

INVASIVE SPECIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

October 28 – 30, 2015

USDA National Agricultural Library
10301 Baltimore Avenue
NAL Reading Room
Beltsville, MD 20705

MEETING MINUTES

FINAL ACTION ITEMS AND FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

ACTION ITEMS

Communications, Education and Outreach

- NISC staff should establish a task team to inventory and develop, as needed, data management standards, formats and protocols to ensure inter-operability to support information transfer, national distribution mapping, and awareness of species occurrences and spread. The all taxonomic focused task team should be made up of representatives, as appropriate, from FICMNEW, ITAP, ANSTF, ANSTF regional advisory panels, non-federal national and regional database programs, USDA PLANTS, NAL, ITIS, USGS NAS, USGS BISON, GISIN, NatureServe, NAISMA and NA-IPC. .

FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS TO NISC

During this meeting, ISAC approved the white paper drafted by the Subcommittee on Control and Management entitled, *“Enhancing the Effectiveness of Biological Control Programs of Invasive Species by Utilizing an Integrated Pest Management Approach.”* The ISAC recommendation letter to NISC includes the recommendations from the white paper, which are listed below.

Recognizing that biological control of widespread established invasive species can be the most cost-effective sustainable control mechanism, particularly as part of an integrated pest management (IPM) program, ISAC recommends;

1. Federal land management agencies that oversee and conduct control operations utilizing biological control agents should do so in the context of an adaptive IPM strategy by partnering with federal, state, territorial, tribal, and local scientists and agencies of relevant pest management disciplines to improve the effectiveness of biological control agents.
2. Federal land management agencies should place increased emphasis on post-release monitoring to provide feedback and input to the decision-making process and enhance the success and economic performance of biological control programs. To accomplish this, project funding must be assured for the full duration of the project, as well as the broader framework of the IPM approach.
3. Federal land management agencies should include long-term stewardship and sustainability of desired ecosystem functions as the ultimate goal of all biological control programs. To this end, IPM programs may include ecological rehabilitation that will provide resilience to the ecosystem and help prevent re-invasion or replacement of one invasive species with another. This will require coordination among many local, state, territorial, tribal, and federal agencies and academia, including those responsible for developing the biological control programs and those in charge of resource management.

4. Responsible federal agencies should give increased attention during selection of biological control agents for release to: 1) characterizing natural enemy candidates using morphological taxonomy or genetic markers at the onset of a program, 2) utilizing climatic matching models to accurately determine the most likely areas of successful establishment of candidate agents, 3) understanding biological control agent host-finding behavior and attack rates/efficacy, and 4) recognizing the most relevant habitat characteristics/associations of biological control agents in their place of origin to better predict rates of colonization,-spread, and impact in the targeted range.
 5. When biological control is used, federal land management agencies should consider utilizing the information made available from the federal regulatory agencies and other science-based sources to more effectively implement biological control programs.
-

GENERAL SESSION PROCEEDINGS

DAY 1: Wednesday, October 28, 2015

ISAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Chair)

ERIC LANE (Vice-Chair)

JERRY COOK (Secretary)

CHARLES BARGERON

JOSEPH BISCHOFF

PATRICK BURCH

PHILIP COWAN

TAMMY DAVIS

JOSEPH M. DiTOMASO

SUSAN ELLIS

JAMES FURNISH

BONNIE HARPER-LORE

WILLIAM HYATT

PHYLLIS JOHNSON

JANIS McFARLAND

MARSHALL MEYERS

EDWARD MILLS

STEPHEN PHILLIPS

DAVID REID

DAVID E. STARLING

NATHAN STONE

JOHN PETER THOMPSON

ROBERT VAN STEENWYK

DAMON E. WAITT

KENNETH ZIMMERMAN

Invasive Species Action Network

Colorado Department of Agriculture

Sam Houston State University

University of Georgia

American Nursery and Landscape Association

Dow AgroSciences

Landcare Research

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

University of California, Davis

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Retired)

Forestry Consultant

Restoration Ecology Consultant

Connecticut Dept. of Environmental Protection

University of North Dakota

Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.

Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council

Cornell University

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Invasive Species Consultant

Aqueterinary Services, P.C.

Engle-Stone Aquatic\$, LLC.

Invasive Species Consultant

University of California, Berkeley

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Lone Tree Cattle Company

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

OTTO DOERING, III

CAROL OKADA

ROLAND QUITIGUA

TIMOTHY SCHAEFFER

WILLIAM TOOMEY

Purdue University

Hawai'i Department of Agriculture

University of Guam

Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission

The Nature Conservancy

NISC CO-CHAIR PRINCIPALS PRESENT

HOLLY BAMFORD

Assistant Administrator for NOAA's Ocean Service performing duties of the Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Management, U.S. Department of Commerce

ROBERT BONNIE

Undersecretary for Natural Resources and Environment
U.S. Department of Agriculture

KRIS SARRI

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, U.S. Department of the Interior

NISC STAFF AND POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT

PHILLIP ANDREOZZI	NISC Staff
KELSEY BRANTLEY	NISC Staff
STAS BURGIEL	NISC Staff
CHRISTOPHER DIONIGI	NISC Staff
JAMIE K. REASER	NISC Executive Director
MENWYELET "Manny" ATSEDU	U.S. Department of Homeland Security
MARGARET "Peg" BRADY	U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)
DOUGLAS BURKETT	U.S. Department of Defense
HILDA DIAZ-SOLTERO	U.S. Department of Agriculture
SUSAN PASKO	U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)
HILARY SMITH	U.S. Department of the Interior
THERESE TRACY	U.S. Department of State

The meeting was called to order by ISAC Chair Bob Wiltshire at 8:35 am.

WELCOMING REMARKS and INTRODUCTIONS

Hilda Diaz-Soltero (USDA) welcomed the group to the National Agricultural Library and provided an orientation of the building. ISAC Vice-Chair Eric Lane provided an overview of the agenda. Mr. Wiltshire then provided a brief summary of ISAC membership status, reminded the group of their role as ISAC members, reiterated meeting protocols, and welcomed Dr. Jamie K. Reaser to her first ISAC meeting as the new NISC Executive Director. Attendees briefly introduced themselves for the record. A motion was made by Marshall Meyers to approve the minutes from the May 2015 in Silver Spring, MD. Motion seconded by Ken Zimmerman, and passed by unanimous vote.

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Presentation summaries are provided below. Accompanying slides are available on the NISC website at www.doi.gov/invasivespecies/fall-2015-isac-meeting

NISC and ISAC: The Origins

*William Y. Brown, Bureau of Oceans Energy Management
U.S. Department of the Interior*

As one of the DOI officials who collaborated with counterparts at USDA and DOC in authoring Executive Order (EO) 13112, Dr. Brown provided historical account of the developments which led to the issuance of the EO, and the creation of NISC and ISAC.

PANEL DISCUSSION: The Future Direction of NISC and ISAC

NISC Co-Chair Principals:

*Kris Sarri, U.S. Department of the Interior
Robert Bonnie, U.S. Department of the Interior
Holly Bamford, U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)*

Remarks from Kris Sarri (DOI)

- Recognized ISAC members that were leaving, welcomed Jaime Reaser as the new NISC Executive Director
- History on Invasive: Grew up in Michigan, often learnt about impacts of invasives on Great Lakes (eg., power cuts); later AIS was a priority when serving on Great Lakes Task Force on Capitol Hill, now invasives remains an important issue within DOI. Call to action more relevant today than when the EO was signed.
- NISC provides structure for robust federal participation; no single agency is able to handle the problem alone

- Given short time left in current administration, focused on what can be done and carried over to new administration. Working on EDRR Framework, focus on national assessments similar to what is being performed on climate change, improve communication on IS (comprehensive framework that gives a strong, consistent message),
- New issues have surfaced now due to climate change
- Underscored to address wildlife / cheatgrass issues and restore impacted ecosystems.
- Emphasized on regional co-operation enhancement
- Already working with Rob, now looking forward to work with Holly and NISC/ISAC as well

Remarks from Robert Bonnie (USDA)

- Emphasized across agency collaboration to resolve invasive issues
- Forest Service – current emphasis on forest restoration. Acres burned every year has doubled, native species have declined as a result of many natural stressors including IS. Many challenges to urban forests (e.g., EAB)
- Invasive issues are being integrated into the larger program undertaken by NRCS
- NRCS – primary role is to develop conservation programs through the Farm Bill, deals with a variety of natural conservation issues. Numerous areas where invasives are a critical part of work.
- Collaborative approach and partnership among the local agencies essential, Must work across large landscapes – create a need to think bigger and collaborate with other federal, state, agencies and NGOs
- USDA has made a number of investments in climate policy, both reducing greenhouse gasses and ecosystem resiliency. Climate overlay is important when focused on invasive species.
- USDA spending significant time and effort on adaptive agriculture against climate change as well invasive species
- Prioritization and collaboration is extremely important given current budget limitations. Looking to ISAC for advice and counsel.
- Think about goals for last 15 months, what can be done to renew commitment to sustain the issue.
- Invasive species issues are bipartisan issues, so they should be a priority for the future administration

Remarks from Holly Bamford (DOC)

- Despite administration change in 15 months, invasive issues, remain a priority
- Invasive species are impacting fisheries and livelihood, NOAA looks to move forward with policy and strategy
- NOAA does not have a formal invasive species program, yet Team works to coordinate issue within the agency
- Invasive species is emphasized in Agency strategic Planning, emphasized in ecosystem science, economics, and community resilience.
- NOAA focuses on science based decision-making on invasives

Questions/Comments:

Marshall Meyers: Appreciate letter of approval, yet 5 focus areas are not specific and could be a FACA on its own. NISC Member Agencies need to ask of specific advice and recommendations for ISAC to consider.

Response: Agreed, anticipate more specifics

Janice McFarland: 1) Stakeholders want more information on economic impacts, requested additional advice on how economic policy should be done. 2) Request more information on impact to federal authority.

Response: Issue of economics very compelling, different agencies may perform assessments differently, looking to ISAC to help harmonize. Not what analysis should be done – but rather how should they be performed. The issue trying to address should influence the process. Should economic impact, but also how to utilize results.

Bill Hyatt: Thoughts on LCC program, how to make more effective

Response: Collaborative approaches are improving way things get done, thinking of bigger scales. This requires new tools and some trial and error to figure out the most effective structure. Grassroots efforts are producing large results, but mechanisms are still being developed.

Eric Lane: Political appointees can be a champion for the issue, but my speaking about it importance. Request integrate IS into language used, hearing at the Secretary level elevates its importance. As think about how to institutionalize issue, consider linkages to state and local levels. Need to hear about issue on a regular basis to identify opportunities.

John Peter Thompson: Echo Marshall's comments. Request look at reporting relationship; keep an archive of information that flows from ISAC to federal agencies. Help to reflect on action taken to form future recommendations.

Chuck Bargeron: First item on letter was EDRR framework; Given administration change, what can be done to implement and identify dedicated funds.

Response: IS has strong bipartisan interest. Focus on priorities that are key to current and future administration. Important to show successes and accomplishments to help progress issue in the future.

Nathan Stone: Issues at administration level does not translate to grassroots level. For examples, diseases often brought in my ornamental fish – yet this area is largely unregulated. What venue is available to express concerned.

Response: One of the priorities of the administration is to review regulation and determine gaps, as well as what is no longer needed. ISAC should not be afraid of recommending it to NISC Regulations generated by agencies / bureaus; should approach representatives. EO has signed in 1999, much as changed since. Information from stakeholders regarding the issues and potential solutions.

Phillis Johnson: Although administration will be ending shortly, not without influence in agencies. EDRR, landscape restoration, and other programs cannot be done without research. Science behind invasive species is critical. We are limited by Systematics

Ed Mills: Issue is large, often difficult to choose what aspects to work on. Request specific on what products should come from ISAC (e.g., accomplishments, white papers, communication tools).

Response: It is important to have some victories. Asking for recommendations on issues that can actually be fixed that will generate some momentum. Important to stay strategic, needed to understand the issue and direction – allows agencies to execute.

Looking Back and Moving Forward

Jamie K. Reaser, NISC Executive Director

- Talked about why she chose to work in NISC
- It is a challenging job and thought to contribute
- Was asked what can you offer to ISAC?
- Her reply “I am a vision keeper”
- Space Holder—need to bring all entities together e.g., NISC, ISAC, evolve together - new challenges and be able to combat together
- Fire tender- we need to institute sparks and intent across state, federal agencies
- Adding fuel- encourage new people
- Fanning the flame- in federal institute oxygen can be consumed easily

- Inviting others fireside- bring other working on the issue
- Messenger- It is complex, wide ranging issues, need to be messaged effectively
- Deep listening- conversation about thinking differently, moving the ball forward
- Inviting others into the conversation- bring and engage them
- Edge walker- being comfortable in unsafe places, invite risk taking
- Empowering others to do the same
- Scanning horizons- charting a course across terrain, looking forward with new challenges and making decisions
- NISC- protecting what matters the most “how we can do that more effectively, whole heartedly, and incorporating new tools

NISC MEMBER DEPARTMENT UPDATES

Hilary Smith, U.S. Department of Agriculture

- DOI response to ISAC Recommendations / Action Items
 - EDRR Framework and emergency response plan; should be in next 2 weeks
 - Section 7 consultation – will be covered during biocontrol session
 - Awareness campaign – provided summary of work on national awareness campaigns; also involved in state / local outreach efforts
- EDRR Framework – priority for DOI
- DOI Invasive Species Action Plan
- Departments / Bureau Updates

Margaret “Peg” Brady, U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)

- All NOAA – AIS efforts are done by programs without dedicated funding.
- HACCP
- 2015 AIS Workshop
- International Updates; Ballast water, Arctic Council
- ANSTF / NISC / GAO
- Regional Highlights – responding to issues that are impacting NOAA trust resources

Hilda Diaz-Soltero, U.S. Department of Agriculture

- USDA Grants list; on USDA website
- Response to ISAC Recommendations and Action Items
 - Do No Harm Report
 - Hired taxonomists (ARS); pest identification personnel
 - APHIS Pest Surveys (of priority pests; 218 not found)
 - New risk assessment in Aphis – predicative model; species that have been detected though US border or represent a significant threat
- Climate Change paper recommendations

Douglas Burkett, U.S. Department of Defense (AFPMB)

- *Update does not include Army Corp of Engineers*
- DOD priority to conduct operations and trainings; management and mitigation funds of IS is highly variable
- DOD priorities for IS: 1) interfere with training, operations, invasives that impact human health and safety
- Recent efforts: Rhino beetle eradications in Guam, C130 aircraft to control terrestrial weeds, biocontrol efforts in Hawaii, various other control efforts that harm human health, damage infrastructure, or impede operations.

Terry Tracy, U.S. Department of State

- State continues to listen to the recommendations of ISAC to influence international issues, help to understand global implications, allows to deliver expert opinions that other countries respect
- IS do not respect borders and require bilateral cooperation – why work closely with NISC.
- IS has been raised on several international platforms. (Pacific Islands, Caribbean lionfish invasion)
- Goal is to provide practice of One Health – work for a shared understand to recognize public health risk from IS – value input from NISC and ISAC.
- Movement of good can transport IS; influences trade agreements.

Specific recommendation from State: Need numbers. Need to know what the economic loss is from invasive species – especially those that effect international trade agreements.

Caroline Ridley, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (presented to the group by Chris Dionigi, NISC Staff)

- **Court ruling on EPA's Vessel General Permit:** Earlier this October, there was a court ruling that EPA's 2013 Vessel General Permit violated the Clean Water Act because it did not require use of best available technology to control discharges of invasive species from the ballast water of ships. The court ruled that it was the wrong approach to adopt the International Maritime Organization standards for technology-based effluent limits without considering if there were better onshore technologies capable of meeting more stringent limits. Also, the court ruled that the exemption from effluent limits for vessels that travel only within the Great Lakes was not defensible. In talking with the office that writes the VGP, their initial take is that when they write and issue the permit again (in December 2018), they will have to address the elements of the permit that the court found problematic. What it means in terms of specific permit requirements will take quite a while to sort out.

EPA point of contact for questions: Jack Faulk, faulk.jack@epa.gov

- **Asian carp on the move:** Some interesting (largely dismaying) new findings are emerging about short- and long-distance movement of Asian carp in the Mississippi River basin and in the Chicago Area Water System. First, as of September this year, young-of-the-year were observed about 50 miles further north than they had been in 2014. That means small carp are now about 90 miles from Lake Michigan. Second, there are some non-carp fish capable of getting past electric barriers constructed in the Chicago area lock-and-dam system. These fish can surge through with barges traveling to Lake Michigan, and show a potential vulnerability of the electric barriers to movement of small fish. *EPA point of contact for questions: Bill Bolen, bolen.bill@epa.gov*

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

(For proceedings, see SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS section)

NISC STAFF REPORTS

Phil Andreozzi, NISC Assistant Director for International and Regional Affairs

phillip_andreozzi@ios.doi.gov

- Arctic Council Invasive Species activities:
 - The Arctic Council is a high level intergovernmental forum for promoting cooperation, coordination and interaction among the Arctic States, in particular on issues of sustainable development and environmental protection in the Arctic.
 - Arctic Council Member States include Canada, Denmark (including Greenland and the Faroe Islands), Finland, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden, and The United States of America (US) and six Permanent Participants that represent indigenous groups in the Arctic.
 - The US is currently Chair of the Arctic Council (2015 – 2017). During our Chairmanship, the US will focus on three priority issues:
 - Arctic Ocean Safety, Security and Stewardship.

- Improving economic and living conditions.
 - Reducing the impacts of climate change and improving resilience
 - The prevention and management of invasive species is a central component of this climate resilience priority.
 - The expected dramatic increase in energy exploration and other development in the Arctic combined with the other impacts of climate change will cause an equally dramatic increase in the number of opportunities for invasive species (marine, freshwater and terrestrial) to be introduced (propagule pressure).
 - To proactively address this increase in propagule pressure and advance the US priority of climate resilience, the US has partnered with Norway to propose an invasive species initiative under the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) working group. The proposal will concentrate on identifying and developing best management practices to address key pathways and vectors of invasive species movement into and around the Arctic.
 - NISC staff and the US Department of State are co-leading the interdepartmental/interagency team working on this effort and are also the two US representatives to the CAFF international group of experts working on fully developing this initiative.
- National Invasive Species Awareness Week (NISAW)
 - NISC is coordinating the NISAW 2016 Steering Committee, made up of various interested Federal, state, local, NGO and other participants.
 - The NISAW 2016 Steering Committee is considering various options for 2016.
 - ISAC recommendation update: “Recognizing the value of the Invasive Species Working Group established recently under the United States-New Zealand Joint Commission on Science and Technology Collaboration, ISAC recommends that NISC Agencies pursue and support similar opportunities under other existing bilateral and multi-lateral science and technology collaboration agreements for research cooperation on priority invasive species issues of common interest.”
 - U.S. hosted a meeting of the US/NZ JCM Working Group in May, 2015 that was attended by several NZ scientists and 15+ representatives from multiple US Departments and agencies. The two day meeting focused on three areas in the current work plan.
 - Invasive terrestrial vertebrate prevention and management. (Toxicant efficiency, low-density detection and biosecurity).
 - Plant pest control and prevention (border biosecurity, detection, stinkbugs)
 - Pacific Island outreach and coordination (tapping expertise and sharing of technologies/methodologies, invasive ants and biocontrol).
 - Several JCM ISWG phone call meetings have been held as well.
 - Next in-person meetings being planned for early and mid- 2016 on margins of other meetings.
 - Have received tentative interest from Australia regarding an allied effort
 - Many other potential partners through JCM process including France, the UK, and Arctic Council Nations.

Kelsey Brantley, NISC Program Analyst and ISAC Coordinator
kelsey_brantley@ios.doi.gov

ISAC Nominations for Class 9: The open nomination period for new ISAC members was announced in the Federal Register on September 30, 2015. The deadline for submitting nominations is November 30, 2015.

ISAC Statistics: With ISAC in existence for 15 years, below is a synopsis of ISAC activities since its creation in 1999:

- 8 Charter Renewals (2001, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012 and 2014)
 - Charter modification or revisions in 2005, 2006 and 2008)

- 21 meetings – 19 F2F (face-to-face); 3 teleconference (Biofuels, Incentives, and EDRR)
- 165 formal recommendations to NISC as of May 2015
- 9 white papers
- 109 current and former members

Non-Governmental Organizations	22
State Government	23
Local Government	3
Tribal Government	5
Academia	28
Industry	23
International	2
Other (Consultants, etc.)	3
TOTAL	109

- 84 reappointed to a second term
- 4 received new appointment after sitting out for one nomination cycle

NISC Website: Completion of the NISC website to the Drupal content management platform under www.doi.gov was completed in August 2015. NISC still maintains the old URL, www.invasivespecies.gov, which now now redirects users to the new subsite under doi.gov, www.doi.gov/invasivespecies. NISC staff (Kelsey and Jamie) will be working on the development and implementation of a site plan. This priority task will begin after this ISAC meeting.

Stas Burgiel, NISC Assistant Director for Prevention and Budgetary Coordination
stanley_burgiel@ios.doi.gov

Federal Lands and the Movement of Aquatic Invasive Species: In August 2015, an ANSTF/NISC task force released the paper “Federal Policy Options: Addressing the Movement of Aquatic Invasive Species Onto and Off of Federal Lands and Waters.” The report includes an overview of current federal authorities including a summary review of agency actions relevant to managing the movement of AIS along with the laws and policies underpinning that summary. It also identifies a number of policy options for continued work. This information has also been forwarded to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for reference in the development of a report on federal authorities on aquatic invasive species required by the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014.

National Early Detection and Rapid Response Framework: see presentation and Department of the Interior update by Hilary Smith. Additional activities include outreach to the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agency and ANSTF panels (Western Regional Panel and the Gulf and South Atlantic States Regional Panel).

NISC Interagency Crosscut Budget: At the end of May, NISC released its annual Interagency Crosscut Budget which tallies federal agencies expenditures on invasive species activities across 6 general categories: prevention, early detection and rapid response, control and management, restoration, research, education and public education awareness, and leadership and international cooperation. The crosscut includes figures for FY2103 and FY2014 (actual expenses), FY2015 (enacted budget) and FY2016 (President's proposed budget). Timing of the Crosscut's release was expedited per the explanatory guidance provided with the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015. This information was also communicated to the Government Accountability Office for its inquiry into federal spending on aquatic invasive species.

Economics and Invasive Species: Recognizing the importance of economic evaluations and cost-benefit analyses to support resource decision-making NISC has provided input into a number of initiatives in those areas. This includes: support for work by the U.S. Geological Survey to develop a decision-support tool for the control of buffelgrass under future climate scenarios; input into a pilot DOI climate

adaptation analysis for the Southeast looking at the costs of action vs. no action for federal lands; and input to the ANSTF on identifying priority needs for economic analysis and aquatic invasive species.

Free Trade Agreements: Negotiations on the TransPacific Partnership (TPP) free trade agreement for Pacific Rim countries was recently completed. Discussions on the environment chapter of the TransAtlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) with the European Union are starting to get more substantive (note: the EU's position paper from January 2015 includes reference to a substantive provision on invasive alien species). NISC staff continue to engage in these discussions.

Chris Dionigi, NISC Deputy Director
chris_dionigi@ios.doi.gov

Status of NISC Management Plan: Since the last ISAC meeting, my main projects have been incorporating the comments that we have received on the Plan into one document and working with the EDRR Framework. You will hear a more detailed account of the EDRR Framework from others. The future vision for the Plan will be discussed by others as well. So, I will focus my comments on my work to get the draft Plan to its current state.

We received over 850 comments from the full range of NISC members' agencies and bureaus and ISAC members. I greatly appreciate your and their efforts with this important document. Comments ranged from relatively easily accomplished corrections and edits to more encompassing comments. In response to editorial comments, structural changes were made to make the document more readable and the tables more useful. All comments received have been incorporated or otherwise noted in the current draft. That draft is now before NISC leadership for their review.

Some comments challenged long-held NISC focus areas. For example, NISC's work on prevention has mostly been focused upon preventing the introduction of invasive species propagules to additional areas. The primary approach has been pathway interdiction. At smaller scales, NISC has worked to reduce propagule pressure in pathways that spread invasive propagules among areas within the US. However, one reviewer pointed out that the eradication of source populations is as effective of a prevention strategy as pathway interdiction, if not more so. It is my understanding that this is a key component of certain "Safe-guarding" and other efforts, but it was not called out specifically as a strategy in the draft Plan. Reviewers also indicated that prevention could take the form of increased resilience or decreased invisibility of receiving ecosystems. Promoting native biodiversity in both natural and agricultural ecosystems could both a strategy within prevention.

Currently, the Plan has Goal areas that are consistent with those of past plans. Strategic goals, like Prevention, EDRR, and Control, have been retained in this draft. However, reviewers indicated that these are more strategies than goals. They suggested that goals such as increasing biological diversity, increasing ecosystem resilience, and increasing ecosystem services be stated as goals of the Plan, and Prevention, EDRR, and Control for example be strategies within goals.

Some reviewers asked about why certain "species specific" objectives (e.g., feral swine and Asian Carp) were included in the Plan. They suggested that the plan should promote actions to address the damage from feral horses as well – if it was going to go to that level of specificity. They asked what criteria was used to determine what species-specific objectives were included.

Several capabilities and capacities were identified "themes" that underlie multiple actions with the Plan. For example, the need for systematics capabilities and capacities to provide authoritative identifications

of biological specimens and other biological and ecological information is mentioned specifically in one section of the current draft. However, systematics underlies actions throughout the Plan.

A challenge is how to both specifically mention capability and capacity building objectives directed at broad themes in one section, and also reflect that they underlie a range of other actions. Other themes like this were: risk assessment, and the need to differentiate between capacity and capability, funding, personnel needs, and the ability to work with non-federal partners.

Several commenters had concerns about the length and complexity of elements in the Plan and urged a simplification and shorter-time frames to accomplish objectives.

Jamie K. Reaser, NISC Executive Director
jamie_reaser@ios.doi.gov

I'd like to highlight one activity that I hadn't planned to discuss during my other presentations.

The World Conservation Congress is hosted by IUCN approximately every four years. It brings together thousands of leaders from government, civil society, indigenous peoples, business, and academia, with the goal of conserving the environment and harnessing the solutions nature offers to global challenges. Ultimately, it is intended to improve our capacities to manage our natural environment for human, social and economic development through innovative, partnership-based problem solving.

The next Congress will be held in Hawai'i on September 1st-10th, 2016. Invasive alien species have been proposed as one of the major focal areas for the meeting, known as journeys. As you are aware, this issue is a priority for the host state.

The deadline for proposal submissions closed on October 15th. NISC staff were involved in the development of three proposals.

- On behalf of the Department of the Interior, I submitted a proposal for a training course entitled, "Institutionalizing Invasive Alien Species Programmes: Best Practices for Communication and Governance. Institutionalization is one of the meeting themes. Partners for this proposal include the US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, US Department of State, IUCN Invasive Species Specialist Group, UNEP Asia Pacific Regional Office, UNEP Pacific Subregional Office, the Council of Europe, CABI, Conservation International, Island Conservation, and the Hawai'i Invasive Species Council. Assuming the proposal is accepted, we will be developing a guidebook on institutionalizing invasive alien species programs as a complement to the training course. The Council of Europe has offered to fund this product.
- Phil also worked with our colleagues in the Pacific Invasives Partnership (PIP) has to develop two additional proposals. These include:
 - A workshop to highlight the invasive species activities underway in the Pacific, with an emphasis on biosecurity, eradication, and the importance of partnership-based initiatives.
 - An training course that will introduce a wide range of cross-cutting invasive species issues of particular importance in the Pacific Islands. The inter-relationships between invasive species and climate resilience is one example.
- Finally, we were asked to partner with the Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) on a training course that will be focus on selected aspects invasive species management and to collaborate with Island Conservation and other partners on a workshop introducing advances in genetic technology to advance endangered species conservation and invasive species management.

We anticipate receiving feedback on the proposals by the end of January. If you are particularly interested in the World Conservation Congress, please join the presentations and discussions to take place during the prevention subcommittee meetings.

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS (continued)

Presentation summaries are provided below. Accompanying slides are available on the NISC website at www.doi.gov/invasivespecies/fall-2015-isac-meeting

PANEL DISCUSSION: Biocontrol Issues

Moderator - Bob Wiltshire, Invasive Species Action Network (ISAC Chair)

Panelists

Colorado's Biological Control Program

Eric Lane, Director of Conservation Services, Colorado Department of Agriculture (ISAC Member)

Status of Section 7 Consultation by USFWS on Weed Biocontrol Agents

Jeff Herod, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Consultation and Habitat Conservation Planning Branch, and Cindy Hall, National Coordinator, Integrated Pest Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Legal, Administrative, Financial and Ecological Challenges in Implementing Successful Invasive Plant Species Management

Dr. Bernd Blossey, Associate Professor, Cornell University

The presentations set the stage for a discussion on the use of biological control methods to manage invasive weeds with a particular focus around perceived delays and obstacles in the review of biological assessments for biocontrol agents and their potential impacts on endangered species under the FWS' Section 7 consultations as required by the Endangered Species Act.

In response to a question on lag times for FWS internal review of biological assessments, a FWS representative noted that current delays may be associated with staffing changes although the formal process allows for a 130 day window. Currently, FWS is hiring three additional staff to assist with Section 7 consultations and is also working with USDA/APHIS to reduce delays. FWS also noted that they reach out to a range of experts within FWS as well as the Department of Interior more broadly.

ISAC members asked how they can help move discussions forward with particular regard to the connections across science, management and policy, as well as the development of an ISAC whitepaper on the topic. The need to incorporate the full range of practitioners, expertise and perspectives was recognized, possibly in the form of a dialogue that can identify key research questions and the best approaches to address them in a reasonable, transparent and efficient manner.

Blossey reiterated the need for a process to assess potential impacts of all management techniques, not just biocontrol, and stressed the importance of a funding vehicle for biocontrol research that would ensure consistency from initial research to post-introduction monitoring. He also stressed that regulatory agencies should have informed experts with an understanding of current science to evaluate assessments. In response to a question on impacts related to international collaboration, he also noted that Canada is a backdoor where biocontrol releases will slowly move down into the U.S. of their own accord.

New Zealand was highlighted as a model where researchers can consult directly with regulatory authorities early in the process, instead of having to work through mediaries. It was noted that New Zealand hadn't required mandatory monitoring of management techniques, until there was a government audit that revealed that agencies could not document the benefits of their management efforts. Other issues raised included questions around conservation of endangered species outside of their native ranges where they may be invasive and the role of earthworms as ecosystem transformers.

Questions/Comments

Marshall Myers: What is the average lifetime of internal review?

Response (Cindy Hall): Trying to reduce the lag time by hiring 3 more people to lower the workload; there was other process going on at that time.

Bob Van Steenwyk: How can we fix the issue? What recommendation we may have?

Response (Eric Lane): Conversations among the participants is the key; NISC can convene some experts not just from the US but from other countries as well

Response (Bernd Blossey): In New Zealand, early consultation with the regulatory officer, administrative issues are made easier. "Science" should be the guiding principle

Question: How can we connect science and management?

Response (Bernd Blossey): Collaboration among people

Chuck Bargeron: International collaboration with the less travel fund is hurting biocontrol initiation

GROUP DISCUSSION

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION FOR REVISION OF ISAC BYLAWS

Ken Zimmerman, Lone Tree Cattle Company (ISAC Member)

The Subcommittee on Organizational Collaboration is working on suggested language to include with suggested edits in the revision of the ISAC Bylaws. The group will further discuss this topic during Day 2 of this meeting (11/29/2015).

PUBLIC COMMENT

Scott Cameron, Reduce Risks from Invasive Species Coalition (RRISC), provided a recent update of activities including their second annual invasive species reception on Capitol Hill, briefings with Congressional staff and potential future work around endorsement of specific legislation, incorporation of invasive species issues into the next Farm Bill and horizon scanning efforts to identify the next major invasive species-endangered species-landscape conservation conflicts.

Mark Imlay, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), highlighted the presence and impacts of Japanese stiltgrass and wavy-leaf basketgrass in the Mid-Atlantic region along with the need for host-specific biocontrol agents to manage those species.

Day 1 Ends at 5:00 PM

DAY 2: Thursday, October 29, 2015

ISAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Chair)

ERIC LANE (Vice-Chair)

JERRY COOK (Secretary)

CHARLES BARGERON

PATRICK BURCH

PHILIP COWAN

TAMMY DAVIS

JOSEPH M. DiTOMASO

SUSAN ELLIS

JAMES FURNISH

BONNIE HARPER-LORE

WILLIAM HYATT

PHYLLIS JOHNSON

MARSHALL MEYERS

EDWARD MILLS

STEPHEN PHILLIPS

DAVID REID

DAVID E. STARLING

NATHAN STONE

JOHN PETER THOMPSON

ROBERT VAN STEENWYK

DAMON E. WAITT

KENNETH ZIMMERMAN

Invasive Species Action Network

Colorado Department of Agriculture

Sam Houston State University

University of Georgia

Dow AgroSciences

Landcare Research

Alaska Department of Fish and Game

University of California, Davis

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Retired)

Forestry Consultant

Restoration Ecology Consultant

Connecticut Dept. of Environmental Protection

University of North Dakota

Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council

Cornell University

Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission

Invasive Species Consultant

Aqueterinary Services, P.C.

Engle-Stone Aquatic\$, LLC.

Invasive Species Consultant

University of California, Berkeley

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Lone Tree Cattle Company

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

JOSEPH BISCHOFF

OTTO DOERING, III

JANIS McFARLAND

CAROL OKADA

ROLAND QUITIGUA

TIMOTHY SCHAEFFER

WILLIAM TOOMEY

Cornerstone Government Affairs

Purdue University

Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.

Hawai'i Department of Agriculture

University of Guam

Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission

The Nature Conservancy

NISC STAFF AND POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT

PHILLIP ANDREOZZI

KELSEY BRANTLEY

STAS BURGIEL

CHRISTOPHER DIONIGI

JAMIE K. REASER

MENWYELET "Manny" ATSEDU

MARGARET "Peg" BRADY

DOUGLAS BURKETT

HILDA DIAZ-SOLTERO

SUSAN PASKO

HILARY SMITH

THERESE TRACY

NISC Staff

NISC Staff

NISC Staff

NISC Staff

NISC Executive Director

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)

U.S. Department of Defense

U.S. Department of Agriculture

U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)

U.S. Department of the Interior

U.S. Department of State

PRESENTATIONS

Secretarial Order 3336 – Rangeland Fire, Prevention, Management and Restoration

Jim Lyons, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management,

U.S. Department of the Interior

- Developing an integrated rangeland fire management strategy
- Fire plays a significant role on native species
- With the invasive species the fire cycle has altered significantly
- Talked on background on greater sage-grouse conservation strategy
- Sage grouse has been declining but hard to quantify by how much
- Sage grouse depend on sage brush which is most widely spread vegetation in the western US
- Sage brush is home to 350 species of animals and birds but is one of the most imperiled
- Fire and invasive species are the most disturbing factor for sage brush
- 3 key elements to conservation strategy are 1. Strong federal plans, 2. Strong state plans and 3. Effective strategy to reduce fire hazard
- A conference was held in Nov 2014 bringing experts of invasive, fire
- Outcome of the conference was Secretary Order 3336
- SO deals with the rangeland fire prevention, management and restoration
- Structure of SO- 1. Purpose: to work cooperatively and collaboratively, enhanced firefighting capabilities
- Sec 4 talks about policy
- We developed implementation plan
- “Emergency fire management fund”
- Multiyear strategy and we engaged governors e.g., from Idaho
- Working with USDA, EPA
- “Native seed strategy”; collect and make it available
- SO scheduled for implementation so the process was expedited in 2015 fire season
- Work across all jurisdiction

Questions/Comments

Question: What is the recovery time of sage brush?

Response: Decades or may be centuries

Ken Zimmerman: How do you ensure restoration after fire? Or re-invasion is avoided?

Response: We ensured more funds for restoration and is a process of trial-and-error

Janice McFarland: Can you offer socio-economic aspect of this restoration?

Response: Our efforts have caught attention of managers and public attention and it is a work in progress

Cheatgrass Bioherbicide Update

Hilda Diaz-Soltero, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (NISC Policy Liaison)

- Bacteria inhibits cheatgrass
- Applied in fall and the microbes effect the roots in fall through spring
- Presence of root growth inhibitor compounds and are very species-specific
- Upto 5-6 years after application they are effective
- Additional application is needed when new soil is added
- Rangeland, cropland, pastures ideal for bioherbicide application

- Research was done in 100 sq m area and USDA was asked to expedite the service process and will be replicated in a larger scale

Questions/Comments:

Phil Cowan: So it does not kill existing patches of cheatgrass?

Response: That's correct. It inhibits new growth.

Invasive Plant Management and Greater Michael Ielmini, National Invasive, Sage-Grouse Conservation: A Review and Species Program Manager, Status Report with Strategic Recommendations U.S. Forest Service (USDA) for Improvement

Michael Ielmini, National Invasive Species Program Manager, U.S. Forest Service

Bill Hyatt, Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (ISAC Member)

- It becomes connected with fire and invasive species
- Information gathered from federal, state and county officials
- Based on organizational structure of the WAFWA report
- Why invasive plants matter? Invasive annual grass fuel the challenges
 - Information management and science challenges
 - Policy and regulatory challenges
 - Operational capacity and program management challenges
- Recommendations
 - Convene a summit of federal department (DOI, USDA, DOC etc.)
 - It is a landscape scale problem so should be solved in that scale
- Barriers
 - NISC, ISAC and federal agencies uncoordinated
 - Inconsistency among states
 - Inefficiencies within states and among state agencies
- Recommendations
 - Policy and regulatory recommendations - Establish a subcommittee within ISAC to review the current legislative and regulatory framework (federal and state) on invasive species including coordination with AFWA
 - Information management and science recommendations- the ISAC should establish a standing committee dedicated to promoting research and adaptive management to determine how we can prevent the spread of existing weed infestation and consistently reestablish desired perennial plants in invaded sites.

Questions/Comments:

Bonnie Harper-Lore: I hope native restoration team attend the upcoming meeting

Response (Mike Ielmini): Yes, they will be there

JaniceMcFarland: Will socio-economic issues be addressed?

Response (Mike Ielmini): Yes, a range of people will be attending the meeting

Joe DiTomaso: I am trying to restore but re-invasion is susceptible. How do you deal with these issues of reinvasion?

Response (Mike Ielmini): USGS has very well managed data. In some of the areas restoration may not be successful due to various effects. We are learning slowly.

Chris Dionigi: ISAC has tough time reaching out to private communities.

Response (Mike Ielmini): Yes, this is a landscape scale problem and hence be resolved in that scale

National Seed Strategy for Rehabilitation Plant Conservation Lead and Restoration

Peggy Olwell, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

- Due to 2012 Hurricane Sandy a total of \$65 billion worth of damages in 24 states

- 1 million dune stabilizing native plants needed to restore
- No local plants available
- Ad-hoc collection of local seed
- So need of a large scale native seed requirement
- In 2011 Bastrop County, TX fire 5000,5000 seedlings or germplasms used
- In 2012, 2 million acres of sage-grouse habitat burned
- Only 400,000 acres rehabilitated
- 1.6 million acres remain to be rehabilitated
- Seed is a critical natural resource
- National seed strategy involves 12 federal agencies with 4 goals and its associated objectives
- Research is needed on seeds
- DOI Secretary Order 3336- how do we re-establish native plant communities
- National Seed Strategy for Rehabilitation and Restoration
 - Goal 1: Seed supply
 - Identify seed needs and ensure the reliable availability of genetically appropriate seed
 - 3 objectives
 - Assess the seed needs and capacity of federal agencies
 - Goal 2: Research
 - Identify research need and conduct research to provide genetically appropriate seed and to improve technology for native seed production and ecosystem restoration
 - Goal 3: Decision Making Tools
 - Develop tools that enable managers to make timely informed seeding decisions for ecological restoration
 - Goal 4: Communication
 - Develop strategies for internal and external
 - Next step for implementation for national seed strategy

There were no questions or comments following this presentation.

Avian Influenza in the U.S.

Dr. Darryl Styles, DVM, PhD, Senior Staff Veterinarian

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

- All influenza virus A, B, C, D and E originated in ducks
- In 1918, it originated in US but went to Europe with soldiers
- Viruses change the RNA,
- 2 kinds of viruses are highly pathogenic e.g., avian influenza and low pathogenicity with mild symptoms
- H5 and H7 are highly pathogenic
- Transmission/Reservoirs in SE Asia
- H5N8- seen in west coast
- H5N2- in the central US
- In Winter 2014/2015 seen in western zone
- \$600 million spend to combat this virus

Questions/Comments:

Eric Lane: How are the virus making into the environment?

Response: Farmers contaminate themselves and spread to the farm and human activities further spread from point A to point B due to not following biosecurity protocol

Jamie Reaser: what is being done to enhance ecosystem based resilience?

Response: We are looking in human and vet arena. We have to go a long way

Marshall Meyers: how is quarantine done?

Response: 10Km radius zone is highly regulated. Commodity is moved under high surveillance.

SUBCOMMITTEE BREAKOUT SESSIONS – GROUP 1 (1:00 PM – 2:15 PM)

(For proceedings, see SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS section)

SUBCOMMITTEE BREAKOUT SESSIONS – GROUP 2 (2:15 PM – 3:30 PM)

(For proceedings, see SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS section)

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Includes any action items or recommendations produced during breakout sessions.

Prevention

On 28 October, the Prevention Subcommittee heard a presentation on the Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii (RBP) delivered by Tamara Conkle (Naval Facilities Engineering Command HQ, Department of the Navy) and Daniel Cecchini (Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Environment, Department of the Navy). The presentation covered the history of the RBP's development across two phases (Phase I – risk assessments, and Phase II – strategic implementation plan) as well as next steps for moving forward with implementation. Discussion focused on how to keep the implementation plan adaptive, coordination of the overall effort, use of this model for other regions, and linkages to regional trade agreements.

- \$3.8 million funded by Department of Navy
- Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii
- RBP phase-I started in Sep 2009 and consists of (i) executive summary – NISC, (ii) freshwater resources – USGS, (iii) marine resources- Smithsonian and (iv) terrestrial- APHIS
- Phase-II started in Sep 2011: conducted an independent peer review of phase-I which ended in 2013
- Experts from many countries participated in peer review process
- Comprehensive collaboration and consultation among many federal and regional organization while forming the presentation document/ biosecurity
- Guam has established legislation on biosecurity; building climate resiliency

On 29 October, Christy Martin (Coordinating Group on Alien Pest Species) and Josh Atwood (Hawaii Invasive Species Council) provided an overview of the upcoming IUCN World Conservation Congress (Hawaii, 2-5 September 2016). They described IUCN as an organization and outlined five proposed workshops focused on invasive species:

- Islands solutions for IS Crisis – a Pacific Regional Perspective
- Implementing Island Biosecurity – a Pacific Island Perspective
- IS Management – from Islands to Continents
- Institutionalizing IAS: Best Practices for Communication and Governance
- Small Invasive Mammals Pose Large Threats to Island Ecosystems

They also noted ongoing discussions regarding the development of potential legacy commitments at the state, regional and national levels.

The Prevention subcommittee also held discussions on priority topics for ISAC advice, and identified the following:

1. Regional biosecurity and trade as related to (1) Hawaii and Micronesia, and (2) the Caribbean [authorities, regional coordination]
2. Analysis of risk assessment methodologies with a view towards what is practical, defensible and effective [national assessments]
3. Wildlife and animal disease, including animal imports [authorities]
4. Pathways (e.g., tourism, energy development, transportation) and landscape-level prevention [regional coordination]

General Notes:

- Stress the continuing importance of prevention activities within NISC and ISAC
- Consider how to integrate prevention priorities into a communication strategy
- Examine and clarify understanding of federal agencies' authorities (e.g., issue priority by issue priority)

Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR)

On 28 October, during the meeting of the EDRR subcommittee, Hilary Smith (Department of the Interior) provided an update on the status and content of the National EDRR Framework. After questions on timelines and budgets the group proceeded to discuss future EDRR priorities for ISAC and NISC. Topics of discussion included funding for rapid response and preparedness activities, developing priority lists of species, data management protocols and standards, and the identification of appropriate authorities across different jurisdictions and issues. The three priorities that were put forward to the full ISAC included:

1. NISC should identify federal, state, regional, or other leads to be responsible for implementing objectives from the EDRR Framework.
2. NISC should continue to pursue funding for the Emergency Response Fund.
3. NISC should identify, assess, and share, state EDRR species lists to be used as templates, and prepare guidance documents based on existing state lists as examples.

Communication, Education and Outreach (CEO)

The CEO Subcommittee was given a presentation via WebEx by Sherry Aultman of Clemson University on the Junior Invasive Inspectors Program in South Carolina, a citizen science initiative that equips middle school youth and their adult leaders with the knowledge and supplies to conduct visual surveys for regulated invasive forest pests.

No action items or recommendations for this meeting.

Control and Management

Discussed on recommendations to the NISC and came up with 8 recommendations (see priorities/recommendations)

No action items or recommendations for this meeting.

Research

- Hilda Diaz-Soltero: There is a need to enhance systematics capabilities. Ecological Society of America (ESA) has requested for living plant collection. Our strategy is different from ESA and ITAP
- ARS and Smithsonian have their five-year plan but the question is whether they have personnel.
- Had a conference call with John Peter, Phyllis and 6-8 people from the Interior and tried to work on systematics collectively
- The outcome of the conference call was the Interior was interested in systematics but wanted to check back with higher officials

- Phyllis will check with the status of outcome from this call
- Next steps:
 - Select priorities where you need help
 - See where the priority of agency lie

Priorities agenda was set from the subcommittee (see priorities/recommendations)

Organizational / Collaboration

Full ISAC discussion and language editing of the bylaws lead by Ken Zimmerman

Day 2 Ends at 5:00 PM

DAY 3: Friday, October 30, 2015

ISAC MEMBERS PRESENT:

ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Chair)	Invasive Species Action Network
ERIC LANE (Vice-Chair)	Colorado Department of Agriculture
JERRY COOK (Secretary)	Sam Houston State University
CHARLES BARGERON	University of Georgia
PATRICK BURCH	Dow AgroSciences
PHILIP COWAN	Landcare Research
TAMMY DAVIS	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
JOSEPH M. DiTOMASO	University of California, Davis
SUSAN ELLIS	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Retired)
JAMES FURNISH	Forestry Consultant
BONNIE HARPER-LORE	Restoration Ecology Consultant
WILLIAM HYATT	Connecticut Dept. of Environmental Protection
PHYLLIS JOHNSON	University of North Dakota
JANIS McFARLAND	Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.
MARSHALL MEYERS	Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council
EDWARD MILLS	Cornell University
STEPHEN PHILLIPS	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
DAVID REID	Invasive Species Consultant
DAVID E. STARLING	Aqueterinary Services, P.C.
NATHAN STONE	Engle-Stone Aquatic\$, LLC.
JOHN PETER THOMPSON	Invasive Species Consultant
ROBERT VAN STEENWYK	University of California, Berkeley
DAMON E. WAITT	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
KENNETH ZIMMERMAN	Lone Tree Cattle Company

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

JOSEPH BISCHOFF	Cornerstone Government Affairs
OTTO DOERING, III	Purdue University
CAROL OKADA	Hawai'i Department of Agriculture
ROLAND QUITIGUA	University of Guam
TIMOTHY SCHAEFFER	Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission
WILLIAM TOOMEY	The Nature Conservancy

NISC STAFF AND POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT

PHILLIP ANDREOZZI	NISC Staff
KELSEY BRANTLEY	NISC Staff

STAS BURGIEL	NISC Staff
CHRISTOPHER DIONIGI	NISC Staff
JAMIE K. REASER	NISC Executive Director
MENWYELET “Manny” ATSEDU	U.S. Department of Homeland Security
MARGARET “Peg” BRADY	U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)
DOUGLAS BURKETT	U.S. Department of Defense
HILDA DIAZ-SOLTERO	U.S. Department of Agriculture
SUSAN PASKO	U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)
HILARY SMITH	U.S. Department of the Interior
THERESE TRACY	U.S. Department of State

PRESENTATION

ISAC Moving Forward

Jamie K. Reaser, NISC Executive Director

- NISC asks for advice for ISAC to provide – ISAC responds and NISC gives feedback on product / recommendation
- Get policy liaisons to the table; NISC is looking for ways to build capacity (identify staff leads, developing a handbook to give a sense of what will be expected and how to go forward, develop an IS factsheet for each agency to help understand responsibility of that agency and give messaging for department), track work of liaisons in terms of effectiveness within agency (e.g., their ability to bring summaries and feedback back to ISAC).
- Membership:
 - Tribes, NGOs, and Business seems are underrepresented on ISAC (reach out and let them know they are invited to participate in this process)
 - Intended to be able to provide high quality advice (technical experts); interpretation is broadening. Should not have to be an invasive species “guru” to qualify; any look for other expertise (e.g., restoration, economic)
 - Process Capabilities – not just expertise, but also well position to take information and inform other (ability to network).
 - Size (very large – expensive to run, can be cumbersome). Reduce size over time while enhancing the caliber of experts and maintaining the balance of expertise and regions.
- Operational:
 - Need to find a better way to report meetings.
 - Task teams – request for advise has been lacking, has needed to come up with own projects. Move towards task teams with specified direction and deadlines.
 - Targeted standing committees (rather than sub –committees) to provide advise on specific, emerging questions asked.
 - Coordinating committee – rather than steering committee - ISAC rep for each task team interacts with fed representatives.
 - Food and Drink – NISC should be able to provide
 - Location – future meetings in DC, increases possibility that feds will attend, more engagement with public and media. Tentative discussions with Smithsonian for future meetings. Plan in ahead for space use (logically easier if use a consistent location). Task teams may be able to do field trips that add value to the work they are conducting
- Format:
 - Pre- meeting summit: Science / technical presentations. (public meeting)
 - ISAC Day 1: respond to prior recommendations, liaison / meminvolvement ber reports, task team directives followed by task team break out groups.
 - ISAC Day 2: Task teams continue to work. Followed by announcements, recommendations from task teams, principal (federal) response followed by discussion.

- Day 2 – followed by reception (possible poster session, media interviews).

Questions/Comments:

Bonnie Harper-Lore: Should interaction with Federal principals be on Day 1, not 2:

Response: Ideally it would be both, but since unlikely should consider ideal time to invite them to attend.

Stephen Phillips: Cannot lose sight of constituencies, when opportunities arise may need to hold meetings away from DC.

Response: Yes, but need to look for opportunities, perhaps piggyback from other meetings. Also need to increase involvement with ANSTF

Chris Dionigi: Does the group currently use social media to get word out about meeting?

Response: No social media is currently used.

Marshall Meyers: Historically interaction between ISAC and feds have been non-existent. Meetings in DC may be beneficial. Caution regarding social media, as several rules apply.

Bonnie Harper-Lore: In EO, the ANSTF was supposed to be advisors to NISC as well as FICNMEW.

Bob Wiltshire: Is possible to work in emerging issues into direction of ISAC, since may no longer be having field trips.

Response: That is the purpose of the pre-meeting summit.

Bob Wiltshire: Many things are changing, but it is a path forward to being more effective.

ISAC HOUSEKEEPING

ISAC Nominations

- Officers, opening day of next meeting will be to solicit nominations, officer elections at end of meeting. (Interim officers until next meeting).
- Nominating committee corresponded, recommend Interim officers:
 - Bob Wiltshire - Chair
 - John Peter Thompson – Vice-Chair
 - Susan Ellis – Secretary

The floor was opened for additional recommendations. There being none, the ISAC approved the officer slate as recommended.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM