

Invasive Species Advisory Committee
January 25 - 26, 2000
L'Enfant Plaza Hotel, Washington D. C.
DRAFT Summary

Welcome

Gordon Brown, Acting Co-Executive Director, Invasive Species Council (Council), and serving as Designated Federal Official and Chair, called the inaugural meeting of the Invasive Species Advisory Committee (ISAC) to order. He welcomed the members and thanked all attending for meeting under such difficult snow conditions. He regretted that the full staff and membership could not attend, and encouraged the members to consider this an informal meeting.

Tom Lovejoy, Counselor to the Secretary for Biodiversity and Environmental Affairs, Smithsonian Institution, and Chief Biodiversity Advisor to the President of the World Bank and Lead Specialist on the Environment for Latin America and the Caribbean, on behalf of the Smithsonian Institution, then extended his welcome. He noted that Smithsonian has long been engaged in invasive species issues, especially avian and estuarine species research. Currently working on detail at the World Bank, he noted that the Bank's concern with this centers on what new regulations, protections and procedures may be triggered to help screen projects to assure that they do not promote the spread of invasive species.

Mike Dunn, Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, US Department of Agriculture, offered his thanks for coming. He said that the executive branch agencies needed to target resources, get together and address this problem in a coordinated fashion to help identify threats and eradicate invasives where possible. He encouraged the ISAC to hold the agencies responsible for consolidating resources to fulfill the President's mandate. He thanked Smithsonian for supporting this effort and recognized their contributions to the technology of visual imaging which has greatly assisted the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service.

Pat Shea, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Lands and Minerals Management, US Department of the Interior, extended a welcome on behalf of the Secretary. He encouraged the ISAC to outline important policy options to be implemented. He charged members (1) to strive for practical, budget-based recommendations based upon the best available science on resource management, (2) to recommend improvements for the federal agencies conduct their invasives work. He noted as an example that, in the past, poor decisions were made when selecting seeds for replanting burned areas. Mixtures were selected that were dominated by nonnatives some of whose invasive potential could significantly reduce chances for restoration of native plant communities. He encouraged bold efforts and encouraged members to recognize that their deliberations will have far reaching consequences, even international importance.

Agenda overview

Facilitators Paul De Morgan and Lee Langstaff (Resolve, Inc.) introduced the agenda after members identified themselves and the Chair read the names of those not present. He reviewed the goals for the meeting: (1) clarify ISAC mission, (2) identify ISAC role in developing the Management Plan (MP), and (3) explore advisory committee oversight responsibilities to assist the Council.

ISAC roles, responsibilities and operational overview

The chair reviewed the goals for the advisory committee:

- Increase awareness of invasive species issues through public education and outreach.
- Promote new funding and resources to support national leadership and local action.
- Establish innovative partnerships to leverage limited funds -- find model projects to include all stakeholders including nongovernmental organizations, governments and tribes, industry, and private citizens.
- Begin work to support development of the Management Plan (MP) due in August 2000.
- Identify broad stakeholder interests to drive consensus building for Executive branch coordination and Congressional action in support of local partnership activities.

Handouts were provided to update materials sent out with the notebooks – (1) National Invasive Species Management Plan draft outline, (2) Draft timeline for management plan development, (3) Invasive Species Council staff and responsibilities, (4) Working groups list with council staff liaisons, and (5) an updated agenda . These will be provided to all members in a future mailing.

Brief history of the Executive Order

Numerous letters to the White House from scientists, policy makers, and local land and water managers indicated that the Executive branch needed to improve coordination, patch up gaps in authorities, and deliver more action on-the-ground. Rather than convene a commission, the Vice President called upon an ad hoc task force to work with existing entities to fashion an action plan emphasizing increased reliance on science and partnerships. Staff were drawn from the Federal Interagency Committee for the Management of Noxious and Exotic Weeds (FICMNEW), the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANSTF), and the Office of Science and Technology Policy's Committee on Environment and Natural Resources (CENR). The task force drafted a white paper to highlight recommended actions applicable to the full array of species introduced by man's activities to ecosystems where they have established and cause both economic and ecological harm. The task force concluded that an Executive Order would help accelerate action and stakeholder involvement through an advisory committee to improve coordination, promote outreach, and enhance international participation. The goal was to widen the scope, include diverse constituencies, and avoid dominance by narrow a range of federal agency programs.

Federal advisory committees – a brief introduction

Established in 1972, the Federal Advisory Committee Act created a structured management regime for balanced committees convened to provide advice to agencies of the Executive Branch. The law outlines an open process, available to public scrutiny. These 'sunshine' provisions assure stakeholder input and set a standard for public service. Meeting notes and all committee materials are to be made available to the public. Advisory committees file annual reports to Congress. Members of the ISAC are appointed as representatives of important stakeholder communities, therefore the members are encouraged to voice their own opinions.

ISAC roles and responsibilities

The chair then outlined the roles and responsibilities of the ISAC:

(A) the ISAC charter language is drawn directly from the Executive Order (EO)

- Chair of ISAC is to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the other members of the Council. In the absence of a chair, the Designated Federal Officer, Gordon Brown, will act on behalf of the Secretary as chair. The officers will be appointed before the next meeting of the ISAC.
- EO outlines Federal agency duties, creates an Invasive Species Council, specifies Council duties, and directs production of a management plan within 18 months after signing. These tasks circumscribe the scope of the ISAC's deliberations and actions: the executive branch agencies are (1) prevent the introduction of invasive species, (2) detect and respond rapidly to and control populations in a cost-effective and environmentally sound manner, (3) monitor such populations accurately and reliably, (4) conduct research and develop technologies to prevent and control spread, and (6) promote public. The federal agencies have demonstrated a long history of concern and action, however that has not stopped the influx of invasive species.
- The EO makes clear that over arching duties to oversee activities of the federal agencies and the Council and help craft a screening methodology for intentional and unintentional introductions go beyond the development and update of the management plan. That is one important component. The working groups created to support the joint federal (Council) and nonfederal (Advisory Committee) activities will take advantage of existing organizations and partnerships, as directed by the EO to save time and money and increase efficiency.
- ISAC meetings are open to the public – written comments are welcome in advance of the meetings.
- ISAC should seek information and assistance from agencies and other organizations to assist with their mandate. ISAC should consider bringing experts and other representatives to provide information at future meetings. These stakeholder liaisons will allow ongoing public input and contribution to the activities of the Committee.
- Staff for the Council will also provide administrative support for the ISAC: positions for an executive director, two policy analysts, and an administrative assistant will be advertised and appointed in the next six weeks. In addition, detailees from the departments of Agriculture and Commerce will assist with the operations.

A question and answer session followed:

Q: How will the management plan be completed in seven months and provide important leadership?

A: The chair explained that , in addition to staff and agency coordinators already in place and ready to help, a team of experienced science and policy writers will help develop option papers and drafts to speed working group interaction and progress. The draft white paper (or 'action plan') drafted by the ad hoc task force will also help speed development . For example, the section covering regulatory authorities for intentional introductions will follow directly from that document. Staff and others see the task as challenging but doable.

Q: How will existing regulatory authorities be utilized to craft model projects?

A: The chair explained that most agency experts expect the first management plan to be visionary but also needs to include some concrete model projects to demonstrate local action. Subsequent plans will focus more on refining the specifics of how agencies set priorities for all invasives projects.

Q: What fiscal year will be targeted with ISAC recommendations?

A: The chair explained that FY 2002 is the budget cycle most likely to benefit from the first round of recommendations, including the management plan.

Proposed ISAC Procedural Protocols

The members received a handout, a draft of procedural protocols for the committee. The draft will be shared with the other members. Members are encouraged to provide comments for a redraft to be shared at a later date.

Bill Brown, Science Advisor to Secretary Babbitt joined the meeting and provided brief welcoming remarks, encouraging the members to focus on organizing the committee's activities in accordance with the EO. He emphasized that committee oversight and review should extend beyond the management. The committee represents a unique opportunity to facilitate public participation and engage governmental and nongovernmental involvement. He mentioned that additional resources in the FY 2001 budget could help support agency actions in anticipation of the greater detail provided by the management plan for FY 2002.

Development of the Invasive Species Management Plan

The chair provided an overview of the working group structure envisioned to allow joint federal and nonfederal interaction in developing the management plan. There will also be agency and public comment periods provided during the review process. The EO directs that a public process be followed. Clear identification of gaps in authority will help, but new delivery mechanisms should also be considered, especially building upon existing partnerships and the use of best available science to inform field action.

National Action Plan – Section II of the Management Plan

Jamie Reaser then reviewed the National Action Plan outline and how numerous topics are embedded within other subject areas. For example, all items are intended to consider the international component:

- A - how to strengthen, improve staffing and coordination, also how to apply new innovative perspectives, consider new ways to develop regulations through negotiation rather than simply draft and public comment. We should exploit the authorities we currently have.
- B - risk assessment - strategic for intentional species and creative strategies for assessing risks for unintentional invasions. How do we do prevention? Take coarse filter and decide where it is appropriate to design a fine filter? Ballast water moves whole ecosystems, not just individuals.
- C - what do we do now with the invasives we have? how do we manage for existing or incipient infestations. Restoration with natives – how best to balance needs for affordability and chances for successful conservation of ecological processes?
- D - Research - how do we do this, and then share the information quickly and widely.
- E – almost every aspect involves outreach, and the creative use of the internet for database sharing and web queries for best management practices.
- F - build multilateral cooperation, through treaties and other intergovernmental organizations, such as the Global Invasive Species Programme. What is our takeaway message to other countries? Section F will require results from sections A-E. Then we need to carry a small set of unified messages to other countries.

Working Group Structure

Jamie Reaser explained that working groups (WG) convened by the Council and Advisory Committee will have federal and nonfederal co-chairs. ISAC members will be invited to work in the WG as a member, taking a leadership role, or by promoting other nonfederal representatives to participate. Other ISAC members will also be invited to play a liaison role back to the ISAC. Staff will encourage contact and communications during the whole process. A sign-up sheet was circulated to solicit ISAC member participation as member or liaison, and to provide a space for recommendation of other colleagues in the nonfederal arena who have expressed interest and time to participate in the WG process.

Enhanced Coordination and Leverage: Section III of the Management Plan

The chair reviewed the outline, sections III A through G:

(A) Stakeholder involvement and partnerships: a prime opportunity for creative funding mechanisms and joint action at local levels. The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation has created its most popular program to deliver joint federal and nonfederal action on invasive species. Entitled “Pulling Together,” the program blends federal contributions via a challenge cost-share matching arrangement with private dollars. One of the challenges is how to build support for more private sector donations to the fund, so that more projects can be funded, perhaps on a larger scale, too. Another area ripe for attention involves matching for applied research, monitoring and inventory work. Many partnerships are finding that without basic scientific information about the rate of spread and monitoring of control successes, their long-term efforts are hampered. The ISAC can play a significant role promote greater incentives for this kind of tactical science.

(B) Identification of merging issues and threats – the full array of taxa need to be considered, including impacts to ecological services such as nutrient cycling and pollinators.

(C) Coordinated information sharing -- federal databases and nonfederal data could be better utilized by a broad array of professionals, probably using the worldwide web as a vehicle both for dispersal and information gathering). State and federal and international organizations can issue alerts when a problem emerges, using the new technologies to speed rapid response and better target resources for prevention of introduction and spread.

(D) Integrated interagency strategic planning and budget initiatives – under the Government Performance and Results Act, agencies are bound to join forces to increase coordination and efficiency. Invasive species issues cut across several departments and the management planning process will accelerate ongoing efforts such as clarifying the process and by so doing, speeding decisions on biological control introductions where warranted.

(E) Legislative and regulatory strategies -- agencies responsible for land and water management are demanding that better science and research efforts be directed at invasive species issues. In Department of the Interior, for example, the bureaus cited invasive species more than any other operational need when building their requests for science support with the Biological Resources Division of the US Geological Survey. Clearly, the EO mandate to develop more effective screening methods for intentional and unintentional introductions will rely on regulatory strategies based upon scientific information about regional invasiveness, and quantifiable harm to crops and other systems.

(E) NEPA Guidance should be forthcoming as one of the first products under the EO to assure that agencies of the federal government ascertain and weigh in decision making the potential impacts, both near and long-term that their federally-funded efforts engender.

(F) Dispute resolution – not everyone will be able to take part in decision making, so a process will be needed to resolve disputes and try to bring together disparate views in time to influence future decisions in a positive way. The EO commits to a public process and calls on the executive branch to enhance coordination efforts across departments and with diverse stakeholders.

Procedural Protocols discussion as related to MP and WG

The facilitator projected a draft organizational chart (to be included in the mailing to members after the meeting) to provide a graphical visualization of the joint relationship between the Council, the Committee, the Working Groups and the Council staff. The Council has the responsibility to jointly produce the management plan with the Advisory Committee. Therefore, the Committee's advice will be crucial to creating a visionary plan. A team of professional writers will assist staff efforts to draft text of the management plan, providing option papers for the working groups based upon their bulleted input and interaction with the Committee members.

Questions followed concerning the logistics of plan development – will the ISAC have to approve all elements of the plan, or at least review all that the working groups produce. Bill Brown answered on behalf of the Council that ISAC and working groups and Council and staff will act as a team to produce a joint project. The ISAC should be engaged as much as possible, and controversial aspects should be addressed as they arise. The facilitator noted that there may not be total consensus on every aspect. He also called attention to the ISAC opportunity to have a long-term impact on Council and federal agency activities relating to implementation of the plan. ISAC advice extends beyond the production of the management plan.

Guiding Principles

Jamie Reaser reviewed the development of the guiding principles. By the end of March, a team of staff and ISAC members are expected to finalize the principles.

OVERHEAD 1: guiding principles are statements that direct essential actions toward a specific destination (outcome). Positive example -- protected areas are an effective tool for habitat conservation . Negative example -- the US should establish a network of protected areas on the moon.

Guiding Principles challenges + opportunities needs actions

She said it is a nested process leading from your ideals to the practical on-the-ground work.

OVERHEAD 2: guiding principles, elements of importance:

- diversity of stake holders
- complex problem
- flexible
- promote rather than prescribe

She emphasized a flexible product that addresses the wide range of issues

OVERHEAD 3: today's challenge --

- small ISAC working group to work with staff
- feedback on what process works best for the ISAC to participate in this process, help us know how we can work best with you
- what are the criteria for framing arguments for the guiding principles

She mentioned that staff would like to receive other model examples of guiding principles. The timeline for staff is as follows:

Feb 10: other models and draft guiding principles due to staff.

Feb 15: ISAC small working group to meet with staff to review models and chart next steps.

Questions and answers followed:

(1) are guiding principles also goals of the EO?

Guiding principle is more of an ideal than a specific goal with an objective that could be measured. Action Plan should be driven by the guiding principles (analogy: frame of the house). Goals of the Action Plan are by analogy, the rooms in the house.

(2) The Federal Interagency Committee for the Management of Noxious and Exotic Weeds (FICMNEW) is almost finished with their model for weeds. It might be of value.

Good, exactly what we are looking for. Other groups who have produced guiding principles include the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP).

The following ISAC members volunteered to serve on the guiding principles small working group:

Ted Batkin, Dennis Brinker, Faith Campbell, and Gabriela Chavarria.

Development of Management Plan -- discussion

Working Groups will be selected in the near future. Federal and nonfederal co-leads will be designated after discussions with ISAC and others. The goal is to allow the groups to form without strict process, since subgroupings make sense – some of the groups include several topics.

Questions and answers followed:

(1) Size of working group -- a problem of scale?

Staff responded that hope is for small groups (<30 members per subgroup).

Unsuccessful nominees for the ISAC were invited to join the working groups because of their expertise and clear interest in advancing the goals of the EO. Staff will interact with ISAC as working groups are selected.

(2) How much work will be involved in the working groups?

Staff pointed out desire to expedite writing by soliciting bulleted ideas from working groups – writers will put text into more formal layout of report. Liaison role will likely involve less work than membership role. Members can determine the limit of their participation.

(3) These are big issues: need to break them down. Hope expressed working groups will go on after the management plan, otherwise plan implementation is at risk. Staff assumes the management plan will be a dynamic plan and that it will be updated. EO has some specific tasks assigned to the Council -- content and continuing enterprises. We must make sure that the WG are kept on task and focused. Tasks of the Council include oversight of federal agencies whether on the council or not. EO specifies some specific tasks: (1) how to screen against introductions (both intentional and unintentional), (2) develop NEPA guidance, (3) facilitate a web-based information sharing capability.

End of day -- wrapup

Facilitator asked that members look at the list of working groups and the draft procedural protocols in anticipation of more discussion about the dynamics of specific working groups and how they should evolve. He invited members to consider listing out some “over arching issues.” He also called for a volunteer spokesperson for the joint meeting with the Council.

Public Comment

Paul Gertler of the Western Governors' Association: Encouraged members when they involve stake holders and partners, to put a heavy emphasis on international elements and to expand coordination with state and local governments.

Embassy of Chile: Please consider the human health effects of invasive species. The ISAC should consider advising the Council to include Health and Human Services as part of the council.

Staff agreed these were both important considerations.

Logistics

ISAC to meet at hotel in morning to see if weather conditions allow meeting(s) to continue at the Smithsonian Institution. Lobby meeting suggested at 8 am next day; phone voicemail on staff phone lines to advise of conditions.

DAY 2. January 26, 2000

The facilitator introduced the newly arrived members -- Kathy Metcalf and Allegra Cangelosi. Three others joined the Committee later in the morning: Liz Chornesky (alternate for John Sawhill), Sarah Reichard, and David Wilcove. The facilitator solicited comments from the members concerning the previous day's work and goals for the future of the Committee.

Mr. Lindow encouraged the Committee to address the provisions of the charter and convene the working groups promptly. Mr. Stocker called for the Committee to translate needs into meaningful legislation and regulations. Ms Campbell challenged the Committee to help the government by creating and implementing the most effective and protective program 'we can get.' Mr. Toba cited tribal government as an important ally in invasives issues. Mr. Brinker called for efforts to improve the health of the land. Ms. Chavarria requested members to build many different projects that work on-the-ground to build partnerships. Mr. Secrist, on behalf of Governor Kempthorne, cited the state's terrestrial weed concern and increasing problems with aquatic invasives. Federal lands comprise 64% of Idaho lands – he called for greater financial investments and personnel to manage these lands. Mr. Dewey emphasized his commitment to encouraging education and awareness. He said ignorance is the big problem; the Committee needs to get the message out. Mr. Buck noted the difficulty of the issues, but he pointed out that Hawaii would like to help move the issue by emphasizing the practical implications. Mr. Kanter noted the need to bridge the information gap nationwide and the need to make sure that the necessary information filters down to port authorities and shipping personnel. Ms. Sheehan called on the members to first meet the long-term mandates in the EO and then the MP as a tie to on-the-ground activities. Mr. Regelbrugge observed that his industry thrives or withers depending on control of the invasives trade even as they struggle to understand which of the plants they are producing may be considered invasive. He offered the nurserymen as well positioned to help with education and outreach. Mr. Batkin urged the committee to bring together multiple areas of the government (federal, state, local and tribes). Noting that invasives issues constitute a multi-departmental issue, he called on the members to bring these areas together and work to achieve consensus. He noted that increased travel and trade has really changed the way we need to address invasives. Dr. Jackson urged the removal of regulatory barriers to increase partnerships -- use science and common sense to address the issues. He said the activities under the EO should strive to not only remove invasive species, but help restore habitats. Dr. Mooney congratulated the group for its dynamism and expressed optimism for the future.

The facilitator outlined work for the day:

1. Review working groups -- structure and scope of their activities (including member sign-ups as participants and liaisons),
2. Discuss further the procedural protocols draft passed out the previous day,
3. Discuss how to facilitate stakeholder consultation and input, and
4. Discuss the guiding principles and recommended activities for the working groups.

Working groups: Mr. Kanter asked about the structure of the working groups: what is envisioned for federal government participation and how other stakeholders will be brought to the table. Mr. Secrist added that the issues are important enough that members should invite excellent candidates, rather than simply wait for volunteers.

Mr. Buck and Dr. Jackson echoed this and asked for a separate sign-up sheet for member recommendations for working group participants. Several members expressed concern about the size of the working groups.

The chair pointed out that specific funding is not available for support of the working groups -- the staff recommends extensive use of email with face to face meetings at the beginning and end of the process. A web site will be created as soon as possible; a listserver may help the groups to communicate without having to check periodically for web site updates to working papers. To assure diversity, many interested groups have been contacted about the working group opportunities. He encouraged members to reach out to their respective constituencies for recommendations. The working groups will likely subdivide into subgroups, so the concern for numbers will be closely watched by staff, and the members will be informed.

Discussion then turned to how the working groups will involve stakeholders. Some members suggested that a separate working group to cover "over arching" issues be established. Dr. Mooney raised the issue of "human dimensions," the different ways the public here and abroad view these sociological issues through the lens of culture and economic well-being. Members discussed the merits of inviting observers of societal change (futurists, for example) to highlight how individuals make the choices they make. Several members considered the over arching issues to be an important part of each topical working group's assignment. Others suggested a new group. Dr. Mooney agreed to work with staff to suggest what a separate group on over arching issues would cover. The staff will clarify the charge to co-leads for the working groups in consultation with the committee liaison members. Some members agreed that the over arching issues should be the ongoing business of the whole committee. Several suggested inviting speakers to help clarify the issues.

Procedural protocols: After the break, the facilitators encouraged members to inform staff of designated alternates for meeting attendance and other committee activities. The protocols document could also incorporate more discussion of the role of the member liaisons to the working groups. Staff will be glad to receive any comments on the draft.

Facilitating stakeholder consultation and input: The chair introduced members to some of the activities already underway which have helped to involve stakeholders:

1. Information sharing: DOI, USDA, and Commerce have engaged the *Charles Valentine Riley Foundation* to both conduct an inventory of invasive species databases that apply to and sponsor a stakeholder roundtable discussion of the following:

a. Model Projects: Including how to share information between structured database systems, emphasizing a variety of habitats and management/control issues. The projects will involve federal and nonfederal professionals and other private citizens. The goal is to demonstrate that information exists which, if more widely shared can improve action on-the-ground.

b. Use of the worldwide web: Information is available on invasives, however it has not always been edited or tied together in a way that emphasizes the caveats needed to better make use of the information. The web also represents an opportunity for outreach and communication. By bringing together diverse

stakeholders in a roundtable discussion, the efforts will call on other partners to help define how best to use the web for enhancing communication.

These efforts are being coordinated with a wide variety of existing organizations and partnerships.

2. South Africa workshop on best management practices: An upcoming conference (2/22 - 24) will encourage land and water managers from the developing nations of southern Africa to engage the scientists of the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), who will rollout their multi-year project in Cape Town in September, 2000. The point is to utilize technical exchanges of scientists and managers from Southern African neighboring countries and highlight other successful efforts from Australasia and the United States. Another goal is to create support for ongoing exchange programs for African and other developing nations' invasive species professionals who would be able to participate in the United States with federal, state, tribal and private practitioners. This will help build international cooperation and collaboration, one of the goals of the EO.

Members discussed enhancing cross-agency coordination models. Ms. Chornesky suggested a freewheeling web system where anybody could add information, rather than have a manager editing everything. Dr. Campbell emphasized the research potential of web-based data and suggested that the educational opportunity to raise awareness of invasives issues should be pursued promptly. Dr. Mooney noted that some other nations are actually leading the US in terms of novel approaches -- he suggested we solicit for input from outside our borders. Ms. Metcalf called on members to alert their constituencies for improved information sharing. Mr. Batkin and Mr. Buck raised the issue of a communications plan as a logical starting point.

Bill Brown mentioned the success to date of two other cross-departmental web sites -- frog web and the coral reef task force web site. These generate substantial traffic from students and others interested in materials for kids as well as the policy and economics issue treatments. He expressed some doubt about federal delivery of a communications plan, but encouraged the members to raise the bar by bringing advertising agency and other pro bono contributions to the table. After questioning, he assured members that a contribution of federal funds could be committed to match such an effort. Dr. Reaser mentioned the recent State Department demarche cable which has elicited responses from many countries. The summary will be made available to the members. A GISP paper on social marketing will also be circulated.

Dr. Mooney raised the issue of representation of human health issues and suggested that the members consider encouraging Council participation by HHS (Health and Human Services). After some further discussion, the members present agreed that the committee should address:

- 1) public health needs,
- 2) economic resource issues, and
- 3) communications strategy

Guiding principles and recommended activities for working groups

After lunch break, the facilitator engaged the members in a discussion of what activities should be covered by the working groups. A series of charts captured the committee's deliberations. He suggested that the committee review the summary of

the members' suggestions to date and follow up with a discussion of next steps. The following charts represent the input from the committee members:

Ideas for Stakeholder Consultation & Input (chart 1)

- Develop or implement committee communication plan/policy
- Private sector (committee member lead) -- networks to deliver information on the committee activities to constituents
- Catalyze economic studies of costs of no action, and benefits of action
- Educational effort - with regular continuing presence and output to wide range of audience
- More input/access to expertise on human health and resource economics
- Presentations to committee from international (and insular) constituents (Hawaii, New Zealand, SAI)
- Summary of responses to Department of State demarche re invasive species.

Working Groups (chart 2)

1. Policy and regulation
2. Risk Assessment and Management
3. Management: Control and Restoration of Existing Invasions
4. Research, Information Sharing, Documentation and Monitoring
5. Communication, Education and Outreach: Targeting Affected Groups
6. International Activities and Partnerships: Building Coalitions and Capacity

Crosscutting/over arching issues (chart 3)

- Political realities
- Resources/budgets
- Implications of foreseeable changes in the "lay of the land"
- Balancing negative impacts of controversy vs. negative impacts of invasive species
- Broad societal implications or approaches
- Human Dimensions
- Bio-control
- Tourism
- Trade
- Broad taxa coverage

Phase 1 -- Discussion of working groups

Working Group 1 Policy and Regulation

- Existing regulatory authority and activities
 - where used and not used
 - how to use more productively
 - gaps
 - clarification needed
- Review existing state/regional/local activities
 - what in federal authorities constrains or could enhance state/regional efforts
 - see what could be integrated into federal level
- Resources to explore
 - Office of Technology Assessment report
 - safeguard and review by National Plant Board of APHIS activities
- Consider totally new/alternative approaches
 - existing regulatory incentives

- private sector initiatives, things that negate the need for federal regulation
- alternative approaches
- economic/regulatory incentives
- assess if gaps are/can be filled by private sector initiatives
- Consider overcoming reg barriers
- conflict resolution mechanisms
- consider future changes or regulations, approach/application
- Identify regulatory inconsistencies (fed/state/local) and remove them
- Jurisdictional guidelines and approaches

Working Group 2 Risk Analysis and Prevention

- Analysis and prevention are not necessarily linked
- What level of risk is acceptable? Precautionary approach?
- Prevention: Coordinate with WG1 as the issues overlap
- Risk Assessment - coordinate and interact with group 4 (research)
- Ecological Society of American project as a resource
- Prevention - how to set priorities linked to Risk Assessment methodology
- Do not tie up prevention discussion waiting for all risk assessment information
- Risk Assessment: includes pathway analysis
- Links to monitoring tie with prevention
- Analysis of status of international obligations (International Plant Protection Convention [IPPC] and effects on WG 1 and 2)
- Detection barrier approach overwhelmed by over arching issues so must use Risk Assessment to address detection and prevention
- Broad definition of Risk Assessment - evaluating relative risk
- Risk Analysis includes pathways
- Consider unintended consequences

Working Group 3 Management control

- Development of state, local, tribal early detection/response through cost-sharing mechanisms
- Consider existing management efforts on-the-ground - do not reinvent
- Balance between attacking invaders and restoration
- Consider practical methods be open to all kinds of management approaches
- Do not assume natives are always better
- Cross-sector impacts. Economic and Biological -- for example, Department of Agriculture vs. Fisheries
- Consider barriers and solutions to private/public sector partnerships
- Consider/spell out consequences of not managing
- Take an ecosystem approach (cross-media) to management
- Consider dispersal barriers
- Interaction between site-specific management and regional/broader scale management (site specific tends to get attention, but is often an example of “perpetual motion”)
- Vector management -- do not constrain the identification of pathways
- Protected area issues
- Habitat restoration and areas that are unable to be restored: Disturbed areas that may never be considered as areas to be returned to native state.

Working Group 4 Research, Info Sharing [Internal Emphasis]

- Information management systems, this will be important for the international component

- need computerized network that is accessible to those outside government
- Include plant pathogens -- full range of taxonomic groups
- Inventory of research -- ongoing/funded by each agency, information needs and challenge to the agencies to see where they are spending research dollars.
- unified budget enhances agencies working together
- identify gaps/overlaps in research -- to help set priorities, identify where dollars are going now
- Research on management techniques, pathways, etc. -- information that can help with problems now. Decide what research should be done -- (pathways vs. “kill technologies” vs. impact studies).
- Economic research

Working Group 5 Communications, Education, and Outreach

- Framework for a National public awareness campaign with emphasis on the public/private partnerships (transportation, seed trade, pet industry, nursery)
- Build on existing efforts (NOAA/Sea Grant)
- Identify what is currently being done
- Coordination of efforts -- especially for resource management to do this
- Mergers between the chemical and biological pollution area in expanding their message beyond just chemical pollution
- Promote and facilitate state and local communication programs -- also state-specific communication programs. (National Association of Counties)
- Identify all target audiences
- tailor message/outreach for most effective communication with each audience

Working Group 6 International Activities and Cooperation

- Identify gaps in international agreements
- Link national and international databases
- coordination/cooperation with international efforts
- Look at how well we meet international responsibilities
- Global vectors
- Examine existing trade and other agreements that may impede invasive species efforts and consider for future negotiations
- Treaties like IMO/MARPOL -- how does U.S. Coast Guard translate these policies to this system. Evolution of invasive species efforts into those existing treaties.
- Consideration of extra-territorial effects of U.S. activities
- Nondiplomatic international activities

Phase 2 -- Invasive Species Council Tasks (Chart 4)

1. Oversight of agency implementation of EO
(table this now and recognize that the group needs to think about this later after a look at the Coral Reef Task force procedures -- staff will provide these)
2. Field Action (encourage planning at tribal, local level)
WG3
3. International Cooperation
WG6
4. NEPA Guidance (including procurement of native species)
WG1
5. Network for Environmental, economic and Human Health impacts
WG4
6. Information sharing

- WG4
- 7. Risk-based screen to prevent intentional introductions
WG2
- 8. Risk-based screen to prevent unintentional introductions
WG2
- 9. Management plan development

Bill Brown noted that the committee needs to develop an explanation of the process you will follow, including what you are doing and how you will respond to criticism. The committee probably needs a group of people to work on this issue. He reminded members to make sure that each of the tasks noted on the chart needs to be covered by at least one WG and the WGs need to coordinate on these tasks. He added there may be a need to do this outside of the WG structure; to do this separately as the entire ISAC.

The facilitator asked that the members consider if each of the tasks is covered by a WG. Ms. Cangelosi suggested that the committee should ask each WG their opinion of task 1 and then have ISAC decide. Dr. Wilcove offered that the agencies might be the appropriate ones to do this, not the ISAC. Mr. Buck asked the staff to make recommendations on how best to address these tasks. The facilitator closed by saying the chart (4) represents the current view of the committee.

Bill Brown noted that the ISAC is a good place to start on oversight, because the committee can provide intellectual acumen and a view from different perspectives.

Crosscutting over arching issues

The members expressed an interest in knowing what is going on in the agencies now. Dr. Campbell suggested that budget information on invasives needs to be highlighted with respect to expenditures in other programs. Mr. Buck called for analysis of 'scale and scope' as a way to begin the process. Ms. Metcalf requested that the Council to provide the budget information.

Mr. Shea suggested that the committee needs to think about the budgetary information when making recommendations. He added that each WG needs to have the budgetary information that applies to its area. He suggested that advisory boards can help coalesce budget processes and priorities. Bill Brown and Keith Pitts reiterated that the committee is not being asked to recommend earmarks. Mr. Shea closed with a call to the committee that it think beyond budget figures, and focus on the priorities for action, making recommendations on how funds should be allocated.

CLOSING

Staff will provide budgetary information (cross-cut where possible across agencies to track the same activity). Email lists (including alternates) will be provided so members can communicate. Staff will begin work to set up a basic web site; video conferencing will be investigated to save travel costs. Staff will summarize the next steps in a memo to the members. Committee officers will be announced as soon as possible. Staff await member concerns or suggestions for revisions to the procedural protocols document. Meeting date discussion led to agreement by those present that some preliminary option papers or management plan draft documents should be available for discussion, preferably two weeks in advance of a conference call or meeting. Staff suggested early May as next best date. The members raised the issue of

time available at the meeting to discuss all the material -- eight hours may not be enough time for the next meeting. Some suggested meeting outside Washington, DC.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Charles Valentine Riley Foundation Executive Director Dick Ridgway encouraged members to participate in the projects for information sharing and the stakeholder roundtable. He urges the members to move full speed ahead.

The staff would like to thank Frederika Moser, Department of State, for her dedicated effort to capture the minutes of the meeting. Additions or corrections should be directed to Gordon Brown, Acting Co-Executive Director, Invasive Species Council, 1849 C St., NW, Room 6635, Washington, DC 20240.