

Because this is so important, and we are all saying that we want to have the system, and a lot of us have been saying it in testimony, and we are putting our professional credibility on the line that we can do this and deliver it.

So I really think we ought to make sure that we get some of those experts, whether they be Forest Service, or NOAA, or Fish and Wildlife Service to the table.
DR. STOCKER: Well, I agree with your point about that very thing as well. If not, how do we -- you just made a suggestion how do we make sure that happens.

MS. BARTUSKA: Well, certainly identify -- there could be multi-stages. We could just identify which agencies we want to have at the table, and see if we can get them there. If there is reluctance at the agency level, then I think we make a strong recommendation and request formally to those agencies for those individuals.

If not, then an individual in the program, and I guess that is where the agency liaisons would need to provide feedback, and can they get the appropriate expertise. But if they are not, then I think that's where we step in and say you have got to have it. This is too important for us just to let it go.

DR. STOCKER: Duly noted.

MS. UPSTON: Yes, I was just going to say does this become an action item? I had started a list.

DR. STOCKER: Actually, I was asking this Barbara. I have Barbaras lined up for infinity.

MS. UPSTON: for as far as you can see.
MRS. COOKSLEY: I agree that we need to get the agency experts on board with us.

DR. STOCKER: And that if you have problems doing that, you can come back to Lori and her staff and this group to see what we can leverage within the agencies.

MRS. COOKSLEY: I think so. This committee has shown itself pretty amenable to looking at letters if we need them.

DR. STOCKER: Allegra.

MS. CANGELOSI: Okay. Forgive me if I missed this in your presentation, but on the aquatic side, and Ann was quite right to point out that it may involve some complexities, the aquatic side, that need to have some careful looking at.

For example, in the Great Lakes or other drinking water sources, the issues of the tools that we have available to us in a rapid response scenario is huge, and I am wondering if there is any way to incorporate the overall need for development of environmentally sound and publicly acceptable tools, especially on the aquatic side.

And then sort of in keeping with that, at times it may be the economics that are of keen concern, particularly where ships may be involved as
needing to be participants in a rapid response scenario to help attenuate spread.

And techniques, again, tools, which are economically available to the ships I think is another big gap. So in the aquatic side, we have our biggest limiting factor, I think, is the tools available to us.

DR. CAMPBELL: Could you (off microphone, inaudible)?

MS. CANGELOSI: No, I am talking about --

DR. STOCKER: Well, that question is not going to show up, and so Faith, throw it on the record or throw it away.

DR. CAMPBELL: I was asking Allegra to clarify what she means by economic tools.

MS. CANGELOSI: I mean economically achievable tools. So, for example, if we have an infestation in a harbor area, and ships may be key players in allowing the rapid response to proceed successfully, what can we ask them to do?

And is it something that they can do and survive as an industry, and is it something that we can do without contaminating the drinking water of the City of Duluth, or whatever the harbor is.

DR. CAMPBELL: Well, in the ag context, it
frequently comes up to compensating the owner of the
trees or the animals, or whatever that are destroyed.
So that might be part of what is going on here.

DR. STOCKER: Dean, was yours about this?

MR. WILKINSON: Not exactly.

DR. STOCKER: Then let's pause for a
second. Diane's was.

MS. COOPER: I think as we move forward
developing some systems or processes, or consolidating
those that are already done, relying on governmental
agencies to do that is fine. However, I think I just
want to throw out that let's not forget about industry
input, in terms of -- well, when we go out to
implement these programs and plans, because often
times it is the industry folks that are out on the
grounds.

We have a lot of regulations that are made
from the deck, but we are out there every day, and we
are probably -- some of our industry folks are
probably the first ones to recognize or to be
detecting some of these species.

DR. STOCKER: Chris, on this?

MR. DIONIGI: Yes, just a very quick
follow-up to Allegra's comment, and Bill, and Faith,
and Phyllis, and other people who were with us at the
NRC conference or workshop on Friday.

One of the things that was identified is that in so many situations just our technical repertoire of things that we have to respond to are very limited, and we end up slaughtering, and cutting, and burning.

And there was an identified need to stimulate research to find additional tools for that very thing.

DR. STOCKER: Donnie.

MR. DIPPEL: Are you looking at tools also as chemicals, like pesticides and things of that sort? You know, there is a process in the State where you do Section 18s and 24(c)s which can respond quickly to these requests, and it is a response to being able to treat something that is not on the label, and you are able to go out and do these by working through your State ag departments of getting chemicals approved.

There is four different types of Section 18s. One is crisis, and one is your normal Section 18, and your emergency for any type of human effects on people or animals, or whatever, Section 18.

So there is a tool in the Ag Department where you can get something approved very rapidly if you need it, and working through EPA, and also there
again it has to prove that it is safe, and it has to have certain tolerances and things of that sort, but they can work very rapidly if it is needed.

MRS. COOKSLEY: Okay. We caught ourselves in our task team discussion of getting down to perhaps too much detail at this time, and we need to have those tools identified, but we also have to remember that these are ISAC recommendations to the council, and some of this will fall into perhaps what our writing teams do, and we may end up having another subcommittee under this to address some of that.

And we appreciate all of that input, because we do need to know what tools, and where do we need them, and do we need research on the tools. Again, you know, perhaps terrestrial to aquatic, they are going to differ, and we need to know where to look, and to give it again to the folks on the ground, the agencies and industry on the ground.

When I have this invasion, it has been identified, and miraculously there is going to be out there and now how do I do it. But today probably won't work in what we are probably going to present to ISAC yet.

But we definitely need to recognize that we need them, and we need to have them identified.
DR. STOCKER: And permitting processes will certainly be a part of any ED&RR. Dean.

MR. WILKINSON: When the issue came up as a model, I thought of at least a couple of models and maybe Kathy can weigh in on one of them that I am going to mention.

This really is in my view a little more like an oil spill, and there are identified regional plans for response to oil spills. There is at least three different levels that they deal with, and it is a more localized response in a lot of places, and I would urge -- and way back when I handled marine mammal emergencies, and worked up a contingency plan which I can share with the committee.

I was the person in the nation responsible for responding to marine mammal emergencies.

DR. STOCKER: The bathtub was full of elephant and seal. Ann or Lori, who wants to go first here? Lori.

MS. WILLIAMS: I looked through quickly, and maybe I missed it, but I think what Allegra was talking about in some of these other points could go as an edit to the essential principles and guidelines draft that has been developed.

So one thing that people might want to do
is take a quick look on your airplane ride home and get us some more specific comments directly to that document, and then your input can be folded in before the writing team even starts.

DR. STOCKER: Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: Yes, on a slightly different subject, as I have heard that the different task teams reports, and thinking about how several of us have here lately and my guess is that there will be others who will be asked here in the new Congress.

It would be great if we could start putting together some key messages according to these different subject areas. What are the things or what are those underlying foundational things that we all agree on so we can be promoting them.

Like do we all agree that there should be a call for a national early warning system, period. If there is, then let's have that in effect in our back pocket so that next time when we hear the testimony we already have that in place.

Now, I don't know if that is a job for the communications team to help do that, or all of us have to do it, but I would like to recommend or request that we try to figure that out.

DR. STOCKER: Bill.
MR. DICKERSON: A related issue, kind of following up on what Ann said, and it is a sensitive issue, and I don't even know for sure exactly how to address it. except that I have a gnawing concern inside of me.

If you look around, there are lots of things that are worthy for us to do, and there are lots of things that are Federal support, and I am thinking specifically yesterday afternoon at Tom Bewick's presentation when he mentioned that to fully implement that extension program would probably cost somewhere around $225 million.

I am not saying that is not an important thing to do, but somehow or another we need to have a system of alerting the council and others to priorities, because $225 million would probably empty the bucket for a while.

And it is probably something else that we could do with at least part of that money that would help in controlling basic species at least in the short term a lot more than that $225 million there. So I don't know how we address it, but I am concerned.

DR. STOCKER: I personally enjoy pauses. Well, what I think we will do is that we have had a good focused discussion on one group, and I think we
will now throw it open to a general discussion on all
the groups and the question at hand is, is this
process working, and can we move it along better than
we have been. Are there key things that we need to
talk about from the logistics side, and how we are
using our task teams.

And then from the issue side, are there
things that we need to be pushing on more firmly than
we are. I don't want to lose two of the things that
just came up.

You both raised issues, and you have asked
for some guidance on getting some agreed upon bullets
I will call them for right now, and brought up an
issue about assisting NISC in prioritizing allocations
of your tax dollars. So let's not forget those, but
let's also not --

MS. UPSTON: Well, that's what I was going
to ask. If I could also get help from the group of
what you want to call action items that need to be
reviewed and considered at the end of this meeting to
move forward and those things which you are talking
about for the March agenda.

I think I captured some things that came
out of the discussion, like is a letter from the ISAC
communication group asking about the staffing
position, and some ideas for logos.

These were requests that were being made, and I will put them up and then you can decide at the end if these are legitimate ones. But if you want it on the action item, help me out by saying so and I will track them that way as well.

DR. STOCKER: Kathy.

MS. METCALF: Randall, I suspect that maybe your face on a frankenfish would be a good logo for ISAC, and you could put me on the swamp eel.

DR. STOCKER: Some have already suggested that it is already on the frankenfish.

MS. METCALF: Three quick points.

DR. STOCKER: That is going to cost you by the way.

MS. METCALF: Yes, to become the permanent secretary for the steering committee. I can see it coming. Three quick points. One is I completely agree with what Ann said about trying to get some key speaking points on testimony.

I think we need to always keep in mind though that it is not ever going to be ISAC's points. It is going to be the person who is testifying points, and that it probably only becomes an official message when NISC approves it, and then certainly I
would guess we could probably mention the fact that we were on ISAC and that NISC approved this concept.

So I don't know why I have become the APA police person, but I fear for that.

DR. STOCKER: Is the next point in the same -- I don't want to interrupt you, but I already did.

MS. METCALF: Okay. No, it's not.

DR. STOCKER: Let me suggest something a little different than what you just said. If this is or if ISAC chose to have a list of bullets, a single piece of paper that had 11 things on it, then they could use that as they wish.

Any one of us could go and say that ISAC did this, and I swear to god that ISAC did this. NISC doesn't have to bless a list of bullets that we put together that we would then perhaps forward to NISC as our whatever. But that list could still be created.

MS. METCALF: I would issue a great deal of caution on using the words, "ISAC did this."

DR. STOCKER: Well, so would I. I am just saying that to have NISC's concurrence on what we produce doesn't necessarily always involve bringing it to them and getting their official blessing on it or minutes.
MS. METCALF: My only point on this is that our administrative voice created by the executive order is an information flow to NISA. It is not an information flow out to other public groups.

DR. STOCKER: I would concur.

MS. METCALF: So I am just telling you what I would do. I would welcome the speaking points, but I would use it perhaps as my own rather than actually saying that ISAC decided that.

MS. WILLIAMS: I would really concur with Kathy on this. I think especially since we are talking about Congressional testimony. You just don't want -- I mean, the one thing that you don't want to do is characterize something as a position of ISAC.

ISAC itself doesn't really take positions. You made recommendations to the advisory committee. It is a nicety in a number of areas. It is not a nicety in terms of testifying before Congress. So that I would agree with her.

That doesn't mean that anything that you said today that you can create a list of messages, and you can forward those to NISA. People can use them when they are testifying in their individual capacities.

But I think it is an important distinction. So thank
you, Kathy.

DR. STOCKER:  And let me say that, for instance, I could bring a list of the task teams that ISAC has and use that however I wanted to. Honest, it exists. There is that list.

Now, if I use it inappropriately, people can yell at me, but there is not a whole lot they can do, because the mechanism doesn't prevent me from saying ISAC developed these taskings. That's all I am saying.

And Maybe that conveys some information by what task teams they picked.

MS. METCALF:  I give my time back. I forgot my other two points.

(Laughter.)

DR. STOCKER:  Yes. All right. The billboard is still up.

MR. BUCK:  Is this a general dialogue on the task teams?

DR. STOCKER:  Yes, this is a general dialogue on the task teams, with the objective of learning what we need to do to make them even more effective than they have been.

MR. BUCK:  Okay. And let me throw out a hand grenade here. And I am reacting a little bit to
Jim's points yesterday about us not being focused and playing out of the field. And also in the context that I have six or seven advisory committees, and it is fun to be on the other side of advisory other people.

But we are so much better than we were before. But I think the key issue that was brought out about urging the staff to be -- with all the positions being filled, I just don't feel like we are utilizing the expertise of this committee yet to its full potential.

We are spending a lot of time self-organizing ourselves to be able to figure out how we want to operate, and I think, for instance, that Ann brought out a point for key messages that we should have.

To me the staff, if the staff was there, that the communications should have outlined 10 or 12 key messages already that we can react to. We are still spending a lot of time generating our own organizational structure, and that spends a lot of our time.

It is not really our expertise at all. We still are not applying the joint expertise that we have, and I figure it is a symptom of two things.
One, there is not enough staff, and the positions are not being filled.

And, two, is that we still have not connected to the agencies at all. We all have our own internal connections, but they are not reaching out at all and asking us how we can help them.

We are spending a lot of time generating how we can think we can influence things, and we are not getting that feedback. So we have come a long way for that, and that has been around since day one, but I still sense, and some of the dialogue on the task teams are still that way.

We are spending a lot of time self-organizing ourselves, rather than having our expertise utilized in a way that would be the most effective and efficient.

DR. STOCKER: You are going to get asked this again, and so I may just ask you. We have got some positions that we have heard about, and we want to do what is most effective in getting those positions filled, and simply what is the answer to that.

MS. WILLIAMS: I could say something, but I won't. No, I think that you have already made a number of statements that the decision makers, to the
extent that I have access to the direct decision makers, and which I don't always, but are Jim Butler, but much more Jim Tate.

He was here yesterday and he heard you, and he has been hearing me. So I think we have got the staffing plan done. So I think we are on target for that. I think that I would really agree with Michael, but I do think we sent out in this book some very specific things to ask for your advice and input on.

What are the essential elements of the Early Detection, Rapid Response System, and there is a lot of good work out there. There is the FICWNEW proposal. There is the ANSTF. What general overall overarching guidelines do you think should be in this document.

What should we include in the NEPA guidance. We gave you a specific outline, and I know that it is not a detailed draft, but sometimes that gets words that are needed, and what should be in the NEPA guidance.

What should be in those appendices, and what would help people. I think we are starting to ask for a lot of specific input from this group, and we need to get things out further in advance. We need
to -- you know, there is a lot of improvement that we could make, but even with the limited staff that we have now, I think we are asking for some very specific things.

And the agencies, it is not always directly in this meeting, but the agencies help put together everything that is in this book. The staff did not do any of this unilaterally. Well, maybe something.

But 99 percent of it, the agencies put this together. The agencies put together the cross-cut, and the agencies put together the draft on NEPA, and so some of this needs to happen unfortunately because of the way that things work, and how many agencies are involved by e-mail request and by asking you to react to written documents.

So if there is other ways and better ways that we could request the information, I am open to that, but I guess I am saying that we are starting to do that, and sometimes we don't get a lot of reaction back from sending out these requests, except on the budget.

And we are not getting back what I think this group is capable of giving us, and a lot of that is that of course everyone is extremely busy. But
that would be my own plea, is to take a look at what is in this book, and give us some criticism or whatever, but some reaction.

DR. STOCKER: And let me suggest in the agenda that we can do a little bit better job of posing a question. There is a draft attached, and are you happy with it, and what are your suggestions.

So that it is clear to the recipients of what the most benefit that can come out of this meeting is, and there is always a timing issue. It never comes in a month ahead of time. It always comes in later than you would like.

We are humans, and that is how we work, but I think we can design those agenda sentences to extract more focused input. Thank you. Kathy. Unless you guys want to respond to what Lori has brought up? Will you yield your time?

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

DR. STOCKER: Rebecca.

MS. BECH: My comment to Michael is that the taskings are designed to bring agency participation to the table with you, and with people that are actually having to go back to their agencies and try to work some of these issues through.

So perhaps some of the task teams and
because it is just beginning, there may be -- you know, you may not have quite that feeling that the agencies are there with you, but that is why we were trying to bring key people from those agencies together.

If that is not or if there is another mechanism as well to bring these issues and have you continue to advise and work with the agencies, then maybe we can discuss that if you would like to do something within these meetings itself.

But that was the design of the tasking to try to do that. So that was my only comment.

DR. STOCKER: And I will also add that the self-evolvement we understand, but that the alternative was to be sort of told how to do it, and the balancing act is probably the awkward stage that we are going through. We all kind of knew that we were going to go through that, and so some may go faster than others. Kathy.

MS. METCALF: This is my second term and so I don't have to be political, and I already told Lori that I am going to say this.

DR. STOCKER: You don't have to be political?

MS. METCALF: I don't have to be political
anymore.

DR. STOCKER: I thought you were going to say that I don't have to be polite.

MS. METCALF: You always have to be polite. Two things. I think Bill brought up a good point about talking numbers with the agencies, and I think at a certain level that is probably a good thing.

But I think to understand the way that budgets are prepared in Washington, it becomes very dangerous for an advisory group to start trying to do the push me and pull you of authorization and appropriations.

I think -- and to give you an example within the Coast Guard Budget. We have been trying to get more money for the invasive program within the Coast Guard budget, but guess what now? Congress gives them one set of money, and if you start earmarking certain things, then you have now begun the impact on the rest of the agency's budget. So you get a whole lot of enemies coming at you. It is something that we need to consider though.

But the one thing that I told Lori that I was going to say that probably is not politically correct is one of the things that has concerned me
throughout this process is that I feel like but for the Gordons, and the Rebeccas, and the Deans, I almost feel like there is not a council.

But for the actions of those three people, I don't see who we are advising. We don't see people at meetings on a regular basis, and I am talking about high level appointees or just below the appointee levels.

The people from the agencies that are here have been terrific. They are bending over backwards, and they are trying to do 20 jobs already, and we are adding another 10.

But the concern that I have got is that somehow we have got to figure out how to link up, and this is not unique to this particular group. We have the same problem in the marine transportation system, an interagency group and advisory thing, and it is something that happens with advisory committees, and agency groups.

We have to figure out how to make the connect, because Lori works for the council, and she can't go to the council and say, hey, you guys, you aren't doing your job right.

DR. STOCKER: But she can once.

MS. METCALF: Once, yeah, and then she is
going to -- well, she can work for us any time she wants. But I think that is a real broad overshading thing that we uniquely have got to address as a private sector advisory group.

We need to see people at policy making levels, and no offense to Rebecca Gordon and Dean, but we need to make sure that the leadership of these agencies believe that this is important, because all these agency people sitting here probably have three other meetings that they needed to be at this morning.

And they are doing it because they think it is important, but the disconnect between what they think is important in preparing documents, or programs, or presentations, and the disconnect between that and the pocketbook is huge.

**DR. STOCKER:** Ann.

**MS. BARTUSKA:** Yes. I guess just to follow up on that. It seems to me that many of us as individuals or as small groups have had great success in going to agency or departmental leadership and being heard, and that connection back to the ISAC is not made.

So somehow we have got to convey that there is value in this group supporting the agencies and the departments for wherever they are going for
their programs, and for their budgets, and that there is value associated with this.

And I think the only way to do that is to have more face to face opportunities as individuals or as groups with some of those to get the chiefs of the Forest Service to recognize that we are a viable organization or a group, and not just some paper pushing -- well, getting together four times a year or whatever it is.

But it does seem like we need to escalate the amount of communications that we are doing as either individuals or as an entity, but on behalf of ISAC and the evasive species plan.

DR. STOCKER: I am going to call on Nelroy next, but in the middle of this, I am going to ask for Jim Tate and Jim Butler to fit in to that assessment, and whether that changes it slightly or not.

MS. METCALF: Just real quick. I think the three sponsoring agencies have been to the table all along, and I don't want to name other agencies, but let's put it this way.

Invasives come in on transportation vectors, and through a lot of this process there has been an agency that I think has been missing in a lot of this input, and it is not just that agency.
But I think to Jim Tate and Jim Butler, what I would like to see is all of the Jim Tates and the Jim Butlers across the agencies on ISAC. Not every meeting by the way.

DR. STOCKER: Nelroy.

DR. JACKSON: I want to bring us back to the issue of what do we do about the other four tasking teams. There is a plus and minus, or a pro and a con, and one of Dr. Butler's things has been that he thinks we are too defused and not focused enough.

We have identified eight task teams, and four of them met today, and should we just stick with those four and move forward, and what do we do with the other four, which are control and management, information management, international cooperation, and research.

I think it is an important issue that the steering group needs some guidance on this, too.

DR. STOCKER: I will let you jump in when you want to, because I don't know what yours are related to.

MS. CANGELOSI: Nelroy raised an important point, and I will address that, and then I will go to what I was going to say. But I think that all of
those task teams ought to remain and expand, but that we may not want to try to schedule them all for the same period of time in a meeting.

That just spreads us too thinly, and maybe some will be more active than others. But we clearly want to keep oversight in mind, and I know that is the wrong word, but we want to looking at and becoming involved as needed in those other areas as well.

And certainly international is a big one and it is pressing, and it needs to be addressed. So maybe the constraint of time shouldn't cause us to restructure those.

The point that I wanted to raise was more of a question, and maybe it is something to think about until this afternoon's discussion about the legislation that has been introduced, but clearly I and -- and I am quite sure that the staff involved in the leadership offices on that legislation would be interested in input from those respective task teams on the specifics of the bill that has been introduced.

And a question that I have is how, and when, and whether that type of input can be delivered.

MR. WILKINSON: I wanted to raise a question.
DR. STOCKER: Okay. Let's talk logistics.

We have got about -- I am hoping about 6 or 7 minutes to wrap up this general discussion. So let's keep it short. And then I have a little housekeeping on some letters that we would like to go through before lunch.

Now, this is more important frankly than the letters and we can push it behind lunch, but just so you know what I am thinking.

MR. WILKINSON: I wanted to ask ISAC something that I have tried to do. For instance, I think I sent out a copy of the bill for people to look at. I know that I have sent out a number of Federal Register notices, and has that been helpful to ISAC.

If so, we will continue it, but I actually have not seen -- actually, Diane responded to one thing that I did send to her that I alerted her to. But we have actually tried to make an effort to do something in this area, and I am not sure we are getting anything back. You may be doing it on your own.

DR. STOCKER: Anybody opposed to receiving those raise your hand. And the rest of us designated Diane to respond for the next calendar year.

MS. COOPER: I would be happy to.

DR. STOCKER: If you want a response, you
ought to ask in your e-mail communications that you would like a response. Sometimes we just get stuff because it is FYI, and if you want a response, we can respond.

MR. WILKINSON: I am sure that ISAC, per se, can respond to a Federal Register notice. But if something comes up on IPPC, or that type of thing, one of the things that I view our role as is a communication to you so that you do know that some issues are out there.

And you may want to comment individually on those issues, and/or contact others who may want to respond.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. And you are getting them as individuals, and you can always respond as individuals. And if you have key questions that you want to address, you can always add them. Rebecca, and then Bill, if that is okay.

MS. BECH: Kathy, one of the things that we talked about was having a joint council ISAC meeting in March. My only thought about that was the only time we tried to do that previously, it wasn't a real satisfying meeting.

So we need to think about real hard about what that agenda would look like. However, I would
like to bring up the Shepardstown meeting, and that was more of a working group informal. We brought a lot of key administrators, and the kind of people and interaction that you are talking about.

So perhaps you might want to suggest that it is time to look at that and could we design a meeting where we could go something like that again, if that was something that was a little more satisfying.

And if you remember, too, about the workshop that we had in Shepardstown. That is really where the idea of having all of these task teams, and a lot of this that we are working on right now is generated at that meeting for those of you who were present during the first round.

So we have not done something like that and I would just like to pose if that worked, maybe we would want to make a recommendation to do that.

DR. STOCKER: Bill.

MR. DICKERSON: For the staffing optimism that you have expressed, is that something that is still pending in the future, or is it a done deal and all you have to do is paperwork?

MS. WILLIAMS: Nothing is a done deal these days, but what we have is a staffing plan and
Jim has approved that. What we need to do is move it forward through the departmental process, and basically the Chief of Staff has to approve it.

I don't have a budget in the classic sense. I am within the Secretary's office budget. So technically for most of the positions I believe that they are in the budget proposal that I submitted.

But they still all have to be approved through the Secretary's office, and that is just the way our budget works. So, you know, I am optimistic. I can't say for sure that they will all be approved, and the budget situation is a little bit up in the air since we don't even have 2003 appropriations.

MR. DICKERSON: Randall, what I would suggest is the possibility -- well, I would suggest, and not a possibility, but I would suggest that the group consider maybe you writing a letter of appreciation for Rebecca, and Lori, and Chris, and the staff, that now supports us.

But that it is critical for this increased staffing level to allow us to essentially increase our level of participation.

DR. STOCKER: Let me do this. Let me talk to Lori a little bit during lunch about what some of the options are for that, and then can we agree right
after lunch that we will bring back what seems to be the best idea there?

Because I have got about five other questions to ask, and I might find out quicker over lunch than I would now. Would that be all right?

MR. DICKERSON: I agree to that. I would suggest though that sometimes you can get approval, and the process of going through the process takes months. I would like for this to take weeks and not 6 or 8, or 10 or 12, months.

DR. STOCKER: I think that we all agree with you. Nelroy.

DR. JACKSON: Bill, with all due respect, when I met Dr. Tate, I think it was very clear his commitment on exactly what Lori said. That there is a personal plan, and it is just simply that there is no deliberate delay.

It is moving forward with deliberate speed, and it is just a process that they have to go through. I am not sure that us writing a letter is going to do much good at this point.

MR. DICKERSON: Well, obviously I don't want to fight a battle that doesn't exist. I just think that sometimes things can move fast, and sometimes generally they move slow in the Federal
process. I think that it is urgent enough that we are
devoting our attention, and our time to this process
to facilitate that, and we need these additional
horses.

DR. STOCKER: Let me continue that
discussion over lunch. I think that there is an area
that I personally think we need to pay attention to,
and let me try to find out what the options are in a
bit of background discussion.

George, and then if that is a convenient
point, we can move to the letters. If not, we can use
all the time.

DR. BECK: I do not believe having all the
task teams is a lack of focus, and I think we should
retain them. I mean, they will become useful in time,
and they will become nice vehicles to provide
recommendations and advice.

DR. STOCKER: David.

DR. LODGE: I don't disagree that all the
task teams are useful in the long run, but I think
what we saw this morning is that we simply can't meet
all of them at one meeting. I mean, it is just
logistically impossible.

And so for subsequent meetings, maybe
setting or identifying a subset of task teams that
will focus on a meeting I think would be the most helpful approach.

DR. STOCKER: Yes, this is a learn by doing organization, and I at least learned that possibly the two or three groups that have something bubbling the most might be able to take the best advantage of it.

But each group probably could probably determine whether this is the meeting that they needed to do that with. We agreed to do this at Yellowstone to sort of make sure that you had an opportunity to do that.

We have seen one way of doing it, and now our job is to try and figure out what a better way would be in the future. Nelroy.

DR. JACKSON: I need to ask one more question. We allocated about two hours for the task teams. Is that about the right amount of time? We need a little bit of feedback. Is two hours enough, or do we need to go to four hours with task teams?

Why don't we do a show of hands. Is two hours enough?

(A show of hands.)

DR. JACKSON: Okay. Four hours?

(A show of hands.)
DR. JACKSON: Thanks.

DR. STOCKER: Luckily, there is nothing in between. David.

MS. UPSTON: There is one thing I just want to offer, because Nelroy and I talked about this, and he may have forgotten. The option is that if you wanted all the task teams to meet, you have to tell the steering committee that one group would meet one day, and one group would meet another day, and the second group another day.

So there is a way to do it, but you have to say to the steering committee that you want all task teams to meet within an ISAC meeting and then displace something else from the agenda, and have two hours one day, and two hours another day. So there are other options for having everybody meet.

DR. STOCKER: And let us kind of work on that a little bit. Next time we may send out a tentative thing and call for your comments on it.

MS. UPSTON: Good.

DR. STOCKER: All right. Anything else about the general task team issues? Bill, your card is up.

MR. DICKERSON: In response to the comment that Kathy made just a second ago, my message is that
my concern about the budget was not in detail, but was hoping to help the counsel rank priorities, and I wasn't trying to allocate dollars or suggesting that we do that, but is to allocate priorities and identify what we think are priority issues.

DR. STOCKER: Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: This is a different topic.

DR. STOCKER: That's perfectly all right.

MS. BARTUSKA: This is with regard to another task team, the research one, and this looks like it is the only place on the agenda to bring these issues up. But I was recently participating in a CSREES, which we all now know, right?

DR. STOCKER: Too late. You owe us lunch.

MS. BARTUSKA: No, I heard someone say it earlier. The National Research Initiate, NRI, was seeking input, and it was very interesting to me that almost every group that was there identified invasive species as a priority, and I think there is an opportunity -- and is anybody from CSREES here right now? I don't see Tom.

But I think there is a real opportunity for ISAC to provide feedback to them about future priorities, because as I understood it, they are looking at really reorganizing the different program
areas within the NRI, and invasive species doesn't show up explicitly anywhere.

Biosecurity does, but every group that was participating identified invasives. If we went in there and said that invasive species science is important, boom, boom, boom, and had a direct letter from ISAC, or however we want to work it through the council, I think it would have some great impact right now. So that is a recommended action if we agree.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. And there is a members forum later on, and so we will have an opportunity to bring up some things. I just wanted to remind everybody that that does exist. I am not trying to lean into the next 10 minutes other than just slightly.

And with that, Ann, you must mentioned that we will go on the flip charts so we don't forget that later on.

MS. BARTUSKA: Yes, and the reason that I wanted to bring it here is that I saw that coming from the research task team. That's why I -- because I know that there was some priority setting already taking place.

DR. STOCKER: NRI used to have that as a noun somewhere in there. So it is not there now.
MS. BARTUSKA: It is there. George.

DR. BECK: The NRI tends to structure the RFPs or requests for proposals around tests, rather than -- and to have something identify this as an invasive species will be too broad. It will have to be broken down by animals, plants, aquatics, what have you.

MS. BARTUSKA: Actually, I would like to counter that, because that is exactly the proposal that was put on the table, is doing away with their previous program areas, with a whole new set of program areas, all related to agriculture, and none dealing with natural resources whatsoever that I could tell.

And the feeling was that to have one specifically on an invasive species biology, which would cover the whole array from cellular to community was getting a lot of attraction in this group, referencing also the different society.

So it seems to me that through or from the stakeholder's process they really are reworking their NRI program areas. At least that is what I was led to believe.

DR. STOCKER: George.

DR. BECK: Yes, I guess I wouldn't be
surprised with that, but boy, there is an army of people out there that will fight that tooth and nail. So I think we want to work with them, rather than trying to swim around them.

DR. STOCKER: There is a soldier sitting right over here. All right. Is this a good time to pause on this? Chris.

MS. ROTH: Just one quick comment. My information on this is a little bit old, but it was my understanding that there is a national CFAR, and sorry for the acronym, because I don't know what it is.

DR. STOCKER: He buys lunch.

MR. DIONIGI: No, it's not when you -- if you use one and don't know what it is, then you are allowed. Okay.

(Laughter.)

MR. DIONIGI: That is working to double the size of agricultural research spending, and I think they would be a very excellent group to work with on that. Tom Hebert would be a contact for that.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. Is now a good time to shift gears? This is going to go fast, but this is going to be that we all either like it and nod, or we talk about it later, or do something dramatically different with it.
So if you don't like it, say so and you are protected. The first thing is you hold in your hand the draft summary of ISAC budget task team comments that Bill handed out yesterday afternoon.

You read it, and several of you met today and had a couple of items. Bill is going to take his lunch opportunity to make revisions, and right after lunch, he is going to read to you the new language.

To me it looked principally editorial, with a couple of items that were I would say content, and Bill will read those to us after lunch. All right.

I will set that aside, and the next one is a draft letter from members of ISAC written by Faith Campbell, Jeff Stone, and Craig Regelbrugge.

There is at least one change to this letter before we say anything. The last paragraph currently says, "in contrast that the majority of." That has been changed to, "in contrast most of."

DR. CAMPBELL: "Virtually all," I think.

DR. STOCKER: Jeff.

DR. CAMPBELL: There are a number of changes.

MR. DIONIGI: But the rest of them are all editorial changes that I saw.
DR. CAMPBELL: Two substantive ones.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. You have an option. You can read the substantive changes and hope you get group concurrence. Is there anyone that already knows that they are not going to concur with this being an ISAC letter that I would sign for ISAC?

If you already know that now, say so, and then it will become or will drop down -- well, we will worry about that later. They would become an individual's as they choose letter. So if you already know that you don't want this to be an ISAC consensus letter, say so right now.

MR. DICKERSON: Bill Dickerson, question.

DR. STOCKER: Bill.

MR. DICKERSON: Signed by you to whom? To the council?

DR. STOCKER: It says, "Ann Veneman."

DR. CAMPBELL: I would follow the precedent that we did the Yellowstone letter on. Did that go through you, Lori, or did that go directly to Gail Martin?

DR. STOCKER: It went directly to the council, and went to all the council members.

DR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Then to council, who would then forward it to the council members.
DR. STOCKER: Right.

MR. DICKERSON: A letter to the council. I just wanted to make sure that we stay within the bounds and the concerns of yesterday anyway.

DR. STOCKER: Ron.

MR. LUKENS: I don't want to oppose the letter, but I am concerned that -- I mean, we have never discussed the wood packing industry as a group that I can recall, and I mentioned this to Faith, and she pointed out the letter that we wrote from Yellowstone about the lake.

And that was indeed a well-accepted premise from the aquatic side, although we had never specifically discussed boat washing programs, or whatever it happened to be within this group.

The other difference is that there is a constituency out there that stands to be impacted here; whereas, with the Yellowstone letter there wasn't. I guess I don't know anything about wood packing. So I don't know all the intricacies of it.

And I just kind of wish that we had had an opportunity to discuss it. I have no conceptual objection to the letter at all.

DR. STOCKER: You will have an opportunity to discuss it, and you will have one at lunch perhaps.
with Faith, and you will have a members forum this afternoon with a bit of time.

And then you can discuss it at your leisure. There is a time limits factor here, and like I said, if you don't want it to be an ISAC letter, say so now, and then we don't have to go through the rest of this discussion, and the rest of it can be discussed more leisurely.

DR. CAMPBELL: I would say, Ron, that there are five people here who have some background in this issue who are supporting this letter. I think it is five; Jeff, Ann, me, Craig, and Bill.

DR. STOCKER: And they are available to discuss it at lunch. We understand what we are doing to you, and we know that this is a crunch, and that this is not how we like to do business.

But because of the time factor, we are willing to give it a shot. You at least had a chance to read it last night. That is not much, but it is a chance. Allegra.

MS. CANGELOSI: I share the level of, I guess, lack, of information that Ron has, and also the concern that we are promoting a particular technology at the exclusion of another technology. And I accept that the experts feel that is consistent with a
performance goal, but I wonder why we couldn't just take the problem and make it go away by using more generic terms.

I mean, is it necessary for us to say no more solid wood packing, and use alternatives, rather than saying use alternatives, but don't present the problem without referring to the specifics? I just wonder if that is a way to make it go away.

DR. STOCKER: Faith, do you want to respond to that?

DR. CAMPBELL: I think we could use something like -- well, avoid technology that avoids the problem once, but I think if we get too far away from the specifics, then the Secretary won't know what we are talking about.

DR. STOCKER: And I am going to suggest this, because the clock is ticking. We have learned a little bit, and those of you that want to take advantage of the opportunity, there are people in the room that will talk to you about the issue.

I will bring it up this afternoon one more time, and if you have solved your individual questions, fine. If not, then it will fall on to Faith to collect as many signatures as she wants for an individual's letter that will go out. Does
somebody have a problem with that? Craig.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: If I could just make one or two additional comments that I think might help to alleviate some of the concerns that seem to be in the room.

I think the concern that drove the authors of the letter were that absent ISAC weighing in, we were afraid that there would not be a long term view. That we would put ourselves in a position where this pathway, which is extremely problematic, would be dealt with incompletely, and we wouldn't have ultimate resolution.

So I think what we are trying really to do is to raise the distinction between the near term and sort of triage measures that need to be put into place, and the long term vision.

We want a long term vision to be articulated, and that long term vision ought to be that we either have development of treatments that are fully affectatious, or we shift to alternative materials.

And so I think there might be some editorial changes in the letter that could help, and rather than advocating for a specific position, it would sort of help us to say look at the near term and
the long term in your rule making.

    I think the other comment that Ann made
was that there is an opportunity here to call upon the
council to take a look at incentives, and to take a
look at international capacity building toward
acceptance of alternatives, and those types of things
so that there is a positive side to it that is not
currently reflected in the letter as well. So I just
would like to throw that out for the group's
consideration.

    DR. STOCKER: Okay. That takes our
available time, and we are going to pause right there.
If someone wants to argue that we keep talking about
this instead of the first 15 minutes of your lunch, say so.

    (No response.)

    DR. STOCKER: Hearing nothing, continue
the discussions and dialogues, we will bring up each
one of these this afternoon, and a third. We will
meet back here at one o'clock roaring and ready to go.

    The International Group had better find
Lori right now so that you know where you are eating,
and is there anything else that we need to say before
we break for lunch?

    (No response.)
DR. STOCKER: Have a very good lunch, and see you back here at one o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 11:47 a.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)
(1:01 p.m.)

DR. STOCKER: My job in part is to make you very, very ready for a new Chair when the time comes, and I am doing a very good job. One of the items that we did not cover that we should have already, and perhaps even first thing, would have been to have approved the minutes from the June meeting. They are Tab 8 in your book.

(Minutes moved and seconded.)

DR. STOCKER: Discussion? I like them as well. Then is there anyone who does not concur with approving the minutes as presented in Tab 8? Hearing none, thank you.

All right. Then moving right along, the next section is titled how science advises public policy, and Dr. Tate, are you going to take the lead on this discussion?

DR. TATE: I am, but we have a power point there that may not be working, and if we could give it a few seconds.

DR. STOCKER: All right. Do you want us to -- we have another item that we could take care of in a couple of minutes. Would that be a good thing?

DR. TATE: Yes, that would be great.
Thank you.

DR. STOCKER: All right. Let us revisit the letters. There is too much fun not to come back to. I am going to have a third confusion. This is a letter of appreciation that has been drafted for ISAC under my signature to send, recognizing Dr. Butler’s contributions to our discussion.

"Dr. Butler, on behalf of the Invasive Species Advisory Committee, I express our sincere appreciation for the critical support, leadership, and insight that you provided to ISAC. The high level of commitment demonstrated by your attendance and participation in our meetings sends a strong message of support from both the Department of Agriculture and the National Invasive Species Council. We wish you the best in your new position, and look forward to continuing to work with you in your new capacity. Please accept our open invitation to attend our meetings. Sincerely."

Does anybody have any comment or suggestions for this letter, meant only to say thank you for doing what you have done. We know that you are in a new position. He is not quite sure what his role will be related to us.

We didn't want to terminate anything. We
are not saying that it is has been fund, and now go away. We are saying that we enjoyed your participation and invite you to continue it if you can or if you will. Comment? Does anybody have any problem with this letter? If so, say so now.

(No response.)

DR. STOCKER: Well, good. As soon as I get back, I will draft it and send it out as an e-mail so that you can look at it. That will give you another half-day at least to see something that you didn't hear when I read it right now, and then we will distribute it.

This is not horribly time critical. I did talk to -- and you tell me when you are ready, because I am going to have to go for longer than you want me to. I talked to Lori over lunch, and our combined consensus is this.

And Jim is not listening to this discussion, or pretending that he is not here right now, but I personally feel that it would be better if I picked up my telephone when I got back, and called Dr. Tate up and explained why we wanted to do everything within our power to support filling the positions that are not filled, and the whole concept of their staffing program as presented.
Since I am not or we are not privy to that staffing arrangement, since this is an internal thing, it is a little awkward to say we don't quite know what your proposing, but by god we sure support it in writing.

Dr. Tate has explained that he understands how important we feel this is, and he was here yesterday when we went through part of this discussion, and that that might be a very good way of again demonstrating our belief that this is very, very critical to our role and mission. Does that sound good to everybody?

If so, then that will be step one.

DR. CAMPBELL: It is a letter?

DR. STOCKER: It is a phone call.

DR. TATE: Would you like me to make some comments on that subject?

DR. STOCKER: It depends on what the comments are I guess, but I think so. He is smiling and so I will say yes.

DR. TATE: Are we legal yet without Lori here by the way?

DR. STOCKER: We are quasi-legal.

MR. WILKINSON: She is the official FACA person.
DR. STOCKER: The door is open let the record reflect.

DR. LODGE: She is in the building.

DR. TATE: I will just clarify if I may a few of the things that I said yesterday. While the Department of Interior has been charged by the executive order with staffing and providing the facilities for the Invasive Species Council, the Department of Interior has received a great deal of help from other agencies, especially the co-chairs.

And we thank them for that help that they have given us. At a principals meeting a couple of months ago now, we sat down and agreed on the basic outline of how we want to do the staffing plan.

And Lori has written a memo from the Invasive Species Council to me and to the other principals, with the outlines of that staffing plan. It has a short term and a long term component.

The short term is basically let's get on with it, and the higher the international director, but the only remaining question is that at our discussions at the principals meeting we felt that there was a need to be sure that the international coordinator, or director I guess is the term that is used, is properly recognized in other cabinet level
departments for that person's ability to get the job done.

And we considered several ways to raise the profile of that person. In the job description, for example, in the form of what title that person carries, and in the form of what grade that person carries, and in the form of who that person reports to.

Those kinds of questions came up, and how it is going to be settled and what I can talk the Department of Interior into doing along those lines will have to remain open.

I am trying to resolve your feelings that maybe you don't know exactly what it is that we talked about, and I am trying to give you as much as I can reasonably without making promises on behalf of the Department that the Department can't keep necessarily.

Beyond that we also recognized something that you brought up yesterday, and that was the need to have an outreach person, and that is an educational outreach person in their portfolio.

That has come to our attention day after day, after day, and the council, in its coordinating role, simply can't coordinate unless it has that outreach, and has somebody really devoted to that job.
Also in our staffing, or in the staffing plan that Lori provided, in the short term is making sure that we relieve Kelsey of her many, many duties so that she can focus on the things that she is assigned to.

And that means giving us a secretary at the council. Then the last thing in the short term and probably most important is assigning somewhere in the staffing plan a liaison to the advisory committee.

That was the thing that Nelroy and I talked about a couple of months ago, and we recognize that need. So in the short term that is where we are headed, and in the long term there is some additional things, and we can go into those later if you wish.

DR. STOCKER: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. Is the techno wizard ready?

MS. PASSE: So far, so good. It will be about two more minutes. Sorry.

DR. STOCKER: That's all right. Lori, we have taken care of the "what do we tell Dr. Tate" issue, and in other settings that could have been interpreted as being awkward, but what the heck.

We have adopted the letter to Dr. Butler, and we have a couple of minutes right now. Anybody want to venture either of the other two documents?
MR. CORN: I am going to object to the wood pallet letter. I think that if we are to send something like that as a group that we should be forewarned and given the opportunity to review some materials, and there should be a discussion presented at the meetings.

I think the way that this is being handled compromises the value of anything that this committee might produce. We are basically being asked to send as a committee something that some of us, at least me, and maybe nobody else, really don't know anything about.

DR. STOCKER: We understand completely. Faith, with that, you are now free to obtain individual signatures, and the entire issue won't go away, and we can certainly put it on the agenda for March if it merits that. Okay. Any other comments?

MS. WILLIAMS: I just wanted to briefly express my appreciation for those who had the arduous duty of attending lunch at D.C. Coast across the street, which is quite a good restaurant and recommended by our distinguished secretary, Ann Bartuska.

But we had a discussion about dealing with
some of the international issues, both in terms of in
the interim before we get our International Assistant
Director on board.

The State Department was represented and
we had so much interest, and not all the agencies that
wanted to be there could sit at the table. So
apologies to others. We had 12 people that wanted to
sit at the table and D.C. Coast could not accommodate
everybody.

But the short -- we had a good discussion,
and we had the sign-up list for people that were
interested in being on the committee, and the major
duties of the committee are going to be discussed in a
conference call in early January.

And one of the first items of business
will be going over some of the work of the North
American Task Team that has been ongoing by the
Federal members. So if anyone else -- I am going to
pass around this list, and you can see who is going to
be on the International Committee at this point.

And we have also had a very generous
offer, at least for the short term, and maybe we can
talk him into the long term, Gary Beil is going to be
the chair of that committee. So, we made some real
progress, and we had a nice lunch.
And if other people are interested in participating, or at least sitting in on that additional conference call when we set out the terms of reference in early January, sign your name. And Marshall Meyers, you signed your name already and so you are on here.

Okay. But I will pass this list around so people know who attended the meeting and who is on it from ISAC.

MS. UPSTON: Is that an action item?

MS. WILLIAMS: We will talk. Yes. The International Committee really was already established, but we lost our chair, and so this was to kind of reinvigorate it.

DR. STOCKER: If you look towards the bottom of your agenda, about 4:45, we were going to talk about future ISAC meetings, and let's just go through the mechanics if we can. We can do that at any time. For instance, the next date, and get it on your calendar, is March 4th and 5th, 2003.

And my first question is do we have a where on that meeting?

MS. WILLIAMS: I think the early indications was that people wanted that in the D.C. area because it was near the budget cycle, but we are
hoping that is not the case is not the case. But my understanding is that people wanted that meeting in the D.C. area, and that we would do the next meeting, an early summer meeting, I believe somewhere outside the D.C. area.

DR. STOCKER: The next dates I have are June 24th and 25th, and after that October 29th and 30th. Let's talk about the June meeting location, and we have enjoyed our opportunities to see different things and be different places.

And the summer meeting seems like maybe a good opportunity to do that. Does someone want to toss out an idea for a good location for our June meeting would be? You can't mumble Hawaii and get anybody to vote for it.

DR. CAMPBELL: Could I ask what the budget realities are here, Lori, or don't you know?

MS. WILLIAMS: I think what we could do at this point is take proposals for a couple of different places, and then we would probably have to price them out, and we don't have -- no one's budget is approved because the appropriations hasn't been awarded.

But we could take ideas, and then we would have to price it out. We wouldn't sell it today.

DR. JACKSON: Lori, Bill Dickerson isn't
here, but he was suggesting the Outer Banks in North Carolina.

MS. LELAND: I would like to suggest that June is a fine time for Alaska.

MEMBER: Having been there in October, I would concur with June.

DR. STOCKER: Having been there in June, I concur with June. All those in favor of Alaska in June.

MS. UPSTON: Are these proposals, or --

DR. STOCKER: These are possible sites for meriting further investigation.

MS. UPSTON: And these are for June, at the Outer Banks and Alaska.

DR. STOCKER: June, correct, the 24th and 25th. And I may have heard incorrectly, but I thought someone said Hawaii.

MS. UPSTON: Yes.

MR. LUKENS: Are those dates that we called out, are those standing?

DR. STOCKER: Those are standing dates, and it wouldn't be changed unless something fairly dramatic happened. The next thing that we will try, if at each meeting we can add the out-meeting, then we won't get caught where we don't know where the next
meetings are.

So the next out-meeting would be February of 2004; is that correct? March of 2004 is what we have done in the past, and we have talked about joining it with the Weed Awareness Week, Linda.

MS. SHEEHAN: Can you remind me again when the two-year appointees appointments are up? Would it be right around then?

MS. WILLIAMS: This is 2002, and so, yeah, it would be --


MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS. SHEEHAN: So we will get that meeting in before we go. Okay. Great.

MS. WILLIAMS: We will have a party.

DR. STOCKER: Look at your calendars, and I am proposing a meeting for -- do your calendars have 2004 on it to begin with? Mine doesn't. What is the date of the -- let's go back to the original discussion. We had Weed Awareness Week at the tail-end of February. Do you want to wrap your meeting around Weed Awareness Week?

It is no longer a staff issue, and it used to be. You can wrap it around Week Awareness Week, and know that, for instance, right now I am looking
around the room and three of us would be the previous week anyway.

    I am relatively close, and these guys are West Coast guys, and would much rather come out here once for an extended stay, versus two times a week apart. Is there a downside to meeting around Weed Awareness Week? If not --


    DR. STOCKER: We would meet at the tail end of that, right?

    DR. JACKSON: The proposal would be to meet in like Thursday and Friday, the 26th and 27th.

    DR. STOCKER: So right now the proposal is 2004, February -- what are the two dates that Nelroy just said, that Thursday and Friday, the 26th and 27th, for that out-meeting. Craig.

    MR. REGELBRUGGE: Clearly this is a situation where what works for the group is what needs to prevail, and I happen to be among those who planned around the dates that we chose when we last met, and have since developed conflicts on the new dates being proposed.

    DR. STOCKER: And this is for 2004.

    MR. REGELBRUGGE: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: I apologize.

DR. STOCKER: You buy us lunch tomorrow. Unless I hear an objection, I am going to suggest that our new out-date be February 26th and 27th, Thursday and Friday, of the last week of February of 2004. So with a Thursday and Friday, that means going and getting home late on a Friday night.

That means a tour, if we do one, on a midnight tour of Washington, D.C. Okay.

MR. BRIGHT: Just a quick question. When would the new class, if you will, be coming on? When would be the new appointees? How does that work?

MS. WILLIAMS: Ask me to do the math after lunch.

MR. BRIGHT: Sorry. But it would be fun -- well, not fun, but it would be interesting if we had some sort of orientation or meeting just shortly thereafter so that the new people could see what is going on.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. Now, go back to your calendar for the fixed meeting, October 29th and 30th of 2003. This coming October meeting, we have a member who no longer can be there, or is arguing that
the previous week makes it unlikely, or the following week, I guess.

The only way we can change the October 29th and 30th meeting is if there is a better day somewhere right around there. So if you would look at your calendars, please, for October 2003.

And somebody suggest a better date than the 29th and 30th. The 30th was the day before Halloween, and had a little problem with it anyway. It takes me 24 hours to get in my costume. George.

DR. BECK: What about a week earlier?

DR. STOCKER: All right. A week earlier, October 22nd and 23rd. And raise your hand and be honest if you didn't bring your calendar, and you won't know until you get back.

I will send an e-mail out to remind you that we are proposing to change the October 2003 meeting, and move it up one week until the 22nd and 23rd, and if you have a problem let us know.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: Hey, Randall, does anybody particular from the USDA know what the dates of the North American Plant Protection Organization meeting are, because the U.S. is hosting and it may be that week.

MS. SHEEHAN: I had it on my calendar and
we had originally talked about the 21st and 22nd, and then scratched it out for some reason. I don't know, but perhaps that was it.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: I can verify those dates.

DR. STOCKER: Your calendar shows the dates that we didn't pick?

MS. SHEEHAN: I'm organized.

DR. STOCKER: The best that we can do then is send it out as an e-mail and people can check their various locations, and come back and go from there. We are doing this to help Nelroy out. So, what can I say.

Right now it is set for the 29th and 30th of October 2003, and as soon as I get back, I will send out an e-mail that proposes moving it one week earlier to the 22nd and 23rd.

If everyone is happy with that, we will move it. If somebody other than the people that forgot their calendars is upset about it, we won't.

All right. This is a very important area, and the fundamental question that we have all grappled with is how does the advice given by technical advisory groups and the like become policy, and we are about to find out. Dr. Tate.
DR. TATE: If hi-tech fails us, it really brings us to the point where we say to ourselves the whole business of science advising public policy is between people, and it has very little to do with hi-tech.

The real down side of this is that my associate, Jim Stone, sitting here to my right, worked hard to produce a power point show for you, and I will attempt to interpret it on the white board instead as we go through this.

One of the reasons for talking to you today about science and public policy is because we have been challenged, or we have received opportunities is a way of saying it at the Department of Interior, and in this Administration when we first came aboard, we had something that some people called the lynx scandal, but we call it the lynx opportunity.

This is a case where some Department of Interior people, and some Department of Agriculture folks, and some State of Washington folks devised a new way of testing the way that science is conducted in the surveys for lynx and some of our National Forests in the west.

And in attempting to do that, they went outside of the standard protocols of science. They
clipped some hairs off of captive links, and they clipped some hairs off of mounted links, and sent them in through the system to suggest maybe that the lab couldn't really identify lynx hairs from other kinds of hairs.

And in the process, they went outside the protocols of testing in the lab, and protocols that are set up in the way that science is done, and they caused us a lot of grief, and created new opportunities for us.

One of the opportunities that was created was that the Department of Interior and the Department of Agriculture were asked to produce a science ethics. What we expect our scientists to do as they pursue their field as scientists working for government.

And it brings us then to the greater question of what happens to data when data come in from scientists, and it becomes suddenly available to help advise public policy.

Our challenge or our opportunity there was the Data Quality Act that was passed as a part of an appropriations bill in the waning days of a Congress a couple of Congresses back.

It was something that was -- that charged each department in the U.S. Government to create a
statement about how data would be handled, and exposed to the public, and provided to the public, for public consumption. The Act also provided --

MS. SHEEHAN: We are going to try to --

DR. TATE: Well, you don't need to necessarily. In the Data Quality Act, we also -- the Congress also provided an opportunity for someone to challenge data that might be brought forward for public consumption, either on a website or printed page, or what have you.

A great deal of concern was expressed among our scientists at the Department of Interior and other places that we were in fact editing what scientists produced and how they produce it, and how it gets interpreted to public policy.

So the title of the talk is how science advises public policy, but I don't think I am going to answer how it does. I am going to only give you some ideas that Jim and I have cast about a bit, and we thrust it out on to the waters a few times.

And I would appreciate your comments as we go through this, and feel free to interrupt me at any time. To enter into the subject itself, and I can start with any one that I have got here, we would like to think that we have a body of knowledge out there,
but unfortunately that body of knowledge, and in this case shaped like a cheese, is full of holes.

There are a lot of different things that advise that body of knowledge, and one of them of course is the scientific method. Another is undoubtedly TEK. Traditional ecological knowledge is one way of saying that.

You know, there are people that live with nature, and live with the world, in such a way that they adapt to it. They get ideals, and they adapt to those ideas, and they continue to persist, whether they are native Americans, or whether they are ranchers, or foresters, or loggers.

People who live day to day with nature, and acquire traditional ecological knowledge, and has not been tested by the scientific method necessarily, but nonetheless is a part of our body of knowledge.

We also have inputs to this body of knowledge of in the laws and in the regulations that we provide, and that modifies and produces some of the holes in this cheese ball here.

And then there is the public desire, and what the public really wants, whether the law is there or not, and whether science supports it or not, and whether it has been shown to succeed or not.
Let's take this a little bit further. Science is usually defined as a process of hypothesis testing, where we find flaws in the body of knowledge, and we test the hypothesis.

And go through a process of scientific method of hypothesis testing. Come to new conclusions, and perhaps modify the body of knowledge in some ways. This science cycle advises the management cycle, where decisions are considered, made, evaluated for success and also modify the body of knowledge.

Traditionally in the science cycle, and maybe we will have that done just by the time that we are finished here. But traditionally in the science cycle, we have set up some mechanisms for evaluating our own work in -- excuse us, and these include peer review, and they include risk assessment and risk analysis.

We have even had in the laws and regulations an attempt to define what science is by the courts. I don't know if you are familiar with Daubert v. Dow, a Supreme Court case in which the Supreme Court decided that in the case of a pharmaceutical lawsuit that science contain certain characteristics that involve peer review,
reproducibility of a theory, risk assessment, and things of that nature.

And those of us working in the public policy forum have to deal with that particular law, and its input, and even defining our science. We have a mechanism among scientists of peer review, where the limited number of persons that know a subject particularly well are often chosen to advise and otherwise review the decisions and the hypotheses that are being formed.

And to give them a stamp of approval, and that the body of knowledge then becomes sort of a paradigm. Paradigms change very slowly, and change very cautiously, and they often change when generations of scientists change; one generation passes away and another one comes aboard, and by golly there is new ideas that suddenly pop up.

There has been an attempt, and there are constant attempts to adopt the peer review process that is used by scientists and make it work for the management cycle as well.

According to one study, about 80 percent of the people who are interviewed would like to see some kind of a peer review process appear in the management cycle, and in the decision making cycle on
the lower end or on this end of the body of knowledge.

So much so that we had a couple of bills introduced this last year, and the Sound Science Bill was one of them by Richard Pombo, and a couple of other folks on the House Resources side.

And they put some very strict constraints on what they called the science, and asked for a peer review as defined by them. And the question really comes to us then as scientists who are working on these things and trying to advise public policy does in fact the peer review process as practiced by scientists, and the science cycle, does that really work.

And I think the consensus probably is that it does not work. That way it works, but we probably are going to have to modify it in a major way. If we have peer review here, we commonly find ourselves doing an independent review of the science, or if you want to an independent review of the body of knowledge.

And Congress has set up mechanisms for doing that, and that's where the National Academies of Science have taken one of their academies, the National Research Council, and commonly put together panels.
And these panels review things. Now, here is another of our opportunities that we have experienced. It is called Klamath at the Department of Interior. And in that case of Klamath, we had a National Research Council review of the science behind or the science in the independent review of this body of knowledge, whether they concluded that we didn't have very good science, or whether they concluded that we had great science, is very much still in debate a year later.

But the point that I want to make here is that the National Research Council is one way of doing an independent review of science. If we have peer review among scientists doing their own work. We have independent review here at the body of knowledge level.

We have seen difficulties with that, and they are very costly to go to the National Research Council. It takes a lot of time, and I am talking about $200,000 to $500,000, even a million dollars for some of the NRC studies.

I am talking about a year to two years for most of them to assemble a panel, get the questions right, and to answer the questions. In fact, in Klamath, we have been moving forward with an interim
decision by the panel at the NRC for the Klamath decision, which in itself makes it rather awkward.

However, for that independent review of science, you want a body that -- to do that independent review that is in fact quite acceptable to all-comers. We don't want to end up with the "my expert is better than your expert" syndrome that often occurs.

And the National Academies of Science have built a reputation for themselves, and there are other ways. There are individual consultants out there that who give themselves creditability in doing independent reviews of science by working through one of the professional associations.

There is one group without naming and appearing to support individual potential reviewers, there is one group here in Virginia, or nearby in Virginia, that aligns themselves with the Society of Mechanical Engineers, so that they choose their consultants for the independent review from the ranks of the known professional engineers, sort of bringing some of the cache from the peer review into the independent review of science by bringing scientists down to do this.

And the question always comes up in all of
these reviews is how do you deal with conflicts of interest if you only have four people who know a particular subject very, very well in the entire world. They undoubtedly have worked for someone else that might have a position -- a left or a right, or a north or a south -- on this thing.

And all of the independent reviews of science that we have dealt with so far try very hard to find a way to avoid conflicts of interest. The very last stage here is how do we do reviews of the management cycle, is the part that I understand the least frankly.

I know that we have things in place such as alternative dispute resolution, which we discussed just the other day, or just yesterday as we were looking at ways in which the advisory committee could help the council in particularly difficult questions, and how you advise them in those questions.

We also have the NEPA process, which you discussed yesterday. We also have negotiated rule-making, which is a requirement of a Federal law. But this is the part where most of the conflict occur, from here on down, both in the independent review of science and in the review of the management cycle and the decisions that are being made there.
So with that, it just outlines I think the way we have been thinking about this, and what we have been doing about it, and what we have been doing is that we have a code of ethics which right now has been written by the Department of Interior folks, and is undergoing its own independent, third-party review, so that I am not influencing how the review of that science ethics policy comes out.

And which will in fact direct the activities of scientists working for the Department of Interior, scientists contracted to the Department of Interior, and scientists who are signed on as grantees.

And they all will be subject to the same departmental rule making as it were. Then we have the handling of data, which largely is here in the how we handle the body of knowledge, and we have recently published for each of our bureaus in the Department of Interior a Federal Register notice and a website statement of our data quality guidelines.

The National Invasive Species Council with Christy Onecee's (phonetic) good works has created their own version of it, and we are deciding among the principles right now whether the Department of Interior statement on data quality guidelines is going
to be the one that will hold for the council, or
whether we somehow want to divide it up among
Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture.

    Obviously I prefer that it just stay in
one place, and Interior makes sense because we are the
host to the council, but that is a decision that has
yet to be finished up.

    The last thing then is that we have begun
a process of asking each of our bureaus in the
Department of Interior to develop a peer review policy
for science that is done in the Department, and those
documents are now coming out of each of the bureaus,
and will be reviewed at the management level.

    And in addition then as we move on down
here, one last thing is that we have the alternative
dispute resolution people in each of our bureaus, and
in the secretary's shop, and this is the Elena
Gonzales that I mentioned to you.

    And they try to help us manage this cycle
down here, and with that I think I ought to shut up
and just leave with you the ideas that those are the
things that we are working on.

    DR. STOCKER:  Well, I am guessing that you
are willing to answer a question or two if they come
up.
DR. TATE: Very good. Yes, thank you. Thank you for mentioning that. What has been handed out here is a paper by a consultant, Deborah Brosnam. She lives and works in Portland. And she has discussed rather well some of the issues that I have brought up here today, and comes to the same conclusion or maybe I come to the same conclusion that she does, that the peer review process works for some of these other things, like independent review and the management cycle, but we will probably have to modify it.

And this is an opportunity for you to see some of the logic behind it. It is a paper that I highly recommend to you.

DR. STOCKER: Richard.

MR. ORR: Yes. I appreciate that, but there is one thing that I have been struggling with and of course since I am not from the Interior, don't take this defensively, but you have that huge body of knowledge.

The problem that I often run into or see when doing risk assessments is that government agencies will often selectively choose from that body of knowledge that those results, which supports an existing policy, that this can be intentional or
unintentional.

but it does skew the final results and it does skew the management process. Any suggestions on how to overcome that?

DR. TATE: That is an excellent question frankly, and we had an example similar to that very early on in this Secretary's work, and that was -- I am just talking about it in general terms, of course, but that had to do with caribou numbers and caribou distribution on the North Slope.

And there were allegations that some of the bureaus had chosen to give us selective information, and more importantly to some of us, they had purposely disregarded data collected by contractors to the oil companies, as if those data were somehow tainted.

Frankly, that is one of the things that we are addressing in the science ethics, how you conduct science and still be a government employee, and at what level then does the management decision to go one way or another is that we are carefully trying to say that scientists don't make the management decisions, but the scientists give the scientific data and advise, much as you advise.

And that is the best that we can do at the
moment, unless you have other ideas.

DR. STOCKER: Other questions or comments?

Michael.

MR. BUCK: Jim, in my experience in the lower circle is that many of those controversial public policy decisions are really based on values, and not science, and scientists are either put in a position in the decision matrix where they do not belong, and are misused.

Or the type of science, the social scientists, are not even there, and that is where you get conflicting. But a lot of those public policy issues are really not based on science at all.

And a better identification and elucidation of the values that are really driving those decisions is the type that you need, rather than a peer review scientific review.

DR. TATE: That's correct, and that is the area where I as a sometimes practicing scientist have the great problems. Jim and I have talked about it at length. Do you have anything to add to that?

MR. STONE: Well, I would certainly agree with that, but I think in what we are seeing is that kind of an interesting twist on that, is that those kinds of decisions that probably don't really hinge on
science, the science may still be brought in after the fact by someone who doesn't like the decision that was made. And then we are faced with having to deal with the science anyway.

But as Jim talked about up here the other things that go into making a decision sometimes are pretty overwhelming. Just what the public wants, or -

DR. STOCKER: Well, we would have liked to have shown you this if we could.

MR. STONE: Well, yeah. We are just attempting to diagram the kinds of things that go into decisions, because if we get to the point that we think that science has the only say in these decisions, we are going to be sorely disappointed.

The other thing though in the case that you mentioned I think is things like alternative dispute resolution, where you are not really using that to deal with the science. You are using that to deal with the other social conflicts that are impacting the decision.

And so maybe that is a better way to kind of mitigate those kinds of things. Jim, I wasn't listening when you got introduced. I am not positive that we introduced you. I am assuming right now that
you are Jim Stone, and I probably even know what organization you work with.

MR. STONE: Take a guess.

DR. STOCKER: Does it have a U in it?

MR. STONE: Actually, I am an employee of the Bureau of Land Management, or at least they are paying me. Whether they are happy about it, we will leave that. I have been working with Jim now for several months, and the only connection I have I think in this group is that I think you probably know a Celestine Duncan.

DR. STOCKER: Yes, we know a Celestine Duncan.

MR. STONE: And she was Celestine Crawford when I knew her, and she and I mapped soils in the New Mexico desert about 25 years ago or so. I just talked to her a few months ago.

DR. STOCKER: Any special reason you were out mapping? What we are going to ask you is if it would be a good idea to take the presentation that you were going to give, and then maybe we can distribute that to the members.

We thank you very much for the hard work that went into it. Sorry that the mechanism wasn't quite there.
MR. STONE: What we may do is just take a couple of those diagrams that we can just reproduce, and if we should e-mail it to somebody that --

MS. WILLIAMS: I can take care of it.

MR. STONE: To Lori? Okay. That's how we will do it.

MS. WILLIAMS: That's a lot.

DR. STOCKER: The cheese theory of life as we know it. Ron.

MR. LUKENS: I just wanted to give an example of a very cumbersome way that this has been approached with regards to the Federal Fisheries Management Councils. There was a scientific analysis done of the economic status of the charter boat fishery in the Gulf of Mexico.

And the science that did the study understood the caveats of the data that they had, and they understood how the study was designed, and if it had been peer reviewed, which I am not sure whether it was, from the scientific perspective, it probably would have been blessed.

And say, yes, you had a study design, and you did it, and here are your assumptions, and so on and so forth. And when the presentation was made to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, there
were quite a number of quite astute charter boat industry people there who literally ripped holes through that scientific paper by pointing out that it missed the reality by looking at the wrong place.

And while the answer that they got was right according to what they did, the answer that they got in reality as it applied to the fishery itself had no bearing on reality.

And it was quite embarrassing for everybody there, and another example -- and they had to go back and rework the thing as is the case.

And also with red snapper, what they have done now is the constituency groups are hiring consultants to do their own stock assessments for the constituency group, and coming and presenting them to the council.

What you end up with is a government stock assessment, and an independently authorized stock assessment, that don't agree. This got elevated to Congress, and Congress said you all take it and give it to -- I guess it was in the NRC or somebody, and you review it all.

Now, that is a horrible way to do business, and so I think that we have got to find some way to resolve that kind of thing, and it really is
values, whoever said that. Michael.

It is people's values and any time you do a study you can shoot holes in it, because the data are never so solid that a Judge can't decide one way or another that he can throw it out.

For the red snapper issue, it had to do with disagreements over how many red snapper are killed in trawls and in by-catch. So that is what skewed the stock assessment.

One assumed a certain level, and one assumed a different level. Scientists understand those assumptions, and their independent results are defensible, but they are different.

So the public doesn't understand that, and nor can they accept it, and litigation ensues, and that is a horrible way to manage as well.

DR. STOCKER: We are going to take one more comment here, and we are going to have to catch up in a few minutes. So, George, briefly.

DR. BECK: I just had a question. Dr. Tate, you pointed out four different areas or bodies of knowledge if you will that are used or enter into the volume of knowledge from which management decisions are made.

Are those dealt with equally or does like
one -- for example, the scientific body of knowledge, does it carry more weight than others, or do we still have the value situation?

DR. TATE: We definitely have the value situation, and I am sure that you are asking the question the same way I would. The traditional ecological knowledge issue, for example, is regularly disregarded, and I am sure that our Native Americans, or our loggers, or our fisherman, commercial fisherman, would say that they aren't getting full credit for their contribution, for example.

So I definitely agree with you that they are not all equally treated. Ever since World War II, we have been a nation that sort of reveres science without really understanding what science is.

And I think that for that reason that it gets a little bit more play.

DR. STOCKER: I want to thank you both very much for the presentation, and I appreciate the effort, and if anyone has any additional questions, during the break you can probably grab them.

The next thing we are going to move on to is titled, "An Update of Analysis of Economic Costs of Invasive Species." We have brought this up many times, and we would love to know the simple dollar
figure we could put on the ecological value of.

    We also know that it is complicated, and most of us don't do these types of things for a living. We also know that some people are examining these things, and I think Chuck is going to lead the discussion on where we are on this. Chuck.

    MR. O'NEILL: Thank you. When we were out in Yellowstone, one of the things that came up was how can we best get a message across not just to one group, but to all the publics who need to be able to buy into and get behind and support work against invasive species.

    One thing that seems to cut across all areas is the economic impact. When you deal with a certain species, it may have an impact only in one area, and only in another area, but ultimately those impacts boil down to either a very, very narrow societal impact, perhaps some of the live Asian seafood invasive species, which carry a religious connotation perhaps to them.

    Perhaps a narrow ecological impact in one type of habitat, but one thing that we were able to identify that cuts across is economic impact. The problem is that we don't have good economic impact information.
On a few species and a few settings, we do have it. I know about five years ago that one of the things that opened a lot of eyes with the zebra mussel issue wasn't its impact on beaches, and wasn't its impact on swimming, and wasn't its impact on power plants, particularly in areas where they didn't yet have zebra mussels.

But what caught people's attention was the fact -- and this got picked upon CNBC -- that if you belonged to an energy consortium, and you were sending electricity into a State that didn't have zebra mussels, even though you didn't have zebra mussels, every time somebody flipped on a switch there was a small cost in their monthly electric bill because the zebra mussels in the power plants that were providing part of your energy.

If you were in an area that was hundreds of miles away from the nearest zebra mussel, but your public utility was planning into the future every time you turned on the tap to run a dishwasher, or for somebody to take a shower, you were paying a little bit extra money because of zebra mussels.

If you look at a lot of invasive species, we see bits and pieces of that, and that is what catches a lot of people's attention. It also catches
politicians' attention when it is time to come up with the appropriations to match the authorizations.

So when we were out in Yellowstone, what we thought was a good idea was to select some representative species that we could get an economic impact handle on, and then be able to use those economic studies as a selling point, a selling point not just for getting funding for NISA and for ISAC, and for the agencies that have to actually implement some of these things.

But for building a constituency out there in the hinterlands to look at, yes, we should all be doing something, and doing our part for this. And, yes, we should be talking to our Congressman to do this much for fighting against an invasive species.

But how do you go about doing this, and this is what we have been grappling with since Yellowstone. I thank you folks for sending tons of information to us in response to our letter asking for nominations of representative species.

This is a very first cut, but we thought that since this was an ISAC project, let's see what ISAC has to say. Now, most of you should have gotten as an attachment in an e-mail a listing of what the raw data coming back from this committee was.
We asked for nominations in several categories. We wanted plants and to address real plant and the product plant. We wanted critters, terrestrial and aquatic. We wanted pathogens, and we wanted insects, or arthropods.

We got a lot of good nominations back. Some of these there is already economic information on, and some of them there isn’t, and the levels of information that already exists vary all over the boards.

What is a representative species, and that is the next step that we need to work with, as well as finding out from some of the "experts" out there, agency experts and university experts, what their nominations be.

We are throwing this out to ISAC as our first cut on how we are going to go about this. I would like at our next meeting to be able to come back with the actual identification of some nominated species that we will then try and find the money to go ahead and do the studies.

But what does it take to be a representative species. Some of the things that we came up with is that it has got to be a species that is going to have the potential for widespread impacts.
A species that is going to impact one very narrow area of the country is probably not going to be a good economic representative species.

And a species that has a high likelihood of having an impact, which sometimes you don't know right way when a species does show up. It has got to have been here in North America long enough that it has been studied and we know what its impacts are, or where they are heading.

The study has to be something that either can be coordinated among other studies that have already been done on it, or can be completed in a relatively short period of time so that the information is going to be useful to ISAC in this.

It probably is going to have to have a constituency. It can't be a species that nobody really cares about. It has got to be going somebody's ox some place along the line. And we need a body of evidence as to the other impacts beyond the economic impacts for the critter.

It can't be something that we can put a dollar sign on, and then say that it is really not affecting anything all that much except a narrow economic area.

Looking at the ones that were nominated by
members of ISAC, I think the argument can be made that any of these fit most of, if not all of, those categories or criteria.

Some people might say don't some of these things already exist. Don't the studies already show up. Some of them do. Some of them are questionable in the way that they are undertaken, and some of them are outdated already, and they are numbers that I don't think that we would want to be able to use with our constituencies, which is one reason that we wanted to do this.

But why did this catch our attention in the first place. I think that Ship had one of the great examples, when we were out in Yellowstone talking about property values along weed-infested water ways. Ship, you might want to just touch on that for a second.

MR. BRIGHT: Yes, just to refresh everybody's memory. Also in your handout or the minutes, and I think it is under Tab Number 9 perhaps. No, excuse me, I'm sorry. Number 5. It is just an article that was done in Lakeline, which is the North American Lake Society's publication.

There was a study done over in Vermont that showed that the effect of the infestation of
Eurasian water-milfoil in the Rutland, Vermont marketplace, caused the average property owner to lose $12,095 in value.

And that is a figure that we were able to use in discussions in the Maine State Legislature, saying that we don't have this here in Maine. It is preventable legislation that we are trying to get passed. We need to get ahead of this, because if we spend a little bit now, we don't necessarily have to pay a lot later.

But we can see what has happened with other States, and you have a couple of people take some representative lakes, and they start doing the math, and they find out what the lost property values is, and what the hit is to the municipality because of moss tax revenue.

And suddenly the figures are right there in front of people like Town Selectmen, and County Commissioners, and State Legislators. And it makes a difference, and that is what I think that Chuck and the group was talking about, is trying to find information that moves people forward.

And when I say moves people forward, I am or we are talking about the general public, the voting public, and the decision makers in a much more kind of
grass roots area.

This helps all of us push this entire issue of invasive species forward, when people like my Senator, Olympia Snow, who as a result of this, we have got a dialogue, is interested in what is going on, and understands that it is important in the State of Maine, and it comes time to vote, and she is now on appropriations, is going to be a lot more friendly.

Or when that stuff comes across her desk, she is like, oh, I know about that. That is what we are trying to do.

MR. O'NEILL: And a good example of how that can be used is in a Fish and Wildlife Service Invasive Species Program brochure, in the back, just talking about what kinds of economic impact these species like this have, and I will quote from it, "The cost of controlling sea lamprey in the Great Lakes is equivalent to the annual fishing license revenues generated by angulars in the State of Wisconsin."

Now, that means something to someone. We are looking at the Pimentel study from Cornell, and exotic species have already cost the United States up to $138 billion annually. That is 53 times greater than all State Fish and Wildlife Agency budgets added together.
These kinds of numbers, if they can be supported, ring to people. They get picked up by the folks who really have to be making the decisions, and by the folks who have to change the way that they do things.

We have seen that with the zebra mussel issue, and when we first started looking at the zebra mussel control, people were very, very leery about how could we spend these kinds of monies and justify spending this kind of money on research on zebra mussel until they started looking at the figures, which were very, very rough figures, that the zebra mussel were having X-millions of dollars worth of potential impact on this specific type of use.

And when they carried that on out, spending from $2-to-$3 million to retrofit a power plant, seemed like a very, very low figure compared to what that was going to look like if they didn't take action.

And when they amortized that over their entire rate payers, it was defensible. It also though made those rate payers realize that if it is going to cost me this many dollars extra per year in my electricity, then maybe I need to do something when I bring my boat back to this lake where there is a
nuclear power plant using the lake for a cooling source, and so that that impact doesn't happen.

The problem is that we don't have a lot of good figures that we can put into flyers like this, and we felt that if we can come up with, (a) a couple of good representative organisms; and (b) the right agency or agencies to do the studies and the funding to do those studies, then it is going to provide us with the kind of information that we need to move forward to be able to keep this ball rolling.

It is amazing what some of the figures look like, but there is not anything there on a lot of things. Now, when I was commenting to people on the survey, what I was getting back in e-mails, and I noticed that a lot of them were forwarded to everyone on ISAC, is that bits and pieces really do exist.

Some agencies have very good information on part of one organism's impacts. And I think what we need to do now as the next step before our next ISAC meeting is identify those agencies, those species, and what information already exists, and see if we can either pull that together, or add to it, to come up with good solid defensible figures.

And to report it back at the next meeting, and then say here is what the CEO committee feels we
can do to move on forward with this data now, or to get this data.

I have talked to Tom over at CSREES about this, and he has some ideas of agencies that do have the expertise to do these types of economic studies, and may have the funding that can be reprogrammed to do them. But first se have to have some very specific lists of species.

Joe, I think, has some things to say about it. He is the one who gave me the Fish and Wildlife brochure as well. Joe.

MR. STARINCHECK: Yes, thank you. Jose Starincheck, and I am the outreach coordinator for the ANS task force and work for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

And what we did with that fact sheet basically was that we have linked our economic analysis with a public awareness campaign, and when we first decided to address the aquatic invasive species issue, we decided to take a target approach.

And we had a couple of constraints that really kind of confined where we were going. One was a limited budget, and two was that we needed something that promoted action, and so we kind of inventoried what the task force had done in the past, and came up
with two products.

One was a model State policy legislation
guidance document that the Great Lakes ANS panel had
done, and two was the voluntary guidelines for
recreational users.

And we took those products and we
translated them into what is known as the Stop Aquatic
Hitchhikers Campaign, and I will pass this around for
those of you who have not seen it. This is just an
example of a partnership packet that we put together.

We have a dedicated website that goes with
that, and the campaign is a collaborative effort,
allowing any public agency to put their logo right
next to the brand and what not. We then targeted the
public policy makers.

We realized that we needed to get the
biggest bang for our buck, and given the fact that we
had limited funding, we searched for strategies on how
to elevate the issue in the context of those two
audiences.

We were going to market this model
guidance document to various State and regional
legislature associations, and/or State Governor
associations, et cetera, and realized, you know, every
State is different. We really don't know how each and
every State does this.

So what we did is that we partnered with the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. We did a survey of State Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and what their perspective is about this issue, and what their programmatic capacity is to address this issue, and their funding levels, et cetera.

There was a whole host of things, and it gave us a lot of really solid information. And then we merged the two efforts -- the public awareness campaign folks and the rec users, and then the State policy makers efforts -- to take advantage of the connection of the State Fish and Wildlife Agencies have with traditional recreational users.

And then we look at all the high leverage opportunities to elevate this issue to new issues, and those high leverage opportunities were ecological impacts, human health impacts, and economic impacts.

We eliminated ecological and human health impacts quite simply because economics as Chuck said cuts across everything. And it is a language that everybody understands.

So it is going to allow us to make this issue relevant to the lay person, as well as the
public policy makers and the decision makers. So what we have done is we contracted out to a resource economist who has a good sense of marking. And what he has done is did a search of the existing data out there, and again hitting on the fact of what Chuck said, and there is data out there, and some of it better than others. And what we have done is that we have taken that $138 billion Pimentel figure, which is just massive, and nobody can wrap their minds around. And we have translated that into relevant economic sound bytes, and that will make or help people understand the significance, the magnitude, and the complexity of this issue. And basically we have translated it into - - in terms of what its impacts are to recreational activities, and what its impacts are to the related industries and the various economic sectors, and what its impacts are to State Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and their abilities to provide rec opportunities, as well as meet their other responsibilities. We focused on State Fish and Wildlife Agencies because more often than not, these are the agencies that are involved with regulating this issue at the State level in some degree or another.
So that is why again we tried to focus on them. The study will soon be finalized and the Fish and Wildlife Service will use that information to develop strategies with our partners again to help elevate this issue in the context of the public policy arena.

And once it is finalized, we will get it to Lori, and she can disseminate it to you folks. Any questions or comments? I actually do have more examples. Unfortunately, I only have about 25 of these. Yes?

DR. CAMPBELL: Faith Campbell. I am a little confused about how you plan to proceed at this point. Some of the species that I know were suggested, there is already quite a lot of economic data, and some of them, maybe there is a great deal less.

And it sounds to me as if you are planning to hold off on those where you have a lot of information while you compile the information on the others, and it doesn't make sense to me.

MR. O'NEILL: No, what we want to try and do, Faith, is come up with two plans, the terrestrial and an aquatic -- two critters, one of each -- that will be used as representative species.
What we want to do in trying to determine which terrestrial plant and which aquatic plant is that we have got the information from this group right now. We would like to work with some of the agency researchers who know what exists, and what doesn't exist out there.

And whittle it down to those two plants, those two animals, the insect, the pathogen, or two of each, and then go from there. Not develop the economic impact data on all of these species, but come up with a couple of representative ones.

And then use those data to put into the materials the way that Fish and Wildlife has in their publications. What we need first is to try and work with some of the scientists to come up with what they would figure would be the representative species.

And later on we can start developing that information for other species, but initially what we want are the economic poster children that we can use for educational outreach purposes.

There may be some of these species that already have enough information that it is just going to be a matter of pulling that together. There may be some that would be a lot more work and effort that may not get first cut.
But the zebra mussel has been the poster child of the aquatics for a long time. Some of the data isn't there, believe it or not. Zebra mussels, we still don't know exactly what they have actually cost. But some of these, we may be able to do that.

I think that some people said that the Asian long-horned beetle has been studied enough that we may be able to come up with a relatively simple economic impact and a forecast for that one. But we are not saying that we are going to do it for all of them, at least not in the first cut.

DR. CAMPBELL: I am even more confused at this point. I'm sorry. I understand that you want to have a package that will have two of each of these in different groups.

And I understand that you want input from more people, especially experts. But it still sounds to me as though you are making this a longer process than it needs to be.

And looking for a more perfect product than maybe you are going to get in a reasonable time, and I think that there is a lot to be gained by using the available information that could be pulled together pretty quickly on some of these species, or maybe some other species, and start getting that out.
And I thought that was the point, to start getting information out, and not to spend years and years more compiling.

MR. BRIGHT: If I might, Faith, I completely agree, and we all agree on that point. I think the question would be that there is some economic data out there. The way it is packaged is not user friendly.

So the question then becomes, for example, for the Asian long-horned beetle that got great press in the *New York Times*, is then because we don't have a communications director with ISAC, or with NISA, that would be a great project for somebody to pull together for a consumer-friendly way to get that data out there.

We don't have that now, and so we are kind of between a rock and a hard place, unless we can find somebody that we could contract out to be able to get down this data. I completely agree with you. I think we all agree.

It would be nice if we could all by the March meeting have a sense of the ISAC board, or a letter, or a recommendation of the NISA saying that these are species that we think are important, or have
real value in being able to make an impact on the general public, in terms of understanding why invasive species is everybody's problem.

And we would like the agencies to focus some effort on this, because we have gotten the agencies' input on what these things are, and so we have got a package. But between now and then, that is a great question, and I don't know how to do it. I don't have the money, and we don't have a person to do it.

DR. CAMPBELL: Well, maybe if you spent some of your time in the next -- in your committee meetings over the next month or so coming up with what you would like to see in the package, then it might be that one of us, or some agency staff person, could spend a day-and-a-half and come up with something that came close to what you wanted in your package for one species or another.

It would be less consistent and coherent than if it is done by one contractor, but we are not going to get a contractor and money for a contractor for some time.

MR. O'NEILL: I don't think that we are looking at doing an economic impact study on an organism.
DR. CAMPBELL: I am talking about taking the available information and putting it in the format and user-friendly package that you envisioned. I am not talking about going out and generating new information.

MR. BRIGHT: If I might, I don't disagree with you. I am not a scientist, and so I wouldn't speak to the amount of time that it takes to do an intellectually rigorous scientific study on something.

I do know something about marketing, and in 45 minutes I promise you that you are not going to get anything done to be able to put together --

DR. CAMPBELL: A day-and-a-half.

MR. BRIGHT: A day-and-a-half, excuse me. I exaggerated. A day-and-a-half, phooey. It takes a lot more that goes into that than I think quite honestly you are giving credit for or understand.

I don't disagree with you that time is of the essence. I completely agree on that point, but I will tell you that if you want to be effective that it is going to take a lot more time and effort than I think anybody at this table has probably got to be honest with you.

MR. O'NEILL: What we would like to as a committee be able to do is by the March meeting have
worked with the agencies, and talked to enough of the people to find out which of these species, or other species if they feel that there is something else that is going to be a good representative species, has the information out there that can be pulled together.

So that when we come back in March, we can say here are the 6, or 7, or 8, however many species that we are going to be using as the focal points, and here is where some of that information already exists, and here is where we are heading with those species.

We don't want to pick species that are going to take a year to come up with the figures. And I know for a fact that one of them probably will not be the zebra mussel, because we don't have defensible figures since 1995.

And those figures are not going to be able to be developed very quickly. Asian long-horned beetle may be one that could be put together by someone in the space of a short enough period that it would be able to be reported back in March.

But we don't want to be having long, drawn out studies, but we do need to be able to find out which of these species are going to be (a), representative, and (b), have enough data out there in different areas that could be pulled together to put
together what we are talking about here.

DR. STOCKER: I am going to interrupt briefly. You have got about two minutes left for this section, and so among your many cards elicit the key items quickly.

MS. BARTUSKA: Can I start? Just one in terms of context, I would like us to start using if we can the comparison of invasive species impact, economic impact, versus fire.

The fire folks have put together a $10 billion a year number for the National Fire Plan, and every member of the invasive species is an order of magnitude greater.

So I think that is a very useful comparison. The other -- and this sort of ties to the next presentation, there is a recommendation from GAO to look at the economics of this situation, and that gives us, NISA, the basis for requesting the Economic Research Service, a USDA agency, to get on with this particular analysis, and not have ISAC members being the focal point for the level of detail that we are really pursuing.

So whether it is a recommendation or just a suggestion, this to me is a very logical thing to do, is to get the agencies to meet that
responsibility.

MS. CANGELOSI: I came int this late, and so I have very little background on the conversation, but Rob Hedberg in the back of the room told me something of interest. That the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Foundation is investing a hundred-thousand dollars into doing this very thing with weeds, aquatic and terrestrial, I believe. So talk to Ron about that.

DR. STOCKER: And I am going to jump in here with one last question. Chair's prerogative. Every time we mention economics, the words of University of Maryland Economic Assessment study comes up. Did we learn something? Do we know where that is?

Okay. Obviously the subject continues to have a lot of interest. Richard.

MR. ORR: There is that committee with the ERS, and in fact it is a joint between APHIS and ERS for our next meeting is Thursday of this week. So it is progressing.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. Now we are going to shift quickly.

MS. UPSTON: Did an action item come out of that at all, or an agenda item, either one?
DR. STOCKER: I will report it at the next meeting. All right. I hate to cut that off, but we are having to catch up on a few minutes in each group's discussion. Lori, in fact, has donated four minutes out of the goodness of her heart as she talks to us about the GAO report.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you. Most of this I would like to be a discussion. I also do want to recognize that we do have a guest in the observers from the Hill, and you might want to make a couple of remarks. I will leave that up to him. It is Cameron Wilson from the Science Committee.

They have had numerous hearings and paid a lot of attention to this issue, and several of you have testified before his committee.

DR. STOCKER: And wave your hand one more time. Some of them missed you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. As most of you know, GAO did -- and as I arrived in this job only a little over two years ago, GAO has done three studies on evasive species, and so obviously we area very popular topic.

But this third study I guess was not requested by Congress, but it covered a number of issues, including -- and I won't cover all of them,
but including some ballast water issues which I will
not cover, and I will leave that to the NISA aquatic
nuisance species experts on that.

The other issue or one of the issues that
we did cover just now was the need for better economic
analysis. I will just read to you, because the
recommendation specifically from GAO is worded in an
interesting way, and I think it might merit some
discussion.

But they did highlight the need for
additional economic impact analysis, which I think we
all agree with. A couple of recommendations that I
just want to highlight for you and talk to you a
little bit about the procedure that the council will
be following in responding to them deals specifically
with the council.

And just for your information the way the
agencies and departments are required under
regulations to respond to GAO recommendations within
-- I believe it is either 60 or 90 days, or 60 days,
and that 60 days, Dean reminds me, that 60 days has
not passed.

So the departments will be responding
individually, but we will be working to coordinate
that response among the council. So the council's
individual departments have not formally responded to the specific recommendations.

But we have been working together on our views on that. So I am just going to present you some ideas of where I think we are going to go on some of those recommendations given that departments are coming out slightly differently.

The first thing that I wanted to mention was that this GAO report did call for a greater focus, and most specific objective measures that the council would set out in terms of its accomplishments.

The first one was that in the management plan that we should include specific objective measures of our goals in that plan in a way to measure whether we have actually impacted the problem of invasive species, rather than just accomplish certain objectives.

And I think that at least most of the departments are fairly much in agreement with that, and I think the first plan laid out an overall, very broad, very comprehensive approach to invasive species, and I am not sure that it would have been possible or even desirable to try to pin down specific measurables at that point.

But I think as we move on in terms of
revising and updating the plan that we will want to look at it. It has come up several times in this meeting that it is not always easy to measure it, especially the negative, and especially prevention.

We don't always have the baseline data, and so I think we should have some caveats as we go forward in promising to count too many beans here. But I think it probably would be good, and ISAC will be asked for advice on that on how in the next management plan when we lay out a scenario or a plan of what we are going to do, is to say how that will benefit the overall problem, and how can we measure progress on that.

So I don't think that is very controversial. One of the other things that the GAO report recommended was to give a high priority to completing Action Item Number 1, and that is the oversight mechanism.

Ann covered that and I think we are moving ahead on that fairly quickly, and so I am not sure that is going to be a difficult task to complete. It may not accomplish everything that people want it to.

But we are going to move ahead fairly quickly with the oversight mechanism. The next thing is that I do want to read, and just so you all
understand that in terms of the recommendation on the economic impacts, it specifically talks about including within the revision of the management plan a goal of incorporating information on economic impacts and relative risk of different invasive species or pathways when formulating a cross-cut invasive species management budget for the Federal Government.

I think that this is a tall order given our level of knowledge on various invasive species, but I would welcome your discussion of that. I think that this is actually quite a difficult charge, and it could further complicate putting together a cross-cut budget.

But that is specifically my view, and not something that we have discussed among the council. Finally, I think if you read the entire report, it expressed a lot of concern about the pace of progress under the plan, and we have talked about a number of elements that heretofore.

But one of those that I specifically was concerned about, because I think the input of this group is very important, is that in some parts of this report it talks about that perhaps we should not involve the advisory committee on the implementation teams, and especially on each of the implementation
teams.

And that those should be Federal only and that the advisory committee should come along after the fact and give its advice. That is not listed in the specific recommendations that it is a recommendation that is made within the report, and I know that there were some issues that we have all discussed and are aware of that did delay the establishment of some of the teams.

But from the staff perspective, we feel that the input of the advisory committee on these implementation teams is very, very important. So I would rather explore ways to accelerate the process, and make progress more quickly to examine particular teams or areas where we might want to move away from a joint ISAC Federal approach than as a blanket issue to decide not to have advisory committee members be a part of the implementation teams.

So I thought that there should be some discussion of that. The very last one is that the report, that so in our examination of current legal authorities on evasive species the council, I guess, should explore whether it would be better if the council was specifically authorized by legislation, i.e., whether the fact that we are not authorized by
legislation, and we are authorized only in an Executive Order, is impeding progress under the plan.

And furthermore I think this is another important recommendation that the departments are going to be exploring, is that each department should put in their own performance plans, or annual plan, or strategic plans, their commitment to carry out the specific aspects under the management plan that they are responsible for.

So that was another recommendation. I thought that it would be really good to discuss these. The departments are going to be coming out with specific recommendations on them.

We are exploring some of those or these already, and I think that these are all really important considerations as we go forward on whether we are going to revise the management plan, or whether there is new legislative initiatives that we are going to be discussing later that deal with the council.

And I would like to get some views on these specific recommendations, whether today or in the future, from the advisory committee as a whole.

DR. STOCKER: The floor is open for discussion on the GAO report. Faith.

DR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. The GAO
recommendation on departments, including within their strategic plans the tasks they should undertake, would carry us quite far if they actually did that. How can we make that happen.

MS. WILLIAMS: Again, I think that of those recommendations in the GAO report that this group strongly supports, it might be good to express that either in the report of the committee. I don't think you necessarily have to write a letter every time.

You can also just put it in the report of the committee that this is a recommendation, or you strongly support the GAO recommendation in that area.

DR. STOCKER: Linda.

MS. SHEEHAN: I second what Faith just said, and with respect to the first point about including objective measures in the plan. Yes, this is something that we touched on a little bit yesterday. The executive order in Section 5 already requires that.

So if they are in agreement, that's good, because that is what the Executive Order says that we are supposed to do. And I understand the first time around that it was kind of hard, but I think we can get around some of these issues about proving the
negative and not having data by building that into a recommendation.

So you could say in order to show that there is measurable progress, we need to build in baseline monitoring, and then follow-up monitoring. So we can consider that, and my question is will we be able to address this in the March meeting, and will that be a working meeting, like Shepardstown.

It doesn't have to be in Shepardstown, but I think it would be important, or at least to me it is important for us to be able to see that this is actually accomplished in the plan.

And I don't see how we can do that without a real working meeting, where we are kind of digging our hands in, and that might be something that we can do homework on beforehand. So that then we can come to the meeting with some ideas and thoughts ahead of time.

DR. STOCKER: Can we get that noted in then as an item. Kathy.

MS. UPSTON: Yes. Relative to the economic analysis, Lori, I agree with what you are saying. I think oddly enough the Government Accounting Office is asking us to take on an accounting task that I think would be very difficult
to do. I think that there is a lot of that out there.

I am not saying that it is tried and true, and is black and white and is absolutely credible. But there is so much we don't know about this issue that it seemed to me that if you are trying to convince somebody to do something that the minute your price tag gets over a billion dollars that you have got their attention.

So it would seem to me that if you are on an order of magnitude that you are comfortable with the level that you are talking about, why do we have to worry about the dollars and cents in the last total?

I mean, I understand that everybody wants absolute certainty, but I think some degree of flexibility and absolute certainly is able to be seeded for the benefit of advancing the issue, and trying to take care of some of the problems.

I don't know how you politically in a politically correct fashion respond to GAO, and I will leave that to higher minds than mine.

DR. STOCKER: Richard.

MR. ORR: I just wanted to respond that by the time an organism does a billion dollars worth of damage and we can record it, we have already lost
control of it.

DR. CAMPBELL: It makes it a good argument for prevention and early detection rapid response for all the others.

DR. STOCKER: Let me ask a real general question. For those of us who don't know very much about GAO at all, how do -- the report came out, and it says what it says, and I trust that everyone has read it at least twice.

It is easily the most important report that came out this year. Correct me now if you are going to. How do agencies respond to the GAO reports? Is this another source of information, or is this thunder and lightening from above?

MR. WILKINSON: Since Lori spent a whole lot of time talking about the recommendations, and I am actually supposed to have by the end of Thursday our comments back for the clearance process, the departments had the opportunity to review that report in draft, and to try to correct factual errors and that type of thing.

And to disagree with things, and which we did in some places, but from a council perspective and from a departmental perspective. Once the report is finalized, and is given to the Congressional
committees responsible, it is incumbent upon the
departments on which the recommendations are made to
give to the chairs of the committees our reactions to
the specific recommendations.

Now, I actually had some problems with
some of the things or some of the assumptions, the
theorems from which things were built.

But at this stage, we are limited to
responding to the recommendations and whether or not
we agree with the recommendations, and how we would
change the recommendations, and that type of thing.
So does that answer the question?

DR. STOCKER: Well, it raises more, I will
say that.

MR. LUKENS: Do you have to go do what it
tells you to do, or do you just respond that I don't
like what you said.

MR. WILKINSON: It is hard to respond.

You can respond and say, no, we can't do this, and
sorry, GAO is way off base on this. But you have got
to realize that they are an investigative arm of the
Congress. If there is a way that you could agree with
them, or tweak things a little bit, it is probably to
your advantage.

MS. WILLIAMS: Even though congress didn't
request this particular report, this report goes -- 
the agency's response is filed with a number of 
different committees. So it becomes a Congressional 
review issue, even if Congress didn't request this 
particular report.

DR. CAMPBELL: I think it is fair to say 
that those of us who are going to be going up to 
Congress asking for their support for the programs, 
and particularly for money, are going to be asked how 
are you solving the problems identified in the GAO 
report, or something close to that

And you, or the council, and the council 
staff, and those of us who want to support you are 
going to need to have what appear to be responsive 
answers to that. Yes, we are dealing with that by 
doing X, Y, and Z.

DR. STOCKER: Deb.

MS. HAYES: Well, I guess that Faith 
basically said a lot of what I was going to say, but I 
will say that we only have 60 days to respond to this, 
and yes, it is lightening from above. We have to 
respond.

And they have to be constructive responses 
as well, although I think we can disagree with the 
recommendations and provide our basis for that
disagreement.

But if we are not going to disagree, then we have to show how we are going to implement their recommendations.

DR. STOCKER: Lori, will you be providing -- I am trying to figure out exactly how this all works. I suspect the way that this works is that you are going to get a request to provide the information to show why the agency that may or may not be doing what we want is doing what we want, and I know what that meant.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good. No. I mean, it is kind of interesting, because all of this is set up for particular departments to respond. It is really not set up for -- and even though this is reviewing the council and all the regulations and everything, and saying who has to respond.

And even our comments were filed with the Interior comments, because it is just -- they are not used to dealing with an interdepartmental council, and their system is just not set up that way.

So even though the council will -- I mean, we will respond, but the individual departments are the ones with the responsibilities both under the plan and to the council, and that will be actually saying
whether they are going to implement these recommendations or not is my understanding.

DR. STOCKER: Will ISAC be able to see the comments before they are submitted to Congress? Will ISAC be able to see the comments after they are submitted?

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, certainly. I think what I am saying now is if you have views on these recommendations and how the Council as a whole and maybe not particular individual departments should respond, it would be relevant to have those in the record.

And it would be helpful to us to get your views. Not that you are going to be reviewing each individual department and how they are responding.

DR. STOCKER: Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: I can't believe that I am going to say this, but I am willing to volunteer to put together a response on behalf of ISAC if I can get feedback from people on individual elements, and I will just go ahead and put it together based on the sections that are in the report.

DR. STOCKER: And let me rephrase that slightly. You are willing to gather information and exchange information?
MS. BARTUSKA: Yes.

DR. STOCKER: We won't have a meeting where we can actually bless it as an ISAC contribution, but the information exchange can go back and forth?

MS. BARTUSKA: Yes, and what I will formally do is after I have got everybody's input and have a report together, I will send it out for concurrence within the total ISAC before it goes forward under your signature.

DR. STOCKER: Is everyone in favor of that?

MS. BARTUSKA: So there will be an e-mail exchange and an e-mail concurrence.

MS. UPSTON: On the GAO recommendation that Lori raised that are in the report?

MS. BARTUSKA: On the report, the comments on the report.

DR. STOCKER: We need two things. We need your comments on the report itself, and then we are going to need some kind of recommendations from individuals on how these agencies should be responding to these comments. Nelroy.

DR. JACKSON: I come from la-la land and I may be way off base here, but reading the language of
the first recommendation, particularly talking about formulating a cross-cutting evasive species management budget for the Federal Government, and coupling this with Mitch Daniels’ letter, is this the President in effect saying with the concurrence of Congress that my Invasive Species Council, get off the dime and do stuff, and do it fast?

MS. WILLIAMS: It is not Mitch Daniels, no. It is the GAO. It is the General Accounting Office report.

DR. JACKSON: Yes, but I am saying that if you look at the fact that we have had action from the OMB and from the GAO, is this in a totality saying to all the secretaries that this is what we want, and go and do it, and do it fast?

MS. WILLIAMS: I am not going to speak for OMB.

DR. STOCKER: We call him "Old Conspiracy Theory" back in la-la land. You draw whatever conclusions you want to. We have had two powerful voices tell us that they think there are some actions that should be taken.

As individuals, we need to look at that report again, identify what you think that input needs to be from you, and then you need to be thinking a
little bit, and put yourself in the perspective of the
agency being discussed, and make some recommendations
how that agency should respond.

Lori, or someone at some point, will be
tasked with putting the bullet list together of how
that agency responds. Give them some suggestions.
The information back and forth will be useful in both
directions, and at some point if we can, we could even
come up with a consensus list of recommendations that
could have official ISAC blessing. Dean.

MR. WILKINSON: To lend a sense of
reality, I actually have to complete our departmental
comments, and initially my deadline was November 18th.
But I am going to be submitting them by the end of
the day on Thursday.

I am not sure that I can take cognizance
of what would be coming back from ISAC for that
purpose. I would also point out, with maybe one
exception, that they are very broad recommendations.
And not very specific, and you should also look at
what they have done in terms of their science, and
this relates back to a previous conversation that we
had.

They talk about monitoring and they talk
about goals, and they talk about accelerating rates of
invasion. And they take what has been reported over 30 years in 30 year blocks.

And I would say from a scientific perspective that if you were putting this in annual increments that the confidence intervals would be so wide that you could not in fact draw conclusions.

That we may be able to tell rates of invasion, in terms of aquatic ecosystems over a 10 year period, but we certainly do not want to be put into the position of saying, okay, our yearly goal is we are going to decide how much better we were this year than we were last year, in terms of rates of invasion.

DR. STOCKER: And with that we are going to move to our next item, unless, Ann, you have a very, very brief comment.

MS. BARTUSKA: I think it is just a question of clarification, and maybe we can deal with this off-line, but I got the impression that you just said, Dean, that we need to send our remarks to the council staff, and I was just assuming that we would just send them directly to OMB as our feedback, with a CC: to the council.

MR. WILKINSON: OMB is --

MS. BARTUSKA: I'm sorry, GAO.
MS. WILLIAMS: That needs to go to the council.

MS. BARTUSKA: It needs to go to the council. Okay.

DR. STOCKER: As individuals, of course, you can send in anything that you want to to GAO, but collectively it will go through the council first. Quickly, Marshall.

MR. MEYERS: A further point of clarification. If Dean has to have it by Thursday, are we going through a wasted exercise?

DR. STOCKER: No. Next.

MR. LUKENS: I was just going to say that we are not attempting to influence individual agency responses. We are responding as ISAC to the council at the Secretary level, and let them deal with it once those responses go up.

MS. WILLIAMS: Let me clarify, and I apologize. Sometimes Dean's deadlines are not exactly when things are due. They are 3 or 4 weeks before things are actually do, because Commerce takes so long to clear things.

But for me I guess what I am really looking for is that I am thinking ahead to the next plan as you can tell from this meeting, and not this
plan, but for an update.

And some of these recommendations go
towards where we want to focus in on the next plan,
and how we can improve the process that you have
already been talking about for the last couple of
days.

And some of the other -- if you read the
totality of the report talking about focus, do we want
zero in on fewer areas. So I think having the
advisory committee views on some of these
recommendations will be valuable, whether or not they
influence any particular departments' response to the
GAO report.

DR. STOCKER: And let me add to that since
this is an outside group that has looked at us along
with the process. This is really our first metric to
take a look and see what some other group thought of
what we were doing for a living, and we had better pay
attention to that.

Many of us expressed glee that we were
getting an outside review, and we had better use it to
the fullest extent that we can. Deadlines be damned
frankly. We can't do anything about anybody's
deadlines, and just do the best that we can with what
we have.
DR. LODGE: Randall, you said we are doing this for a living. Have I missed something?
(Laughter.)

DR. STOCKER: I'm sorry, but I just missed what you just said.

DR. LODGE: You said that we were doing this for a living. Have I been missing out on something?

DR. STOCKER: Oh. Well, $3 million for a grant and he asks me what I do for a living.
(Laughter.)

DR. STOCKER: We are going to take a break now, and it is going to be a brief break, and we are going to be back here at three o'clock, at three o'clock, a quick 10 minute break. Thank you very much for that discussion.
(Whereupon, at 2:51 p.m., the meeting was recessed and resumed at 3:04 p.m.)

DR. STOCKER: The session is titled, "NISA Reauthorization." Allegra, it is all yours.

MS. CANGELOSI: Hello. This presentation is meant to be short, and Kathy, you are doing it with me? You are on the agenda, too.

MS. METCALF: No, I will explain that after you are done.
MS. CANGELOSI: So that means that we won't be going over all of the substantive issues in the bill, the big bill that is over a hundred pages, and it covers a lot of the different issues that we are working on.

So I do urge everyone on the ISAC to please take a close look at it, and give your comments either to me or to Cameron, or one of the other staffers of the lead offices so that we can take them into account.

But first a quick history. Over the last several months, probably starting last year about this time, the Northeast-Midwest Institute, in sort of a cooperative arrangement with the ANS task force and the NIST, undertook to try to develop through a lot of stakeholder input a starting point for the NISA reauthorization.

And we did that by taking regional panel input that they had provided to the ANS task force, and we looked at existing or pending legislation, which Congressman Baird of Washington, and some Great Lakes legislators put in.

And we called together focus teams, and some of you have participated in those, where we tackled a particular issue through a call with the
experts from around the country to sort of volley on ways forward so that we had at least some sense that there would be agreement around the proposals.

The House Science Committee held hearings, and so did a Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and more recently a joint subcommittee hearing has been held between Resources and Science, post-introduction.

The bill was shaped up and sent off to Leg Counsel for a long stay. We lost several weeks there, and I think that the biggest bottleneck there was the Homeland Security Amendments that were flooding the Leg Counsels in both the House and Senate.

But when we did get it back, that allowed us to begin to circulate the actual draft, both among different stakeholder interest groups, but also among the folks on the Hill that might put their reputations on the line, and actually sponsor a NISA reauthorization.

They had further input and helped to address concerns of other colleagues of theirs who would like to join on as original co-sponsors, and the product of all of that activity is what was introduced on September 18th in both the House and the Senate by partisan groups, and rather large ones.
And let's see. The main sponsors in the Senate were Senator Levin and Senator Collins of Maine, and there were -- Jonathan or Nicole, do you remember, or Cameron, how many other co-sponsors we had in the Senate? So, 15 to 20.

And then in the House, it was a group of 40, and Congressman Ehlers, and Congressman Gilchrest, Baird, and Hoekstra, took the lead on it. I don't have to tell you that we have to do virtually nothing to raise concerns about exotic species in the Northwest and Midwest regions, and many other parts of the country.

They seem to have their own trust people, because they are on the front page all the time, whether it is a snakehead fish, or a swamp eel, or whatever.

And so it was a matter of just directing the offices to the most recent press in their region to help convince them that they needed to be part of this. The hearing were quite good and I could turn it over to Cameron to provide a summary of that.

But are there any questions, first? Oh, probably one last thing about the form that the bill takes. The House bill is actually two bills. It is a management portion and a research portion, and I think
I reported that to you last time that I talked to you about this.

That there are structural reasons within the House that makes that the best approach, at least initially. And then in the Senate, it was all woven together in one bill, and the hopes were that the two bills in the House would ultimately get woven together, too.

So any advantages that you may see if you do a comparison between the Senate bill and the House package will actually be afforded by both chambers down the line, and there are advantages obviously to integrating the management and research portions.

So are there any questions about that process? If not, I can just quickly sort of run through the topical issues, and I have this power point presentation that has a lot more detail in it than I am going to go into.

So I am happy to print it out or give it electronically to Lori, and you all can take your time and look at it. One last thing is that, yes, it is true that September 18th is very late in the session.

And there was a possible scenario that would allow consideration of a bill like this if the elections had been such that neither chamber flipped
in terms of the regime, and there was something very predictable and a long lame duck, then there might have been a possibility.

But as soon as the elections happened, it was pretty much clear that we would be talking about consideration of this next year. The good news is that the hearing that was most recently held in Science and Resources were an effort to get the agencies going on their detailed review of this so that we could hit the ground running as soon as the next session starts.

And the leadership in the House, and I believe the Senate is in concurrence and on record that they plan to reintroduce on January 3rd the first day back, and try to get action on this bill in both chambers within the first hundred days.

So what does it cover? It is a reauthorization of the National Invasive Species Act, which revised the Non-Indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act.

It has several provisions in it that gets program coordination, because the first important thing to cover is that the ANS task force, which was created under existing law, now has a new partner to play with in this area, and that is the ISAC and NISA.
So a fair amount of attention to that, and urging more international coordination, getting a broader agency representation on an ANS task force were all part of the coordination.

And then finally with the State management plans, helping to develop guidelines so that they are more consistent, and giving States the wherewithal to develop plans.

With respect to prevention, there is still a focus on what is considered the leading pathway ship but it is not the sole focus on pathways. So I will quickly go through the ship provisions.

There are some baseline requirements on all vessels that have -- that are basically like good housekeeping and record keeping. There is a faster track laid out for new vessels than existing vessels with respect to ballast treatment, because it is much easier to address treatment in a new build.

Ships entering the U.S. waters after operating outside the EEZ, whether it is the Great Lakes or any other port in the U.S., will be subject to mandatory ballast management.

And that can take the form of -- well, I will talk about that next. Coastal voyages have to do the good housekeeping. They have to comply with the
new vessel requirements, and upon promulgation of a final standard, which is no later than 2011, they will also need to comply with that unless they are in an enclosed area.

In terms of standards, the legislation lays out a two-step process. The most important step is the second step, and that is where all the action is for protecting the environment. Ultimately, it is a standard that is designed to eliminate risk.

I know that makes people like David Lodge a little -- well, you know, it eliminates risk using the best available technology economically achievable.

So we try to borrow some wisdom from long years of experience within the Clean Water Act, and Clean Air Act programs, to drive technology to the actual performance goal that we are after.

It is something that will be done by the Coast Guard and the EPA together, and they have four years to work out just the way that they want to express the standard, and just the way that they want to certify treatments against it, and just the way they want to do spot checking and monitoring.

They have four years to do that and I think that is roughly in keeping with the Coast Guard's proposed time frame for a standard. It has to
take effect by 2011, but it can be promulgated immediately if there is a sense that there are technologies there to meet it.

And the BAT, the best available technology determination, will be made on a ship class by ship class basis. So we don't have to wait for the silver bullet for oil tankers when there is plenty of stuff out there already for container ships or passenger ships.

And likewise it is delineated between new and existing ships. And there is lots of provisions for periodic review and revision, both for the Great Lakes and the National program, because we are definitely on a learning curve here.

The tiding over period is the interim standard, and the idea there is just to give guidance to those ships that choose to use treatment, rather than ballast water exchange, which is the default activity.

So they're going to do -- they have to do something, and they may do ballast water exchange, and they may substitute a treatment, and the role of the interim standard is to assure that that treatment is as good or better than they would have gotten, or what we would have gotten with ballast water exchange.
Now, a 95 percent reduction in live plankton is what is in the bill because a good ballast water exchange is considered to be a 95 percent purge of the water.

So that would be the upper end of effectiveness. It could be implemented as a size standard if someone wants to translate it from 95 percent of the plankton to 50 microns.

That is all available, but the reality is that this is a tiding over period, and it doesn't need to be perfect. Only a few ships will be using treatment anyway during that period.

Certification protocols are laid out, and I am not going to go into details. We have grandfathering provisions which are a middle point between what the environmental protection interests was like, and what the industry would like, and so you can expect some movement there.

And there is a provision for experimental approval. Other pathways. There will be a pathway analysis required to rank pathways, just like in the National Management Plan, and know that while some of these things are already being done by agencies, this just gives those agencies that much more oomph with OMB, with Congress, with whoever they need to convince.
to provide resources to them.

And if they're half-way done with it, so much the better. They can say we met that deadline, unless so many others that we can't meet. So don't take offense if there are things here that you are already working on.

It should just help you with those projects. There is a requirement for a screening guideline so that there will be consistent screening among all of the new importations of organisms not already in trade, and grants for States to implement their own screening according to those consistent guidelines.

Early Detection and Monitoring, there are two types set up in the bill, and one type is to find out as quickly as possible that there is a newcomer to trigger rapid response, and that would tend to be a more public process, where there would be a lot of outreach to other groups.

And then there is a more rarefied research initiative in the research portion of the bill that would allow us to understand if we are actually changing the rates and patterns of invasions through our interdiction efforts.

Containment and control. We pay a fair
amount of attention to the need for a good solid dispersal barrier in the Chicago Ship and Sanitary Canal, and the potential for generalizing that technology to other waterways.

And again that concern that I raised earlier about the need for more tools in the tool box that won't cause controversy and slow down rapid response efforts. We tried to address that with our research program.

Then rapid response. There is a fund established, and there are four ways or three ways that States can get monies to a rapid response need using that fund, ranging from low energy to high energy, or higher energy.

The lowest energy approach would be to ask for a Federal team to come in and do it for them, and that is one way that States can get action on the ground in their jurisdictions.

The next lowest energy way would be to design for themselves only a plan that would be approved by the Department of Interior as being consistent with guidelines that hopefully you and others will be producing through this effort, and the ANS task force effort and FIMNEW.

And then they can use that money
consistent with that plan and hopefully these would be contingency kind of decisions like what tools are okay to use, and what should we do for this kind of organism versus that kind of organism, and who is on first, and that kind of thing.

And then the third way, which gives you the -- it is the best bang for the buck if you are a State, because you get -- you have to pay less for this one, is to team up with other States and do a regional contingency strategy that is approved, and then the monies would be forwarded to you with less of a cost share.

There is also an upgrade to the nutria. Oh, I'm sorry. The nutria control program, if it isn't authorized through independent legislation, will be incorporated into NESA and the brown tree snake program got an upgrade.

Information, education, and outreach, a lot of these things are already being done by ANSTF, and we hope that this gives it more oomph and a higher elevation in the priority.

The industry outreach is particularly important we feel. On the research side, and here I really should turn it over to Cameron. Do you want it? No? A girl can dream. The pathway survey to
look at race and patterns is in there, and a set of agencies are identified as leads.

SERC, USGS, and NOAA are kind of a team on a lot of these research priorities, with other agencies obviously being involved, but needing to have a leadership team is those three agencies.

And a lot is left up to them in terms of how to structure it. Ecological surveys so that we know what the baseline is. Guidelines for how to conduct those early detection monitoring efforts, both the public process and the more research kind.

And then development and maintenance of a National Pathways and Ecological Survey Database so that researchers can access it, with a lot of coordination to all of the start-up efforts that are already out there.

Further research is that they can conduct some experimental work to compliment the monitoring work, and try to understand what inoculation levels are kind of the kind of critical levels that we should try and bring pathways below.

The establishment of a research development and demonstration program for environmentally sound methods for presenting, controlling, and eradicating aquatic nuisance species,
and that is kind of a sister program to one that already exists devoted specifically to ballast water treatments and ship related issues.

I am not going to go through all of the details of that program, and so if you have more questions, you can ask Cameron. There was an effort in there, or there is an effort in there to try to build systematic expertise, which we all agree is an important objective.

So that is a summary of the kind of subject matter that is in the bill that appropriations have gone up; the authorizations from $30 million a year to about $150 million a year.

We know that Congress doesn't appropriate everything that is authorized, but if you authorize a higher level, you certainly signal to appropriators that this is an issue that Congress feels merits some higher level funding. So that is my part.

MS. METCALF: I will just make clear why I am on the agenda. I think it is because during our steering group planning sessions that I thought it was important for this to get a little more venting than just like a two minute summary, which we have done in the past with legislation in this work.

And the only thing that I wanted to say,
and this is why I said it is all good, is that I want
to do something that I don't think the Senate and the
House staff, or Allegra, would do for themselves.

And that is to note the tremendous
outreach program that everyone has done on this to try
and get people in the ground formative stages in
looking at concepts on this bill.

We didn't all agree on the many
teleconferences that we had, but what we tried to do
was identify issues where we thought there would be
problems, and try and identify potential solutions.

And I only throw this out because it
really -- because to the staff's service and to
Allegra's service, has really been a model of trying
to get something together and get everybody on board
to the maximum extent practical. And I wanted to do
that because I knew that Allegra would not do it for
herself.

MS. CANGELOSI: Thank you.

DR. STOCKER: Now I am thinking that if
she just worked a little harder, she could solve all
of these problems.

MS. CANGELOSI: Well, I would definitely
like to hear some discussion on either the topics, the
process, and then the question that I raised earlier
on how can the task teams be deployed to weigh in on
some of the specific issues.

   DR. STOCKER: Questions and comments?


MR. MEYERS: I still have the same issue
that I raised during some of our conference calls,
which is by codifying major portions of the management
plan, it is now -- if this passes, will be law.

   We could ostensibly be doing two revisions
of the management plan before this reauthorization
would come up again. Are we preempted from redoing
the management plan as it applies to aquatics?

   Because if this becomes the law, how do we
then make adjustments to the management plan with
respect to aquatic species?

MS. CANGELOSI: The drafters of the bill
were really careful to include a lot of periodic
review revision, because it is understood that we are
on that learning curve. There are certain policy
calls that have to be made in order for us to move
ahead at all.

   And some of those include that these
things should be funded, and these things should be
done by a certain date, et cetera, and that is what
the legislation attempts to achieve.
But lots of periodic review and revision, and lots of responsibility for NISA.


MR. MEYERS: Possibly as a suggestion, since lawyers love to litigate, possibly we ought to then have a provision like they put in in the Internal Revenue Code, and if this management plan or any revisions thereto.

Just so there is no squabbling over we can't change the management plan.

DR. STOCKER: I was hoping to be able to work some IRS code into this discussion somehow.

MR. MEYERS: I knew you would, but that's how you get around revisions without having to go through changing the statute.

MS. CANGELOSI: Okay. And I think that would work to put some of that in, but know that this is our chance to get certain things in law for a six year period, or if Congress really feels that it needs to change it, they can always change it sooner. And so this is our opportunity to make those calls that we think are best.

And we could wait, and wait, and wait, and make better and better calls. But we won't have the resources really to pursue them. So this is -- it is
a trade-off to some extent, and I think that the super structure is one that we do have to live with for six years, and so please pay attention to it.

DR. STOCKER: Linda.

MS. SHEEHAN: Two questions, and one I should know the answer to, and I just don't remember. Is following addressed in the bill?

MS. CANGELOSI: Yes. I didn't mention that, that the final standards is related to the entire ship. So to the extent that following plays a major role in the transport of organisms by ship as a vector, the following will need to be addressed in the final standards.

This is so important that we not become perfectionistic about the toenail of the elephant if you will. We need to take up the whole thing into account and try to reduce the transfers that that ship is making, and that's why we need the four years to do a careful job on just how to do that.

MS. SHEEHAN: Okay. Thanks. And has there been any discussions with the Coast Guard with regard to Homeland Security and how that might impact all of this?

MS. CANGELOSI: There have not, and I think it could potentially have a profound impact. I
don't know if it is one that we can avoid. But we may be looking at ways to mitigate. Cameron, do you have any comments on that?

MR. WILSON: There haven't been any, but there will be. And as was said at this point, it is my understanding that the Daschle amendment went down this morning. So I assume that means that the Senate will pass the Homeland bill.

The Coast Guard is going over as we all know in the press and in many different areas where the research is eating up their budget, and while it became clear at the hearing last week that they weren't paying enough attention to this from a members perspective, we continue to understand the pressures that they were put under and one of the questions for the record is specifically dealing with that issue.

DR. STOCKER: Ron.

MR. LUKENS: Thank you. I think I know the answer to this, but the question rises now and again. Many references to the council and its coordination with the task force does not in fact legislatively establish the council or its processes. That is correct? Okay. I just wanted to make sure that was correct.

MS. CANGELOSI: The council is defined in
the law as the three lead agencies, and other agencies
that they may consult with, but it doesn't establish
them, though Congressman Ehlers is also looking at
legislation that would do that. And, Cameron, if you
want to comment on that.

MR. WILSON: Yes. There are lots of
references in the bill to the council, and actually in
both NOAA and DOI's excellent testimony, they pointed
out that, and they were also encouraging in that to my
mind they called for a statutory creation of the
council.

And we do have draft legislation that has
been floating around for eight months or so, and that
I have not actually had a chance to finish because we
have been working on other stuff.

And I would be happy to share that with
anybody that is really interested at this point. Lori
has seen it, and it has been circulating for some
time, mostly internally.

But we do plan to reintroduce it probably
the first day back within Congress as a separate bill,
because we consider that to be -- while incredibly
related to aquatics, we don't want to get that -- it
is really a separate issue, because the council is
responsible for so much more.
DR. STOCKER: Lori.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. First of all, I wanted to join Kathy. I think this has been a tremendous effort. I am an old Hill rat myself, and so I know how hard it is to get some of these things just even introduced.

And so it is a tribute to Allegra and a lot of other people who have worked on this. I think that we have already had a hearing on that thanks to Congressman Ehlers and Congressman Gilchrest, and I think the Department's sense that I got from all their testimony was very, very supportive of the direction this legislation is going, and we are very interested in seeing it go further.

But reserving the right to look at some of the details, and I think the level of detail in the bill is one issue that we will look at. Of course, the Executive always likes maximum flexibility, and we will continue to argue before that.

But I think that there might be some areas where additional flexibility can get out at some of the issues that Marshall was bringing up. One of the things that I think would be useful that we might do is people don't mind is that this is very relevant to the pace of work of the council, in terms of if we are
going to provide broad guidelines on things, and meanwhile it is being legislated, those guidelines are not going to be terribly relevant.

And so I think that we are pushing ourselves and you all in terms of at least under the broad direction to get that out, and it is partly due to the pace that has increased on the Hill.

And I think maybe just parceling this out on doing some summaries of individual sections dealing with early detection efforts and rapid response screenings so that people can sort of zero in on that part of the language, this is a hard bill to take in all at once.

So we might do that and provide all of that to you through the various implementation teams that are looking at this, and so you make sure that you are thinking about what is in this bill, as well as what are in all the other pieces that we are considering as we move forward on the council work.

MR. WILSON: Let me kind of just respond quickly to Lori. That is a fair point in seeking administrative flexibility and Executive Branch flexibility, and we certainly would be encouraged to do so just as long as it doesn't undermine Congressional prerogatives And we reserve the right to
define that in any way we wish.

DR. STOKER: And the IRS code. Do you want to jump in on this, because David is actually next.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: I have been on for a while.

DR. STOKER: Craig.

MR. REGELBRUGGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had just a committee referral question. I am wondering and it seems that the language, and particularly the language on screening perhaps creates referral issues with agriculture committees, for example. And I am just wondering to what degree that has been clarified.

MS. CANGELOSI: The parliamentarians in both chambers are referring it to -- well, in the Senate it was Environment and Public Works as the sole -- they only had one committee of jurisdiction, but they can share that voluntarily, and they plan to with Commerce.

In the House, it was transportation and infrastructure, and resources for the management bill. And, Cameron, was the Science bill referred to differently?

MR. WILSON: The Science bill, HR 5395,
was referred to the Science Committee as primary T&I, Transportation and Infrastructure secondary, and House resources was also given a referral; and due to a quirk of -- and it wasn't really an oversight because we intended to include the Smithsonian, the House Administration Committee also got a referral over the Science bill because they have black letter jurisdiction over the Smithsonian Institution.

But the House Ag Committee did not get a referral, and it would be up to them to pursue that referral at a later date.

MS. CANGELOSI: And I think that, although the parliamentarian didn't believe that there was a reason to have a full referral, it is probably something that the leadership will want to have at least in formal communication with the Agriculture principals on.

So that there can be no -- that there won't be a sense of being excluded. So I think that there is -- with this whole bill there has been a theme of collaboration to the greatest extent possible, and it wouldn't surprise me if that wasn't manifested in some kind of informal outreach to the Agriculture Committee.
DR. STOCKER: Lunch, for instance. David.

DR. LODGE: I am David Lodge. I echo some of the comments earlier about how wonderful this process seems to have been with Allegra and Cameron, and others, and clearly it is a very complex issue, and lots of necessary compromises, and nuances, and finessing various issues.

But I want to raise a question which became more acute in my mind today, especially given our conversations in the Pathways and Screening Task Team. The relationship between NISA and ANSTF, and the division of duties -- I noticed that one of the things that you highlighted, Allegra, in the presentation was ANSTF sort of gets the lead on -- and I think I have got this right -- pathways.

NiSC gets the lead on sort of screening protocols. So I guess that now in light of our conversations today, it makes me sort of ever more worried about how you bring those two things together.

MS. CANGELOSI: Okay.

DR. LODGE: Now, I sort of understand some of the reasons I'm sure that you went into on that, and it makes sense at one level, but at another level I am worried about where it leads eventually, and how these two groups are going to coordinate.
MS. CANGELOSI: There was not enough space on a power point slide to put the number of shall consult with, concur with, collaborate with, coordinate with, et cetera.

But usually whenever an ANS task force is given the lead, it is with a closed partnership with NISA or vice versa. And the only reason that the pathways things was given to the ANS task force as a lead was because it was going to be building on an existing effort that is already being overseen if you will by NISA. And it was in consultation with both Kathy and Lori.

DR. LODGE: I have a quick follow-up. And I see that, and I have read it, and so I know that all those other agencies are listed each time. I guess I am really asking a question that may be unanswerable at this point, but I am asking a question about after the bill, how do we implement this?

How is that actually going to work in practice, and maybe we need to wait to find that out, but it might be worth thinking about now.

MS. WILLIAMS: I don't think it would be good to wait until it passed to find it out, but I do think that one of the things that the council is going to do, and this hearing came up pretty quickly, and we
had other things, and the agencies had to come up with testimony fairly quickly, we wanted them to concentrate on that.

But the council is going to host some meetings among the Federal agencies to go through some of this bill more kind of line by line, and get into the nitty-gritty details. And I think that is a very good question, and I will report back that ISAC and others have asked that.

We need to really think about if this is workable, and so far we have had ANSTF is going to do their report next, and so I will leave that to them. But so far we have just had such an excellent working relationship with the ANSTF, and it is very clear that on some of the issues where they have really established themselves and are more clearly aquatic, and won't set precedence for the broader taxa, if they can take the lead on that, I think that is something that the council is very, very comfortable with.

And we are more the overall big picture coordination, but that doesn't answer your specific question of how is this going to work in each instance, and we need to go through that.

MS. CANGELOSI: And one response to Lori's earlier comment about the guidance that the bill may
be -- that the task teams may be wanting to give, and
the timing relative to the bill.

Though there may be some detail in certain
provisions of this legislation, there is quite a bit
of flexibility. There are deadlines, but there is
quite a bit of flexibility for agencies, in terms of
how to meet them and design them.

The guidelines for screening are left
completely to the agencies to work up what they have
to do about certain outcomes of that screening are
structured.
But how to screen organisms is definitely still left
to the agencies.

And I guess I wanted to say that because I
don't want you to be overly frightened that there may
have been some technical calls made in much of the
bills, and the expertise to make.

In fact, if anything, to the extent that
this group can get a head start and have gotten a head
start on those things, that's good, because ultimately
it is going to be right back in your laps when this
thing passes. Only there will be a statutory deadline
to keep the secretaries of the departments interested.

DR. STOCKER: And with that, unless there
is a final 10 second comment, then we return to your
capable hands, and I assume that we will have updates or not, depending on what this bill does between now and March.

MS. UPSTON: Are there any action items that are going to come out of this?

DR. STOCKER: No.

MS. CANGELOSI: Well, didn't we want the task teams to give us some kind of feedback?

DR. STOCKER: Right. Lori has the task and she is going to cut the thing up and mail it to the appropriate people, and yes, thank you.

MS. CANGELOSI: Are those Federal people or are they the ISAC team? Okay. Thank you.

DR. STOCKER: The next item on our agenda is -- it says short updates. We have heard about the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force many times, and we have also heard about the Federal Interagency Committee for Noxious and Exotic Weeds.

And the question that has arisen periodically is how do we coordinate with both of those two groups, and we wanted to provide this opportunity for brief updates from both.

I think we would probably learn more about what to expect in the way of interaction in the future with the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force, since
some of it is now getting codified.

Let's hear the rest of the story from the FICMNEW people as well. Now, who is going to start this discussion, Mike or Sharon?

MS. GROSS: I just want to give you guys just a general overview of some of the activities that we are doing with the task force, and I would like to mention here that many of the ISAC members here are involved directly with the task force.

Ron Lukens is an ex officio member of the task force, and there are many other ISAC members who are part of our committees, or they are members of our regional panels. So, you guys actually have fairly good representation relative to the task force.

People have attended quite a few of our meetings. If there are aquatic people who aren't involved in any of the task force things and they would like to be, please let me know, because we have numerous committees and working groups, and there is no shortage of areas to get you involved in.

The task force actually sees itself as the aquatic arm of the invasive species council, and we take very seriously our responsibilities to kind of lead the implementation of those activities under the guidance of the Invasive Species Council.
So you hear a lot of interaction from people of how does the task force fit into, and we is us, and us is them. So we eventually run out of people in the agencies, and it is pretty much the same people doing things.

So to separate ourselves from the council is pretty much impossible. It just keeps rolling downhill and we are at the bottom. So it kind of moves along in that direction.

Just as a reminder, the task force was established in '91, and the focus of the task force is in a single word, and it is coordination. So it really comes down to trying to coordinate the activities of the Federal Agencies or the State Agencies, with the regional entities, and with a lot of local organizations.

The basic premise of the task force is that agencies that have the responsibilities to address the resource issues have to work together and coordinate their activities in order to be effective.

And I think yesterday's discussion regarding coordination kind of brings that to light as to the relative importance of the whole coordination issue. You know, you can work at the Federal level, but unless you can coordinate your activities at the
State level, and at the regional level, where things actually go on the ground, doesn't really make any difference.

Some of the activities that the task force has been working on. Probably Cathy Short, who is one of the co-chairs of the task force, probably gave you guys an update at the Yellowstone meeting.

And some of the activities that have been going on since the last meeting, we have completed our strategic plan. And you may think, well, gee, have you gone all this time without a strategic plan.

We actually had some resemblance of a program plan, but what we tried to do with the Invasive Species Management Plan is to put all of that into a strategic plan that outlines what our goals were, and to really focus on what some of our objectives were, and how we would go about meeting them.

And one of our or one of the things that we hope to accomplish with that was to make ourselves more effective in implementing the plan. If we could try to just keep focusing everything down so that we really worked on those specific items in the plan relative to aquatics.

One of the things that we ended up doing
was realigning our task force structure so that it was
more closely aligned with both the task teams and many
of the activities that are outlined in the National
Management Plan.

So what we have done is to take what was
before a somewhat flat structure, and we have made it
less flat, and we tried to set up groups that had as
best we could a one-to-one correlation with many of
the existing task teams in the Invasive Species
Council.

And we have been successful in some parts.

We have the legislative mandate on the one hand, and
the National Management Plan on the other hand. So as
Marshall said, there is -- you know, we are trying to
make sure that those things melt, and that we need the
mandates under everything.

We also set up a prevention committee
which Richard Orr actually leads, and in doing that,
we established working groups to get this one-to-one
correlation relative especially to screening and
pathways. So that those groups can work directly with
the task teams.

We also have a risk analysis working
group, and that one deals specifically with developing
risk assessments that the task force has leaned
heavily on in trying to develop future control plans, or regulatory actions for some of the agencies that actually have regulatory responsibilities.

We have established a research committee to try to work more closely with the research task team, and we have had in the past a communication, education, and outreach committee, and you have heard from the chair of that committee, Joe Starincheck, a little bit earlier today.

And again we tried to make sure that the activities that we are doing relative to communication, education, and outreach feed directly into the activities of the task team.

You heard Joe talk a little bit about the Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers Campaign. It has been very successful for us. The last version of NISA required the task force to develop guidelines, voluntary guidelines for recreational users.

And what this is, is basically taking those guidelines and getting them out on the group, and getting them to stay. And I would have to say that it has been much more successful than I ever dreamed that it would be.

We are initiating with the pet industry trying to get the same type of campaign going to get
the same type of education, and the same type of slogan, and that whole kind of marketing campaign to try to be more effective.

You have got to believe that people want to do the right things. You just have to get the message out to them. The Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers, again that was focused on our voluntary recreational activities guidelines.

It focuses on actions that minimize or avoid the transport of aquatic ANS nuisance species. Again, looking at whether it is fishing, or boating, or hunting, or seaplanes, scuba diving, all the areas in the aquatic recreation community where you might transfer aquatic invasive species.

We also have another activity, and it is an effort that has been supported primarily through our Western Regional Panel, looking at preventing the westward spread of both zebra mussels and other aquatic invasive species.

It has been going on for quite some time, and is a major component of the bill as well. We could say that we have been successful, and there are no zebra mussels so far in the west. Hopefully it is from the activities that we have done, although it is hard to say. We will take credit where we can.
That is the hard thing about prevention. Everybody wants a measurable progress and prevention, and you are never sure whether your activities are the ones that are responsible for something not getting there.

The task force has always been involved in the development of a cooperative control program. One of the focuses of the task force has always been with the resource agencies, both at the Federal level and at the State level.

And in developing these operative control and management programs has been very important, because what it does is it lets us take the limited resources that we have, and put them together in a single management plan so that all of the other agencies know who is doing research, and who is doing monitoring, and who is developing control methods, and kind of who is responsible for what.

It doesn't always work great, but at least you have a forum for people to get together to look at individual species, whether it is green crab, brown tree snake, Caulerpa, nutria, the New Zealand mud snail, the Eurasian ruffe, the Chinese mitten crab.

These are some of the species that we have control of in management plans that are either
developed or we are in the process of developing them. Two of the primary things that the task force has done that I think really focus and address this coordination issue are the regional panels that are developed and the State Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan.

The regional panels are set up to establish the regional priorities and really coordinate regional activities. We currently have five panels. We just established one last week, the Mississippi River Basin Panel, and they have been talking about that for a couple of years.

And MIRCA, the Mississippi Interstate Resources Conservation Association, they are going to host the Mississippi River Basin Panel. And while we were at our meeting last week, the Task Force met in Hawaii, the Pacific Island, a lot of the Hawaiian people are very interested in setting up a panel that deals just with Pacific Island issues.

So they will probably come back to us with a proposal to establish that as well. The Mid-Atlantic has been bouncing around a panel for the last 2 or 3 years, and I think we are closer now than we have been for a while, and we are still looking at trying to get one in the southeast.
The State Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan, and again, this is kind of taking things down to the next level. The Act has laid out that a State could develop these plans, and we currently -- and the plans are submitted by the Governors, and then they are cost share grants available for plans that are approved by the task force.

And most of the specifics are laid out in the statute. We currently, and this doesn't show everything because we just approved four new plans last week, but there are currently -- I guess 13. somewhere around that -- plans approved.

These are both State and interstate plans, and the interstate plans usually have more than one entity, more than one State, or in some cases tribes that are involved in these.

Last week we approved plans for Massachusetts, Maine, Montana, and Alaska. There are probably four more States that are in the process of developing these plans.

The plans have been really good for the States, because what it does is it let's them do at the State level the same thing that we are doing at the Federal level. It brings all the agencies
together that are working on these things, and really
develop a kind of strategic effort.

They may not get money the first year, but
people begin to work together and it is that effort of
working together and getting the word out that then
helps them at a State level through their legislators
really develop some kind of a -- some leverage for
trying to get more funding. And it has been effective
for several States.

I am going to stop now, and if anybody has
any questions or comments.

MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Sharon. That
was really helpful, and if you are around for a few
more minutes I'm sure that people will come up with
some questions. I think I am running this for the
moment, and so -- oh, a question. I'm sorry, go
ahead.

MS. COOPER: I am glad that you raised the
issue of how important the State management plans are.
I know that in Washington State, my home State, it
has been instrumental in bringing all the stakeholders
together.

But what we are finding is even though we
are all at the same table dealing with the issues, we
are forever looking for additional funds. And I guess
this is a question to Allegra. On the bill, Allegra, was there additional funding that would be provided? Maybe you know, Sharon.

MS. GROSS: There is $30 million for authorization.

MS. COOPER: So those States that currently do not have management plans are really going to be behind the 8-ball when this bill gets passed, and those States that have plans then will be in line to get these additional funds; is that correct?

MS. GROSS: These are authorizations, and not necessarily appropriations. But authorizations are a great thing. We were authorized at a previous level of $4 million, and we actually have only ever had appropriated about $825,000.

So there is still the difference between authorized and appropriated, but we are getting close, and we are working on it.

MR. LUKENS: But she is right. I mean, if money is available, the ones that have plans will be in line, and it is an advantage.

MS. GROSS: Having an approved plan is much better than not having an approved plan.

MS. CANGELOSI: And it is a very
compelling argument to appropriators that there are five approved plans out there which require X-hundreds-of-thousands of dollars, or millions of dollars, and they are waiting for these resources.

As opposed to if we -- if you appropriate those resources, maybe somebody will need them. So it is really good that you move ahead with the approvals.

Also, I was reminded that in the reauthorization package that States would have access to some money to help them develop plans, as well as just to implement.

There were some complaints that not everyone has the wherewithal to develop.

MS. GROSS: That has been a big problem with a lot of States. They don't even have a person to develop the plan. So they have not had -- you know, a lot of States have struggled just to get a person to do that.

MS. WILLIAMS: Richard.

MR. ORR: This isn't so much as a question, but I do want everyone to know that on the screening and on the pathways working groups, which are truly going to be hard working working groups, there are still some openings.

So if you are interested, and you believe that you have the time and something to contribute, I
would really be happy to get your name. Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Mike.

MR. BUCK: Yes. I wondered what was the wrap-up from the individual State plans to identify what sort of regional groups would be formed? Is that just based on the interest of the specific States, or what is the relationship of the individual State plans and design of the regional organizations?

MS. GROSS: The regional panels have been more kind of geographic. They focused on large water sheds that kind of had things in common. Oh, except for the Western regional panel, which obviously covers everything else.

But we have the Great Lakes, and the Mississippi Basin, and so there is not really a direct one-to-one relationship between the State plans -- is that what you are asking, the regional panel, or --

MR. BUCK: Well, the criteria, the criteria that would help drive the next process and identify State plans to identify what specific regions would be working together.

MS. WILLIAMS: Are the regions are identified in the bill?

MS. GROSS: No, they are not.

MS. WILLIAMS: Oh, they're not?
MS. GROSS: No, only two are identified in the bill, just the Western and the Great Lakes panels. The task force actually did some work a couple of years ago to identify what the most logical breakout was, and that is where we got to the Middle Atlantic, the Southeast, and we had not yet identified the Hawaiian Islands, or I'm sorry, the Pacific Islands, until we went there and realized that their issues are common enough with that group that they don't really fit into the Western Regional Panel.

MR. BUCK: So what was the States' individual input into finding the regional organizations?

MS. GROSS: Oh, actually -- okay. I understand what you are saying. In most cases it is the States that actually drive pulling these together. I mean, if the States aren't interested in putting together regional panels, the regional panels don't happen.

So in most cases like in the Northeast, and in the mid-Atlantic, and even in the Pacific Islands, it is typical that the task force will invite somebody to be an administrative lead, but then the States actually pull together the efforts.

It is always the States that end up
leading the efforts to pull together the other States.

MS. WILLIAMS: Ron.

MR. LUKENS: Also, Michael, there is a difference between what a regional panel can do, and what a group of States with implementation authority can do.

So, for instance, if you want to submit a project like we were talking about earlier today in salt cedar, you wouldn't give the regional panel money to go out and do an on-the-ground project, because the regional panel doesn't have an entity to accept money.

And it has no authority, the panel itself, to go out and do a project. So you have got the regional panel that provides advice, priorities, and planning activities.

And then you are going to have to in an interstate situation, you are going to have to have States that are willing to come together and submit a joint proposal, or have money that they all want to bring to the table together to submit or to conduct an interstate project. So those are a little bit different.

MS. WILLIAMS: Other questions? Okay. I think we are ready to hear from FICMNEW. Mike.

MR. IELMINI: Talk about low-tech. Can
you hear this? Yesterday, we had a presentation from Tom Bewick, CSREES. Do you remember that acronym? And we have had some discussions about the acronym FICMNEW.

Now that has been a fine one, because we have had a lot of feedback about the nasty connotations, the hard to say, and certainly the tongue-twisting part of it.

But I think that Tom has trumped us. So we no longer hold the throw-in of the world's worst acronym, and we are going to try to move on to the next part of that. But anyway, my name is Mike Ielmini, and I am the co-chair of the Federal Interagency Committee For the Management of Noxious and Exotic Weeds, or FICMNEW as we used to call it.

My other co-chair is Gina Ramos, from the Bureau of Land Management, and I am from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. And we have been engaged in FICMNEW activities for over a decade now. This organization is noted in the Executive Order.

You have some briefing information given to each of you on its history, and we have found since the Executive Order was passed the need for increased efforts by FICMNEW to help implement the National Evasive Species Management Plan, and certainly help
support the work of the council, and the council staff, and other organizations out there.

And including reaching out and increase our collaboration with the States. FICMNEW is focusing on plant issues, plants of all-taxa group categories there, where there is aquatic plants, terrestrial plants, the plants that are tied to the noxious weed laws.

The plants that are tied to the Federal and State regulations, and authorities of the agencies within FCMNEW, have the ability to either interact on, implement, or certainly enforce if it is an action that is regarding some sort of a statute.

And in case you have not seen the list, there is 15 of those agencies covering a pretty wide spectrum, from the Department of Defense, EPA, the Department of Energy, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce.

So we have got quite a few people engaged at this level. We have realized that the whole key to this effort, and we heard this talked about quite a bit already here at this meeting, is that the people on the ground make it happen.

And the direct link to the people on the ground are the neighbors in the community. And in many ways the agencies with FICMNEW and certainly the
other departments with NISA, are those neighbors, those Federal entities, the Federal presence in those communities.

Those places where the State and the local, and the Federal people come together on the ground to implement either a law, or a statute, or some sort of action to thwart these in these species. So you will see that there has been some milestones established.

We have noted those, and FICMNEW has taken a leadership role in the development of a national strategy if you recall several years back, and certainly the publication of the Invasive Weed Fact Book, a FICMNEW publication.

And one of the ways that we try to implement these actions and tried to -- and now that we have an Executive Order and a management plan, to take on some of these tasks within that management plan, is to meet and design a work plan for FICMNEW operations.

And we just recently completed one of those operational planning efforts. The FICMNEW work planning retreat/meeting was held out in Shepardstown, West Virginia, back in late September or early October.
And we were able to come up with a set of work plan action items to help implement the management plan, and some other priority action items that the agencies themselves could take on.

So you will note that those are in there. I am not going to go through all of those. There is a few key points that I wanted to note there that we wanted to take on, one of which was the early detection and rapid response issue.

That is probably one of the hottest and most critical issues that the agencies within FICMNEW have chosen to deal with. It is certainly something that the agency operations on the ground need to consider when they are trying to prevent these species.

So many of you have heard of the draft early warning action plan that FICMNEW has come out with, and we are going to finalize that, and public comments have come in, and the deadline has been reached.

We are going to take that with a task team and design a set of strategies, and include those along with this management plan as it is finalized, and present that to the National Basis Species Council.
And to ISAC for their use in an all-taxa group effort. So this is a piece of the puzzle, and an opportunity and perhaps some recommendations that might work, although it is related to plants, we hope that some of the design of this are able to be applied to other taxa groups.

So it is a straw-man, and it is a piece of the puzzle, and we want to make sure that it is taken not only seriously, but tested. So we are moving forward along with this with the design of criteria, and you will note that in the back of that work plan handout that we gave you a set of criteria that we are going to be using to establish a set of pilot project locations in which we will test the State and local elements of this management plan.

Those State and local elements are the key -- Those are the on the ground part of it to simplify the Early Detection and Rapid Response effort. We basically broke these down to three major categories.

The early detection, and obviously the detection part, and that is the eyes and the ears on the ground, and the people who are going to spot this stuff.

And the second part of that is the identification and vouchering, and that is the making
sure that you know what you are looking at, and the third part is the action.

So if you simplify early detection and rapid response into those three categories, it seems pretty simple. Many of the people who are engaged in the early detection and rapid response task teams through NISA are also members of FICMNEW.

So a lot of those concepts are coming and moving back and forth, and we hope that they are implemented as soon as possible. So that is one of the things that we wanted to show you to focus on. The other part of this is the collaboration and communication with the States.

Again, realizing that these agencies within FICMNEW, that many of them are the folks down there in those communities at the local level, and they have an obligation to be good neighbors, and they want to be good neighbors, and they want to interact as close as they can with the State and local entities.

And so what we have done is tried to reach out. If you think about it from their perspective, they really don't care whether Item Number 26 in the National Basic Species Management Plan is implemented or not. They don't even understand that exists.
And in many ways they don't understand that NISA has designed this to be a collaborative effort and including them on the ground. So what we are trying to do is to reach between the lowest levels at the foundational agency-community level, and up to the Washington level, and certainly at the national headquarters here, and bridge those gaps.

One of the ways that we have done that is work closely with in the weeds arena, the North American Weed Management Association, WSSA; and the Weed Science Society of American, and other groups tied to that arena.

And to help bridge those gaps, and try to bring these people together to communicate, collaborate, encouragement the establishment of State organizations, collaborative efforts with local communities, counties, and States, and their Federal partners.

And in the case of the North American Weed Management Association, FICMNEW has now become a -- and I guess this is the third year, a major component of their national conference. So the next one coming up is going to be in Salt Lake City for those of you who wish to attend.

And it will be something that again helps
the Federal sector bridge the gap between the State and local sector by communicating and collaborating. That is all that I have right now. Most of the information you have, and in the interest of time, most of it can be acquired through those handouts. And anything else, you can contact us directly. And we meet monthly and we certainly welcome you to attend the meetings, and the upcoming National Invasive Weed Awareness Week activities has a special session on FICMNEW during that, from February 24th to February 28th, event session. So thanks very much.

MS. WILLIAMS: Mike, you have also been helping us planning with the field trip tomorrow, and I don't know if you wanted to just highlight a couple of things that will come up tomorrow. That would be great for just a minute or two.

MR. IELMINI: Sure. There is an opportunity to get out there to see some of the activities of the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service Patuxent Wildlife Refuge out in Laurel, Maryland.

And so for those of you who are going to attend that, I talked to the refuge manager this morning, and I understand that they will have some opportunities to see some of the activities that they
have got going fighting phragmites.

    And including some of the presentations by
the National Park Service's exotic plant management
teams, and some of the new technologies that they have
been able to implement in fighting phragmites.

    So it is one of those issues that stretch
across certainly in this part of the country many
different land management agencies, State and private
areas. So, they like to talk about some of the things
that they are doing.

    This time of the year isn't a really good
time of the year to show control activities with
weather conditions and such. But they do want to talk
about some of this and ask for your input, and some of
your expertise on some of the things that they are
trying, and some of the things that they may not havenoticed.

    So feel free to interact, and they will
let you have a chance to get inside and see the
National Visitors Center there, and maybe even browse
their bookship and some of their trinketry.

    So feel free to bring your checkbooks if
you are interested in that kind of thing, and get out
on the grounds and hopefully the weather is going to
be nice.
DR. STOCKER: All right. Sharon and Mike, thank you both. We appreciate it. Okay. We are not entering the members forum section, and with your permission the first thing we are going to bring up is Bill Dickerson's lunch time revisions.

And, Bill, if you can, the plan is for Bill to simply read the changes --

MR. DICKERSON: No, I am not going to do that. I have revised those plans.

DR. STOCKER: Good luck, but go ahead.

MR. DICKERSON: Yes. What Chris and I did at lunch is -- well, let me back up and say this. Thank you all for the comments that you made. I had about six people provide comments back to me. Chris and I went through those at lunch, and went over and added those to the documents.

Now what I have done is provided these revisions back to the people who made those suggestions. They have all agreed that we have met their concerns, except for Allegra, and she --

DR. STOCKER: And I have got to tell you that we have got about 30 seconds to get this done.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. It is ready to be done. So based on the fact that those people who made comments, their comments have been taken into
consideration and have their approval, and I suggest that we now have a document that has met everyone's approval, and we would like for the committee to approve it.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. There is a bit of trust here. The people that liked it before, it has now been changed, and they have to accept the fact that the changes were for the better.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. I will say this. The changes for 95 percent were editorial, and were periods, commas, and this sort of thing. There were also a few additional changes to emphasize things. We will send you a copy of the document by e-mail this week.

DR. STOCKER: How about tomorrow?

MR. DICKERSON: Well, I am on the road tomorrow, but as soon as Lori and I can get together and do it, and I have a revised copy, we will do that. But the changes that have been made were the ones that were recommended, and we have agreed that they are fine.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. Now I need to know is there anyone who has any problem with that? Kathy.

MS. METCALF: Randall, if we can get these things in the next couple of days, is there anyway
that we can just simply respond that way? I completely trust Bill, and everyone has made a comment that it was 95 percent editorial, and it is 5 percent potentially substantive ones.

DR. STOCKER: Well, if you have a question, let's get the answer. If she is wanting 48 hours to make comments and --

MR. DICKERSON: Well, let me do this. I have the copy right here. I will leave it with Lori. If any of you would like to see these, or anything else, I've got to go.

DR. STOCKER: Okay.

MR. DICKERSON: And so --

DR. STOCKER: Well, here is what we are going to do. Lori is going to get it, and Lori will type it, and we will send it out. You will have a chance to review it and get back, and the turnaround will be very, very quick. What is your drop dead on this?

MR. DICKERSON: Well, it really needs to be done by the end of the week.

DR. STOCKER: Well, that's easy. Today is only Tuesday.

MS. UPSTON: So the action item is?

DR. STOCKER: A version will be e-mailed
to everyone tomorrow, and then you will have until
Friday at noon to get any comments back to Bill. Is
that all right?

MR. DICKERSON: That's fine.

DR. STOCKER: Okay. Now we can move on.

Once Friday noon has gone by, send copies to me if you
have any problems and if you want a third party to
know that you had problems. But once Bill feels that
he doesn't have any problems, it will come to me for
my signature. All right. Ron.

MR. LUKENS: Just very quickly. Obviously
in the future we are going to do this differently, and
it is very difficult to respond to a document that is
responding to another document which you have not
read.

And so I am assuming that in the future
that we will be able to look at the source document to
be able to evaluate what it actually means.

MR. DICKERSON: That gets a little
complicated. I would say that the sub-task group, the
group that is working on the cross-cut budget, we will
provide the documents so it can respond. So that is
fairly easy. If you are not on that group, it gets
more complicated.

MS. WILLIAMS: I think what we can do is
the document that was given to the -- and I am just going to go out on a limb here, but the document that was given to the budget committee, which was almost half of ISAC, is a document that doesn't contain any numbers.

I don't think that it violates any OMB rules, and we will -- my problem is going to be identifying that exact document, because we have now revised -- we have gone through many revisions, but assuming that I can do that, I will provide it as an attachment, and obviously it was a draft that has now changed. But that was a document that the committee was reacting to.

MR. DICKERSON: Lori, Marlene, my secretary, has a copy of the document that you provided to me. So if you need that, then you can request it from her.

DR. STOCKER: And your point is well taken. We all understand that we are operating magnanimously in short time periods and that we will always do everything the future to avoid this. Several of these crept in on this go around. All right. Nelroy.

DR. JACKSON: I would just like to emphasize that we agreed to this procedure in
Yellowstone, because we knew that it was a position of trust, and time for the 14 budget people. We also met -- and in Bill's defense, we didn't meet and say this is not how we would like to operate in the future.

And we have been promised that we would have more time to go through a more deliberative process according to our own operating guidelines.

DR. STOCKER: We now are at the members forum section. So you now have an opportunity to use this in about any way that you want to. You can summarize impressions from the meeting, and you can bring up things that you thought were going to come up and didn't, and pause, an think of something constructive that you want to add to today's discussion. And take advantage of the opportunity.

Allegra.

MS. CANGELOSI: Okay. Since I am still remembering things that I should have brought up with the NISA presentation, I have a further question there, but first I want to say that this was a great meeting.

We got a lot done and we keep learning as we go along about ways to make it easier for everyone to respond in a substantive way. But it is definitely great. Thanks to the steering group for all their
extra hours to make that happen.

On the NISA thing, the time line is pretty sensitive, and I don't know that we nailed down exactly what the ISAC committee's role might be, vis-a-vis the NISA, and when. So could we do that?

Because again, January 3rd is when it gets reintroduced, and so one window of opportunity is prior to January 3rd, and then after that it gets messier, because then it is referred to committees, and it less of a focal point to direct comments to.

Also, FYI, be aware that the legislation was circulated in draft to the committee a couple of times before it was introduced, and at this point major structural changes become much more difficult.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. I think I don't want to speak for all of the different departments of the council, but I think that there is going to be two things that are going on.

I think that the departments are going to have some more detailed comments that they are going to come up with on their own. They said that in their testimony. And I think we have provided copies of some of the testimony in your packets, and you can go over that.

So the detailed structural comments that
the departments want to make that the council be coordinating to the extent that we are asked to. I think the other thing is that my initial plan was to make sure that all of the different implementation teams that were affected by this legislation have specific language in that legislation.

And that they be aware of that as they develop their procedures. I think it is up to the implementation teams to figure out how to respond to this knowing the deadlines.

One of the things that -- and so I don't know that -- I wouldn't want to make a decision for all the different teams on how they were going to deal with this. But I just think that we all have to be aware of it, and setting our time schedules accordingly.

MS. CANGELOSI: A quick follow-up then. Relative to the ISAC itself, is there some practicality perhaps to a potential letter to the secretaries that comprise the council regarding the urgency of their giving attention to this bill, and supporting it to the extent possible?

DR. STOCKER: Allegra just asked you a question.

DR. JACKSON: Go ahead, Marshall.
MR. MEYERS: Support it in one fashion? I am not sure what you mean by that.

MS. CANGELOSI: Well, I think that one way we could lose this battle is if the agencies take a position against reauthorization for one reason or another, and that the administration might do that.

So if the ISAC feels that legislation defining deadlines and a structure along the lines of what was introduced is something that the agency should aggressively pursue and partner with, then that is definitely something that we might want to let them know.

The details of the legislation I think are more the province of the task teams to comment on, but the desire to get it enacted within the first few months of the next Congress in time to affect the appropriations process is another higher order thing, and the ISAC may want to take a position on that.


MR. MEYERS: Again, I hear one thing, that the task teams may take positions, and ISAC may take positions. Any positions that we take would be passing comments on to only NIST, correct?

MS. CANGELOSI: That's correct. On the one hand, it is a question of should there be a
reauthorization, and should it be within the time
frame that we currently have momentum for within
Congress.

Can we urge the agencies to take this
seriously and give it a lot of attention, and work
with Congress constructively to make it happen.
That's the first order. The second order is what are
the details of the comments that ISAC might like to
give to the agencies that they might consider as they
give comments back to Congress on the details.

DR. JACKSON: Allegra, are we skating on
thin ice here? Is this a FACA issue again? Is it
better for us to work from now on as individuals on
this? I defer to Lori's comment. I am not sure.
Lori.

MS. WILLIAMS: I think that the
clarification was that this is not ISAC taking a
position on this legislation or any of the details.
It could only be recommendations back to NISC. And I
guess that is one approach.

The other approach is just to move forward
on the work that we set out before us, especially in
terms of guidelines on issues that relate to what is
going to be dealt with in this legislation without
only responding to -- I mean, I think it is great to
respond to this legislation, but there is a lot of
other things on the table, too. So that is another
approach.

DR. JACKSON: Allegra.

MS. CANGELOSI: Yes, I am certainly not
saying that we should only do that and stop everything
else. But I am asking can we do that, and can we as
the ISAC make a recommendation along the lines of
those letters that we have looked at today in this
session to the agencies that comprise the Invasive
Species Council, and that they should take this
opportunity seriously, and they should work with
Members of Congress to get a legislation enacted in a
timely fashion.

DR. JACKSON: I guess my reaction is there
any indication that they are not taking it seriously?

MS. CANGELOSI: Yes, among certain
agencies.

DR. JACKSON: Kathy.

MS. METCALF: Yes. Yes. Yes, there is.

There is a split in the administration as to whether
or not this whole idea ought to be reauthorized at
all, and relative to whether or not we ought to go and
push for a timely reauthorization, I think that is a
broad enough general question that ISAC may very well
be able to respond to NISC, and perhaps weigh in and encounter some of the agencies that to this day, and in fact in front of Congress, said they really don’t need to be reauthorized or be reauthorizing this.

When we get to the details of the bill, I think we are going to have problems. I know that I would have some problems endorsing the bill, and with all of the specificity that is in it.

But the general concept of whether or not we need to reauthorize, I would hope that ISAC could send a message to NISC.

DR. JACKSON: Okay. Would Allegra or Kathy be willing to draft a letter and circulate it around ISAC, and let’s use our procedure, our in-between meeting procedure to agree or disagree in writing a letter and moving it forward?

MS. METCALF: I will try and draft it and give it to Allegra, and then I am not sure what the procedure is at this point, but I guess to get it to Lori and get it out to the group.

DR. JACKSON: Well, I think from our operating guidelines that we would have to have approval by ISAC. I mean, it would be a positive response from every member would constitute an agreement for a letter to go forward from ISAC.
MS. METCALF: Endorsing the general concept of reauthorization, but not necessarily specifics of the bill as introduced.

DR. JACKSON: Precisely. Is that an agreement from everybody? Thumbs up?

(Vote taken.)

DR. JACKSON: Okay. The next comment.

Michael.

MR. BUCK: I am hearing that it is an inevitability that there will be legislation introduced that puts the National Evasive Species Council in statute. We heard about it, and said is a draft going around, and have you seen it.

So I am just curious. Is there any dialogue on that, and are we in support or not? Is that kind of inevitable that that kind of legislation is going to go forward in some form or fashion?

DR. JACKSON: Lori.

MS. WILLIAMS: I think there is this plan, and nothing is inevitable in Congress, but I think Congressman Ehlers has announced his plans to introduce that legislation on the House side. I don't know of a companion bill yet on the Senate side.

And I don't know, but it certainly is not on the hundred day time frame necessarily that the
other bill is on. But it is a very positive sign for
the introduction of a bill, and Congressman Ehlers has
announced that he is going to do that.

MR. BUCK: I'm just curious if people
think that is a good idea or a bad idea, or the
upside, or the downside?

DR. JACKSON: Good question.

MR. BUCK: It is obvious that it is going
to be in front of us.

DR. JACKSON: Comments from members? Ron.

MR. LUKENS: Well, we have never discussed
it, although I have heard a number of people in
several instances say that it is an issue that seems
to be potentially holding us or slowing us down.

The fact that Executive Orders perhaps
don't -- and especially in an administration that
didn't originate the Executive Order probably doesn't
carry as much weight as legislation perhaps does, and
that maybe it would help.

But we have never discussed it, and that
is probably something that we should do.

DR. JACKSON: Are you proposing that we
put that down as an agenda item for March?

MR. LUKENS: I will propose that if that
seems appropriate to everyone else.
DR. JACKSON: Well, whether it is appropriate or not, ISAC can still discuss it. We can list all these suggested agenda items, and they will go through the steering group anyway. Gary.

DR. BEIL: I was curious. Earlier in the afternoon, Lori passed around a paper to sign up for folks that are interested in the International Committee, and I was wondering if that made it back to you, Lori.

MS. UPSTON: I have it.

DR. JACKSON: Okay. Fine. Barbara is the keeper of the list.

MRS. COOKSLEY: Just to make sure that it didn't get lost in the shuffle of paper and I was going to pass it on to Lori. It is going to make its way into the brief -- the quick minutes. Did somebody not get a chance to see it who wanted it?

DR. JACKSON: Any other comments? Yes, Ron.

MR. LUKENS: I assume from time to time that we are going to continue to have issues that pop up with an urgent deadline that we have not had time to consider perhaps as well as we would have liked to.

Two of them came up this time, and I am sensitive to the fact that issues do come up in an
urgent fashion, and need to be dealt with. Have we talked about how we can handle urgent time bound issues that may come up at or just before a meeting, such that maybe we all have a little bit better of comfort in dealing with some of this stuff?

DR. JACKSON: Ron, I think that is in our guidelines, operating guidelines. We try to avoid impromptu issues, and I think we should just use the procedures that we have agreed to.

And that is that everybody needs to have notice, and I think that we have made some -- we have got an agenda out earlier, and we have gotten the notebook out earlier, and we are making progress in those kinds of things.

And similarly for new subjects, I think if they come up late, we still have to go through our procedures, and not just one or two people, but it unilaterally has to go through the consensus process.

Lori.

MS. WILLIAMS: I wanted to make one comment. We didn't want to take a lot of time with this, but a number of people that were on the conference call that we had with the budget committee, some of these so-called impromptu issues have come up on the budget issues because of the time frame and the
difficulties of getting budget input from ISAC because of the contingencies of the budget process.

We talked about a couple of things on how to make that process work better. If we are always -- if you are always only reacting to drafts that come out of the cross-cut, I think we are always going to run into some of these problems.

But one way to look at it is once we have done one cross-cut and we can give people some notice on what general areas the direction the council is taking, is one idea, and that Bill and the rest of the people on the conference committee discussed is getting the budget committee or ISAC input on what should be in a cross-cut in those particular areas without you waiting to react to a draft.

So, one, we have got early input just in broad terms on what ISAC is interested in, in terms of the cross-cut, and then what we would do is share more, rather than specific drafts in all cases if there is a change anywhere, and share earlier more conceptual frameworks of what that cross-cut is going to look like.

And that way we would not have so many of these 24 and 48 hour time frames, and that things could at least operate along the guidance that is set
out in the transition papers.

   So that is kind of what we talked about
for the budget committee on those particular issues,
and I think that's where some of the problems have
arisen at this meeting.

   DR. JACKSON: Ann.

   MS. BARTUSKA: Just first a comment on
Ron's point. We in the conservancy are pretty
committed to authorizing NISC as an entity, and have
testified on that. So we will add that to our
comments in March. But I also have another comment on
the staffing.

   We have talked a lot about the importance
for doing that as quickly as we can, and while off-
line I asked Lori a question about the continuing
resolution, and I don't think it came up in this
discussion.

   We can push for this all we want, but
under a CR, they may not be able to do any hiring
until there is a budget. And the last story is that
we are talking about a budget in June. So no matter
what we say, they may not be able to hire a position.

   And I would love to hear feedback back on
that, but we may want to think about and ask Lori to
think about alternatives to staffing is that is
actually the case.

MS. WILLIAMS: I am not sure of the situation, but I think for existing -- well, what we do have is that we are operating under a Continuing Resolution. My understanding, and please correct me if I am wrong, is that we continue to operate with the same level of funding.

So if the staffing plan is approved, because all of this has now been grouped together, I should be able to fill existing vacancies. What I wouldn't be able to do is fill any new positions that were only in the '03 budget, and that would be unfortunately communications persons.

So I am still hoping, no matter what the budget scenario is, to be able to fill vacancies. I am always looking in terms of -- and I think that we have heard from a number of Presidential Management Interns, and detailees, that we really do look to the departments and agencies to help us provide expertise on a temporary basis to the council, and I think there is a lot of advantage to that.

So I am always looking for those opportunities and should any of you know of additional ones. I am always trying to hit up the agencies once again for help on these projects, but
some of them are very short-staffed right now, too.

DR. JACKSON: Lori, for a point of clarification. The Assistant Director and the biologists are already funded, right, or are authorized, but it is the communications person and the secretaries that would be additional? Is that clear to everybody? Kathy.

MS. METCALF: I just wanted to bring one thing up. I know the guidelines that we set up for short term turnarounds, and I also understand that there is some short deadlines that are no fault of our own.

I mean, we just don't have control over the United States Government in the way they decide to time things. And before Ann said what she did, I was going to volunteer the fact that I could type, but then I would be afraid that Lori would think that I am volunteering to joint her staff.

And actually what I was volunteering for is that any group like this I think needs the capability -- and I will be glad to volunteer for it, as I think Linda Sheehan and I did it at one of their earlier meetings.

But if we can get a laptop, and we can have a working draft coming into a meeting of a
document, and some revisions need to be made, editorial or otherwise.

If we have strikeout and underline capability, I would be happy to volunteer to serve in that administrative function so that the minute that we take a break, we can take the recommended changes into that document, and before people get back from break, as long as we have got copying capabilities, it can be in front of everybody.

So we have got that, and I think that a group like this needs to be able to do that if the group deems it necessary.

DR. JACKSON: Thank you. I think what we need to do is to have a portable printer next time. I think we have lots of laptops. Any more comments from members? If not, we will move into the public comment period.

DR. STOCKER: This is an opportunity for the public to make a comment. You should have signed up if you wanted to make a comment. There is a few minutes if you didn't and choose to. We do have one person, and not a stranger to most of us.

Jamie Reaser would like to come and tell us what she really thinks of what we have been doing the last few years. God help us. And that may be a
bit of an assumption for new members. Was Jamie here at your first meeting? So you know who she is. She was the International Director.

MS. REASER: Worse yet, I had to sit next to Richard Orr to do this. Thank you all. I am Jamie Reaser, and I am now the Executive Director of the Global Invasive Species Program, known as GISP, and I bring you regards and regrets from your ISAC colleague, Jeff Waage, who is the Chair of GISP, and who has just returned today from reviewing a project in Pakistan.

I would like to take this opportunity to update you on some of GISP's activities just very briefly, as well as to acknowledge the many supporters and partners that GISP has had in 2002 through U.S. based organizations and U.S. agencies.

GISP is now in the process of significant growth and transition as we prepare to better meet the needs of our various stakeholders, particularly developing countries and international conventions.

In September of this year, we opened a U.S. office of the GISP Secretariat at the Smithsonian Institution's Natural History Museum here in Washington, D.C.

This office is primarily charged with
overseeing projects that were initiated in 2001 and in 2002 to fundraise for project and operational costs, and to build partnerships with U.S. based agencies and institutions.

There are currently four staff members in the U.S. office. In addition to myself, Alexis Gutierrez, who many of you know, is our project manager, and we are very pleased to have her with us.

Dr. Laura Meyerson, who many of you also know, is a detailee to us from EPA. She is our working group coordinator for evaluation and assessment; and with me this afternoon is Kit Batten, who is a policy intern from UC Davis, who is helping us lead a project on dam removal as a pathway for invasion.

With funding from the World Bank, we are in the process of opening our primary secretariat office at Kirttenbosch Botanical Garden in Capetown, South Africa. Five staff members will be hired, and it will be advertising those positions within the next month for a chief executive program manager, and program coordinator, communications officer, and two administrative posts, and if anybody is interested in moving to South Africa, let me know.

We greatly appreciate the support that we
received this year from the various U.S. agencies and organizations. Project support has come from the U.S. Department of State, from the U.S. Department of Interior, the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service on behalf of the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force, the Office of Insular Affairs, and USGS.

We have also received project support from USAID, from The Nature Conservancy, from the Bishop Museum, from the Pacific Science Association, and from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

These funds have enabled us, among many other things, in 2002 to carry out 3 of 5 regional workshops for policy makers on invasive species, as well as a workshop on the biological and socioeconomic impacts of invasive species on island ecosystems.

Financial support from the Secretariat this year has come from the Nature Conservancy, and from USGS, and EPA as I mentioned earlier has detailed Laura Meyerson to us as a AAAS Fellow full-time, and we are very appreciative for that as well.

We have additional pledges for support by the end of the year from the Environmental Protection Agency to support our work on an inland waters assessment, and we also have pledges of support from
the Department of Transportation to support the Secretariat.

To all of you representing these organizations, our sincere thanks, and gratitude, and our intent to carry on those partnerships. I would also like to express my thanks in particular to Michael Buck and Lu Eldredge for the leadership that you provided at our two regional workshops in Hawaii this past fall.

And GISP wishes to continue and even expand upon our partnerships with U.S. agencies and organizations, and I would like to pledge our support to NISC, and ISAC, and FICMNEW, and ANSTF for any international activities in which you might need our assistance in the near future.

Anyone who wants to reach us at the U.S. office, I am about to give you the phone number, and so pick up your pens. Our main line is (202) 633-9800, and you can also reach us on 633-9804. No fax number yet.

You can use my e-mail account at the moment, and we are in the process of getting our Smithsonian account set up, and my e-mail account is sprgpeeper@aol.com. Thank you all.

DR. STOCKER: Thank you, Jamie. I would
say Jamie has risen to the level of executive director very naturally. She stole all our previous staff and she promised that I wouldn't take more than a minute-and-a-half to discuss all of that. Thank you and good to see you again.

Is there anyone else from the public that would like to make a comment of any kind? Seeing no movement in that direction, we will now move to the final session, which is titled, "About Future ISAC Meetings."

We have covered the March 4th and 5th meeting, and it has not changed, and we reviewed meeting dates, and we added a possible October 2004 date that we will talk about more in the future.

Now if there are agenda items, Barbara has been keeping a very nice list of the things that came to her attention, and if there are agenda items that either didn't make that list and you think they should have, or additional agenda items that we should at least consider for the next meeting, remembering that you will have between now and certainly halfway to the next meeting to make other suggestions about agenda items, this is certainly not your last opportunity.

Chip.

MR. BRIGHT: It save me an e-mail to
Nelroy. We have Susan from Ag who is doing the new website, and we thought it would be wonderful if maybe she could come and take us through the new website. Okay. She would love to have our input as to what we would like to see on that. And that is Susan McCarthy.

MS. UPSTON: Susan McCarthy, demo, on website? Is that it?

MR. BRIGHT: Yes.

DR. STOCKER: I am going to rephrase that right now. I am going to suggest that what we would like to have her talk to us about are things that could be on the website.

MR. BRIGHT: Yes.

DR. STOCKER: And maybe problems that she is having. The demo you would have taken care of yourselves, because you would have poured over it many times before you come to that meeting.

MR. BRIGHT: Absolutely.

DR. STOCKER: Because if I have to sit through one more website --

MS. UPSTON: I take that to be a no?

DR. STOCKER: No, that is an excellent topic.

DR. JACKSON: I mean, no on a demo, but a
yes on the discussion of the website?

    DR. STOCKER:  Sure. Other items? Ship
was about to ask me to come look at his website. We
will have Barbara go through everything that she has
got.

    MRS. COOKSLEY:  Well, it is really Ann.

    DR. STOCKER:  It is about time for Ann to
do her stunning tap dancing rendition of everything
that happened at this meeting, and probably what is
going to happen at the next.

    DR. JACKSON:  Starring Vanna White.

    DR. STOCKER:  And to the background music
of The Highlighters.

    MS. BARTUSKA:  Okay. Starting at the top,
and this is one that we do need to have an action on.
I missed this and so I didn't get all of the details.
It is a recommendation that we add a general counsel
to keep ISAC on focus, and I am assuming that means at
this meeting, but it wasn't clear to me from the
notes. So who is going to do that?

    DR. JACKSON:  Jim Butler and Jim Tate.

    MS. BARTUSKA:  They are going to make the
request. Okay. And that will be by the next meeting
that we will have a contact? Okay. Then the next
item was having each department walk through the
regulatory process, and again I am not really clear. I was coming in at the middle of that, and so I don't know what the details are.

DR. JACKSON: And that was in relation to potential conflict resolution within the departments.

MS. BARTUSKA: So is this now an action?

DR. JACKSON: That is an action again for Lori and all the departments.

DR. STOCKER: And I can't remember who made the suggestion, but at least part of it was phrased that you all would probably want to sit here nailed to your seats and hear every agency discuss all their regulatory powers.

I know that is written down, and I know that is summarized, and so my next recommendation is let's provide that as background information, and if there is an agenda item that we need to address, and focused on a specific question, let's hear it right now.

DR. JACKSON: No, no, I think this was an action item for the Department and the agencies.

MS. BARTUSKA: So we will redo this and have each co-chair department will develop a list of their regulatory -- no.

MS. WILLIAMS: That's in the plan.
MS. BARTUSKA: Let's reserve this one.

DR. STOCKER: We are going to put a star -- not a star. That's the wrong -- we are going to put a big ugly blob next to this one, and we will go back and talk to Jim Butler if we need to, and find out and get a little clarification.

MS. BARTUSKA: Good.

DR. STOCKER: He and I chatted about it briefly afterwards, and I just think that he thought that we didn't have any of that background and needed it. It is in written form, and it is available. Raise your hand right now and we will send you an extra copy.

Otherwise, it is Appendix 2 apparently in the back of your National Management Plan.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. The next item was that we would take a look at the focus of the management plan in a fresh way, and to give ourselves sort of a mid-course correction.

And that does tie to the agenda item, which is going through the update -- well, I can't see it now, but we had an item in here about the revision of the management plan. So we will take a look at that in time for the March meeting.

ISAC requests enforcement info from
agencies, and we have now put that on the agenda for March, and we will have an update on the enforcement regulations from the different departments.

DR. CAMPBELL: Actions not enforcement.

MR. BRIGHT: Enforcement actions.

DR. CAMPBELL: Actions and penalties.

MS. BARTUSKA: Enforcement actions, and that is on the March agenda. Violations and penalties.

MRS. COOKSLEY: Jim Butler said he would get it for the Department of Agriculture, I think.

MS. BARTUSKA: The three departmental liaisons will pull that together? Is that what I am hearing?

MRS. COOKSLEY: The staff will make it happen.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. All right. The other thing that we talked about was difficult communications materials. One thing that we will get is the power point on NISC and ISAC, and a power point presentation that will be distributed to all of us, as well as updates on the -- I think the management plan, I think we were just talking about --

MS. UPSTON: What was suggested there as I recall was that ISAC members should be a presence at
the regional panels, for instance, and more outreach, and that you should have the slides, and information about ISAC, and information about NISC, and the management plan information that you can hand out, provide, or have in slide form, and that is an action that people were asking for.

MS. BARTUSKA: I think we were going to also get extra copies as needed from Chris, as people requested them to you. Okay. We still have here this idea of a State survey, and the only action that carried forward was that Allegra's group would be willing to help support that.

We never took that any further. At this point, I think the offer is on the table, but we don't really have an action item in terms of an entire packet of a State survey. Is that correct?

MS. CANGELOSI: The only other addition is that David Lodge indicated that they have not been actively pulling that information together already.

MS. BARTUSKA: So is there somebody who will take responsibility to pull forward what we currently have?

MS. BECH: Another comment. Bill Dickerson also said that the National Plant Board has a lot of information, and so I think one of his
discussions was that there is maybe pieces of that out there, and what you need to do is to bring that together.

MS. BARTUSKA: Right. So who is going to do that?

MS. CANGELOSI: I don't know, because those other pieces aren't on the list right now.

MS. BARTUSKA: We have no one really assigned to do that, unless that is what you were offering to do, Allegra.

MS. CANGELOSI: What -- I don't know whether this is more appropriately NISC staff taking that leadership role of pulling together what is out there and helping this group decide what --

MS. BARTUSKA: I believe the intent of the survey suggestion, and I forgot who made it, was --

MS. CANGELOSI: Bill.

MS. BARTUSKA: Well, he is not here.

DR. STOCKER: Let's let Bill anyway.

MR. BUCK: I think that the issue was that people need to coordinate better with the States, and someone needs to do surveys, and people offered things. I get a survey a week, and so let's not do any more surveys.

MR. LUKENS: The survey actually was
specific to what is listed in each State, on the State lists for prohibition, or their clean lists, or whatever is listed. That was one part of the discussion, I believe, at least.

MS. BARTUSKA: I am going to make a suggestion that this is sufficiently unformed and all over the place, and there is a lot of volunteers, but nobody really is willing at this point to say I am going to do it all.

Let's just table this one, and if there is a -- and tell Bill that we are tabling it, and if there is a burning desire to move it forward, that we actually develop something specific.

MR. DIPPEL: I would be glad to have my bunch check into it and see what is available out there and report on it at the next meeting on the different lists that are available, because I think that we have looked into a bunch of those already.

MS. BARTUSKA: All right. So Donnie is going to look into the list, and then could you contact David and see what he has done, and then we have the two pieces come together for March.

MR. DIPPEL: Sure. I will talk to David and Bill both.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. Key messages for
testimony, and things like Earning Warning System. We had some discussion about that. Is that something that the staff is going to be willing to do? We didn't really say who had that responsibility. Yes, Dean.

MR. WILKINSON: I think it was something that was ISAC generated, and not staff generated, in terms of things that anybody from ISAC who might be going to testify would say, okay. We have determined, for instance, in some fashion that early detection and rapid response is a priority or something like that. I do not see that as being a staff function.

MS. WILLIAMS: I think one thing that if we were going to provide a power point, and we are going to be redoing some of our power points about NISC and ISAC, and I think a good, short to the point, power point is going to have some of those key messages.

So maybe we should just get that out and see if that addresses the need if there is further need for developing more messages.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. And I have one other suggestion, and I will at least help with ours, that each task team provide a couple related to the work that they are doing so that we have a list of things
that reflect team efforts in very clear, short, 10 words or less?

DR. CAMPBELL: My memory is that this was proposed as something that the ISAC would convey to the NISC in order to buttress budget and other priority setting in the Departments themselves, and maybe up on the Hill to say early detection and rapid response is a high priority, and do we all think so.

So that is separate from power point presentations, and it is definitely an ISAC initiative, and not a staff initiative.

MS. BARTUSKA: So are we okay with this step right now, where the task team will do a first cut based on what they are working on? No?

DR. CAMPBELL: I thought it was going to be just a general statement that early detection and rapid response is an extremely high priority and should receive the funding and other backup by the agencies and the Congress that that word implies.

That's not to say that I don't think it is a good idea for the task teams. I thought that your suggestion was that each task team provide to the council staff one or two brief slide-worthy statements about their work for inclusion in any power point presentation.
MS. BARTUSKA: No, no, no, no. I was just thinking that we need to start saying what we were talking about in a way that we can all share and use.

DR. CAMPBELL: That's fine, but I don't think it addresses that bullet.

MS. UPSTON: Does anyone remember who --

MS. BARTUSKA: Me.

MS. UPSTON: What do you mean --

MS. BARTUSKA: Well, what I just said, that we are all testifying that we are doing different things, and it seems like it would be very nice if we all shared the share statements, so that when any of us went up somewhere that we had that accessible.

We didn't have to use it, nor do we use it to represent ISAC. But we have at least a common language or common statements that we all feel pretty good about based on our deliberations.

DR. JACKSON: Ann, can we add communications and outreach tasking to put that together, and combine it with your suggestion that each task team provide one or two bullets as to what they are doing?

MR. O'NEILL: Is that the same as what Ann was asking for, or is that the -- are we talking slides for the power point, or are we --
DR. JACKSON: No, a list of 10, maybe 10
items that are messages that are the most important
things in ISAC's mind as we go and talk to different
people, and meetings and what not, that these are
uppermost in their minds.

MS. BARTUSKA: Is that a yes?

DR. JACKSON: That is a yes.

MS. BARTUSKA: Excellent. Okay. The next
one is looking for additional State reviewers of early
detection and rapid response guidelines, as well as
looking for agency contact points on that for the
early detection, rapid response.

MR. LUKENS: I will be glad to provide
that to our Gulf Regional Panel and get responses back
from them, and it is populated with a number of State
agency people if that would be helpful. Is that what
you were looking for, or what we were looking for?

MS. BARTUSKA: And I think if there is
anyone else who feels like they have some ideas about
who might be able to look at those guidelines, they
should provide them to Barbara.

And then the other was the agency contact
points, and requesting that -- I can't remember now
what the language was, but that we strongly encourage
that the different agencies that have involvement in
early detection and rapid response be part of the team.

Communication staff position, and letter of support from the task team. Do you guys have that covered? Okay. ISAC is coming over to this list, ISAC ideas for a logo. And we don't have anybody assigned to that. Were there going to be some volunteers?

MR. WILKINSON: I indicated that if anybody wanted to forward ideas to me that we can play with them.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. To Dean as appropriate or as interested.

DR. JACKSON: Diane and I were interested in working with Dean.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. A review of the early detection and rapid response guidelines. We are to provide any comment by February of '03, in preparation for the March meeting. And that would again go into Barb or Chris individually reviewing those.

ISAC communicating via the research task team input to the CSREES national research initiative. We don't really have any volunteer for this. I think we have just a research team leader. George.
DR. BECK: Would you repeat that again?

MS. BARTUSKA: That we would like to have input to the NRI stakeholder process.

DR. BECK: I think it would go to NSF, too, wouldn't it?

MS. BARTUSKA: Yes, that would be good. So is that something that the research team will take on?

DR. BECK: Sure.


MS. UPSTON: This is Randall's.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay.

MS. UPSTON: He is going to draft it, and e-mail it, and ask for comments, right, Randall?

DR. STOCKER: Yes.

MS. BARTUSKA: Very good. Okay. Providing input on '05 priorities. I can't remember why we referenced the GAO report, but that is something that we need to be prepared for, and we know that we will get it, and we should be prepared from Scott's request to provide rapid feedback, and that would be through budget. So, Bill, budget team.

Okay. Over here, Kathy is going to draft
a letter to NISA supporting NISA reauthorization, and it will be e-mail circulated to ISAC for comment and approval. Do we have a due date on that?

MS. METCALF: I will have it to Randall by the 21st.


MS. CANGELOSI: Kathy, are you still planning to do that in coordination with me, or are you just --

MS. METCALF: Well, yes. That's right. My apologies. I will have something due by Thursday, and maybe to you early next week.

MS. BARTUSKA: The next item is that we will have the early detection and rapid response, and Lori is looking for feedback on the items that were in the notebook that we got, and we have talked about the early detection and rapid response guidelines.

We have not really talked about the NEPA appendices in detail and that still is an opportunity for us both in the outline, as well as in the appendices. So feedback to Lori. Any particular date, Lori?

MS. WILLIAMS: I think early detection and rapid response, that you are going to put the writing team together pretty quickly. So that would probably
be within the next couple of weeks for both of those would be best, and NEPA by the end of the calendar year.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. GAO report. Ann is willing to gather information from people and put together a letter to Lori on behalf of ISAC. Time line is -- from Ann. What was I doing about that? Oh, there is an e-mail from me with some items. That's right.

I am going to give you some elements to fill in. Okay. By December 2nd, feedback from -- and you should be sending me things in the course of that time. We will do a quick turnaround, by December 4th, because it has to be to Lori by December 6th to be in the process.

So if you have any thoughts on the GAO report and the recommendations, start pulling them together now and we will fast crank that out. And we are talking about a 2 to 3 page letter at most. So it is not really, really complex. Just hitting the high points.

MR. DIONIGI: Just one thing, too, that I think that we will end up having to do via the e-mail, and it is just something that we never got to at this meeting. But you folks need to approve your minutes
from the Yellowstone meeting.

MS. UPSTON: We did it while you were gone.


MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. NISA reauthorization, and Lori will send elements of that to the various task teams for comment. And then last is a version of the budget summary will be mailed out November 20th, and responses by November 22nd at noon. Those are the last two conversations that we had.

So we have a few things to do, and I am not even going through what you all agreed to within the task teams. These are just the general ones. That's it.

DR. STOCKER: Allegra.

MS. CANGELOSI: Just back on the conflict resolution thing. I think we did decide. Several people suggested that it would be useful to have a time in the agenda of each meeting to raise the instances in which there was a conflict between agency activities and the Executive Order, or between agencies, or within bureaus within an agency. And we are to indicate the potential impact and some recommendations.
MS. UPSTON: It didn't get as carefully spelled out. That was Bill's suggestion. It is to provide a list of issues that we are aware of for NISC. What he said was that it didn't have to just be disputes, but it was there, and I was going to flush that out. It is on the agenda.

MS. CANGELOSI: Thank you.

MS. UPSTON: Thank you.

DR. JACKSON: I would recommend that that be done before the meeting.

MS. UPSTON: As part of the next steps, I will take all of the task teams flip charts, the action flip charts, and I will have them to Lori by Friday. So you will have at least all of this as fast as Lori and Ann can approve it, and that is part of the guidelines and get it out to you.

So what is going to be on the agenda for March, you will have that pretty quickly, or at least what has to be considered. It doesn't all have to land on it.

DR. STOCKER: Faith.

DR. CAMPBELL: Thank you. I at least came or was distressed that we came to so little resolution on the dispute resolution discussion, and I was under the understanding that what we were trying to do by
creating a process was to get away from ad hoc
mentions in the full ISAC forum of conflicts that are
already fairly far along.

They are usually fairly far along by the
time that we hear about them. So I hope that the
council staff will continue to work with the agencies
on developing a real process for trying to resolve
these things much earlier, and in a much more
harmonious way.

And maybe our role in that might be to
suggest subject matter areas where such conflicts are
most likely to arise. So it would kind of the early
warning that I mentioned and warn people about.

DR. STOKER: I am going to let the sense
of what you just said was aimed at an agenda item,
because that is what we are talking about. So briefly
you want to make sure that this isn't gone away, and
you can talk to the staff at length.

But as an ISAC issue, is it on one of our
items or not? I thought it was.

DR. CAMPBELL: It is on there as a
continuation of what we have been doing, which is
coming into meetings and saying that I have got a
problem, and I am trying to move it to a more
productive system.
DR. STOCKER: Great. Our job will be to see what that next step is, and to pose the question for the next meeting so that we don't just wind up discussing it again.

We have learned many things in this meeting, and one of the things that we have learned is that we are now -- that we are learning. We are at the point where we can see a question, and try to come to an answer to it during a meeting, and there discussion has had its role, and we are beyond that in some areas.

DR. JACKSON: Faith, over lunch we had a discussion, and I am going to try to see if I can reword this whole issue away from conflict to harmonization of procedures or something, and just use a completely different term and streamline it.

DR. CAMPBELL: I think the initial question, and it might have been on the agenda, or maybe it was that we asked for input on, and it was not necessarily individual disputes that we should address. But the types of disputes and those types of things.

If we as we developed this process can continue to get ISAC input on it, then that is fine, but I kind of agree with Faith on that. We don't
necessarily want each dispute to be raised by ISAC. But if there are issues that come up, of course this is a good forum to bring them up in.

DR. STOCKER: Mike and then Ann, and you are going to get about 20 seconds a piece, because we are running out of time.

MR. BUCK: I just wanted to thank Lori and all the staff for all the hard work that they did to put this on. And, Kelsey, I am very impressed with her power of snapping her fingers. I think we need to use that a little bit more. I think it is very effective.

DR. STOCKER: You will have your chance to jump. Trust me. Ann.

MS. BARTUSKA: Okay. I have to apologize. I have 22 pages of notes, and Barbara and I went through and tried to match up all of the actions that we thought that we had, and we did miss one, because I wrote something on top of it.

And that is an action item. What are ISAC's expectations regarding resolving disputes and harmonization, and how should, and when should NISC get involved. So we will dutifully add that to our action item, and we do need a leader to take on that, and I think Nelroy said that he was. So we are okay.
DR. STOCKER: Okay. We have plenty of agenda items to sort through. It is a nice card, Nelroy, and I'm glad that you got one. Do you have to?

DR. JACKSON: Yes.

DR. STOCKER: If it will help your digestive process.

DR. JACKSON: Is everybody in the steering group going to be here tomorrow? No? Could you see me before you leave then.

DR. STOCKER: He sees you right now, Nelroy. That wasn't hard. I want to take the opportunity for just a minute or two and state what I think we may have learned from this particular meeting.

We learned a lot in Yellowstone, and we have learned a lot in every meeting, but in this meeting I think we learned that just opening the door and saying tell this group something isn't the most effective way for us to move ourselves to the next level.

And my phrase for that is we are beyond the narrative. We have got to learn to incorporate that information on our own, because as a group it doesn't push us to make decisions and to edge each
other up to that next level, whatever it is.

So one of my goals is going to be for the
next meeting to pose these as questions. Group, here
is the question in front of you that you are going to
be asked, and the answer will be something -- yes, no,
or tabled.

But to try to put a little sharper edge on
what that specific is, and we have gotten a lot of
good narrative in. There is nothing wrong with that
information. It is important.

But we are going to have to do some of
this on our own. How many people read the GAO report
all the way through? Raise your hand.

(A show of hands.)

DR. STOCKER: I know, and I know how touch
our schedules are. My next goal that I have written
down is that before the next meeting, and when that
agenda comes out, we are going to highlight what we
think is critical for you to have gone through.

And if that means a section of the report,
then I will take it upon myself to try to identify
what that section is, and try to narrow that down to
the smallest amount possible.

But as individuals, we have got to take
some homework assignments and get those done ahead of
time. The third thing I would like to say is you don't know how important it has been for these guys to be talking to each other on a regular basis, or maybe you do.

But it has made the whole process different in my mind. I think you feel comfortable, and I hope you do, in how they are evolving an agenda that is including your wishes and needs.

I am certainly comfortable in what they are coming out with and in being more of a time master than trying to at the same time do everything that frankly David Lodge tried to do when he was in this position.

I have got it much easier than he ever dreamt of having it. With that --

DR. LODGE: I did dream it.

DR. STOCKER: Meeting evaluation. There are any number of ways for you to tell us what you really think. Barbara, for instance, can even bear brutally honest truth. Nelroy and I can't. But Barbara can.

You can tell Lori, but you need to tell us. If there are things that you liked and didn't like, we need to know. They want to know what worked and what didn't.
Now, we could say right now give us this or that, but if something really irritated you, you have got to tell us that. If something was wonderful and you have got to have more of it, let them know that as well.

Just one item each would a world of good.

If it is about us as personalities, tell Barbara. She is too nice to make us cry.

MS. UPSTON: Some of you are going to be leaving, and some of you are going to be going on the field trip tomorrow, but if all of you would take a moment to provide ISAC with ted evaluation forms that are being passed out -- (inaudible, off-microphone).

DR. STOCKER: This agenda reflected what we thought you wanted from the last meeting. We either got it right or we got it wrong. It says here 7:45 tomorrow morning, bus arrives. So I assume if we are in the lobby of the hotel that is the correct location.

Anything else anybody else needs to bring up before we fill out our forms and agenda? If not, thank you very much. It was a very good meeting, and I appreciate all of your help, and all of us getting all of this done all together. Ain't we cool.

(Applause.)
(Whereupon, at 5:15 p.m., the meeting was concluded.)