

ISAC Teleconference Meeting Minutes

December 6, 2017

Participants

- Chuck Bargeron (Chair), University of Georgia
- Edward Clark (Vice-Chair), The Wildlife Center of Virginia
- Slade Franklin, Wyoming Dept. of Agriculture
- William Hyatt, Connecticut Dept. of Energy and Environmental Protection
- Janis McFarland, Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.
- Laura Meyerson, University of Rhode Island
- Carol Okada, Hawai'i Dept. of Agriculture
- Blaine Parker, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
- Sean Southey, PCI Media Impact
- Gary Tabor, The Center for Large Landscape Conservation
- Jeffrey White, Newmont Mining Corporation / Elko Land and Livestock Company
- Jamie K. Reaser, NISC Secretariat
- Kelsey Brantley, NISC Secretariat
- Jhoset Burgos Rodriguez, NISC Secretariat
- Stas Burgiel, NISC Secretariat
- Jason Kirkey, NISC Secretariat

Introduction

The meeting is called to session and Chuck Bargeron provided an overview the teleconference agenda. Roll call was conducted by Kelsey Brantley.

Adoption of Meeting Minutes

The next agenda item is to adopt the meeting minutes from the following past meetings:

- December 2016 – Washington, DC (National Museum of the American Indian)
- March 2017 – Teleconference to approve the ISAC White Paper entitled, “Strengthening Federal-State Coordination”

There were no comments.

December 2016 Minutes: Edward Clarke introduces a motion to approve minutes as written. Motion seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Minutes officially approved and adopted.

March 2017 Teleconference Minutes: Blaine Parker introduces a motion to approve the minutes as written. Edward Clark seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Minutes officially approved and adopted.

Updates on ISAC White Paper Recommendations – Jamie K. Reaser

- The infrastructure white paper has been posted for public viewing on the NISC website and has been moved forward to NISC senior leadership. The Federal-State Coordination paper was also posted and moved forward.
- A U.S. Army Corps of Engineers detailee with the NISC Secretariat is writing a report on infrastructure impacts by invasive species, due to be completed in December.
- A number of meetings have taken place between Interior and USDA senior leadership with state leaders to gain an understanding how the recommendations for Federal-State coordination interface.
- As recommended, a position with the NISC Secretariat for a Federal-State Coordinator is in process and will be moved forward in the near future. This position will be a term appointment for at least one year with the hope that resources become available to extend the position further.

Questions/Comments:

B. Hyatt: Recommendations were brought before AFWA and all FWS agencies, and the recommendations were endorsed.

C. Bargeron: Who from USACE is working the infrastructure detail?

J. Reaser: Michael Vissichelli.

Adoption of White Paper

The ISAC Chair acknowledged the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the funding which facilitated completion the Federal-Tribal paper; and the National Park Service for providing the funding that for the Managed Relocation paper.

Federal-Tribal Coordination White Paper

B. Parker introduced the paper and expressed thanks to BIA for providing the funding for completion of the paper. He then summarized the paper's recommendations.

Questions/Comments:

S. Franklin: Recommendation 4 (a) and (b): Are you looking at multiple conferences or just a single conference? There is a potential typo that makes this unclear.

Answer: Both. We need to get one conference done to start in order to better coordinate with the tribes and their needs. With hope and appropriate funding such a conference would be followed many more. That typo should be fixed to read "national conferences."

S. Franklin: I am concerned with the conflict that may be created by federal coordination by NISC and state coordination that may already exist.

Answer: The aim is to get the tribes up to capacity. Federal coordination with the tribes would not preclude coordination with already-existing state programs, but hopefully would not create redundancies.

G. Tabor: There are existing mechanisms in some states where you add all the stakeholder groups together in round tables. Can this process take advantage of the community-level convening to get these different coordinating bodies together?

Answer: Yes. However, the overall focus of our paper was on federal coordination, but I think that opens the door also for greater coordination with states too.

B. Hyatt: Among these six recommendations are there any thoughts on priority, urgency, or sequencing, which could be of value?

Answer: The order they are in corresponds to their priority, however, we took an approach that sees these recommendations are feeding off one another, and not necessarily a linear process.

S. Franklin: I would have liked to see some language suggesting that NISC staff would help coordinate some of these discussions with states.

C. Bargeron: Footnote #5 addresses some of these concerns about not precluding state coordination.

S. Franklin: It does, I would have just liked to see it worked into the recommendations themselves.

B. Parker: There is a language issue in the footnote, where “federal-state” needs to be struck out and replaced with “federal-tribal” but the larger point still stands about state coordination with the tribes.

B. Hyatt introduces a motion to approve. E. Clarke seconded. The motion passes unanimously. The white paper entitled, “Strengthening Federal-Tribal Coordination” was adopted by ISAC.

Advanced Biotechnology White Paper

L. Meyerson introduces the Advanced Biotechnology white paper and summarized the recommendations.

Questions/Comments:

B. Hyatt: Recommendations 4 and 5 discusses coordination by and among the agencies. Is this correct?

Answer: This is correct.

B. Parker: Is there any sort of push in place to get these recommendations implemented? Would there be a conference, a series of memos that go out to different groups?

Answer: There are multiple targets, including the federal departments that are engaged in the coordinated framework. There are a number of discussions that have already been initiated to determine what the best mechanisms are to get these departments and agencies talking with the regulatory agencies and anyone outside of government that would be involved with these technologies.

B. Parker: Are unintended consequences of these technologies discussed here or are they not pertinent to the goals of this paper?

Answer: The process laid out here is to identify the risks during problem formulation, and to incorporate such risk assessments in any actions.

TAG is discussed and concerns are raised that this federal preemption does not include state or tribal participation in the process from the beginning. These concerns, however, are ones that can be addressed in subsequent meetings and work rather than expanding the intent of the current paper.

S. Franklin motions to approve the paper as written. Motion seconded by B. Hyatt and G. Tabor. The motioned passed unanimously. The white paper entitled, “Advanced Biotechnology Tools for Invasive Species Management” was adopted by ISAC.

Managed Relocation White Paper

E. Clark introduces the white paper and summarizes the recommendations.

Questions/Comments:

J. McFarland: Clarification question; Where is the discussion on impacts to current ecosystem located? Similarly, when it comes to monitoring does that include both the current and recipient ecosystem?

Answer: We operated under the premise that leaving the species in the current ecosystem is not an option. Monitoring, however, is implicitly comprehensive and includes both the current and recipient ecosystems.

S. Franklin: Clarification question - What is the external review process that is mentioned in the paper.

Answer: The external review process would include non-federal experts and other public comments that would be called on for input into the process to provide accountability.

J. White motions to adopt the paper as written. B. Parker seconded. The motion passes unanimously. The white paper entitled, “Managed Relocation: Reducing the Risk of Biological Invasion” was adopted by ISAC.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be an in-person meeting on February 27, 2018 through March 1, 2018, concurrent with NISAW. There will be some interaction between NISAW and ISAC activities. The location will be the National Museum of the American Indian. The format will be completed revised from any prior advisory meeting processes. The current vision is for a full three day meeting. The first day will be a NISC stakeholder’s forum. Senior leadership has developed a list of questions on which they would like to get recommendations and input on. The public is invited to respond to these questions either in writing or in person through participating in the stakeholder forum. The second day will be a workshop format for ISAC. ISAC will take up any remaining work from prior process and will further focus on developing a draft memo in response to the discussion of the stakeholder forum. The draft memo will be presented on day three in a leadership round table.

A conference approval package has been submitted for consideration and approval. The meeting is in “tentative” status until the package is approved – hopefully within the next month.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.