

## INVASIVE SPECIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

### *“Invasive Species and Commerce”*

**December 6-8, 2011**

U.S. Department of Commerce  
Herbert C. Hoover Building  
1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room 4830  
Washington, DC 20030

**DAY 1: Tuesday, December 6, 2011**

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

E. ANN GIBBS (Chair)	Maine Department of Agriculture
ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Vice-Chair)	Invasive Species Action Network
AMY FRANKMANN (Secretary)	Michigan Nursery and Landscape Association
PETER ALPERT	University of Massachusetts
PATRICK BURCH	Dow AgroSciences
EARL CHILTON, II	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
JOSEPH M. DITOMASO	University of California, Davis
OTTO DOERING, III	Purdue University
SUSAN ELLIS	California Department of Fish and Game
BONNIE HARPER-LORE	Restoration Ecologist – Consultant
SCOTT HENDRICK	National Conference of State Legislatures
PHYLLIS JOHNSON	University of North Dakota
SUSAN KEDZIE	Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe
ERIC LANE	Colorado Department of Agriculture
ROBERT McMAHON	University of Texas at Arlington
MARSHALL MEYERS	Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council
EDWARD MILLS	Cornell University
STEPHEN PHILLIPS	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
KRISTINA SERBESOFF-KING	The Nature Conservancy
CELIA SMITH	University of Hawaii
DAVID E. STARLING	Aqueterinary Services, P.C.
NATHAN STONE	University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
JOHN PETER THOMPSON	Invasive Species Consultant
JOHN TORGAN	The Nature Conservancy
ROBERT VAN STEENWYK	University of California, Berkeley
DAMON E. WAITT	University of Texas at Austin

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT**

TIMOTHY MALE	Defenders of Wildlife
JAMIE REASER	Independent Consultant
JENNIFER VOLLMER	CPS Timberland

#### **NISC STAFF PRESENT**

LORI WILLIAMS	NISC Executive Director
CHRISTOPHER (CHRIS) DIONIGI	Assistant Director for Domestic Policy
KELSEY BRANTLEY	Program Specialist and ISAC Coordinator
STAS BURGIEL	Assistant Director for Prevention and Budgetary Coordination

PHIL ANDREOZZI

Assistant Director for International  
Programs

***NISC POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT***

MARGARET (PEG) BRADY

HILDA DIAZ-SOLTERO

PETE EGAN

MATTHEW FARMER

ARNIE KONHEIM

GINA RAMOS

MICHAEL TRULSON

U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)

U.S. Department of Agriculture (FS)

U.S. Department of Defense

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
(CBP)

U.S. Department of Transportation

U.S. Department of the Interior (BLM)

U.S. Department of State

Ann Gibbs, ISAC Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m.

Ms. Gibbs welcomed everyone, and acknowledged the six (6) new members of ISAC Class 7:

- Patrick Burch
- Bonnie Harper-Lore
- Susan Kedzie
- Marshall Meyers
- Robert Van Steenwyk
- John Peter Thompson

An overview of the meeting theme and agenda was given, and attendees introduced themselves, and a focus of the meeting was provided.

### **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 2011 MEETING**

A motion was made by Damon Waitt to approve the minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Otto Doering, and the minutes were approved by general consent.

### **NISC STAFF REPORTS**

*Lori Williams, NISC Executive Director*

Ms. Williams thanked the Department of Commerce for hosting ISAC, as well as Peg Brady and Susan Pasko of NOAA, for facilitating the use of Room 4830.

Ms. Williams shared with the group the status of Gordon Brown, NISC Policy Liaison to DOI, who fell ill and has been hospitalized since October 2011. Mr. Brown was released from the hospital today (12/6/2011), however, an expected return date is still unknown.

Staff Updates:

- The NISC Office Manager position is close to being filled. The new hire is expected to be on board on or about January 2012.
- NISC has welcomed two fall interns, Zachary Heath (Oregon State University), and Sarah Radden (Howard University).
- NISAW coming up Feb. 27 – March 3, 2012. Planning is coming along and should have final agendas for the sessions next week. Participation is encouraged with local events. Highlight will be urban invasive species and a grass roots day.
- Ms. Williams was invited to speak on invasive species to the National Association of Attorney Generals during their conference in Miami, FL in November.

*Stas Burgiel, NISC Assistant Director for Prevention and Budgetary Coordination*

- NISC and ANSTF Prevention Committee is meeting to look at pathways.
- Trade – working to get invasive species language in trade agreements.
- Climate Change – recommendation for NISC and ANSTF to work together on this effort.

*Phil Andreozzi, NISC Assistant Director for International Programs*

- Micronesia Biosecurity Plan – Dept. of Defense has funded at \$2.7 million a biosecurity plan to look at all species and has added \$1 million to implement the plan. Working on moving this plan to the rest of the Pacific.
- Also working on invasive species concerns in the Arctic.

*Chris Dionigi, NISC Assistant Director for Domestic Policy*

- Good coverage in USA Today on invasive species last week. Also working with Discover Magazine. If there are any storylines or topics let him know.
- Major cable network is planning a reality series on invasive species, which will be anchored in policy and science. They will be starting in New Orleans.
- Approached the Wildlife Habitat Council – they certify corporate lands as wildlife habitat. They're interested in having a third party certifier for this. As the members are working with these lands awareness is being raised about invasive species. Production start could be the same time as NISAW so something could be done in conjunction.

#### **NISC RESPONSE TO ISAC RECOMMENDATIONS** *(from the June 2011 Meeting)*

**Recommendation #1:** To enhance the effectiveness of biological control programs at their inception, ISAC recommends that NISC Departments and Agencies working on biological control of invasive organisms, plan, conduct, and evaluate their programs in the context of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach. This may require integrating biological control in concert with other management options (i.e., physical, cultural, and chemical) to achieve maximum effectiveness. For example, many invasive species are susceptible to both biological control agents and competitive interactions. As a result, using these approaches in concert can provide synergy towards achieving the desired land management objectives

**Response:** *Still getting information from the different agencies and are finding that where there are resources and/or an area-wide program, the recommendation is being done. Still some work to do on this but are some good models out there that can be integrated within the agencies. Will report on this at the next meeting.*

**Recommendation #2:** To further enhance the potential effectiveness of biological control programs, ISAC recommends federal land management agencies that oversee and conduct control operations utilizing biological control agents become more fully engaged in adaptive management by collecting and sharing post-release monitoring data. This Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach should emphasize partnerships with local controlling authorities, post-release monitoring and collaborative programs with land managers and other federal, state and university scientists in other pest management disciplines to develop principles and technical guidance and recommendations for invasive species management. As examples, such efforts have already been established by Team Leafy Spurge and the area-wide melaleuca project.

**Response:** *This is a great idea that all agencies agree with but is a question of resources and how the data is shared.*

**Recommendation #3:** ISAC recommends that NISC support [www.invasivespecies.gov](http://www.invasivespecies.gov), established according to Executive Order 13112, Section 4, Item F, as the primary website that coordinates critical and unique information on national invasive species and serves as a link for accessing all federal invasive species programs.

**Response:** *Leadership at the Dept. of Interior supported keeping the NISC site separate and so far it has remained. Goal is to improve the NISC website. Some sites are being shut down but we're on solid ground for now. The Coburn Amendment asked Government to look at efficiencies with inner agency efforts to save money. Invasive species are being looked at.*

**Recommendation #4:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), ISAC recommends that NISC Departments, Agencies and their contractors assess the risk of invasiveness whenever their activities lead to the introduction of [non-native] species or their subsets (i.e. moving organisms from where they occur to where they have never occurred historically).

**Response:** *The Executive Order requires agencies to address invasive species. The issue is how is the EO being implemented from agency to agency? This needs to be the focus with models for the agencies to follow.*

**Recommendation #5:** That NISC adopt the attached ISAC White paper entitled, Marine Bioinvasions and Climate Change, and recommendations therein.

**Response:** *National Oceans Council has been developing ocean action plans that are looking at concepts in this White Paper. This is still in draft form.*

### **NISC MEMBER DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

*Gina Ramos and Brian Arroyo, U.S. Department of the Interior*

- Bureau of Indian Affairs – Budget for invasive species has \$3 million over the last few years. They require a 50/50 match with the tribes.
  - 65 tribes implementing 350 projects covering 200,000 acres.
  - Renegotiating with the EPA for pesticide application on native American lands.
- Bureau of Land Management – working on invaders of public lands.
- Bureau of Reclamation - prevention
- Fish & Wildlife Service – had a large rat eradication on one of the islands. For FY 2012 this service will still be active
- National Park Service is an active partner in Quagga and Zebra mussel spread and control. Work on other invasive species is taking place.
- US Geological Survey – the 2012 President's budget request terminates the National Biological Information Infrastructure.
- NPDES rule went into effect October. Grace period until January 2012 for federal agencies. This is being discussed to ensure compliance.

*Questions/Comments for Ms. Ramos:*

- **E. Chilton – NPDES – our state agency is interpreting the waters of the US in a certain way. Is the interpretation consistent? Every state is interpreting this in a different way.**
- **S. Ellis – Western states are concerned with lack of assistance on aquatic nuisance species. Message will be taken back.**
- **P. Alpert – difficulty with invasive species that are outside the park. Park Service is allowed to enter into agreements to work outside of a park.**
- **B. Harper-Lore – NY Andorondak Park is an example.**
- **O. Doerring – history of the NPDES – EPA was not in favor of the court decision that is forcing these changes.**

**Fish & Wildlife Service**

- Billions of species are coming into the US every year through legal challenges. Looking at the Lacey Act as one of the tools to deal with what is coming in. It's going to take a lot of time and effort to make the changes to this antiquated Act.
- Revamping Risk Assessments
- Partnering with science and are looking at a broader perspective.
- GAO audit will show that there are a multitude of approaches that have been taken to deal with invasive species. From listing to response.
  - Crayfish are moving across the country and are decimating native aquatic species.
  - Realizing that industry is important in the invasive species issue. Could look at species that aren't in trade now and stop them from becoming an issue. Prevention is where we can make a difference.

*Questions/Comments for Mr. Arroyo:*

- **E. Lane – frustrated with the lack of action and disagree that we have time as was indicated. Not satisfied with what was heard today—haven't seen anything come out of this administration in three years.**
- **P. Alpert – moving towards science based management are you thinking of looking at going in the direction of managing habitats to make them less invasiveable.**
- **E. Mills – it's important to develop your power base, are you engaging the States in the broader invasive species issue? Absolutely.**

***Arnie Konheim, U.S. Department of Transportation***

- Aircraft disinsection – deals with flying insects in the passenger cabin. With focus on mosquitoes.
- Chemical disinsection is being endorsed to deal with this.
- Not voluntary for the passengers.
- Work is taking place to make this required when the plane is going through areas that are known as a risk.
- Looking at a non-chemical solution.
- Air curtain – in tests 100% of flies and 99% of mosquitoes were stopped. Delta agreed to do a test in Ghana.

Questions/Comments for Mr. Konheim:

- **B. Harper-Lore – appreciates the good work.**
- **J. DiTomaso – use these air curtains in supermarkets. Would there be more prevention to have the curtains as you enter an exit the aircraft? Have looked at this.**

**Hilda Diaz-Soltero, U.S. Department of the Interior**

- All of the Recommendations made by ISAC since 2003 have been adapted by the USDA, where applicable.
- \$1.351 billion is the USDA's 2011 budget for invasive species.
- The Recommendations applicable to USDA from the June 2011 Meeting were reviewed and responded to.
- Multi-agency grant funding opportunities for invasive plants were presented and explained.
- USDA Do No Harm report will be coming out in February.

**Margaret "Peg" Brady, U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)**

- Chesapeake Bay Executive Order
- Five areas of focus with agencies working cooperatively to leverage resources.
- Great Lakes Restoration Initiative – funding from EPA for grants
- NOAA Habitat Restoration Project Solicitations
- Updated and revised
- Lionfish – developing a national prevention and control plan w/ANSTF subcommittee.
- ANSTF November Meeting was held and was successful.
  - Next meeting is May, 2012

Questions/Comments for Ms. Brady:

- **S. Ellis – who is the contact--Susan Mangan**
- **C. Smith – Great Lakes activities but no mention of partnering with Canada? While there's opportunity with Canada partnerships, these funds were directed at the states. Is there a problem in the northern Lionfish expansion? Don't think it'll be able to reproduce.**
- **A. Gibbs – Siqueterra, what is it? A family of toxins from dinoflagellants (similar to red tide).**
- **C. Dionigi – Siqueterra is a neurotoxin**

**Mike Trulson, U.S. Department of State**

**NOTE:** In lieu of a presentation, Mr. Trulson provided the DOS update to the group in hard copy (see Attachment 1).

## LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Jason Goldberg GAO Audit on how to prevent wildlife disease – *by the end of the month report should be ready*

E. Chilton – Bill relative to NPDES had opposition and was wondering if this was moving at all? *No.*

A. Gibbs – Farm Bill authorization isn't moving forward because the joint standing committee on deficit reduction or supercommittee failed to agree on a deficit reduction deal. Because of this legislators don't think that they could get agreement on farm bill funding at this time.

K. Serbesoff-King – bipartisan letter from Florida to release the snake rule (listing of constrictors in the Lacey Act).

S. Hendrick – do track legislation on their website.

O. Doerring – August 18 the Director of the EPA released a report that shows that nitrogen is critical in invasive species. "Reactive Nitrogen in the United States: An Analysis of Inputs, Flows, Consequences, and Management Options".

[www.epa.gov/sab](http://www.epa.gov/sab) then go to reports and enter keyword nitrogen to get to the report.

## KEYNOTE ADDRESS

*Margaret Spring, Chief of Staff, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), US Dept. of Commerce*

- Welcomed the new and returning ISAC members and thanked everyone for their efforts.
- Chair of the coordinating board on Marine Transportation
- Comments were provided on invasive species in the marine environment; impacts, concerns, efforts, etc.
  - **B. Wiltshire – highlighted the tremendous societal costs involved with invasive species. Any suggestion on how ISAC can highlight the need for prevention in these tough budget times? All agencies are having to justify that every dollar spent is not a waste of taxpayer dollars. ISAC could document examples of successes to assist in the policy making—voices from outside the federal government.**

## PRESENTATION: INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVES ON THE LACK OF UNIFORM BALLAST WATER REGULATION

*Kathy Metcalf, Chamber of Shipping of America*

*Questions/Comments for Ms. Metcalf:*

- **A. Gibbs – what would you do to fix this? 1) Enact the legislation—one program with the most stringent standards; 2) Review the technology every 5 years; 3) Find research dollars to assist ballast water manufacturers in development**
- **J. Torgan – states enacted legislation as the federal law wasn't stringent enough, but could give rule making to a federal agency. Is this in the current legislation and could you support it? It's not in there and we couldn't support it—replacing one patchwork of rules with another. Should look at the safety net built with the states and look at an alternative.**
- **E. Mills – from the states perspective a national standard is wanted and the states are pushing for it.**
- **B. McMahon – Hull fowling is the other big issue as we're losing**



chemicals for this and there aren't many replacements. Yes, this is true but the Navy has some self-polishing coatings.

- **E. Chilton – strong preemptive language is wanted. What process for compromise is out there to get this?** *The environment cannot be compromised. We need the strongest standard out there.*

## **DISCUSSION: PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION ON POTENTIAL FRAMEWORKS FOR VALIDATION OF ADVANCED IS DETECTION METHODS**

*ISAC Members*

- National Academy of Science review is wanted. Will review at the subcommittee meeting and will bring a recommendation.
- **H. Diaz-Soltero – try to be specific to the agencies that you are directing the recommendation to.**
- **P. Alpert – Fish & Wildlife Service had a meeting on using eDNA in their IS management. It's expensive and takes a long time to develop for each species.**
- After discussion it was decided that the Subcommittee would review and decide whether or not to present a formal recommendation to the full ISAC.

## **MEMBERS FORUM**

**Bob Wiltshire, Invasive Species Action Network:** Moving on planning process on International Conference on Didymo, also known as Rock Snot.

**Scott Hendrick, National Conference of State Legislators:** Continues to be involved in invasive species issues through the National Conference of State Legislators.

**Bonnie Harper-Lore, Restoration Ecologist:** Defining constituency on this Committee. Worked with Wisconsin DNR on garlic mustard trying to determine the spread in preparation for control. Working with U of M to document the spread of Chinese Silver Grass. Working with young people to create a video game on terrestrial invasives.

**Susan Ellis, California Department of Fish and Game:** Quagga and Zebra mussel issues – resolutions to get more federal actions on these issues.

**David Starling, Aqueterinary Services, P.C.:** VHS virus with fish – working on biosecurity plan.

**Nathan Stone, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff:** Arkansas ANS plan was submitted to ANSTF. The National Aquaculture Association is doing educational programs.

**Earl Chilton, II, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department:** Finished ANS plan and have submitted it. Management Plan has also been updated. NPDES issue has caused Texas to develop their own permit, which was approved in November. 90 days now to develop protocol on how to comply with the TPDES. Budget reduced by 60%. Hydrilla expanding even with Grass Carp management taking place.

**Otto Doering, Purdue University:** Involved on the EPA Science Advisory Board

**John Peter Thompson, Invasive Species Consultant:** Happy to announce finished his first book. Appointed to serve on the Maryland Invasive Species Committee. Writing for the Forest Service. Working with Community College. Twitter account on invasive species is up and running.

**Damon Waitt, University of Texas at Austin:** Successful statewide plant and pest conference. Looking for an Invasive Species Manager. EO 13514 – sustainable practices for designed landscapes – guides federal agencies on federal lands – based on sustainable sites initiative—encourages use of native plants and management of invasive plants.

**John Torgan, Save The Bay:** Now have a job with The Nature Conservancy in Rhode Island. Rhode Island Marine Invasives, Flash Cards and Wanted Posters at [www.crmc.ri.gov/invasives.html](http://www.crmc.ri.gov/invasives.html).

**Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council:** Re: Habitattitude – needed work so PJAC is helping to rework this. Working to develop YouTube messages to educate on responsible aquarium owners. Pet Pathway Toolkit released ([www.petpathwaytoolkit.com](http://www.petpathwaytoolkit.com)) Funded by grants from the UK and US governments. BMPs and tools to minimize the risk of invasive species. Water garden BMPs for retailers and gardeners—highlights regionality issues—once complete will be available on the PJAC website. Holding a summit that will address the conflicting rules and regulations to develop a. Looking at airline regulations for transport.

**Peter Alpert, University of Massachusetts:** IPBES – panel on biodiversity and ecosystem services – soliciting comments and suggestions until 12/15/11. On loan from the National Science Foundation running the review on the grant program devoted to biodiversity through the SEES program. While Invasive Species are not mentioned they could fall within the parameters of these grants.

**Robert Van Steenwyk, University of California, Berkeley:** Research and entomology on invasive species. Working on two invasives—one eradicated and one moving east—spotted wing drasafala.

**Kristina Serbesoff-King, The Nature Conservancy:** Holding 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Caribbean Florida Fire and Invasives effort. Next meeting is going virtual and all are invited to attend. This is the 3<sup>rd</sup> and final year of the Dept. of Defense funding of the Florida Invasive Species Partnership/Cooperative Invasive Species Management Areas – focusing on structure and building partnerships. 2<sup>nd</sup> year of python patrol to train biologists and law enforcement on how to deal with a python sighting. 14 southeast and southwest counties can call 888-lveg0t1 to report a python sighting.

**Phyllis Johnson, University of North Dakota:** Huge oil boom in North Dakota, after many years of population decline it is beginning to climb. With this is coming the big equipment and concerns with invasive species. Have premiere university with unmanned aerial systems. In the next couple years FAA is approving the use of unmanned aerial systems. Potential applications for invasive species.

**Ed Mills, Cornell University:** Hydrilla is the newest invader. EAB continues to spread. St. Lawrence Seaway issues with ballast water.

**Robert McMahon, University of Texas at Arlington:** Working on zebra mussel potential invasives in northern lakes.

**Patrick Burch, Dow AgroSciences:** Background in forestry and currently at Dow.  
Working on refining guides for users – how to select site of invasion and the application.  
Looking at efficacy of the weeds being controlled and the plant reactions to the control.

**Joe DiTomaso, University of California, Davis:** A member of the California ISAC. Working on all taxa with social media and developing a conference on this. On sabbatical working on a weed control book.

**Eric Lane, Colorado Department of Agriculture:** WWCC weed conference – funding issues with ARS and APHIS make it difficult for researchers to complete a comprehensive control. Frustrating to not have an answer on whether biological controls exist for common weeds. Would benefit with more involvement on the federal level at these meetings. Looking at doing more of a webinar next year. Making good progress with on-line digital mapping system – a 50,000 ft. mapping program that assists with management and control of invasive species. Collecting data now and will be put up on the website.

**Susan Kedzie, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe:** Ambassador for the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe working on aquatic and forestry systems at the base of the Mississippi River. Only manager that covers 800,000 acres. Involved with the MN Aquatic Invasive Species committee to learn and develop an assessment tool to predict which watersheds are most vulnerable.

**Ann Gibbs, Maine Department of Agriculture:** Re: Dittimo – Maine is proposing to list this on the aquatic invasive species list. Difficult to get anything changed that involves legislation. In third year of forest pest survey project with 16 states involved and federal partners. Focusing on schools.

**Celia Smith, University of Hawai'i:** Algae clean-up project has only had one resort support the effort.

#### **REVIEW OF DAY 1 ACTION ITEMS**

There were no Action Items to report.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

***There being no further business the meeting adjourned for the day at 4:50 p.m.***

## INVASIVE SPECIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

### *“Invasive Species and Commerce”*

**December 6-8, 2011**

U.S. Department of Commerce  
Herbert C. Hoover Building  
1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Room 4830  
Washington, DC 20030

### **MINUTES**

**DAY 2: Wednesday, December 7, 2011**

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

E. ANN GIBBS (Chair)	Maine Department of Agriculture
ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Vice-Chair)	Invasive Species Action Network
AMY FRANKMANN (Secretary)	Michigan Nursery and Landscape Association
PETER ALPERT	University of Massachusetts
PATRICK BURCH	Dow AgroSciences
EARL CHILTON, II	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
JOSEPH M. DiTOMASO	University of California, Davis
OTTO DOERING, III	Purdue University
SUSAN ELLIS	California Department of Fish and Game
BONNIE HARPER-LORE	Restoration Ecologist – Consultant
SCOTT HENDRICK	National Conference of State Legislatures
PHYLLIS JOHNSON	University of North Dakota
SUSAN KEDZIE	Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe
ERIC LANE	Colorado Department of Agriculture
ROBERT McMAHON	University of Texas at Arlington
MARSHALL MEYERS	Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council
EDWARD MILLS	Cornell University
KRISTINA SERBESOFF-KING	The Nature Conservancy
CELIA SMITH	University of Hawaii
DAVID E. STARLING	Aqueterinary Services, P.C.
NATHAN STONE	University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
JOHN PETER THOMPSON	Invasive Species Consultant
JOHN TORGAN	The Nature Conservancy
ROBERT VAN STEENWYK	University of California, Berkeley
DAMON E. WAITT	University of Texas at Austin

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT**

TIMOTHY MALE	Defenders of Wildlife
STEPHEN PHILLIPS	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
JAMIE REASER	Independent Consultant
JENNIFER VOLLMER	CPS Timberland

**NISC STAFF PRESENT**

LORI WILLIAMS  
CHRISTOPHER (CHRIS) DIONIGI  
KELSEY BRANTLEY  
STAS BURGIEL

PHIL ANDREOZZI

NISC Director  
Assistant Director for Domestic Policy  
Program Specialist and ISAC Coordinator  
Assistant Director for Prevention & Budgetary  
Coordination  
Assistant Director for International Programs

**NISC POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT**

MARGARET (PEG) BRADY  
HILDA DIAZ-SOLTERO  
PETE EGAN  
MATTHEW FARMER

ARNIE KONHEIM  
ADRIANNA MUIR  
GINA RAMOS  
MICHAEL TRULSON

U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)  
U.S. Department of Agriculture (FS)  
U.S. Department of Defense  
U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
(CBP)  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
U.S. Department of State  
U.S. Department of the Interior (BLM)  
U.S. Department of State

***The Meeting was called to order at 8:14 a.m. by A. Gibbs.***

**PRESENTATION: STATUS OF U.S. COAST GUARD NATIONAL BALLAST WATER DISCHARGE STANDARD AND EPA VESSEL GENERAL PERMIT**

*CDR Ryan Allain, U.S. Coast Guard*

*Ryan Albert, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*

- Vessel General Permit – released in 2008 by court order. Knew that more and improvements were needed. [vgp@epa.gov](mailto:vgp@epa.gov)
- USGS Ballast Water Requirements – information is obtained on how much ballast water is coming in and where it's coming from.
- Drawbacks to Ballast Water Exchange
  - Not all ships are capable of doing this.
- Ballast Water Final Rule – anticipating publish date of February 2012.

*Questions/Comments for Mr. Allain:*

- **P. Alpert – What different models to quantify potential invasives through ballast water are available?** *The National Academy of Sciences report, Assessing the Relationship Between Propagule Pressure and Invasion Risk in Ballast Water, details some of these models and states that further research is needed in this area.*
- **E. Mills – expand on technologies that are available.** *Infrared, heat treatment in experimental phase.*
- **B. McMahon – in validating treatments, how do you tell the difference between a dead and a live organism when you do your counts?** *Common techniques look at whether the organisms show signs of movement. Look at fluorescent dyes and other technologies.*

**PRESENTATION: POLICY ON INVASIVE SPECIES IN USFS MANUAL**

*Mike Ielmini, U.S. Forest Service*

- The Invasive Species Policy Guidance Manual was published in the Federal Register 12/5/11 after a 9-year development process
- 193 million acres in the U.S. are national forest system
- This is for the land base only.
- Objectives for invasive species – IPM approach that works with neighbors
  - Prevention
  - EDRR – inventory and survey susceptible areas
  - Control and Management
  - Restoration
  - Organizational Collaboration
- Policy Statements for invasive species
  - Deal with invasive species
  - Determine the vectors and factors
  - Determine the risk of introducing, establishing, or spreading
  - Prior project approval
  - Prevention from accidental spread through all vectors
  - Active state program that includes a process that insures materials available to the public are weed-free (invasive-free)

- Partnerships will be established to carry out the objectives
- Cooperate with state governments
- Invasive Species Mgt. Program Forest Service Handbook is being developed and would like ISAC's assistance in putting this together
  - 9 chapters on hands-on and how-to carry out the objectives and policies in the Guidance Manual.

*Questions/Comments for Mr. Ielmini:*

**H. Diaz-Soltero – this was started in 2001 and a huge effort. This is going into the Manual of the National Forest System. This will be implemented and will be done. Forest Service would like input from ISAC. This is going to be the result in many agencies if we don't get the CEQ guidance.**

**P. Alpert – more about details on how ISAC can help.** *Work through the subcommittees when ready. Also at Public Comment.*

**E. Lane – congratulations on the progress so far. States are intrigued and are looking forward to partnering. How does this proceed across the other federal landscapes? Especially those that overlap?** *Service first is an administrative way of simplifying separate polices but when it comes down to it policies are different and it'll take coordination on the ground. BLM has similar policy and have included this under this umbrella—not a policy but a regulation change.*

**D. Waitt – Wow! Fantastic! Well-done!**

### **PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON APHIS NAPPRA RULE**

*Ingrid Berlanger, Arnold Chance, USDA – Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service*

- Changes in Q37 – covers the importation of plants for planting
- NAPPRA is a new rule – effective June 2011 – public comment closed in November and now working through comments received.
- Production facilities moving off shore and difficult to determine origin
- Pests borne internally, difficult to detect, limited technology at the borders, introduced pests are likely to become established, inadequate info available
- Plants entering with phytosanitary certificate and port of entry and risk assessment only for plants in growing media
- Q56 for fruits and vegetables for consumption more strict than Q37
- NAPPRA is a big policy shift – Plants whose importation is not authorized pending pest risk analysis
  - Created new import category of plant taxa
  - Performance standards
- Process
  - In July published Round 1 of candidate taxa – 107 hosts of 13 pests and 41 plants
  - Final Federal Register notice will affirm candidates as NAPPRA pests, subsequent rounds will follow (at least twice a year these will be published)
- Quarantine Pest Plants
  - List of species
  - Has to meet the PPA definition of a noxious weed
  - Meets the intent of IPPC definition of a quarantine pest
- Host of Quarantine Pests
  - Identify at least one quarantine pest



- Meet the definition of a quarantine pest
- Range and distribution
- Look at the Countries sending, the amount, and the mitigation measures
- Data sheet is written for every taxa listed on NAPPRA w/scientific justification
- Data sheet vs. Risk Analysis
  - Data sheet gets a plant or host added to NAPPRA list
  - Risk Analysis removes from the NAPPRA list
    - Quarantine pest plants
      - Weed Risk Assessment
      - PRA
    - Host
      - PRA

Or it could be put on the Noxious Weed List

***Plants for planting websites:***

- PPQ Stakeholder registry:  
<https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USDAAPHIS/subscriber/new/>
- PPQ Plants for Planting:  
[www.aphis.usda.gov/import\\_export/plants/plant\\_imports/Q37/nappra/index.shtml](http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/plant_imports/Q37/nappra/index.shtml)
- Regulations.gov:  
[www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=APHIS-2011-0072-0001](http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=APHIS-2011-0072-0001)

*Questions/Comments for Ms. Berlanger:*

**J. DiTomasso – plants can be in the US but not widely spread and control, what is meant by this?** *Those under official control would be on the list. Those not under official control would not be listed. New USDA initiative called FREE Stamp (Federally Recognized State Managed Phytosanitary Program). There is a list of plants that were assessed and are allowed to come in. Where are the known lists, how can they be regulated and/or mitigated, tec.*

**P. Johnson – with taxa are there adequate resources to support systematic taxonomy?** *Always an issue but utilize federal partners outside of APHIS to do this.*

**K. Serbesoff-King – how are you generating the list? Working on this for a number of years, started with a paper published by CPHST under PPQ. How do you add to the list? Easy to do this, either directly or during public comment. Who pays for risk assessment?** *APHIS does this. Do have the mechanism to ask for data. Individuals can propose species for inclusion under NAPPRA during a regular request for comments in the Federal Register. Requests for a formal pest risk assessment of a NAPPRA-listed species have to come from a foreign country's designated national plant protection organization.*

**PRESENTATION: The US AND CHINA: ACTIVE TRADING PARTNERS IN COMMERCE AND BIOLOGICAL INVADERS**

*Richard Mack, Washington State University*

**SUMMARY OF REMARKS:** The greatest current increase in commerce and the greatest associated threat of species introductions to and from the U.S. is trade with China. The number of invasive species in the U.S. that have been introduced from China is still relatively low, but several recent introductions have proven highly destructive, and climatic similarity suggests that the potential for future invasions is high. So far, there are

no special policies in place to counter this.

- Looked at evaluating species from China that would grow in our environment and could become a problem—naturalization and invasion.
- Potential for invasion is a two-way street.
- Plant exchanges will continue and need effective assessment tools to protect both our countries from invasions.

**PRESENTATION: DHS CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION: ACTIVITIES AND AUTHORITIES RELATED TO COMMERCE AND THE INTERNATIONAL MAIL/EXPRESS COURIER INSPECTION**

*Matthew Farmer, U.S. Dept. of Homeland Security*

*SUMMARY OF REMARKS:* An overview was provided of International Mail and Express Consignment inspections with special emphasis towards invasive and exotic species. Aspects of both the International Mail and Express Courier import processes were covered with entry process, targeting, inspection techniques (X-ray, K-9), legal authorities, challenges, and recent discoveries.

*Questions/Comments for Mr. Farmer:*

**J. DiTomaso – the dogs, are they trained for plant materials?** *They are trained on 5 scents initially then they can be trained on other scents.*

**K. Serbesoff-King – what would be a recommendation for the U.S. Postal Service?** *They are currently working on a detection system. They will have scanning capability. No timetable for this. Are there any international agreements to require inspections prior to mailing?* *No, nothing from the country of origin.*

**C. Smith – had thought that rare and specialty types of commodities that were being shipped in. Surprised at how common what's being shipped.**

**E. Lane – using the leaf example, when an inspector finds something is there a way of back tracing if the shipment is split up after entering the country?** *Once it's left the facility it could be recalled but it's usually passed along to USDA, SITC.*

**B. Van Steenwyk – what are the penalties for smuggling items in?** *Failure to declare is \$300, customs is 3 times the domestic value, as a Trusted Traveler the fine is \$500 with higher inspection rates in the future. Commercial matters can have criminal penalties.*

**L. Williams – percentage of cargo coming in that is inspected is 2%. The mail that comes in and is inspected is 25% and is based on the risks provided from the agencies.**

**D. Starling – any plans for gamma radiation on everything that comes in?** *Would like to do this very much. Don't have effective levels of documentation.*

**E. Chilton – if something comes through that's on the federal list are they fined for the shipment or is each fined as a separate violation?** *Turned over to the appropriate agency and it could be either way. Once a violator, do they try to change their Company name?* *Yes.*

**M. Meyers – of the mail that is inspected, is there a higher observation rate of express mail?** *It is at a higher rate.*

**PRESENTATION: AN ANALYSIS OF AN INVASION PATHWAY: PATTERNS OF LIVE VERTEBRATE IMPORTATION INTO THE UNITED STATES**

*Christina Romagosa, Research Fellow, Auburn University*

The wildlife trade is an important biological commodity that creates global movement of millions of individuals annually. This anthropogenic transport of wildlife is a major threat

to biodiversity by depleting wild populations and introducing invasive species, disease, and parasites. For vertebrates, trade in live specimens is the most important pathway related to their introduction. The US is one of the largest global markets for live vertebrates and because importation records are maintained by US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), an unusually complete record of legal trade can be generated. Importation data for 6 taxonomic groups (amphibians, turtles, lizards, snakes, birds, and mammals) from USFWS declaration forms for available years between 1968-2009 either from USFWS or from published compilations of these data. These data were used for a synthetic review of US trade in live vertebrates over 30 years, and its contribution to the invasion process. Specifically, Dr. Romagosa 1) summarized the cumulative number of species imported, 2) compared the magnitude of individuals imported for available time periods, 3) summarized geographic patterns, and 4) estimated the number of species entrained in this invasion pathway. The US imported over 4300 species and approximately 300 million individual terrestrial vertebrates during 1968-2009. Trade-related dynamics have led to changes in species used for trade, individual quantities of those species traded, and their geographic origin. In relation to the invasion process, roughly 12% of all vertebrate species imported were introduced, 25% of those introduced established breeding populations, and finally, 38% of established species spread from the original introduction site. These results provide a baseline for the proportion of imported vertebrate species entrained in this invasion pathway, and suggest that USFWS data are an informative source that can be used to assess trade dynamics, its relationship to biological invasions, and related policy.

*Questions/Comments for Ms. Romagosa:*

**M. Meyers – were the South American species backed out of what was reported from Asia?** *No. Purging of the data, the original import data could no longer exist so it's now difficult to defend yourself. The data is outsourced to a group that aren't biologists but data entry. Andy Rhine at Rhode Island is doing a paper and is having to pull out the data and manually create a data base.*

**P. Brady – on the fish imports are they broken out for fresh and salt?** *Yes, they are now.*

**D. Starling – how much of data may be biased by improved culture?** *With increased capability of keeping these alive, you'd think there'd be more that were captive bred instead of imported, but it's not.*

**P. A – were the U.S. territories included in the information presented?** *No, only the continental U.S. was included.*

**S. Kedzie – who is responsible for paying for the additional layer of dealing with imports—the process of imports?** *Commercial importers have to pay for inspections and have to pay for licenses to import. The problem comes from those that aren't going legally through the system. Much of the costs are being born by the taxpayers. This system is then unsustainable and we need to go to corporations that are gaining from this. You need a variety of regulatory and non-regulatory approaches. The majority of the species that are coming in are benign.*

**M. Meyers – not enough time to discuss the above topic, it's very complex and needs to be worked on.**

**J. DiTomaso – any way to estimate what % of movement of animals is legal vs. illegal?** *Level of illegal trade data is available but not known for this meeting. There are some species that aren't captured in the database of things that are here but no records exist of their importation.*

**C. Dionigi – there's issues with the animals themselves but could be vectors of disease. Any way to mesh what's known from public health fields to flag things that are coming in?** *Yes, there is work being done on this.*

**K. Serbesoff-King – with the bird trends, was there an increase with illegal imports of birds once the law was enacted?** *No, there was an increase of captive bred.*

**P. Brady – who is supporting this research?** *National Fish & Wildlife Foundation and other similar groups. Challenging to find funding for this type of research.*

## **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Subcommittee on Organizational Collaboration**

*Susan Ellis, Chair*

- Update was provided on NISAW
  - February 26 – March 2, 2012
  - Next week solidified Agenda will go out
  - Logistical challenges
    - Working on getting back on FaceBook – J. Thompson agreed to put the information up
  - Need to update and revise the By-laws to reflect the Charter. Will be presented prior to and will be voted on at the next meeting.
  - With P. Andreozzi back we'll be working on international items.
  - We need to take into consideration that our Recommendations to federal agencies should be written in a way that doesn't go against

### **Subcommittee on Early Detection and Rapid Response**

*David Starling, EDRR Subcommittee Member (acting for Stephen Phillips, Chair)*

- Ongoing action is the PCR draft that is now a recommendation.
- Looking at making this into a White Paper.
- Update from C. Dionigi on funding for rapid response. In a draft in the National Ocean policy (published in the Federal Register end of Dec/beginning of Jan). The idea is that this would be for species and instances where they aren't big yet. Once the legal mechanisms get in place then will look at ISAC to decide on funding.

### **Subcommittee on Research**

*Peter Alpert, Chair*

- Proclaimed that in the Fall 2012 P. Johnson will be the Chair.
- Congratulated ourselves on the AAAS Meeting that was held this year on invasive species.
- Noted that there is a sister group in OSTP is a subcommittee on invasive species. Going to invite one of the members to our meeting in the Fall 2013.
- Want to know what the Dept. of Transportation did on Recommendation #4 from June.

### **Subcommittee on Control and Management**

*Joe DiTomaso, Chair*

- Biocontrol
  - Four recommendations have been made on this over the past three years. With these, the subcommittee would like to produce a short White Paper that focuses on the difficulties of doing this and the need for long-term funding. Plan is to have the draft at the next meeting.
- Use of genetic engineering in weed management was also discussed. Will develop an action item on this once more is known.

- Continuation of last meeting where we were requested to present a recommendation on the IR-4 program. Didn't quite understand and are writing an action item to find out if the agencies are looking at labeling chemicals to deal with invasive species.

### **Subcommittee on Communication, Education and Outreach**

*Damon Waitt, Chair*

- Trailers have been developed for each of our White Papers
- Update on NISAW
- Update on NISC Newsletter and website. Asked for website stats.
- Discussed the press releases that were discussed in the Organizational Collaboration Subcommittee.
- Communications Plan will be reviewed and circulated to all ISAC members for possible inclusion in the next Management Plan.
- Action item is for NISC to disseminate the White Paper trailers at NISAW

### **Subcommittee on Prevention**

*Kristina Serbesoff-King, Chair*

- Ecommerce and invasive species and the internet. Spent time discussing the development of a White Paper and questions for the eCommerce discussion tomorrow morning.
- The Subcommittee will reconvene after tomorrow's session and all are invited.
- J. Peter Thompson introduced the book he wrote for APHIS with contributions from H. Diaz-Soltero. Looked at how to look at ornamental nursery stock as pest free. The National Plant Board has taken this up for consideration. Working with the states to get resources out to those in the field, steering committee is working to do field visit to CA to see what systems are in place, and working with industry in states on various levels. Looking at an audit based system of inspections. States are leery of the changes being considered.

### **PRESENTATION: DEMONSTRATION OF THE GLOBAL INVASIVE SPECIES COMPENDIUM**

*Hilda Diaz-Soltero, USDA Policy Liaison to NISC*

*SUMMARY OF REMARKS:* The presentation will allow ISAC members to learn to use this global repository of up to date scientific information on invasive species from all taxa, all ecosystems, that have the worst impact on the environment, economy and animal health. Information is freely available on the web and can be important for prevention, EDRR, control and management of invasives, as well as research and policy making. Planning for a webinar to demonstrate the site. [www.cabi.org/isc](http://www.cabi.org/isc)

*Questions/Comments for Ms. Soltero:*

**B. Harper-Lore – was involved in the inception workshop---thank you for making this available globally at no charge. Had a demonstration by CABI and it was extremely useful.**

**M. Meyers – raised issues on the fact sheets and that the reviewers would be included. It doesn't look like they are there. This is a significant concern to make sure the authors are qualified. It will be. This will be one of the tools used by agencies to determine invasiveness.**

**E. Chilton – since risk assessment will be a part of this what did you use?** *A basic model was used to do this. You can then export the data into your model.*

**B. Wiltshire – role out is 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2012.** *Yes, wanted ISAC to have a preview prior to the June meeting. Not all functions are available on the website today, but will be continuously updated.*

**B. McMahon – can't wait to see this. Is the date set for the webinar?** *Not yet, looking at the first of February and will have more than one.*

**P. Alpert – published articles will they be linked?** *Yes.*

**M. Meyer – what happens if the article is rejected?** *They get back to the submitter to let them know. Will this be updated in versions so that it can be referred back to?*  
*Yes.*

### **PRESENTATION: ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL RESEARCH PROGRAM (APCRP)**

*Al Cofrancesco, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*

*SUMMARY OF REMARKS:* The APCRP is the Nation's only federally authorized research program for aquatic plant management, and is nationally recognized as the leader in aquatic plant management research and technology development. Timothy R.E. Keeney, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce stated in Congressional Testimony, September 27, 2007 before the Subcommittee of Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans Committee on Natural Resources U.S. House of Representatives that "The Army Corps of Engineers has done an outstanding job of developing control methodologies for specific weed species through their Engineer Research and Development Center. It should be noted, however, that their success was the result of a decades-long commitment involving significant financial resources." Support is needed to get funding re-established through appropriations for FY 2012 and in the President's Budget for FY 2013.

*Questions/Comments for Mr. Cofrancesco:*

**S. Kedzie – sympathize with funding issue. Are there any sites that you are currently managing that you can address from a restoration angle. EPA is funding a major initiative in the Great Lakes GLRI where restoration is being addressed.**

**H. Diaz-Soltero – do you have a short synopsis on effects by not funding this program and the effects of invasive species?** *Yes, this can be provided.*

**P. Alpert – was this an in-house research program?** *It was but there were cooperators all over the U.S. Will labs be shut down without funding? Used cooperators labs but the researchers without funding will be transferred.*

**E. Chilton – for those without an invasive plant problem in their state, I want to point out what a great help this group has been with biocontrols.**

**E. Mills – we've had some huge natural disasters recently, how much of this is diverting funds from programs like yours?** *It's hard to say if these are in direct competition.*

**P. Johnson – agree with H. Diaz-Soltero in that we need to make the argument in big picture, big dollars to get their attention.**

**B. Harper-Lore – years ago when highways was tasked for controlling aquatic invasive species your lab is where we went. To build a case to save this, how long before Hydrilla comes to MN and clogs the waterway?**

**B. McMahon – if you lose your funding will the biocontrol lab be shut down?** *Yes. It's very difficult and expensive to reopen one of these once they are closed.*

**J. Peter Thompson – FYI-biocontrol labs in ARS are being shut down also.**

**Problem with talking with Congress is trying to get them to understand exponential growth.**

**K. Serbesoff-King – Is there a recommendation that ISAC can make collectively?**

*To be discussed.*

**E. Chilton – a recommendation on this was made last year.**

**B. McMahon – this program cannot be lost!**

**L. Williams – ISAC can recommend to NISC which will go to OMB.**

*A short recommendation will be written and submitted.*

## **GROUP DISCUSSION**

*ISAC Members*

- **B. Wiltshire** – what in ARS is being closed?
- **J. Peter Thompson** – 10-12 ARS labs are being closed.
- **B. Harper-Lore** – is there anything that ISAC can do to assist the NISC staff? Will ask again in June what NISC and the staff need to accomplish their goals.
- **L. Williams** – appreciate the offer but are set today.
  
- Planning for Next ISAC Meeting (Spring 2012) – the meeting is scheduled for May 22- 24, 2012.
- **P. Brady** – reminder that ANSTF is the first week of May.
- **A. Gibbs** – reminder from Denver there was a presentation on implications with invasive species in relation to natural disasters. Talked about Chicago, Portland, OR, and New Orleans.
- **C. Dionigi** – lived in New Orleans and could provide local contacts. In May termites fly and crime rate is high.
- Asked our Texas members about helping and this would be an option.
- **B. Harper-Lore** also has contacts in Mississippi.
- **E. Lane** – with regard to topics, would be valuable to focus on animals and what the Fish & Wildlife Service is doing in respect to animals being imported. Could part of the June meeting be focused on this with field trips, etc.?
- **P. Alpert** – Oregon had the advantage of focusing on forest issues, which haven't been covered in recent years. With issues in forest management it would be good to look at this area.
- **H. Diaz-Soltero** – when we have the meetings in DC we get more participation from the agencies. If you're going to discuss budget cuts then these are the people you want to provide presentations. They might not be able to attend if it's not in DC.
- **C. Dionigi** – offer has been made from the Georgia Aquarium.
- **E. Chilton** – thought that Texas was good as all issues are there. If we were to come back to DC then would there be an opportunity to see on-the-ground issues? Possibly.
- **Recommendations / Action Items were addressed.**

NOTE: B. Wiltsire will be sending out a post meeting survey. Any questions you'd like to see added should be sent to him.

## **FINAL ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION ITEMS**

### ***Action Items***

- 1) From the Organizational Collaboration Subcommittee: If possible, starting with the most recent class there will be announcements or letters sent the appointees' Congressional delegation for the new and reappointed members of ISAC.

**Approved.**

- 2) From the Research Subcommittee: To enhance collaboration and cooperation between researchers and policy makers working on invasive species, the Research Subcommittee will invite the Invasive Species Working Group of the Committee on Environment, and Natural Resources Sustainability in the Office of Science and Technology Policy to meet jointly with them at the ISAC meeting in the fall of 2012.

**Approved.**

*Background: The ISWG, the only group under OSTP devoted to invasive species, comprises representatives from governmental agencies both within and outside NISC. A number of ISWG members have participated in ISAC meetings and one current ISAC Research Subcommittee member belongs to ISWG. A joint meeting will help ISWG and ISAC coordinate their efforts for greater effect and efficiency, and the simplest vehicle is a meeting with a subcommittee of ISAC.*

- 3) From the Research Subcommittee: Action Item: ISAC requests that NISC agencies, particularly the Department of Transportation, report to ISAC any actions taken in response to Recommendation 4 from the June 2011 meeting of ISAC.  
**H. Diaz-Soltero – are you asking only Dept. of Transportation? It's not only, it's particularly.**

**Approved.**

*Background: This recommendation stated that "In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), ISAC recommends that NISC Departments, Agencies and their contractors assess the risk of invasiveness whenever their activities lead to the introduction of [non-native] species or their subsets (i.e. moving organisms from where they occur to where they have never occurred historically)." Two key elements of this recommendation are that it includes introductions between states within the U.S. and introductions of a subset of a species.*

- 4) From the Communication, Education, and Outreach Subcommittee: ISAC requests that NISC disseminate the White Paper trailers at the 2012 NISAW Meeting and throughout the email contact list that has been developed of related state organizations.

**Approved.**



5) From the Control and Management Subcommittee: ISAC requests that NISC asks APHIS their position on the use of genetically modified insects and other organisms for the management of invasive species. In particular, what risks and benefits do they see from the use of this technology?

**L. Williams – what is the goal with this? A written response will be sufficient.**

Approved.

6) From the Control and Management Subcommittee: ISAC requests that NISC consult with major federal land management agencies, including BLM, Forest Service, National Park Service and other agencies on whether they have problems with invasive organisms that they could help address by the registration of currently unavailable products through the IR-4 program. In addition, if they can benefit from new registrations, would they provide some level of funding to support the process?

**Approved.**

7) When developing the Agenda for ISAC Meetings, the Vice Chair should communicate with all speakers to confirm final details and attendance.

**Approved.**

8) ISAC asks NISC to wish Gordon Brown a speedy recovery.

**Approved.**

### **Recommendations**

1) From the EDRR Subcommittee: ISAC recommends that NISC support and encourage the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences review of frameworks for the validation of advanced molecular assays for aquatic invasive species detection technologies and their protocols.

**D. Starling – this concerns the PCR effort that has been worked on.**

**P. Alpert – is it the National Research Council that does this? What is the cost? Between \$200,000 and \$300,000. Does NISC have this? NISC agencies pay for this.**

**B. Wiltshire moved to accept the recommendation as presented. Seconded by B. McMahon and N. Stone. Approved by general consent.**

2) From the Research Subcommittee: Expanding trade across the Pacific poses a dual challenge to the control of invasive species. First, there is a high potential for introductions of new species in both directions. Second, there is a high potential that some introduced species will become invasive because of similarities between the climates and ecology of central and eastern Asia and North America.

*(Recommendation #2 continued)*

In light of these challenges and the potential negative impacts of the introduction of invasive species in either direction across the Pacific on the economies and environment of the U.S. and its trading partners in eastern Asia, ISAC recommends that the Department of State seek the cooperation of appropriate agencies in convening a multilateral meeting of scientists and governmental representatives from APEC countries to develop measures to prevent the introduction of invasive species in the course of transpacific commerce.

**L. Williams** – directing this to the Secretary of State and it might not be the right person.

**S. Burgiel** – wondering in the context of the range of agencies if it shouldn't be other NISC member agencies?

**J. Peter Thompson** – does it have to be NISC member agencies?

**P. Brady** – **has ISAC ever directed anything to OSTP?** *We are an advisory group to NISC, not OSTP.*

**J. Peter Thompson** – P. Johnson serves/served on the OSTP group and was familiar enough to make this connection.

**H. Diaz-Soltero** – she saw the usefulness of OSTP and is why it was suggested.

**J. Peter Thompson** – can we table this until tomorrow's meeting.

Suggestion is to take OSTP out.

B. McMahon moved that we remove OSTP from the recommendation. S. Ellis seconded. Discussion followed.

- **J. Peter Thompson** – this changes the meaning of the recommendation.

- **M. Meyers** – you could take it out and then include explanatory language when it's sent over.

**C. Smith moved to accept the amended recommendation, as edited above.**

**Seconded by D. Starling. One NO vote cast by J.P. Thompson. Approved by general consent.**

- 3) **Recommendation regarding U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:** ISAC recommends that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers immediately reinstate the funding for the Aquatic Plant Control Research Program due to its national importance in the control and management of aquatic invasive plants.

**P. Alpert** – it's not the Corps of Engineers that is terminating the funding. Yes it is.

**D. Waitt to approve the recommendation as written. Seconded by B. McMahon. Approved by general consent.**

*(There was also a suggestion to mention the fact that cutting the program now is just deferring the cost)*

- 4) Recommendation regarding ARS: ISAC recommends full funding in FY 12 for ARS research programs in biological control and other invasive species programs and projects, including systematics.

**P. Alpert** – more preparation for this would have been nice.

**P. Brady** – Six months from now we could have this conversation about other programs. Perhaps we should be thinking about strategies for dealing with reductions everywhere.

- B. Harper-Lore** – could we see if this works with recommendation #3.
- J. Peter Thompson** – can we change it to continue support.
- E. Chilton** – we did that before and it was still cut.
- B. Van Steenwyk** – ARS does a lot more than invasive species with biocontrol. Might want to be more specific.
- Public: Funding comes from both National Institute of Food & Agriculture and ARS and they both need a push to get the funding back. We need this more than ever. Would request that NIFA be added.
- P. Brady** – might want to ask for a budget analysis for the next meeting to assess where we're losing strength.
- H. Diaz-Soltero** – this came up when crafting recommendation #3. Congress has given USDA their money and this sends a message to redirect what has already been funded.
- B. Wiltshire** – what is the difference between Corps program and ARS? Are they both being eliminated. Yes.
- E. Lane** – not all ARS biological control stations are being cut are they? More than one is being cut.
- S. Kedzie** – can OMB provide analysis on this topic?
- D. Waitt** – nice presentation on the aquatic biocontrol that led to the recommendation. We're trying to do this with very little information.
- B. McMahon** – this is general and we haven't had a lot of time on this. Is it possible for the Steering Committee have this at the next meeting.
- E. Chilton** – the station that is being closed is parallel to what the Corps is working on.
- P. Brady** – if we're considering items like this for Spring then would like to offer up the USGS NAS database.
- J. Peter Thompson** – it'd be nice to see what work and the impacts at the next meeting.
- E. Mills** – thinking more strategic, what are the best strategies to deal with cutting budgets across agencies in respect to invasive species.

***J. P. Thompson moved to approve this recommendation as written. E. Lane seconded. Motion failed by a vote of 16 to 5.***

#### **Follow-up discussion on proposed Recommendation #4 (above)**

- B. Wiltshire** recommends that as an action item for the Spring meeting is to have this as a topic.
- E. Lane** – funding cuts are going to be significant across the agencies. Can we be more strategic? This is an intense discussion. Can we schedule some time at the Spring meeting to more thoroughly discuss this?
- S. Kedzie** – where are we going to acquire this information?
- L. Williams** – this is going to be tricky as the agencies don't know exactly where the cuts are going to be. Could possibly get some information about 2012 and will know the President's budget for 2013. Lost our contact at OMB but could possibly get someone at the meeting.
- B. McMahon** – can the Steering Committee work on this for the June meeting? Yes and appropriate ISAC members will be involved.
- S. Ellis** – it's in the bylaws to develop these straw man documents.
- C. Dionigi** – idea of strategizing this is good but there are a lot of layers to this and the discussion should be around invasive species and if a program is going to get cut, how is it going to get cut and could we have input in this.
- P. Brady** – ISAC will be helpful in determining the impacts in what we see in FY 2013.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

***There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.***

***Due to a White House request for Room 4830 at the Dept. of Commerce, the ISAC Special Session on E-Commerce was relocated to the U.S. Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street, N.W., Room 5160 (Secretary's Conference Room), Washington, DC 20240.***

## INVASIVE SPECIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

### *“Invasive Species and Commerce”*

**December 6-8, 2011**

U.S. Department of Interior  
Stuart Udall Building  
1849 C St. NW, Room 5160  
Washington, DC 20030

**DAY 3: Thursday, December 8, 2011**

***ISAC Special Session on Invasive Species and E-Commerce***

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

E. ANN GIBBS (Chair)	Maine Department of Agriculture
ROBERT WILTSHIRE (Vice-Chair)	Invasive Species Action Network
AMY FRANKMANN (Secretary)	Michigan Nursery and Landscape Association
PETER ALPERT	University of Massachusetts
PATRICK BURCH	Dow AgroSciences
EARL CHILTON, II	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
JOSEPH M. DiTOMASO	University of California, Davis
OTTO DOERING, III	Purdue University
SUSAN ELLIS	California Department of Fish and Game
BONNIE HARPER-LORE	Restoration Ecologist – Consultant
SCOTT HENDRICK	National Conference of State Legislatures
PHYLLIS JOHNSON	University of North Dakota
SUSAN KEDZIE	Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe
ERIC LANE	Colorado Department of Agriculture
ROBERT McMAHON	University of Texas at Arlington
MARSHALL MEYERS	Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council
EDWARD MILLS	Cornell University
KRISTINA SERBESOFF-KING	The Nature Conservancy
CELIA SMITH	University of Hawaii
DAVID E. STARLING	Aqueterinary Services, P.C.
NATHAN STONE	University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
JOHN PETER THOMPSON	Invasive Species Consultant
ROBERT VAN STEENWYK	University of California, Berkeley
DAMON E. WAITT	University of Texas at Austin

### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT**

TIMOTHY MALE	Defenders of Wildlife
STEPHEN PHILLIPS	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
JAMIE REASER	Independent Consultant
JOHN TORGAN	The Nature Conservancy
JENNIFER VOLLMER	CPS Timberland

### **NISC STAFF PRESENT**

LORI WILLIAMS	NISC Director
CHRISTOPHER (CHRIS) DIONIGI	Assistant Director for Domestic Policy
KELSEY BRANTLEY	Program Specialist and ISAC Coordinator
STAS BURGIEL	Assistant Director for Prevention & Budgetary Coordination
PHIL ANDREOZZI	Assistant Director for International Programs

### **NISC POLICY LIAISONS PRESENT**

MARGARET (PEG) BRADY	U.S. Department of Commerce (NOAA)
HILDA DIAZ-SOLTERO	U.S. Department of Agriculture (FS)
PETE EGAN	U.S. Department of Defense
MATTHEW FARMER	U.S. Department of Homeland Security (CBP)
ADRIANNA MUIR	U.S. Department of State
MICHAEL TRULSON	U.S. Department of State

***The Meeting was called to order at 8:17 a.m. by A. Gibbs.***

It was announced that there is a new directive coming out of the White House that would allow the Canadian Government to inspect goods that ultimately enter into the U.S.

### **E-COMMERCE OVERVIEW**

*Stas Burgiel, NISC Staff*

SUMMARY OF REMARKS: This presentation introduced the topic of Ecommerce and the general effort of the ISAC prevention subcommittee. It set the context for the session and subsequent speakers who will address the finer points of regulations and technical tools.

*Comments:*

- **D. Starling – touched on interstate movement, there are state regulations on the movement of products that should be considered.**
- **M. Meyers – The issue when considering this is that there are so many different rules/regulations that are either changing often or are non-existent. It's controlled under the Lacey Act.**
- **D. Starling – with interstate movement there have been several Supreme Court decisions regarding this. The state can set their own requirements but if they don't it defaults to federal regulation. With cultured animals they fall under the Animal Protection Act.**
- **M. Meyers – has a list of federal statutes that define internet trade.**

## **PRESENTATION: INVASIVE HITCHHIKERS THROUGH THE INTERNET**

*Ann Gibbs, Maine Department of Agriculture (ISAC Chair)*

*Earl Chilton, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (ISAC Member)*

**SUMMARY OF REMARKS:** Both presentations addressed inadvertent movement of invasive species hitchhiking with the legal movement of goods through internet trade. Focus was on both the plant and animal trade.

### ***Invasive Hitchhikers on Plants - Ann Gibbs***

Policy statement on Ecommerce from the National Plant Board can be found at <http://nationalplantboard.org/ecommerce.html>

*Questions/Comments for Ms. Gibbs:*

- S. Kedzie – any discussion about using internet ads to educate the consumer.**
- C. Smith – good idea.**
- D. Starling – another avenue of movement is the wood chips used for the smoking of meats. Could be another avenue for hitchhikers.**
- E. Lane – checked on the internet to see what plants could be purchased, especially those that were prohibited in the state of Colorado. Attempted to buy prohibited plants, stopped the order and received a call from the firm asking for cooperation to complete the order. The other issue is that they aren't licensed to sell nursery stock in the states they are selling.**

### ***Invasive Species, Hitchhikers, and the Internet, E. Chilton***

*Questions/Comments for Mr. Chilton:*

- B. Harper-Lore – with purple loosestrife nurseries was selling a sterile variety whose source – Morden Arboredum, could not prove parentage.**
- J. Peter Thompson – report on nursery industry and sterility – there have been ISAC reports and a special conference on this issue.**
- E. Mills – There is a disconnect between the prohibited list of species in a state and what is being sold on the internet. Is the internet checked on a regular basis? Seems that there is a disconnect between regulators and law enforcement in policing this. They are trained but there isn't the manpower to do this on a regular basis.**
- E. Lane – there are some invasive species that are universally recognized as being bad but in the current regulatory structure each state has to deal with this— grossly inefficient when even the national nursery association recognizes this should be banned. Just to point out that this is a problem for every state to deal with this but they have to.**

## **PRESENTATION: APHIS ACTIVITIES RELATED TO E-COMMERCE**

*Cory Marker, USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service*

**SUMMARY OF REMARKS:** The mission of Plant Protection and Quarantine's (PPQ's) Smuggling Interdiction and Trade Compliance (SITC) Program is to detect and prevent the unlawful entry and distribution of prohibited and/or non-compliant products that may harbor exotic plant and animal pests, disease or invasive species. Information was provided on past and current APHIS SITC activities related to Ecommerce on invasive species.

Questions/Comments for Mr. Marker:

- **H. Diaz-Soltero – tell what APHIS has the authority to regulate.** *Any plant material, propagated or consumption. Don't regulate anything to do with animals or animal products unless edible or medicinal.*
- **S. Kedzie – Are there only two internet analysis doing this work?** *Yes, there are only two and six in the field. Do you need more, and if yes, how many?* *Yes we could use more and funding is a big issue-PPQ is receiving funding cuts.*
- **P. Alpert – any observation on the internet response to regulation?** *There's a trick on eBay that allows people to hide what they buy and/or feedback. So making it difficult. Do*
- **E. Chilton – Do you feel that what you are doing is acting as a deterrent?** *Yes, for U.S. based sellers. Foreign sellers not at all. No cooperation from foreign law enforcement.*
- **S. Hendrick – what percentage of the sellers are innocent or ignorant to the regulations?** *Most of the U.S. sellers are, the foreign sellers are usually not. Do you have a sense of what level of communication you need to apply to deter?* *If there was a pop-up as they were looking to buy he thinks that this would deter the U.S. sellers.*
- **D. Starling – when working with USDA with regulated vaccines it was difficult to track the seller, so all sellers were notified and it helped. Have you thought of using this tactic to deter?** *Big problem with the Asian community and trying to reach them*
- **H. Diaz-Soltero – in FY 2012 1/7 of the APHIS budget is being cut.**

#### **PRESENTATION: OVERVIEW OF LACEY ACT INJURIOUS WILDLIFE LISTING**

*Susan Jewell, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service*

A comparison was given between injurious wildlife (Lacey Act) and the Endangered Species (Endangered Species Act).

Lacey Act – 1900, Interior, NO Plants-wild mammals, birds, fishes, reptiles, amphibians, mollusks, crustaceans, Secretary *may* list, no statutory deadlines, substantial evidence, no appropriations.

Endangered Species Act – 1973, Interior and Commerce, any wildlife or plant, Secretary *will* list, statutory deadlines, best available science, yes appropriations.

#### **PANEL DISCUSSION: PERSPECTIVES ON INTERNET TRADE**

*Bob Wiltshire, Invasive Species Action Network*

*Jeff Barringer, [www.kingsnake.com](http://www.kingsnake.com) (by phone)*

*Kristin Van Hoose, HydrangeaPlus (by phone)*

SUMMARY OF REMARKS: The Internet has provided significant opportunities for the increased trade in live organisms. People around the world can easily communicate and enhanced transportation has made it easy to ship live organisms. While many commercial companies operating on the Web are careful to trade only in appropriate species, many individuals are buying and selling a diversity of species. This presentation will discuss both the hobby and commercial use of the Internet to facilitate trade. Information on herpetology, horticulture and ornamental fish communities were presented.



With regard to “the type of information that we want to gather, need to have, and/or already have pulled together from reading materials,” ISAC asked panel members were to consider the following questions:

1. What is E-Commerce to them?
  2. How would they respond to a federal monitoring/surveillance system that is looking for trade in regulated species (e.g., “webcrawlers”?)
  3. What is the responsibility of E-Commerce traders to inform the public (buyers and sellers that use their website) on invasive species regulations?
  4. What do you think about putting the burden of inspection and regulation on the seller?
  5. What percentage of your trade do you think goes through E-Commerce? Where do you see your E-Commerce’s role in the broader industry (e.g., reptile industry, fish, hydrangea)?
  6. How complex is the chain of supply? (e.g. KingSnake is a web portal of people to sale. Regional distribution, re-wholesalers, retail)
  7. What geographic region does your trade cover through E-Commerce
  8. (e.g., regional, national, international)?
  9. Would you use a list of regulated species? This would be a “one-stop shop” website to find out if a species that is being proposed for sale is regulated in the state in which the buyer resides?
  10. What would you recommend to the federal agencies that help reduce movement of invasive Species through the internet?
  11. What do you see as the best way to keep invasive species from being moved through the internet?
  12. What is the awareness level of internet sellers of compliance with the Lacey Act and horticulture regulations?
- ***Ornamental Fish – Bob Wiltshire, Invasive Species Action Network (MT)***
    - There are multiple ways in which the Internet facilitates the sale of aquatic organisms.
    - True commercial companies are likely trying to do the right thing.
    - Person to person sales represent the greatest threat.
    - Considerable trade of problem species is taking place right now.
  - ***Amphibians and Reptiles – Jeff Barringer, [www.kingsnake.com](http://www.kingsnake.com) (TX)***
    - All-inclusive website accessible by the industry for all regulations on prohibited, restricted, invasive species. Currently too cumbersome to comply with all the different regulations. Everything is legal somewhere and everything is illegal somewhere.
    - Corporations would rather be engaged then enforced.
  - ***Horticulture – Kristin VanHoose, HydrangeaPlus (OR)***
    - Small nursery in Oregon, Past President for the Oregon Association of Nurseries
    - Agree with Jeff in that there should be an all-inclusive website for all to help compliance.
    - Looks like we’re moving in the right direction by asking the questions that

Questions/Comments for the panel:

- **M. Meyers – how many websites in the U.S. are offering the sale of reptiles?** *Probably 4,000-5,000 individual businesses. 15,000 – 20,000 that are advertising other methods.*
- **S. Burgiel – in terms of plant material, how many websites?** *Probably ¾ of the 4,000-5,000.*
- **B. Wiltshire – tens and thousands of people selling fish.**
- **P. Alpert – would it simplify to have the federal government list species if no other states object?** *YES—to have one place for everyone to look and go would be great. We’re looking for direction to comply.*
  - **K. VanHoose – it doesn’t happen overnight so it is something that could be done on a national level.**
- **E. Mills – how do you organize yourself as internet sellers? Do you anticipate organizing yourselves in the future?** *From the aquatic side there aren’t any formal efforts for this. Plants – in OR police ourselves with our Dept. of Ag. J. Barringer – in the reptile world there is PJAC and pet owner and business group that has recently started. Difficult to get educational messages out due to the ads being sent.*
- **B. Wiltshire – have to look at commercial operations and fly-by-night companies and the differences.**
- **C. Smith – how do your groups deal with taxonomic uncertainty? Are there websites you utilize to confirm taxonomy?** **J. Barringer - This is a real problem in many realms and you also have issues with the common names. The laws can’t change as fast as the names change.**
  - **K. Van Hoose -Agree that it’s a moving target.**
  - **B. Wiltshire – concern with ornamental fish is that it’s not known how many species are out there. Often on import/export lists you’ll find fish that are just assigned a name because the seller doesn’t know what they are.**
- **M. Meyers – Is it better to have a list of species and that they are endangered/prohibited instead of trying to wade through the underlined regulation?** *It’s best to have both and technology allows for access to both. It’s going to be complex and nightmarish.*
  - **B.Wiltshire – are increasingly seeing local restrictions which will add to this.**
- **J. DiTomaso – if you look at the names that things are being sold under it’s hard to tell that you’re selling a restricted plant.**
- **K. VanHoose – it’s mostly customer driven. There are people out there selling plants by the wrong name. People are trying to do the right thing.**
- **J. Peter Thompson – if you’re in retail and you’re selling plants, it matters what name you sell it buy and it’s usually the common names. The major problem is that we’re in the fashion industry. The latest and the newest drives the industry which could be causing problems. J. Barringer agrees. B. Wiltshire agrees. It’s a lot easier**
- **E. Chilton – experience dealing with the horticulture industry is not only dealing with the scientific and common names, but you have varieties.**
- **P. Alpert – one option for codifying names is happening with birds. Is there a uniform legal definition of commerce?**
- **D. Starling – the term of commerce is archaic, we usually find commerce, trading, bartering, and exchanging.**
- **D. Waitt – Management with invasive species it’s important to have prevention and think that nothing should be let in until it’s been proven not to be a risk. Who should shoulder the burden of proof?**
  - **J. Barringer – problem is that most of the species we’re dealing with, the horse is already out of the barn. As to new species, reptiles aren’t turning**

*new species over. Has to be a big enough financial incentive to make this happen. This is the problem with ban first.*

- **K. VanHoose** – *with the trademarking that is taking place there is no DNA test to make sure it's not a new variety—no master list out there.*
- **B. Wiltshire** – *it'd be problematic with fish as a lot of fish already in the trade haven't and won't be described. Bycatch is also an issue—the fish that come in with netting a certain species.*
- **M. Meyers** – **1973 the F&WS proposed that everything is proven guilty until proven innocent—didn't work. Also have to pay attention to the definition of commerce and Ecommerce. Advertising could be over the internet, payment face-to-face, what is it? Have to talk about commerce in the broadest sense.**
- **S. Burgiel** – *responsibility of the buyer vs. the seller. The real risk comes when a species is introduced into the environment. Where is the greatest risk from for introduction into the environment.*
  - **K. VanHoose** – *it's the uneducated that don't know the issue.*
  - **J. Barringer** – *You have to take into consideration all the different ways that invasive species are being released—intentional, accidental, environmental, etc. It would hard to say one was a majority. It'd be better to look at providing a mechanism for getting rid of unwanted animals.*
- **M. Meyers** – **in a survey conducted over 90% knew that they shouldn't release but didn't have**
- **B. Harper-Lore** – **In MN authorities recently discovered a 10' alligator in a waterway that was released and was surviving just fine.**
  - **J. Barringer** – *reptile groups are participating in rescuing released reptiles.*
- **S. Kedzie** – **Effort out there to turn in unused medications. Any program out there for animals.**
- **M. Meyers** – **in Florida there is an amnesty program for turn ins but amnesty wasn't provided on the federal level. State-to-state issue. Why would it have to be state-to-state? Depends on what's going to happen to those that are turning these in.**
  - **J. Barringer** – *when he was 11 years old and went on vacation in Texas. Caught lizards and brought them back to Indiana. Called the zoo to find out how to feed them and found out that they had violated the Lacey Act.*
- **K. Serbesoff-King** - **Florida pet trade has a website and will send this.**
- **B. Wiltshire** – **with re-homing, people do form strong attachments to hundreds of once were cute-turned-ugly fish.**
- **J. Peter Thompson** – **the nursery industry has codes of conduct, bumps are being worked on, and there is my book**
- **B. Harper-Lore** – **people who are making the mistakes are uneducated and don't have the knowledge. It indicates that we in the invasive species world aren't getting the message out.**
- **P. Johnson** – **there was one question about creating a buyer user fee that would go to the cost of disposal. Agencies have difficulty accepting fees without offsetting their budgets.**
- **M. Meyers** – **both state and federal levels there are trust funds that disappear and the industry is leery of this.**
- **J. Peter Thompson** – **we're talking about the legitimate business not the Ecommerce non-existent firms.**
- **C. Smith** – **what amount of fee would work? M. Meyers – have to be line item specific for a particular project. J. Peter Thompson agrees. Costs more to collect than they receive.**
- **M. Meyers** – **there are more people that have animals in their households than there are gun licenses.**

- **B. McMahon** – should be some sort of permit.
- **M. Meyers** – there are some states that require permits for some species that are sold but this only applies to brick & mortar places.
- **J. Peter Thompson** – the state of Maryland has created an invasive species committee to look at risk assessment model for plants that are problematic in Maryland and will require anyone involved in commerce of a plant will have to have a “surgeon general” type warning. We’re going to have to decide if it applies to the internet.

*The panel was thanked for their time and expertise.*

### **GROUP DISCUSSION**

L. Williams stated that she was pleased with the number of ongoing projects that ISAC has and the NISC staff is committed to helping with this.

- Thanks to P. Brady, S. Pasko at the Commerce Dept., those at the Interior Dept., K. Brantley was thanked for her efforts on another great meeting.
- A. Gibbs – we need a new Steering Committee member so anyone interested should get in touch with her.
- Reminder of the spring meeting in May.
- Steering Committee will be meeting in January.
- Reminder – there is a large number of us going off in the Spring of 2012 so keep in mind new members.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no public comment.

**NOTE: The Prevention Subcommittee discussion will begin at 1:00 p.m. in Room 4621 in this building (Department of the Interior). All are invited.**

***There being no further business, the Meeting adjourned at 12:02 p.m.***

## ATTACHMENT 1

### **Report on Invasive Species Activities in 2011 for the Invasive Species Advisory Committee Meeting December 6, 2011 - Washington, DC**

U.S. Department of State  
Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES)

Contacts: Michael Trulson (TrulsonMC@state.gov), Office of Ecology and Conservation (Terrestrial IAS)  
Adrianna Muir (MuirAA@state.gov), Office of Oceans and Polar Affairs (Aquatic IAS)

The **Office of Ecology and Conservation (ENC)** leads the formulation of policies to address international threats to biodiversity and ecosystems - notably unsustainable land use practices and land degradation, invasive alien species (IAS) and illegal trade - as well as issues associated with the safe handling of living modified organisms, access to genetic resources, and the sharing of benefits arising from subsequent resource use. ENC promotes biodiversity-related priorities in free trade agreements and other international fora, and reviews and clears official correspondence and policy documents addressing issues at the interface of diplomacy and biodiversity conservation. We also work with the National Invasive Species Council (NISC) to improve communication among domestic USG agencies on international IAS activities.

The **Office of Oceans and Polar Affairs (OPA)** leads State Department involvement in marine invasive species science and conservation policy. OPA represents the State Department at the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANSTF) meetings, and represents the U.S. in international fora regarding aquatic invasive species, including the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, the London Convention and International Maritime Organization, and the South Pacific Regional Environmental Program. Most recently, OPA represents international relations in discussions on ballast water regulation and regional coordination of marine invasive species management.

Here is a sampling of OES activities related to invasive alien species in late 2011.

**Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)**: OES leads the interagency process to develop and represent U.S. government positions on issues being considered at the CBD (the United States is not a party to the CBD). In the recent meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), IAS was recognized as one of the main drivers of biodiversity loss, their increasing impact on biodiversity and economic sectors, and their negative impacts on human well-being, and emphasized the need for continued work on IAS. The SBSTTA will recommend to the COP in October 2012 that the Secretariat:

- Identify and assess gaps in international standards regarding IAS as *pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food*.
- Encourage governments and others to ensure effective collaboration among national authorities and focal points for the CBD and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), the World Organization for Animal Health, the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the SPS Agreement, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to address threats of IAS as *pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food*.
- Provide more detailed guidance on drafting and implementing national measures associated with IAS.

- Document how guidance, relevant activities, and standards of relevant organizations can support parties in addressing the threats from IAS.
- List the most common IAS pathways; and propose criteria for prioritizing and identifying tools to manage or minimize the risks associated with such pathways.

Lionfish Invasion in the Caribbean: DOS and NOAA have been working closely to assist countries and territories in the Wider Caribbean Region in their response to the lionfish invasion. This rapidly expanding invasion threatens the ecological integrity of coral reef ecosystems, native fisheries, and potentially the tourism sector, which relies on healthy reefs to attract divers and snorkelers to the region. Together with Mexico and the Caribbean Environment Programme, DOS co-chairs the Regional Lionfish Committee, an ad hoc committee of the International Coral Reef Initiative that aims to facilitate a regional response to the lionfish invasion. DOS has funded NOAA to carry out work in the Caribbean that will benefit regional coordination which includes training workshops, drafting the first iteration of a regional control plan, and gathering experts in the region to review and reach consensus on a regional response. Partners in ICRI and SPAW will be integrally involved in these activities.

Drafted: OES/ENC – Michael Trulson, x 67113

Cleared: OES/ENC – CDawson ( )  
OES/OPA – AMuir ( )