

ISAC Conference Call

March 29, 2017

Strengthening Federal-State Coordination and Enhancing Federal-Tribal Coordination of Invasive Species

The Department of the Interior recently completed a review of all FACA committees. During the review period, ISAC and other FACA committee business was placed on hold. In accordance with this policy, the ISAC meeting planned for July 2017 was cancelled. These draft minutes would have been reviewed and considered for adoption at that meeting. The draft minutes are being made available as a matter of public record in accordance with FACA guidelines. All references to these draft minutes should indicate that they have not been adopted or otherwise endorsed by ISAC.

Participants

- Chuck Barger, ISAC Vice Chair, University of Georgia Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health
- Ed Clark, The Wildlife Center of Virginia
- Otto Doering, Purdue University Department of Agricultural Economics
- Susan Ellis
- Slade Franklin, Wyoming Department of Agriculture
- Bonnie Harper-Lore, Restoration Ecologist (Retired)
- Bill Hyatt, Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
- Janis McFarland, Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.
- Laura Meyerson, University of Rhode Island Department of Natural Resources Science Coastal Institute
- Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council
- Ed Mills, Cornell University Biological Field Station
- Carol Okada, Hawai'i Department of Agriculture Plant Industry Division
- Blaine Parker, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
- David Starling, Aqueterinary Services, P.C.
- Gary Tabor, Center for Large Landscape Conservation
- John Peter Thompson, ISAC Chair, Invasive Species Consultant

- Robert Van Steenwyk, University of California Berkeley Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management
- Jeff White, Newmont Mining Corporation
- Robert Wiltshire, Invasive Species Action Network

ISAC Conference Call, March 29, 2017 (1:30 to 3:00 EDT) is called to order

John Peter Thompson calls to order the meeting and reminds the committee that ISAC meetings are conducted under FACA rules. The Designated Federal Officer (Jamie Reaser) is present.

John Peter asks for the record that ISAC members be called for roll call. Kelsey Brantley (NISC Secretariat) calls roll. Six members are absent from the call. Nineteen members are present (see participant list above). John Peter declares a quorum is present.

John Peter asks if anyone wishes to be registered for the public comment time at the end of today's agenda. No response.

ISAC's agenda will consist of two items today as noticed in the Federal Register: consideration for adoption of the "Strengthening Federal-State Coordination" report presented by the State-Federal Coordination Task Team, and the "Enhancing Federal-Tribal Coordination of Invasive Species" report presented by the Federal-Tribal Coordination Task Team.

Strengthening Federal-State Coordination

John Peter recognizes William "Bill" Hyatt to present on the Federal-State Task Team Paper.

Bill recognizes and thanks the authors' contributions, the NISC Secretariat for consultations, and the Designated Federal Official, Hilary Smith.

The charge for the report is to investigate Federal-State coordination on IAS issues and develop recommendations for NISC. This mandate that Federal agencies coordinate and compliment State efforts on invasive species issues was noted in both of NISC's Executive Orders (EO) and the Management Plan (MP) (in reference to the EO).

The team's broad approach was to look at a number of case studies in detail and tease out their strengths, weaknesses, and commonalities in addition to learned. The case studies were chosen to represent a broad diversity in the types of issues States and Federal agencies face in terms of collaboration. The chosen studies cross a variety of geopolitical scales and are within both the scope and time capacities of the task team. There are six in total: three at the small State/regional level and three at the larger landscape level. The appendix presents the studies in whole, while the body of the report summarizes the key findings that are common across the case studies. These findings are then

synthesized into three levels of conclusions: (1) improve the design and efficiency of Federal/State communications; (2) strengthen Federal/State partnerships and increase capacity in invasive species issues; and (3) address the needs of particularly large complex multijurisdictional invasive species issues and develop recommendations to explore large scale organizational change. These conclusions were ultimately distilled into a single recommendation to establish a coordinating committee to advance Federal/State coordination by addressing within the government the three aforementioned conclusions.

The composition and intent for this report was set up in a way to implement the mandates in the EOs and the MP and to address the findings and conclusions thereof. Additionally, it is intended to be followed up with discussion and input by a broad group of participants. Recommendations from ISAC on further outlining the recommended coordinating committee membership/participation is welcomed. There has been no pointed discussion to this point except where the task team has concluded the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) (this group was used as a resource in developing the report). Earlier this month at a meeting in Washington, the AFWA endorsed the conclusions and recommendations made in this report. Upon approval from ISAC, it is the task team's intent to seek endorsement from the AFWA as a whole for the report.

A motion to approve the State-Federal Coordination report as presented is put forth. This motion is acknowledged by John Peters who then asks for a second. Jeff White offers second. John Peters then opens the floor for discussion.

John Peters recognizes Otto Doering. Otto commends the report, particularly the diagram presented on page two of the report. He notes that the executive summary outlines the methods and development of the report. He voices a concern that it is critical to have a one to two page executive summary that walks readers through the recommendations and justifications, and consequently suggests the executive summary be edited to reflect this.

Bill Hyatt acknowledges the benefits in Otto's suggestion and agrees to editing the executive summary to reflect this suggestion; however, Bill prefers that the length of the executive summary remains at one page.

Janis McFarlan expresses her support for a one page summary of the recommendations and justifications. Janis seeks clarification on the recommendation to establish a coordinating committee and subsequent membership. She asks whether private industries could be represented, given the value of public-private partnerships (PPP). She also asks whether there was discussion regarding the inclusion of members from the private sector in the context of PPP.

Bill recognizes the importance of PPP collaborations. However, the coordinating committee membership is intended to be comprised of only Federal and States members in order to not be subject to FACA rules. Jamie Reaser clarifies that if a committee is comprised of members outside of the State and Federal governments, the committee would be subject to FACA rules. Bill notes that

this was a driving factor in outlining membership criteria in light of the principal charge of the report to focus on Federal/State coordination.

Janis asks for further clarification if the AFWA, National Governor's Association, and other similar associations meet the criteria to be included without subjecting the committee to FACA rules (since these organizations seem to be broader than Federal/State membership criteria). Bill confirms that the outlined criteria would not subject the coordinating committee to FACA rules.

David Starling is recognized. David expresses concerns that, while NISC re: the EO has increased efforts regarding pathogens and parasites, the report fails to reference or explore pathogens and parasites through the examples given in the context of Federal/State coordination. This is clearly an important issue as there is existing, extensive Federal/State coordination that isn't recognized in the report in addition to State regulations regarding the matter.

Bill acknowledges David's concern around pathogens and disease. Bill confirms that pathogens and parasites are not recognized individually from the general reference to invasive species in the report. Bill believes that this does not preclude them from the broader umbrella of invasive species and the recommendations made in reference to invasive species. Given the heightened interest/efforts in pathogens and parasites, however, it would be beneficial to develop reports from other task teams that would be more specific to these issues.

Gary Tabor is recognized. Gary questions why the Landscape Conservation Cooperative's science delivery efforts are not included in the report given their contributions (despite recent contention with states).

Bill explains that a number of different models for regional collaboration can be used as examples, such as the fisheries commissions, etc. The report efforts were limited to highlighting that there are opportunities for regional and larger collaboration that need to be explored on a case by case basis. Further analysis within the context of the report is beyond the scope of this specific effort. Should the recommended coordinating committee be established, it would be in their purview to look at additional means of collaboration and further explore specific examples in greater detail. The chart that is included in the report is an example from fish and wildlife agencies that is meant to be illustrative of the possible complexities and complications of invasive species networks, such as within the sage grouse issue. It is not intended to be inclusive of other invasive species issues that happen elsewhere. A similar chart illustrating the Asian carp issue would look very different with different actors.

John Peter, in the interest of time and adoption of the report, notes that a revised executive summary can be completed separately as a PR piece. Gary asks that the aforementioned clarification pieces regarding the chart as an illustrative piece and that other efforts are not represented given the report's purview are included in the footnotes or elsewhere in the document to avoid confusion. Bill agrees.

Bill confirms that the changes can be inserted with minimal word change in the examples given, in the recommendations and in regards to the chart. He then recaps the changes that will be made based on today's discussion: (1) lengthen the executive summary to include the recommendations and justifications; (2) include references to the LCC, ANS task force as other examples of organizations that could be built upon to address invasive species issues; (3) address the point of clarification for figure 1 in the text and caption to ensure that it is clear this is an illustrative example and not all inclusive; (4) clarify for recommendation 2 and in the text that the coordinating committee's members are to be government officials.

David makes a final suggestion of including the charge of the report in a prologue or other appropriate place that is separate from the executive summary. Bill agrees.

John Peter closes discussion on this agenda item without objection. He then calls for a vote on the approval of the State-Federal Coordination report. After a roll call vote, and acceptance of Bonnie's vote in the affirmative via email, John Peter declares that the ayes have it and that the motion carries.

Enhancing Federal-Tribal Coordination of Invasive Species

John Peter notes that the task team may not be ready to make a motion regarding the adoption of the Federal-Tribal Coordination report, but that the task team welcomes general and specific feedback.

Chuck suggests that it would be beneficial to conceptually adjust the report to align with the formatting of the State-Federal Coordination report.

Blaine agrees that the task team needs more time to complete the report. The issues of tribal consultation has been the main focus of discussions. They have received feedback from tribal staff (Chris Fisher and Joe Maroney) who work directly with tribes. This consultation assisted in narrowing the focus away from solely considering the consultation issue (though it needs to be addressed) and refocus on developing recommendations. Blaine as the task team chair has only received feedback from one member of the team (Miles) regarding the most recent edits. The next steps for the task team will be to host a team call and get the work back on track.

Jerry notes that the recommendations as they are now seem narrow. He suggests adding two additional recommendations, one promoting the use and work of sniffer dogs who have exemplified successful work in the fight against aquatic invasive species, and the other regarding eDNA. He asks whether the task team had any discussions regarding eDNA or where surveillance stations would be placed.

Blaine explains that the task teams focus was broader and on the bigger picture of getting tribes to the table (including native Alaskan corporations and Hawaiians). In many cases just getting to the

table is not possible. He highlights here that recommendation 4 is one of the most important as it establishes a tribal coordinating position at the NISC Secretariat to help delegate and disseminate information to tribes.

Dave references back to recommendation 3 and that while eDNA is in widespread use, it is only one example of diagnostic coordination. He and others are still dubious of eDNA and should follow up on the white paper submitted. He voices a word of caution against using this technology and in regards to environmental monitoring.

Janis asks if there is a way to bridge the narrative and recommendations of this report and the work of the tribes to the broader State-Federal issues—even nesting a section in regards to the State-Federal report recommendations.

Blaine had discussed with Bill about a way to emulate the State-Federal Coordination efforts without comingling the reports. In many cases States carry the ball for tribes in monitoring and evaluation. There is a fair amount of good coordination that already exists between States and tribes. There are enough different needs and priorities for tribes and the States to warrant separate (but not isolated) entities at the NISC Secretariat level. The task team is working to insure it is not being excluded but is rather part of process.

Janis suggests that the narrative and recommendations regarding technology is broadened to facilitate emerging and advancing technology. It should be flexible to allow for it to stay current and avoid being pigeon holed.

David asks if the task team discussed enhancing training opportunities for tribal liaisons.

Blaine notes that they did not specifically discuss training for the tribal liaisons but intends for these sorts of information transfers be the role for the NISC Secretariat position suggested under the recommendations. Technology and information transfer is an important component that hasn't been carried through these recommendations but should.

Ed Mills suggests the development of an ISAC paper focused on eDNA; ISAC needs to consider vector management and education items.

The Task Team will continue working on the report, incorporating the comments, concerns, and suggestions into the report. Hopefully the report will be ready to consider at next ISAC meeting.

Jamie notes that anyone who wants to join the task team may join. The task teams may share their work with all of ISAC at any time and are encouraged to do so well ahead of the next meeting.

Public Comment Period

John Peter calls on the public to comment during the noticed public comment period. There is no public comment.

Adjournment

Information will be delivered via email by NISC Secretariat staff to the ISAC members regarding upcoming meetings. **John Peter seeks a motion to adjourn. Blaine seconds and without objection the meeting adjourns.**