

Proposed Action Items and Recommendations – Spring 2011 Meeting

June 14-16, 2011 – Denver, CO

Action Items

1. ISAC requests a presentation on the Lacey Act revision activities at its 2011 Fall meeting and welcomes an explicit invitation to participate in any associated public review and comment process.

2. Ask L. Williams to communicate with Secretary Salazar on if he could assist enhancing the visibility of NISC and ISAC.
 - K. Metcalf – not how, but if.
 - J. Reaser – why was this just directed to Interior and not all the Departments? We were going with the agency that signs the letters.
 - D. Starling – do we need to work on this?
 - R. Wiltshire – We're so under everyone's radar screens that we need to improve this. By putting out a press release when members come on and/or leave we could generate.
 - O. Ferriter – newly appointed members are announced. When members are going off this might not be seen as news. There is nothing to stop any members from talking to their local media.
 - C. Dionigi – these meetings are open to the public.
 - J. Reaser – recommendation to the Subcommittee, we've seen a pattern of fewer people requesting membership on ISAC. Perhaps look at drafting press release for the Fall application process.
 - K. Metcalf – the point was not to give recognition to an individual member but to, on a cabinet level, illustrating what NISC and ISAC do.
 - K. Metcalf – we were trying to send a message out about ISAC. We have one job and that is to advise NISC. It is not our job to send out communications for the Secretaries.
 - R. Wiltshire – would not like to see press releases removed from this Action Item. Want to know if there is a mechanism to send press releases regarding the appointments of members to ISAC.
 - C. Dionigi – we don't have to say specifically how to do this.
 - A. Gibbs – can't send it as ISAC.
 - O. Ferriter – as members are appointed we can work through the department to do this and can work with local media and Congress. Yes, this can happen.
 - J. Reaser – there are very few things that we've taken up to this level. Not the best policy approach.
 - K. Metcalf – an example was given from DOD on press releases that are sent out. These are canned releases approved by the Secretary.
 - S. Ellis – Olivia answered and don't need this Action Item.
 - This item was removed.

3. ISAC requests presentations on the differences on awareness campaigns vs. social marketing at a future meeting.
4. ISAC requests a presentation from DHS Customs & Border Protection to discuss their authority to conduct inspections for invasive species of privately owned boats and trailers at international borders.
 - M. Farmer – some of this might be the Dept. of Transportation as well.
 - P. Brady – do we need to be more specific and include hitchhikers/invasives?
5. Propose that ISAC have a full day of the Fall 2011 ISAC meeting focused on ecommerce and invasive spp. We would recommend that this be an additional day in addition to the normal 2 day meeting. We will invite presentations from federal agencies that are involved in curtailing illegal trade through Ecommerce (commerce interdiction) as well as other experts in this subject (both those that deal with invasive species as well as those who deal with ecommerce and other types of trade). We will advertise this to a broader audience and ask them to attend/participate in this day of ISAC. Including NGOs e.g. horticulture, industry, pet trade, trade industry, conservation, and states.
 - E. Lane – add states.
 - D. Waitt – this could be a theme rather than an additional day or it could be a part of NISAW.
 - J. Reaser – intent was to use this full day as part of the process to develop a White Paper on ecommerce and invasive species. It would be advantageous to have this as part of an ISAC meeting.
 - R. Wiltshire – the Fall meeting was already extended to 2 ½ days.
 - A. Gibbs – this would go to the Steering Committee for consideration.

Approved by general consent as written.

Recommendations

1. From Control and Management subcommittee — To enhance the effectiveness of biological control programs, ISAC recommends that NISC agencies working on biological control of invasive organisms plan, conduct, and evaluate their programs at the inception of the program in the context of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach. This requires integrating biological control with other management options (i.e., physical, cultural, and chemical) to achieve maximum effectiveness. ISAC has previously recommended an IPM approach to invasive management strategies. While most biological control efforts often consider themselves a stand-alone, silver bullet solution, a more integrated approach should increase the probability of success. This recommendation addresses the National Invasive Species Management Plan, Implementation Task CM.1.2: Identify and address strategic gaps in regional invasive species control and management efforts and tools.

- E. Mills – remove potential.
- R. Wiltshire – can we say all agencies or should we indicate NISC.

R. Wiltshire moved to approve as written. O. Doerring seconded. Approved by general consent.

2. From Control and Management subcommittee — To further enhance the effectiveness of biological control programs, ISAC recommends NISC Departments and Agencies that oversee and conduct control operations utilizing biological control agents become more fully engaged in adaptive management by collecting and sharing post-release monitoring data. This Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach should emphasize partnerships with local controlling authorities, post-release monitoring and collaborative programs with other stakeholders in other pest management disciplines. This recommendation addresses the National Invasive Species Management Plan, Implementation Task CM.4.1: Enhance ecosystem recovery decision tools and conduct ecosystem assessments.

O. Doerring moved to accept as written. E. Chilton seconded. Approved by general consent.

3. From the Communication, Education and Outreach Subcommittee – As directed by EO 13112, section 4, item F, ISAC recommends that NISC support the website, www.invasivespecies.gov, as the primary website coordinating critical and unique information on national invasive species and serving to provide a linkage for accessing all federal invasive species programs.

- C. Dionigi – what was the intent behind national invasive species?

- N. Balcom – not sure if it's directed or intended.
- N. Stone – the ANSTF has their own website—does this imply that all have to go through this site?
- R. Wiltshire moved to accept as written. C. Smith seconded. Approved by general consent.
- B. McMahon – will there be time to restructure these grammatically? Yes.

4. From the Research Subcommittee – Introductions of species or their subsets (i.e. moving organisms from where they occur to where they have never occurred historically) by actions of NISC Departments and Agencies and contractors need to be assessed for risk of invasiveness.

Background: The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires a “detailed statement by the responsible official” for “major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.” The research subcommittee would like to emphasize the degree to which this applies to relocating plants and other organisms (e.g. oysters, tunicates, sponges) for use in research, aquaculture, restoration, or conservation, or as biofuels or ornamentals. This could be intercontinental movement (e.g. Miscanthus, Arundo for biofuels; Elaeagnus, multiflora rose, crown vetch, saw-toothed oak, or salt cedar for restoration or conservation, Asian oysters and fish for aquaculture) or interstate movement (e.g. Spartina for restoration; Panicum for biofuels) of species, or particular genotypes of species.

- A. Gibbs – who is this directed to?
 - C. Smith – change it to NISC.
 - P. Brady – what are we aiming at with this with contractors? Is it more federally funded projects?
 - C. Smith – this seemed useful to include this pair.
 - P. Brady – perhaps we're talking about a broader funding mechanism.
 - O. Doerring – if we didn't go that broad than we'd hit more.
 - P. Brady – the other area of concern is with research activities.
 - J. Clark – say “and their contractors”
 - N. Balcom – contractor or grantee?
 - J. Vollmer – wouldn't the word actions cover funding?
 - J. Reaser – the key authority that covers this is NEPA.
 - R. Beard – all federal activities are covered by NEPA. Staying with this makes a lot of sense.
 - C. Smith – if this is approved in concept then the Research Subcommittee will go back and reword this.
 - O. Doerring – we'll refer to the Act and to the activities.
- D. Waitt moved to accept and R. Wiltshire seconded. Approved in concept by general consent.