

ISAC Meeting Minutes

February 27–March 1, 2018
Smithsonian Institution
National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI)

Tuesday, February 27, 2018

Participants

- Chuck Bargeron (Chair), University of Georgia
- Edward Clark (Vice-Chair), The Wildlife Center of Virginia
- Slade Franklin, Wyoming Dept. of Agriculture
- William Hyatt, Connecticut Dept. of Energy and Environmental Protection
- Janis McFarland, Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.
- Laura Meyerson, University of Rhode Island
- Carol Okada, Hawai'i Dept. of Agriculture
- Blaine Parker, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
- Brent Stewart, Hubb-SeaWorld Research Institute
- Jamie K. Reaser, NISC Secretariat
- Kelsey Brantley, NISC Secretariat
- Stas Burgiel, NISC Secretariat
- Jeffrey Morisette, NISC Secretariat
- Jhoset Burgos Rodriguez, NISC Secretariat
- Jason Kirkey, NISC Secretariat
- Sarah Veatch, NISC Secretariat

Introduction

The meeting is called to session and Chuck Bargeron provided welcoming remarks and an overview of the agenda. C. Bargeron reviewed the roles and responsibilities of ISAC members, Federal employees, and stakeholders.

Roll call was conducted by Kelsey Brantley.

The forum process overview was provided by Ed Clark. Additionally, E. Clark provided an overview of the five questions posed to the public in FR 4241 (January 30, 2018). C. Bargeron noted that the audience should email all additional comments to ISAC to C. Bargeron.

Presentations

Mike Cuffe, Montana House of Representatives

M. Cuffe: Provided written comments to ISAC. XXX emphasized the need for the public to understand the relationship and problem between creating regulation and increasing penalties for compliance.

Recommendation: The agencies should create and promote public service announcements, YouTube videos (such as for mussels or weeds), and social media campaigns that focus on storytelling in order to reach the next generation. It will be important/useful to provide the information (through new mediums) to retailers and other locations, including posing contests for solutions to all stakeholders. It is important to stop invasive species at the source. The Federal government has already demonstrated increased involvement, but this needs to continue to be motivated.

B. Hyatt: What is the public perception and acceptance of the boat inspection requirements?

M. Cuffe: There is some push back from the public that claims it is a waste of federal dollars to require inspection stops. Agency staff are concerned that regulations need to be more specific. However, cooperation and communication as a whole has been better over the past years. Boat inspectors are conducting good outreach at the inspection stations. Boaters who understand the gravity of the situation are accepting. The goal, though, should be that boaters already know the reasons and gravity for inspections before getting to the inspection station. It shouldn't fall on the inspectors.

Chris Stelzig, Entomological Society of America

C. Stelzig: The Entomological Society of America focuses on strategic initiatives—how we as a society are going to deal with invasives—and believe that arthropods needs more focus. Invasive arthropod damages cost \$18 billion in control efforts. Chris noted that they don't have the answer, but they have a position statement on the direction we can go. This is a challenge on an immense scale with 25 million container units moving through the Vancouver port where we only inspect .5-1% of those.

Recommendations: Invasion biology needs more attention and federal funding with prevention, EDRR and adaptive management partnerships being of high importance. Chris emphasized the need for funding research for solutions.

E. Clark: Does the society have a formal position on the risks associated with biological control? ISAC has discussed and acknowledged the unintended consequences previously.

C. Stelzig: The Entomological Society of America does not have an official position, but it under consideration working through strategic initiatives—given the mindset that there is no silver bullet. However, without funding, these searches go nowhere.

Grant Sizemore, American Bird Conservancy

G. Sizemore:

Recommendations: Grant suggested that the agencies on the NISC provide relevant species profiles, which will be very helpful to NGOs to be able to reference Federal resources in an effort to certify unbiased information. The profiles should acknowledge they are invasive, be backed by science, suggest management options, etc.

Patrick Atagi, National Wooden Pallet and Container Association

P. Atagi: Patrick provided a background on the wooden pallet industry and noted that they are seeking more information and information sharing on invasive species in order to pinpoint vectors. He noted the challenges working with Federal agencies where he is often directed between two for information when neither wants or can share the data. The Association must partner with universities or other organizations to avoid it being an “industry study.”

There was then discussion on the life span of pallets and priority points of interest such as foreign pallets. Patrick noted that the mulch produced at the end of life of a pallet has not been a known or significant vector for invasives. Additionally, he addressed a question on tracking pallets by noting that trackers aren’t feasible given costs and logistics (they fall off when impacted).

C. Stelzig notes that the Entomological Society of America could be a good partner as they conduct research and collect data. This is an opportunity for partnership.

Marshall Meyers, N Marshall Meyers, PLLC

M. Meyers: In regards to cooperative federalism—this is a very important issue that would mean truly integrated work within and across the Federal government, including states, tribes, and the public.

Recommendations: We need better communications, cooperation, and collaboration at all levels. We need more transparency and integration so that individual agencies are not self-sustaining and silo-ed. We need timely information/data that is properly dated. We need to improve social media efforts and talents, education, and industry outreach—changing how we communicate. We need better data and quality controls. We need to know and discuss where data will be housed and who will manage them, including an online list of federal and state laws and regulations. This list of laws and regulations need to keep updated with species nomenclature and systematic changes. In his opinion, this efforts requires technology and collaboration within and across the federal government and sub governmental units. He also considers that there is a need to amend the Lacey Act to better address border crossing issues in a way that will authorize emergency listing of species for quick response. In response to questions from ISAC, he thinks that we need to consider using USGS’s BISON and NISC to manage a central repository of such lists in coordination with sub governmental units. He also notes that education needs to extend to the federal/state family too, not just the public.

Heath Packard, Island Conservation

Did not submit written comments.

H. Packard: Started by thanking and acknowledging federal partners on their mission to eradicate invasive species from island ecosystems. Island Conservation is the world's only global NGO dedicated to preventing extinctions by removing invasive species from islands. They estimate that hundreds of islands are owned by federal agencies. Due to the high level of biodiversity and extinction rates, islands have a high return on conservation investment.

Recommendations: Heath urged further collaboration and partnership between every level of government and society to advance our goals with invasive species. He reiterated the need for education and awareness of the issue and our work. We need clarity and consensus on priorities and next steps. There are existing vehicles for cooperation like MOUs and the Trilateral Committee that are good opportunities. There is a need for partnerships in/with the private sector for biosecurity and thinking beyond political boundaries. We need uniform EDRR monitoring approaches and resources and permits in place for immediate assistance and early and rapid response. Additionally, we need to streamline permits and the regulatory process (NEPA, programmatic approaches, public private partnerships, etc.). We need to set priorities for the mobilization of data. Innovation is also key to saving money and scaling up the scope of our work, including exploring genetic tools.

Heath spoke on current inventory and prioritization projects.

Belle Bergner, North American Invasive Species Management Association

Submitted comments.

B. Bergner: NAISMA standardizes procedures, policies, and standards and supports advancing cooperative federalism and promoting effective partnerships. She spoke on the Play, Clean, Go campaign and the importance of developing a standardized brand and uniform message that is widely visible/usable. She also spoke on the Weed Free Forage and Gravel Program and the standards and training provided. She noted that NAISMA is looking at expanding to top soil and fill. In order to broaden partnerships and be strategic about building a network, Belle wants to build a directory of producers to link with consumers (through a marketplace or their annual meeting).

Recommendations: One limit is that there are not many federal agencies participating—ISAC can help find and identify partners.

Lee Van Wychen, Weed Science Society of America

Submitted comments.

L. Van Wychen:

Recommendations: Keep an open mind about gene drives and don't lump it into the GMO debate. There are successful biocontrol programs that demonstrate the opportunities here. ISAC/NISC should identify the risks and the potential success to keep this technology available.

Lee spoke on the good neighbor concept and sharing information across weed management jurisdictions.

Lloyd Knight noted that the hiring freezes are causing a loss of institutional knowledges and putting stress on local knowledge. This is a problem when the federal family doesn't rely on local knowledge.

C. Stelzig noted that the Entomological Society of America is hosting a summit to call for broader perspectives modelled after the Paris Climate Accord proceedings in order to have representatives advocate in their respective countries.

M. Cuffe noted that the success of partnerships is determined by the initial arrangements and agreements, by how inclusive the roles and responsibilities are.

P. Atagi highlighted that the attitudes of the federal representatives is of high importance and **recommends** interacting with the associations during their meetings. Institutionalizing a positive attitude is difficult but using third party partners is helpful.

M. Meyers noted having a bottom up approach helps too by hosting multi-stakeholder meetings. He **recommended** to NISC/ISAC to endorse a format that builds trust on the working level versus the policy level.

M. Cuffe noted that while good programs can get built and move on to implementation, there are often challenges in keeping the money on track to the original intention, especially when new factors tempt to derail the implementation process of particular programs.

Break – 15 min

ISAC Questions to Audience

ISAC reviewed aforementioned priorities and emerging themes from the presentations and morning discussion and allow the public to elaborate of provide additional information.

Among the things discussed, the public and ISAC members consider the need to provide native fauna and flora information as an alternative for nonnatives. Although this information is available for technical audiences, it should be available for the general public in a way that can be useful and practical (e.g. buying plants for a garden on your local hardware store). The public notice that the State of New York has a “alternative” programs for certain plants and pets but caution should be taken since programs designed for pants can have practical difficulties when use for pets (e.g. gluing or attaching identification markers on fauna). Another important observation is that the term native is limited to a specific geographical area and does not encompass the entire nation. Species that are native to a specific region of the nation could be

invasive on other regions. “Alternatives” programs should also take this into consideration. As noted by ISAC members, universities and state agencies have an important role on this types of programs.

ISAC and the public also discussed the need increase public awareness by using key messages that work with for the entire community. They considered that NISC could help provide tool kit with key talking points brought to specific topics and themes. They notice that NISC have recently develop messages of hope to inspire people to action. This messaging campaign will help NGO’s reach more receptive and informed audience without the need to introduce the issues from its simplest form. There is also a need to flip the message from a negative messaging to a positive pro native campaign. The audience notice that we should consider aiming future camping’s towards children hoping to influence parental knowledge and behavior. The audience also discussed the idea of created a mascot or marketing symbol that can be united around and appeal to children and adults like Smokey the bear. The audience and ISAC questioned how the current budget cuts would affect outreach efforts.

ISAC and the audience also considered the current data compilations capability, availability, and accessibility. They explored the example of the birding community as a model of effective communication and response capability. Some considered that providing a website with where to get data might be more helpful than a single standardized repository. Single standardize repositories have issues with compatibility that reduce contribution. The State of Idaho contracts with locals and is improving communications such as updating websites, using real time data, and serving as an online resource to expand to other information site. The challenges here are ongoing funding and who will continue to manage the sites/information.

It is emphasized that the initial input of information into any system is vital and not to neglect more basic means of communication such as email and phone calls.

The group then discussed EDRR and what an EDRR response should look like. Some of the challenges in successfully conducting EDRR is the permitting process, resources, and prioritization. There needs to be a reserve fund, streamlined or existing permitting, and existing cooperative/MOU agreements. There is a legislative model in Alaska dealing with rat and oil spills that can serve as a model for having standing NEPA permits and standing EPA registration for tools. Not having this prevents rapid response. It is noted that they would like NISC to consider investing in strategies and tools on a programmatic level, such as during the review process, advising land managers, and education so as not to have to start at zero education when trying to implement EDRR initiatives. Programmatic assessments will be important to leverage between projects so everyone is not reinventing the wheel with every EDRR project. It is also noted that there are additional avenues for EDRR initiatives such as governor’s office that have the authority to work in emergency capacities.

Lastly, ISAC discussed the use of social media with advice that NISC should utilize social media in a strategic cooperative approach. A challenge will be getting the message to scale and to the target audience in order to warrant the time/funding investment. Associations can be a significant partner in the social media efforts of the issue.

E. Clark provided an overview of the afternoon agenda prior to breaking for lunch.

Lunch Break – 12:30-2:00pm

Afternoon Session – Facilitated Stakeholder Dialogue

Clark explained that the purpose of the meeting is to receive input from stakeholder groups, specifically representatives of states and territories, local governments, federally-recognized tribes, and governmental associations, which can be incorporated into ISAC guidance to NISC

He reviewed the 5 questions to be addressed:

1. How can NISC help advance cooperative federalism—an approach in which national, state, territorial, tribal, and local governments work together to solve our shared invasive species challenges—in order to better protect our nation’s biodiversity, land and water resources, public health, and other assets?
2. How can NISC facilitate more effective partnerships with the private sector in order to reduce the risks of invasive species crossing U.S. borders?
3. What are the highest priority opportunities to streamline federal regulatory procedures to make it easier and more cost-effective for various sectors of society to prevent, eradicate, and control invasive species?
4. How can NISC facilitate the mobilization of non-native species data into public information systems in order to improve decision support capacities at all levels of government and for the private sector?
5. How can NISC foster the development and application of innovative tools and technologies to enable the prevention, eradication, and control of invasive species in a more timely and effective manner?

After a round of introductions, Terry Gestrin, Idaho State Legislature, opened the comment session. He highlighted concerns about the introduction of invasive mussels into the Columbia River Basin. He noted that it’s an interstate commerce problem, requiring a cooperative federalism-approach. Specifically managing source populations of mussels that are under federal management. He closed by noting that prevention at the source could be far more effective than efforts to catch contaminated boats at state borders.

With regard to invasive mussels, there was a wide-ranging discussion about boat inspections at state borders, efforts (or lack thereof) by jurisdictions with infested waterbodies to prevent further spread, boat decontamination procedures,

Bill Whitacre, Western Governors Association, highlighted the WGA’s interest in invasive species, including its policy resolution on the topic as well as an initiative to improve sharing and recording of invasive species data. He noted that planning is ongoing for a new initiative focused on biosecurity. Responding to a question from McFarland, Whitacre outlined a qualitative exercise to develop a list of prioritized invasive species that should be made public in March 2018. Franklin asked about whether WGA is looking at the interstate movement of agricultural commodities, such as hay, that may be infested with invasive species. Whitacre explained that such topics could be addressed under the biosecurity initiative.

Chris Heck, National Association of Conservation Districts, noted that while there are regular discussions between state and federal officials, oftentimes they don't include individuals with the authority to make decisions. He highlighted examples where NEPA compliance for developing environmental impact statements, effectively barred a rapid response on the ground. He closed by noting problems with federally funded projects that do not make their monitoring and data reporting readily available, which precludes identifying lessons learned or replicating successful projects.

On NEPA, Shorb noted that even after EPA registers a pesticide, agencies have to go through their own internal approval process which can add delays (he highlighted one example where BLM took an additional 10 years, compared to NPS' two years, to make a specific approval).

On the issue of cooperative federalism, Josh Shorb, Park County (WY) Weed and Pest Control District, highlighted successful experiences with the 23 weed and pest districts in Wyoming with state-federal agreements. These agreements allow for coordinated efforts across a number of different jurisdictions. He underscored the value of EDDMaps for data management as well as NAISMA's weed free forage standards. Responding to a question from Franklin on quarantine of farms selling forage, Shorb explained that they are quarantined until they are verified as being weed and pest free. Shorb emphasized that any changes should make sure that they are beneficial, specifically noting concerns that amendments to the cooperative agreements could affect movement of funds and regular operations.

Aaron Foster, Fremont County (WY) Weed and Pest Control District, also addressed the weed and pest districts, noting that each is to have a certified supervisor with training on weed science and entomology. He noted state efforts to support overseas research on biocontrol agents, as well as regulatory bottlenecks for approving the use of agents within the U.S.

Clark then asked if there were other areas outside of the five questions, that audience members would like to prioritize.

Heck underscored the importance of support for research, particularly with shrinking budgets (e.g., pest controls, economic viability). Whitacre also underscored the importance of research for WGA's priorities.

Regarding questions from ISAC on effective control EDRR, Shorb highlighted the role of the cooperative partnerships, which allows for work on different jurisdictions. He highlighted their willingness to use their own funds to control weeds on federal lands if that would be in their long-term benefit. He noted that it's often faster to conduct work on private vs. federal lands, given permitting requirements. He explained that treated sites get visited multiple times for post-treatment monitoring and that BLM and USFS sites can opt into weed free forage requirements.

John Teem, ILSI Research Foundation, noted his past work as a researcher for a state agency. He noted difficulties in securing funds, particularly when research methods differed from the orientation of the funder's mission. He suggested further consideration of support for scholarships, post-docs, fellowships, and young investigator rewards to fund research. Responding

to questions about funding sources, he noted past, ad hoc funding opportunities from NOAA and USFWS. Foster noted the critical role of the University of Wyoming in biocontrol work, and Franklin emphasized its extension role in training and outreach to landowners.

Lloyd Knight, ID State Department of Agriculture, stated that it's not just about funding, but that there also needs to be trust building and partnerships between state and federal agencies, particularly in the West given the high percentage of federally managed land.

At the end of the discussion, Clark summarized the main points of dialogue and closed the session.

Wednesday, February 28, 2018 – ISAC Working Session

Opening Remarks/Announcements

Bargeron opened the meeting at 9.10 am and ISAC members introduced themselves. He reviewed the agenda for the next two days, and highlighted the process for the election of the next ISAC chair and vice-chair. Bargeron noted that he had assumed the role of interim chair after John Peter Thompson's term expired, and Okada was appointed as interim vice-chair. Okada will receive nominations for the two officer positions.

Approval of Minutes

Bargeron then introduced the minutes of the December 2016 ISAC meeting. During the discussion, Franklin made a correction on figures relating to the state of Wyoming's budget for work on state land. Clark made a motion to adopt the minutes, which was seconded by Hyatt. They were adopted unanimously with Franklin's amendment.

Bargeron then introduced the minutes of the December 2017 ISAC teleconference meeting. Clark made a motion to adopt the minutes, which was seconded by Parker. They were adopted unanimously.

Member Updates

Parker highlighted a grant received last year from the Bureau of Indian Affairs for invasive species monitoring in the Columbia River, which will continue again this year. He noted work on an "Eyes on the River" campaign, and is anticipating additional funds to support student work at Washington State University.

Stewart highlighted his engagement with the ISAC task team focused on wildlife health and invasive pathogens.

Okada noted her work on state legislation related to biosecurity. She also referenced discussions in state regarding restrictions on the use of pesticides in agricultural areas that may have impacts on pest management programs.

Bargeron noted the convening of the North American Invasive Species Forum (May 2017, Savannah) with support from BLM and Syngenta, and that the next forum would hopefully be in 2019 in Mexico. The first day of the Savannah meeting, included a workshop on mapping invasive species and associated standards, whose work will be continued at workshops with the Western Weed Coordinating Committee and the WGA.

Meyerson outlined her continuing research on plant genome size as a potential trait for biosecurity screening. She noted her role as coeditor and chief of the Journal of Biological Invasions, which includes engagement with the NISC Secretariat on a national invasive species assessment.

Franklin detailed monitoring and control efforts related to populations of medusahead and ventanata species, which includes an investment of \$200,000 to \$300,000 in funds to be matched by federal agencies. He is working with USFS on sage grouse studies, including a focus on managing cheatgrass and other weeds, as well as addressing erosion and consequent weed invasion risks associated with highly concentrated prairie dogs populations.

Hyatt highlighted the Recovering America's Wildlife Act (HR4647) as a means to increase revenue to states for wildlife conservation, including invasive species work. The bill has strong bilateral support and would channel funds from the Pittman-Robertson Trust Fund.

Clark explained how he had inherited chairmanship of the wildlife health task team from Marshall Meyers, who termed off of ISAC. The Wildlife Health Center of Virginia has expanded its programs including a postdoc position. Currently, he is looking at developing a one dose treatment for black bears threatened with sarcoptic mange in Pennsylvania.

McFarland reviewed the Weed Science Societies of America meeting in DC earlier in 2018, which included links to pollination, water quality, endangered species, mapping, monitoring, and data work. She noted that WSSA's next meeting will be in Louisiana.

Update from NISC Secretariat, Jamie K. Reaser, Executive Director

Reaser reviewed the current staffing status of the NISC Secretariat: four permanent staff (Brantley, Burgiel, Morisette, and Reaser), three term appointments (Burgos-Rodriguez, Kirkey, and Veatch), and two former detailees (Frey – NPS, Vissichelli – USACE). She noted a revised report card providing an update on progress in meeting the objectives of the NISC 2016-2018 Management Plan. She also reviewed the recent production of a number of products and initiatives, including:

- 2017 Interagency Invasive Species Crosscut Budget
- NISC Communities of Practice for Science/Technology and Law/Policy
- Protecting What Matters Success Stories
- Digital Makerspace

On the topic of infrastructure, Reaser she noted Vissichelli's work to complete a report on infrastructure and federal agencies. She explained that next steps could include an interagency

task team, an information sharing network, attention to gaps in authority, and integration into the administration's broader dialogue on infrastructure. On EDRR Reaser highlighted progress on a series of assessments focused on federal capacities, as well as a number of pilot projects. Next steps include publishing the assessments in a special journal article and initiating an interdepartmental dialogue on EDRR. She also noted the adoption in May 2017 of the Arctic Invasive Alien Species Strategy and Action Plan and the formation of a follow-up coordinating group to focus on its implementation. Looking forward, priorities include developing the NISC 2019-2021 Management Plan in line with administration priorities.

Regarding a question from Hyatt on the Digital Makerspace, Reaser noted that the challenge related to rapid 'ohi'a death is tied to a prize purse.

NISC Department Reports

Scott Cameron, Assistant Secretary, Policy, Management and Budget (acting), Department of the Interior, mentioned lags in the Senate's process for confirming political leadership within DOI as well as other Departments, which has impacted to Departmental prioritization processes. He reaffirmed DOI's commitment to invasive species, NISC as well as ISAC. Cameron then outlined a number of Secretary Zinke's priorities that intersect with invasive species, including building a conservation legacy, responsible development of energy and natural resources, good neighbor policies, protecting people and orders, striking a regulatory balance, and modernizing infrastructure. He noted internal efforts to reorganize DOI bureaus along a common set of regional boundaries. He finished by highlighting a number of ongoing efforts including the interagency crosscut budget, actions to address risks of the spread of invasive mussels into the CRB and Western states more generally, and governor-centered EDRR initiatives.

Hyatt noted that the emphasis on cooperation with states dovetails with the Recovering America's Wildlife Act. Parker highlight opportunities for further collaboration with tribes. In response to questions from Meyerson and McFarland regarding resources for NISC, Cameron noted that funding for FY2018 and FY2019 will continue at current levels, but that there are future efforts to share the burden of supporting NISC with other departments.

Kaush Arda, Senior Advisor, U.S. Agency for International Development, noted that USAID is a bit of an outlier in the NISC family given its international focus. With seven ongoing programs funded at \$3.5 million, USAID's activities focus mainly on food security threats such as coffee rust and tomato leaf miner. Arda highlighted the need to share domestic experiences with biological invasions related to development so that other countries could avoid those mistakes. He finished by highlighting the need to build national capacity to address sanitary and phytosanitary issues related to trade.

In response to questions from Clark and Parker about trade and SPS issues, Arda note that there are sensitivities that restrictions on imports to prevent introductions of invasive species is a trade concern, but that are legitimate ways to do that by focusing on limiting imports for infested regions and identifying processes that exporters can use to minimize risks associated with their commodities. Regarding a question from Barger on current work related to biocontrol, Arda noted that he would check into that further.

Paul Doremus, Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Management (acting), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, confirmed that NOAA is also lacking in Senate confirmed appointees. He highlighted NOAA's primary focus on the national weather service and the fisheries service, and does not see invasive species as a major commitment of political leadership. He did expect that they will have to address invasive species issues in fulfillment of NOAA's authorities. Doremus highlighted NOAA's work related to innovative technologies to catch lionfish, use of eDNA for monitoring, and efforts in the Great Lakes related to databases, mussels and algal blooms, and EDRR capabilities directed at silver and bighead carp.

Responding to a question from Meyerson on research into invasive species impacts on aquaculture, Doremus noted related work in two East coast labs. Regarding use of eDNA in the Columbia River Basin, Doremus stated that NOAA has a lot of cooperation with tribes on salmon, but nothing focused on mussel prevention. Barger asked about the use of and access to weather data for invasive species modeling to which Doremus noted internal efforts to develop a single, national information center.

Michael Slimak, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, noted his engagement at the origins of NISC, and stated that EPA would continue to support NISC, if not with money then with staff support. He explained that EPA's focus has traditionally been aquatic nuisance species, as well as the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and pesticide applications. He further addressed issues related to ballast water and the Vessel General Permit, the status of the 2018 Asian Carp Action Plan, and budgetary status of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

Hyatt and Parker noted ongoing opposition to legislation related to proposals for a vessel incidental discharge act that would remove states' authorities to regulate ballast water. Franklin emphasized the need for fast review and registration of pesticides through FIFRA, and Slimak asked for specific examples of where regulatory delays had hampered work on the ground. McFarland noted her appreciation for EPA's work on risk assessments for new technologies.

Menwyelet (Manny) Atsedu, Department of Homeland Security, noted challenges with and efforts to adequately staffing field offices, particularly with agriculture specialists. He highlighted the International Trade Data System (ITDS) to centralize information submission and access related to documentation for commercial shipping. He noted CBP's national targeting lab which assesses import risks and guides port inspections, as well as the use of mobile specialists to deal with immediate priorities (e.g., flower imports for Valentine's Day and Mother's Day).

Responding to Clark's question on information sharing with other departments, Atsedu noted that one of ITDS' objectives was to facilitate access to relevant data.

Samantha Simon, Senior Invasive Species Coordinator, U.S. Department of Agriculture, highlighted that USDA has 29 agencies with an overall goal of protecting US agricultural health. She reviewed USDA Secretary Perdue's new strategic goals, many of which relate to invasive species. Simon noted her appointment to the role of Senior Invasive Species Coordinator in October 2017, and outlined efforts to appoint agency invasive species coordinators, re-establish a USDA invasive species working group, and develop a departmental invasive species plan. Responding to a

question from McFarland on the agency coordinators, Simon explained that there are seven prime agencies with coordinators: Agricultural Research Service, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services, Farm Service Agency, Foreign Agriculture Service, National Institute for Food and Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, and the US Forest Service.

Clark noted ISAC's work on invasive pathogens that affect wildlife health, which identified gaps in federal agencies' ability to address the problem. Responding to his question as to whether USDA has the legal authority and programmatic focus to address imports affecting wildlife health, Simon stated that USDA would be able to address as threats to agriculture as well as wildlife. Franklin expressed an interest in the continuation of state forest grants, while noting difficulties with turnover in forest service staff at the local and regional level. Responding to a question from Meyerson on USDA interest in supporting NISC, Simon stated that there is a lot of interest in the issue and in USDA taking an active leadership role.

Working Lunch

Consideration of ISAC Wildlife Health Task Team White Paper

Clark introduced the task team's draft of the paper on "Reducing the Risk of Invasive Pathogens to Wildlife Health in the United States." He noted that they had paired down much of the content, but included attention to pathways for introduction of pathogens, agencies authorities (particularly USFWS), and the need for deeper cooperation across APHIS, CBP, CDC, and FWS, as initially recommended by a 2010 study by the Government Accountability Office.

During discussion Parker noted his suggestion for an interagency newsletter that would go to port staff. Clark noted the linkage to existing recommendations focused on sensitizing staff to the priorities of other agencies. There was discussion and agreement to add language on tribal engagement in coordination with different levels of government, as well as to add a footnote related to a recent Court decision on FWS' authority related to interstate movements of injurious wildlife.

Clark's initial motion to accept the paper from the task team was then seconded by Franklin. The paper was adopted unanimously with the two amendments.

Election of Officers

Okada received one nomination for chair: Chuck Barger, and one for vice-chair: Blaine Parker. These candidates were proposed for acceptance, and McFarland seconded the motion. The appointments were unanimously approved as a recommendation to be finalized by the NISC Executive Director.

Thursday, March 1, 2018 – Federal-State Roundtable and ISAC Working Session

Federal-State Roundtable

Bargeron opened the meeting by explaining that ISAC has distilled a number of recommendations from the stakeholder events and committee discussions over the past two days. The roundtable was chaired by Scott Cameron, Department of the Interior and Bill Hyatt, ISAC/Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. Other roundtable participants included: members of ISAC; Belle Bergner, North American Invasive Species Management Association; Mike Cuffe, Montana State Legislature; Terry Gestrin, Idaho State Legislature; Samantha Simon, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Chris Stelzig, Entomological Society of America; Lee Van Wychen, National and Regional Weed Science Societies; and Bill Whitacre, Western Governors Association.

Bargeron then presented the distillation of ISAC's recommendation to the roundtable as a basis for the morning's dialogue. The recommendations stated that NISC should:

1. Meet regularly and discuss the current status of management of Invasive Species within their respective agencies, including authorities, capacities, programmatic priorities and needs to facilitate coordination and collaboration.
2. Facilitate access and sharing of invasive species data into public information systems to improve decision support capacities at all levels of government and in the private sector.
3. Identify and use existing state and local cooperative agreements to increase the capacity of each agency and state to respond to localized invasive species issues (e.g., CWMA, CISMA, CRM, PRISM).
4. Identify and expand current Good Neighbor Authority and cooperative agreements with local, state, and Tribal invasive species management agencies.
5. Establish a rapid response fund with emphasis on the direct management of new invasions.
6. Streamline federal regulatory processes (e.g., NEPA), agency risk assessments, bio-control and emerging management technologies.
7. Strengthen regional coordination efforts of state, tribal, and territories to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species into the U.S. (inter-state and intra-state).
8. Establish a Federal-State-Tribal Invasive Species Coordinating Committee and designate a fulltime staff member to serve as chairperson of the Coordinating Committee and to enhance implementation of federal-state-tribal invasive species efforts.¹
9. Foster the development and application of innovative tools and technologies to enable the prevention, eradication and control of invasive species in a more timely and effective manner.
10. Review and implement the recommendations from the full slate of ISAC recommendations from its White Papers.

Hyatt asked whether the first nine recommendations encompassed what was discussed during the stakeholder rounds on Tuesday. Responding to a question from Cameron regarding consideration of written comments to the Federal Register Notice, Bargeron confirmed that they had been reviewed, including those that had come in subsequent to Tuesday's discussions. Cameron also noted that it would be useful to identify any recommendations from those comments that were less appropriate for federal uptake. Bargeron explained that most of the comments were relevant, although there were some that were a bit more general in nature.

Regarding the recommendations, Stelzig noted that the only reference to funding was for rapid response, but not for research, prevention, mapping, and other issues. He also highlighted previous discussions on the use of social media, communications, and outreach.

Cameron addressed the issue of funding and EDRR, explaining that DOI has requested funds for EDRR activities in the President's proposed budget for at least 2-3 years, but those requests were denied. Cameron noted that that may be because the request for funds was under the Office of the Secretary. Cameron noted that agencies have not been signaling EDRR funding as a key priority to the Hill, by going to Congress to request a re-programming of funds to address invasive species priorities. Clark highlighted lessons learned from the case of wildfire funding, as well as rapid response coordination efforts with non-federal partners. He stressed the need for a pool of resources that could be made available to such entities in emergency situations. Van Wychen noted difficulties in competing with other funding priorities such as wildfires in USDA and maintenance backlogs in NPS.

During a discussion on the amount of funds necessary for a response action. Franklin noted that a small amount of seed money can be critical for bringing folks to the table and leveraging additional resources. Clark noted that the quicker a response can be initiated, the cheaper the overall costs may be. Cuffe noted the need to have a framework and mechanism to secure funds that are not being used. Simon stated that it would not be practical to have a pot of funds waiting for emergency use. Instead departments should have a response framework in place and then make requests on their emergency budgets as situations arise. Hyatt disagreed stating that funds could be held by a third party entity, such as the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, to ensure that they are not siphoned for other activities. Stelzig argued that unspent funds could be used for other invasive species priorities, including support for citizen science. Clark stated that at minimum departments should do contingency planning which would include identifying where funds would be sourced. Otherwise responses would be slowed down as decision-makers searched for funds.

Gestrin, Parker, Cuffe, Hyatt, and Barger supported use of the incident command system as a model for responses providing different examples from the Columbia River Basin, Montana, and training exercises. Whitacre stressed the need for practicing ICS beforehand and not learning the system during an actual emergency. Cameron outlined the Continuation of Operations (COOP) Exercises that agencies are required to conduct. They include table top exercises, review of planning materials, and staffing responsibilities. He noted that governors can declare states of emergency, suggesting that it might be useful to look at regional coordination among states.

Van Wychen suggested looking at USDA's extension service and expanding its focus to address more natural resources issues. This could include revisiting the Smith-Lever Act. Stelzig highlighted the need to look at lessons learned by the CDC during the ebola and zika outbreaks. Clark also emphasized the capacity of CDC's public health service, noting its broad authority to issue quarantines, shut down facilities, and commandeer resources. He asked if DOI or USDA had those abilities. Simon stated that USDA has those authorities and uses them, citing examples of responses to emerald ash borer and foot and mouth disease. Gestrin said that state and local departments of agriculture may have similar authorities. Reaser noted an ongoing analysis of authorities by NISC Secretariat staff, adding that the existence of authority does not always confer

the resources necessary to implement it. For example, CDC had to request funds from Congress to address the zika virus outbreak.

Regarding a question on the use of good neighbor authority, Franklin stressed the need to expand its application as he frequently sees the need to address infestations on federal lands. Simon stated that the USFS operates under that authority as it is an efficient use of resources. Whitacre noted his impression that USFS uses good neighbor authority more often than BLM, and also encouraged its broader usage. Referencing other agencies, Burgos-Rodriguez noted that NPS has a slightly different authority to cooperate inside and outside of park borders, and Reaser stated that BIA uses cooperative agreements as a mechanism to do their work. McFarland supported the idea of agency invasive species strategies and suggested that they address integration of good neighbor authority into their activities.

Cameron then introduced the topic of streamlining federal regulatory processes. Okada stressed the need to look at biocontrol approval processes. Franklin highlighted vastly different time periods for agency risk assessments of the same herbicide. Cameron suggested that one agency could use another agency's risk assessment, and Reaser noted a Canadian initiative to develop a clearing-house of all risk assessments to avoid such duplication.

A number of speakers referenced NEPA. Clark stressed the need for categorical exclusions for rapid response actions. McFarland highlighted NEPA permitting for different control technologies to address invasive species on islands. Cameron noted internal discussions within DOI on the need for categorical exclusions, as well as the question of whether one agency could use another's categorical exclusion. Cuffe asked whether such provisions could also be used to address native pests, such as the mountain pine beetle. Clark noted that the response goal for invasive species is preferably eradication, but that might not be the case with native species.

Regarding the recommendation on regional coordination, Simon highlighted internal discussions within USDA's on means to improve work across its agencies. Cameron highlighted DOI's efforts to re-organize its bureaus along a common set of regional boundaries. This would include the identification of a regional director from one of the bureaus to serve as key contact point for states and other entities in that region. McFarland then asked about how to prioritize invasive species. Cameron suggested that this be done on a regional and not national basis (e.g., cheatgrass, Asian carp). Simon highlighted APHIS' Hungry Pests campaign which identifies 11 key invasive species threats. Whitacre noted WGA's ongoing efforts to prioritize invasive species in the West, which should be released soon.

Regarding the recommendation on establishing a federal, state and tribal coordinating committee, Hyatt explained that this is a new request stemming from recent ISAC white papers. He noted that ISAC's state-federal paper has a proposal that includes suggested representation and terms of reference.

Bergner then called for more attention to the role of outreach and education in supporting prevention efforts. This could include a coordinated messaging campaign that can help change behavior. Bargeron noted that a number of good campaigns exist and suggested looking at gaps across them. He also highlighted ISAC's past work on the topic. Franklin explained how a number

of Western states adopted the Clean, Play, Go campaign, because a unified campaign would simplify communicating the message and be a more efficient use of funds. Stelzig emphasized the need to engage marketing professionals. Participants then joked about potentially campaign mascots, such as Smokey the Stinky Bug or Darth In-Vader.

Regarding the final recommendation on implementation of ISAC recommendations, Simon asked if that included the full slate of recommendations since ISAC was formed. Bargeron and Clark explained that it only included more recent ISAC white papers that included involvement of existing ISAC members.

In closing the session, Cameron thanked everyone for their participation and noted that discussions on these topics will continue among the NISC co-chairs.

Working Session

ISAC reconvened to work on the 2019-2021 recommendations. The group revising the recommendations referenced the proper ISAC white paper reports. ISAC considered which white papers should be included, aiming to balance information availability with watering down the recommendations. ISAC discussed the integration of additional comments resulting from the *Moderated Roundtable Discussion with ISAC*. ISAC voted to approve the recommendations and authorized the ISAC Chair to make non-substantive changes to the document. The vote passed and the recommendations were adopted.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.