

**Draft Agenda for September 2007 MAP Meeting**

**Location: Friends Meeting House, 351 Dubois Road, Annapolis, MD. 21401**

Tuesday, September 18, 2007

9:00 am Announcements and Introductions (Fredrika Moser, Panel Chair)

9:15 am Review and Approve Agenda (Fredrika Moser, Panel Chair)

9:30 am Incident Command System (ICS) Training (Tim Deal)

11:00 am Break

11:20 am ICS Training (Deal)

12:30 pm Lunch

1:30 pm Rapid Response Exercise/Discussion on ICS and our rapid response plan (All)

3:30 pm Break

3:45 pm Chinese mitten crab update (Carin Ferrante, SERC)

4:15 pm Working Group Updates

5:00 pm Adjourn

Wednesday, September 19, 2007

9:00 am Panel Budget and Small Grants Competition (Slacum)

10:00 am Working Group Break-out

11:00 am Break

11:20 am Working Group Reports

12:00 pm Nominations for Panel Chair and Vice Chair (Moser and Slacum)

12:15 pm Unfinished Business and Discuss Dates/Locations for Spring 08 meeting (Moser)

12:30 pm Adjourn



**Mid-Atlantic Panel Meeting Minutes – 9/18/07 to 9/19/07**  
**Friends Meeting House – Annapolis, MD**

**In attendance:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
Julie Slacum	US Fish and Wildlife	<a href="mailto:Julie_thompson@fws.gov">Julie_thompson@fws.gov</a>
Fredrika Moser	MD Sea Grant	<a href="mailto:moser@mdsg.umd.edu">moser@mdsg.umd.edu</a>
Steve Minkkinen	US FWS	<a href="mailto:steve_minkkinen@fws.gov">steve_minkkinen@fws.gov</a>
Sarah Whitney	PA Sea Grant	<a href="mailto:swhitney@psu.edu">swhitney@psu.edu</a>
Dieter Busch	EIAS	<a href="mailto:Dieter.Busch@EIAdvisoryservices.com">Dieter.Busch@EIAdvisoryservices.com</a>
Scott Newsham	US Fish and Wildlife Service	<a href="mailto:Scott_newsham@fws.gov">Scott_newsham@fws.gov</a>
Lt. Matt Denning	US Coast Guard	<a href="mailto:matthew.j.denning@uscg.mil">matthew.j.denning@uscg.mil</a>
David Heicher	Susquehanna River Basin Commission	<a href="mailto:Dheicher@srbc.net">Dheicher@srbc.net</a>
Robert Coxe	Pennsylvania Division of Fish and Wildlife	<a href="mailto:Robert.Coxe@state.de.us">Robert.Coxe@state.de.us</a>
Jim Grazio	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection	<a href="mailto:jagrazio@state.pa.us">jagrazio@state.pa.us</a>
Catherine Martin	Delaware Fish and Wildlife	<a href="mailto:Catherine.martin@state.de.us">Catherine.martin@state.de.us</a>
Ray Fernald	Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries	<a href="mailto:Ray.fernald@dgif.virginia.gov">Ray.fernald@dgif.virginia.gov</a>
Jonathan McKnight	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	<a href="mailto:jmcknight@dnr.state.md.us">jmcknight@dnr.state.md.us</a>
Sharon Gross	USGS	<a href="mailto:sgross@usgs.gov">sgross@usgs.gov</a>
Jessica Smits	MDSG	<a href="mailto:smits@mdsg.umd.edu">smits@mdsg.umd.edu</a>
Liana Vitali	Chesapeake Bay Program	<a href="mailto:Vitali.liana@epa.gov">Vitali.liana@epa.gov</a>
Greg Ruiz	Smithsonian Environmental Research Center	<a href="mailto:ruizg@si.edu">ruizg@si.edu</a>
Carin Ferrante	Smithsonian Environmental Research Center	<a href="mailto:ferrantec@si.edu">ferrantec@si.edu</a>
John Christmas	George Mason University	<a href="mailto:jchristm@gmu.edu">jchristm@gmu.edu</a>
Kevin Heffernan	Department of Conservation and Recreation	<a href="mailto:Kevin.Heffernan@dcv.virginia.gov">Kevin.Heffernan@dcv.virginia.gov</a>
Kerrie Kyde	Maryland Department of Natural Resources	<a href="mailto:kkyde@dnr.state.md.us">kkyde@dnr.state.md.us</a>
Rob Emens	North Carolina Department of Natural Resources	<a href="mailto:Rob.emens@ncmail.net">Rob.emens@ncmail.net</a>

**DAY 1 – Tuesday, September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

**I. Welcome and Introductions** – Fredrika Moser, Panel Chair

The meeting opened at 9:10 am followed by a round of introductions.

## II. Review and Approve Agenda / Announcements

The September 2007 meeting agenda was approved “as is” with no edits made to the document.

Fredrika Moser, the Panel Chair provided some updates on Panel activities and other notable issues.

**NOAA AIS and Outreach RFP:** She noted that National Sea Grant would be administering their AIS Research and Outreach grants competition. Regional panels submitted regional priorities for research, which will be included in the RFP.

**National Experts Database:** The Panel has incorporated all of our state Tier 1 experts in the National Experts Database, but still needs to work on populating the Tier 2 experts, which are people with specific control or taxonomic expertise.

**State Management Plans:** Virginia, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New York have AIS State Management Plans. Maryland and North Carolina are still exploring the possibility of writing a plan. Moser spoke about the May 2007 Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force meeting. There was a special session on state management plans at that meeting. Moser stated that she had originally had doubts about the value of the state management plans but the session changed her mind and perspective on their value. This includes MD seriously moving forward on developing a state management plan.

**Chinese Mitten Crab Project:** The Panel funded Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC) to conduct monitoring and outreach tools for the newly discovered Chinese mitten crab, *Eriocheir sinensis*, in the Chesapeake Bay. SERC will be reporting on those efforts at this meeting.

**Regional Rapid Response Plan:** The Panel has received funds from NOAA to develop a regional rapid response plan. Jessica Smits from Maryland Sea Grant will be working with the MAP to develop the plan. There will be three components to the plan: 1) to introduce the Incident Command System to MAP members today and design a rapid response approach for the region; 2) draft a concise rapid response plan using flow charts of contacts for each state; and 3) host a mock invasion for MAP members to test response. Moser introduced Mr. Tim Deal from Emergency Management Services International, Inc. Mr. Deal is a retired officer of the US Coast Guard and will be providing ICS training in the morning and facilitating a scenario-driven exercise in the afternoon. All participating members will receive certification upon completion of today’s workshop.

**MAP Small Grants RFP:** In the summer of 2007, the Panel conducted its first small grants RFP. Seven proposals were submitted and the Panel will discuss the ranking results and make funding decisions.

**Environmental Law Institute Release of Draft Report:** The Environmental Law Institute has drafted the report, “Halting the Invasion in the Chesapeake Bay: Regional Cooperation under State Authorities on Prevention of Aquatic Invasive Species.” The Panel helped provide them information in developing the report. Moser stated that the report has a table that lists prohibited species by individual state, which will be useful for states to look at other states lists.

**ACTION: Recommend that the ANSTF assemble a similar table and post on their website for all the states. Also list Federal authorities that would be applicable for state or regional rapid response plans being developed.**

Kevin Heffernan asked whether ELI was aware of a similar study being conducted by University of Richmond.

**ACTION: Provide University of Richmond contact to ELI.**

### **III. Incident Command System (ICS) and Rapid Response – Tim Deal, Emergency Management Services International, Inc.**

Tim introduced ICS as an interdisciplinary system that can be applied to a broad spectrum of situations from natural disasters to invasive species management. He also reminded Panel members to try to apply the information learned in the morning training to an afternoon example scenario exercise. All members received a copy of a book titled, “*Beyond Initial Response: Using the National Incident Management System’s Incident Command System*” to supplement his presentation.

Tim began by reviewing the 30 year history of ICS. There were fires in California and there were lives and houses being lost because of ineffective communication. ICS was developed to create an effective means to communicate and respond to a situation. It transcends organization structures and processes that we use in daily jobs. He commented that ICS can be used in situations as small as a road-side car accident to a large scale environmental disaster. The objectives of today’s course are to learn: 1) common terminology used in ICS; 2) identify ICS organization; 3) identify five major management functions; and 4) discuss the ICS planning process. Deal defined the following terms, unity of command, chain of command, management by objectives, and example incident objectives. He discussed the need for a solitary leader called the Incident Commander (IC) who is responsible for the overall health and safety of his crew and the efficient response to a situation. The Incident Commander delegates responsibility to certain working groups beneath him/her called the Command Staff. After the occurrence of an incident, the IC establishes the objectives to accomplish to successfully remediate the situation. The objective must answer three specific questions:

Is the objective achievable?

Is the objective measurable?

Is the objective flexible?

All three questions need to be addressed when assessing the validity of the objective. If the objective does not meet the three requirements, it is not feasible and will need to be revised.

Tim showed a diagram of ICS organization. It is a scalable organization. The needs of the incident dictate the organization. It is important that you don’t over-organize. The optimum span of control is one supervisor to 3-7 people and depends on how complex the incident is.

Organizational structure consists of incident command, command staff, general staff, branch, division or group, and unit. The incident command can be one commander or Unified Command (UC) which has several commanders (this may be applied particularly to inter-state invasive species management situations). Command staff are the officers, general staff are chiefs (Operations, Planning, Logistics, Finance/Administration), branches have directors, divisions or groups have supervisors, and units have leaders. A deputy provides direct support to the Commander and has to have experience being a commander. The commander has the overall responsibility of responding to an incident, determines incident priorities, establishes incident objectives, establishes priorities, identifies constraints and limitations, establishes organization, and ensures responder safety. Operations chiefs deal with tactical action. Planning chiefs manage the planning process and maintain resource and situation status. Logistics chiefs provide support, finance and administration chiefs to cost accounting and procurements. The command staff positions include a safety officer, liaison officer, and public information officer. The safety officer supports operations. There is only one per incident. That person anticipates, detects, and corrects unsafe situations and has the authority to stop unsafe acts. The Liaison officer is the contact for assisting agencies, cooperating agencies and affected stakeholders. There is one per incident. The public information officer manages communication with the public and media. There is one per incident. All incidents start with Operations. The section chief needs discipline and knowledge to implement and carry out objectives. Operations are divided into groups and divisions. The Planning section has responsibility for the majority of the functions and processes. The Logistics section deals with facilities, transportation, communications, supplies, food services, equipment maintenance, medical services, and ordering of incident

resources. The Finance and Administrations section manages all financial aspects, monitors incident costs, maintains financial records, administers procurements contracts, and performs time recording.

In the reactive mode to an incident, the responders “encircle” the problem with resources, which then drives tactical decisions. A proactive response encircles the problem with attainable objectives. From these, objectives and strategies are developed as well as tactics, which are used to bring an incident to a safe and successful conclusion. The tactics will also drive the demand for the appropriate number and kinds of resources needed to accomplish the tasking.

Next, Tim discussed the Incident Action Plan (IAP) or timeline of tactical assignments with which to meet the objective. Written IAPs are usually required when there are two or more jurisdictions involved or the incident goes beyond the operation period. The operation period is a specific time frame in which the work is being conducted. The length of time for the operation period depends on the time needed to achieve objectives, availability of resources, environmental conditions, and safety considerations. While you are working on your operation period you need to start planning for a second operational period. The benefits of these plans are that there are clear objectives and strategies, you can use it as a management tool, it coordinates multi-agency tactics, facilitates shift briefings, and is good for documentation.

Near the end of the morning presentation, Tim referenced scenarios and example IAP’s in the Appendix of his book.

#### **IV. Lunch**

#### **V. Rapid Response Exercise/Discussion on ICS and the MAP Rapid Response Plan**

Fredrika went over the outline for the format that Maryland Sea Grant hopes to use for the regional rapid response plan. She explained that they would be working with individual states to determine who to talk to while developing the plan. She then handed out an example rapid response scenario that the Panel would address in a break out session. Fredrika suggested the Panel identify the difference between an issue and an incident regarding aquatic invasives. She explained that zebra mussels, *Dreissena polymorpha*, found in a quarry may be considered an incident (ex: you could contain or eradicate) while mitten crabs, *Eriocheir sinensis*, introduced in the Chesapeake Bay may be considered an issue (containment and/or eradication would be difficult due to an expansive system). Making this identification can result in the most efficient application rapid response plan.

Members were given the following scenario to discuss:

On Monday, September 17<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 pm a commercial fisherwoman discovers unusual marine algae in her trawl in the Isle of Wight Bay near West Ocean City. She puts some of the algae in a cooler and records GPS coordinates for the area that she trawled.

She takes the specimen to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources office in West Ocean City. The specimen is dropped off at the front desk because no one answers the phone and because it is now 3:30 pm and everyone has gone home and the security person has no idea what to do.

Fortunately, a student intern is still at work and he successfully tracks down someone at MD DNR who is willing to take responsibility for the algae.

For immediate action, MD DNR decides the algae needs to be identified by an expert and that MD DNR should send some of their biologists to the area to see if they can confirm the occurrence. MD DNR suspects the alga is of the *Caulerpa* genus that may be a listed federal invasive species.

In responding to this incident determine the following:

Who needs to be notified?

What are the initial incident priorities?

What are the initial response objectives?

What are the constraints and limitations impacting the response?

What agencies would respond to this incident?

Is there a single agency that has jurisdiction or is it shared (Unified Command)?

The members discussed what the most logical progression of invasive species management actions would be with current understandings of the various state management processes. It was agreed that a specialist would be needed to positively ID the species, not an intern or grad student. Members were concerned of “crying wolf” to a supervisor without good reason. Jim Grazio mentioned that in Pennsylvania, almost 90% of potential zebra mussel sightings were incorrectly identified. Greg Ruiz from Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, suggested a procedure for preserving the sample as a vital initial step because most organisms decay rapidly compromising correct identification. It was also suggested that a source information sheet be filled out upon receipt of a potential invasive organism. The sheet would contain the Who, What and Where to maximize the availability of information. Steve Minkinen from US Fish and Wildlife Service reminded the Panel that, in cases like *Caulerpa*, the species may have floated from upwards of 20 miles away and a waterman may not have noticed it on their boats for miles.

After positive ID states should see if organisms are regulated under state or federal law (ex: Lacey Act under FWS or Noxious Weed Act under USDA) and news of the invasive species should be sent up the chain of command WHILE field work is performed to confirm species presence and determine the extent of infestation. Members also suggested a Notification Checklist or a list of individuals to be notified of the invasive discovery up to the Secretary of Natural Resources per state (Jim Grazio mentioned Pennsylvania would likely notify the PA Fish and Boat Commission before the Secretary of Natural Resources).

Scott Newsham from the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force suggested a decision matrix for deciding whether upper level management should be notified of the discovery of a non-native organism. Kerrie Kyde from Maryland Department of Natural Resources shared her story of a particular invasive weed discovered ten years ago. It was a small unobtrusive patch but now has grown considerably in size. While at the time of discovery, the situation was small enough that it was unnecessary to notify the Secretary of Natural Resources, the absence of any real action regarding the discovery has left its growth unchecked and now out of control. Scott explained that circumstantial situations would dictate various strategies to determine the best possible route almost like a flow or questions chart. The group then discussed the Objective, Priorities and Constraints/Limitations of a management plan and came up with the following responses:

Objective:

1. Determine extent of infestation
2. Determine proper control methods
3. Contain the invasive species (*Caulerpa*)
4. Create an advisory group to determine actions
5. Ensure communication among stakeholders

Priorities:

1. Define species distribution (i.e., determine the extent of the infestation and decide upon sampling protocols)
2. Provide information to colleagues/peers
3. Contain species if possible (i.e., determine control measures)
4. Eradicate if possible
5. Establish source of invasive species
6. Perform a risk assessment

Constraints/Limitations

1. Environmental (i.e., permit acquisition)
2. Legal jurisdiction
3. Finances
4. Time (i.e., training, obtaining permits)
5. Control measures available (i.e. feasibility of available control measures)

It was suggested that all the watch lists such as Federal Invasives Lists, Lacey Act Lists, State Lists, etc, should be organized and made easily accessible. It was also suggested to divide invasive species categorically (state jurisdictions vs. federal jurisdictions) to determine rightful responsibility.

Members agreed the workshop was very useful and eye-opening as well as a proactive step in the creation and establishment of state AIS plans.

## **VI. Chinese Mitten Crab Update – Carin Ferrante, SERC**

SERC received project funding from MAP to create and disseminate outreach materials and to monitor for Chinese mitten crab (*Eriocheir sinensis*). A Task Force was formed in June 2006 after a second mitten crab was discovered in the Chesapeake Bay. SERC has established a mitten crab hotline (phone line, 443-482-2222 and E-mail, [sercmittencrab@si.edu](mailto:sercmittencrab@si.edu)). Carin explained that much of her time was spent answering hot-line phone calls of potential mitten crab sightings and captures. Among the mitten crab sightings, there were also land crab, green crab and red crab sightings as well. SERC has developed watch cards and tri-fold brochures, which have been distributed mainly to boaters, watermen, researchers, and state agency personnel monitoring on the water. The Task Force agencies post watch card information on their websites. SERC has also participated in various outreach events. In October 2006, SERC worked to monitor on the Patapsco with Maryland Department of Natural Resources. SERC also put out traps in various locations. The trap design was based on traps used to capture these crabs in China. Surveys are targeted for adults in areas where they have been found in the Bay. SERC has sent crabs found in the Bay out for genetic analysis. There is a continued effort to create a database of existing monitoring efforts in the Bay that may detect Chinese mitten crabs. SERC has mapped the current distribution of the 10 crabs found to date. Eight of the ten crabs have been females. Most of the crabs have been brought up in commercial crab pots in shallow waters. SERC is still not sure whether it is a self sustaining population. Females have mated and some were carrying eggs. SERC future plans are to: continue monitoring; respond to E-mails and hot line calls; conduct genetic analysis on any new crabs; expand outreach efforts; provide updates to public, which now includes multiple states. Catherine Martin, from Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control asked how juvenile surveys could be conducted. Greg Ruiz from SERC responded that you would probably have to look at burrows. Sharon Gross from USGS stated that you may need a high enough population before you start seeing burrows. Greg Ruiz stated that it could be several years before we find them because there is no proven method of capture for juveniles. Steve Minkkinen from USFWS stated that there must be a high enough population that the male and female find each other for the population to become established. Greg Ruiz stated that the waterman and other people out on the water have been helpful and because of their calls, SERC has identified two additional crabs not native to the Bay. Adult crabs are showing up between May and June here and not dying during that time period after migration, which is

their life history trait in the West Coast of the United States. Genetic analysis is matching most closely with the Northern Europe haplotypes.

Fredrika stated that the Mitten Crab Task Force has done a great job responding to this. She wondered how SERC deals with phone calls when there are no photos. Greg Ruiz suggested that they could develop a stepwise key for the public to use before they call SERC. Fredrika also asked how you could continue to respond to the public without spending too much SERC staff time. Greg suggested that they might utilize a volunteer network or local experts in the future. Carin stated that they will try to improve outreach materials for identification and that they could use a network of people to assist with phone calls and identification. Fredrika suggested sending generic watch cards to other states in which they could put their contact and phone numbers to respond to sightings in that particular state. Also discussed was the possibility of adding an Information Database to the MAP website that would post invasive species tracking information and photos of species as well as an identification game to help the public properly identify possible AIS. Sarah Whitney of Pennsylvania Sea Grant reminded members that a website like that would need to be steadfastly maintained. Fredrika Moser suggested using Panel funds for SERC to create a similar information database on their website for mitten crab. The website could track occurrences, provide an identification key and a template for watch cards that different states could use. This could be applied to different species across the United States. Greg Ruiz stated that he will be bringing the Task Group back together to advance distribution of outreach materials. Ray Fernald from Virginia and Rob Emens from NC stated that they have put signs out with numbers to call for different species and they haven't received much feedback. Steve Minkinen also stated that there have not been as many calls for northern snakehead sightings probably because the novelty has worn off. Greg said that utilizing watermen has been the best option for identifying Chinese mitten crab.

## **ADJOURN DAY 1**

---

### **DAY 2 – Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

#### **I. Welcome and Tasks to Working Groups (Fredrika Moser, Chair)**

**Jim Grazio asked if there were enough members present for quorum regarding the nomination of a new MAP Chair and Vice-Chair. There were NOT enough members present so there will be no nominations at the meeting. Nominations will occur via email.**

Julie Slacum noted that she will be going through the member list and those individuals who have not been in regular contact will be contacted as to their intended status within MAP.

#### **II. Panel Budget and Small Grants Competition Update (Julie Slacum, Panel Coordinator)**

##### **BUDGET:**

**Expenditures:** Salary for Coordinator, Travel to ANSTF Meeting (Chair and Coordinator) and Spring Panel Meeting (Coordinator), MAP Brochures and Posters (around \$4000), Tim Deals ICS Book for the workshop, Software for the website, Funded the top ranked proposal from the 2007 RFP.

**Remaining Funds: \$53,527**

While discussing the Panel posters and brochures, it was noted that some photos on the posters did not have references and that the MAP logo should be added to the brochures.

**ACTION: Julie Slacum to contact Ann Faulds to discuss the incorporation of these suggestions on future prints. Also, send Jim Heicher a laminated copy of the poster.**

Dieter Busch suggested having a pot of funds set aside for these meetings so when each state holds a meeting, there is available funds to cover the costs. Fredrika stated this topic had been discussed before and it was agreed the greatest portion of MAP funds should go to MAP projects. So far, MAP has found other ways to fund the meetings, i.e., Sea Grant has helped with funding food. The Panel decided to go forward with the way that they have been doing things.

### **Small Grants Competition:**

Julie Slacum reminded Sarah Whitney that once grant proposal rankings were discussed, she would need to leave the room since she had submitted two proposals.

Fredrika stated she was surprised at the large overhead costs of some of the proposals and the academia proposals in particular should show the Universities covering a portion of these costs. She said that a 60% overhead fee was not an efficient use of MAP project funding. Sarah Whitney reminded the members that this is the first year MAP administered a RFP and whatever projects are selected now will set the bar for future projects. Sarah was then asked to explain her projects and then asked to leave. Julie displayed a PowerPoint presentation showing the results of the reviewer ranking system.

Frederika acknowledged that asking for RFP's in June was not the best approach for MAP because many of the scientists and academia that would apply for this grant were likely in the field leaving little time to write a proposal. It was suggested that the panel choose the most qualified proposals now and then send out another RFP in January when potential submitters have more time to write their proposals. The #1 ranked proposal (Whitney, "Signs") was funded based on its strong reviews and relevance to the work of the MAP. Discussion on developing the next RFP focused on the meaning of overhead costs vs. indirect costs and continued with the suggestion that MAP only allow a certain percentage of the project to be overhead costs.

**ACTION: Fredrika to research the difference between overhead and indirect costs to better assess the requested funding for RFP's and make recommendations on approach to the MAP proposal review committee (those present at this discussion).**

Discussion returned to the quality of proposals received and it was noted that most of these projects didn't coincide with MAP missions and goals. Dieter Busch suggested that publishing more "good news" stories may encourage better, more targeted proposals. Julie asked the panel to comment on the review and ranking process. Dieter asked about the ranking system and how targeted it was and whether the reviewer's numerical values were worth the same. For example, one member may feel a certain proposal was not suitable for funding and ranked it an overall 20 out of 80 while another member may feel the same way but their individual ranking gave that proposal a 40 out of 80. This can heavily skew the results of the ranking process. Julie reminded the members that the Western Regional Panel relied on the Executive Board to ultimately make the funding decisions.

It was suggested the panel should read the proposals, discuss and select projects for funding. Members decided to include language in the December MAP RFP requiring the funded proposals to write a final project summary and create graphics portraying the research results. These summaries will be collected and posted on the MAP website.

**ACTION: Fredrika to craft language differentiating between overhead and indirect costs that she will submit to the panel by Friday for review.**

The Panel decided that with future RFPs the review and ranking team should consist of 3 rotating panel members and 2 rotating executive committee members that will review submissions and provide summaries to the panel for discussion at the next meeting. This would be coupled with outside reviewer's comments on each proposal, when possible.

### **III. Working Group / State Updates**

#### **• Exotic Pet Amnesty – Dieter Busch**

Dieter proposed that the Panel look into organizing an amnesty day for unwanted pets. Sharon Gross stated that it would be difficult to limit it to aquatic pets. Dieter suggested researching efforts to do this in other states around the nation. This research would help the Panel determine how much staff and assistance we would need (ex. we probably will need a vet present). He can foresee MAP investing in pamphlets or brochures to be handed out at different pet stores discussing exotic pet amnesty and the option of returning your unwanted pet to the pet store as opposed to wild release. Dieter wanted to propose this project to the Panel to see if we should move forward with this and form a subcommittee to put together a more detailed proposal.

Members agreed there is a potential role for MAP to play in aquatic exotic pet amnesty. Fredrika suggested Dieter send an email to the panel to garner member support and assistance.

### **State Reports**

• **Virginia** –Ray Fernald, Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries: There have been several false zebra mussel sightings reported. Monitoring at Millbrook Quarry is almost finished. Snakeheads, *Channa argus*, are being found in the same areas but numbers are steadily increasing. A poster has been recently published depicting all Virginia crayfish including three exotics.

Kevin Heffernan, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation: The State has created an Invasive Species Workgroup which is a reincarnation of the Invasive Species Council that sunset. This group includes people from the private sector. The group is currently working on two lists: a priority list of species for education and outreach and a watch list. The University of Richmond is currently conducting a legal review in which they will look at existing early detection and rapid response programs.

**Action: Fredrika will send Kevin contact information for ELI report to send to University of Richmond.**

VADCR has conducted an aerial survey for phragmites on the eastern shore of Virginia. They mapped the seaside and bayside, which amounted to 3,000 acres. Virginia Commonwealth is working with them to develop a web mapping tool.

**Action: Kevin will E-mail the Panel the link.**

• **North Carolina** – Rob Emens, NC Department of Natural Resources

NC is establishing an invasive species workgroup (1<sup>st</sup> meeting scheduled for 1/10/08) which Rob hopes will lead to the development of a state invasive species management plan and creation of a state-wide IS council.

**Action: Fredrika will send Rob a list of essential components for a state management plan.**

NC has had great success reducing the number of sites infested with *Salvinia molesta*. Only one site remains infested. The NFWF Pulling Together Initiative grant that has been awarded over the last couple years has been

a key source of funding. That funding along with the participation of the local Cooperative Extension office (Pender County) has driven the eradication efforts. The remaining infested site is a cypress swamp that drains into the Northeast Cape Fear River. This year a coordinated intensive survey of a 10-mile section of the NECF River and its tributaries was performed by NCSU-Cooperative Extension, Duke Energy, and other state agencies. The survey did not reveal any additional salvinia.

The state's Aquatic Weed Control Program will be initiating *Phragmites australis* control within the NC State Parks in 2008. This is the first phragmites project since the Program's inception.

Also, the Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Program (APNEP) conducted a large-scale submersed aquatic vegetation (SAV) inventory of the sounds using aerial photography in 2007. This was the largest SAV survey ever conducted in North Carolina and included much of the shorelines of both the Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds. The APNEP feels that this will provide the needed baseline for future monitoring and believes SAV will prove to be an excellent environmental indicator.

- **Pennsylvania** – Sarah Whitney, Pennsylvania Sea Grant: Sea Grant is establishing a monitoring program for zebra mussels to document distribution in Pennsylvania. They are holding a Zebra Mussel Summit on November 14 in Harrisburg, PA. Jim Grazio stated that there is draft legislation in the PA House of Representatives modeled after Michigan's Ballast Water Laws, which will prohibit the discharge of untreated ballast water in Lake Erie. The state invasive species council is still seeking funding for a coordinator. Sarah stated that she has been serving as the chair for the state AIS working group to implement the aquatic section of the state management plan. Their focus is on rapid response, risk assessment, early detection, and funding for AIS management (e.g. NY).

Dave Heicher, Susquehanna River Basin Commission: There are quaggas, *Dreissena rostriformis bugensis*, in Clover Creek quarry. There are zebra mussels in Onsego Lake in NY State, which flows into the Susquehanna, in Eaton Brook reservoir, and Goodyear Lake. SRBC staff has been conducting monitoring in the watershed. They divide the Susquehanna into six sub-basins. They have been finding zebra mussels at quite a few locations in the Susquehanna near the NY/PA border. Upstream lakes are probably the source of downstream infestations. Flathead catfish, *Pylodictis olivaris*, are now in the Susquehanna. They showed up first in the lower Susquehanna. They were seen first at the fish lifts at Conowingo dam. They have now grown to such a large size that they have been entered as a qualifying catch in a Susquehanna River fishing tournament.

- **USFWS**–Steve Minkinen: The Service is looking at food habits of the northern snakehead, *Channa argus*. Steve brought snakehead samples with him, one living and one preserved. Chinese mudfish (*Neochanna heleioides*), which are invasive in Australia, have been found at Chinese markets. The Service worked through the Maryland Department of Natural Resources to list the species. The Maryland Biological Stream Survey found one during a stream survey. The MD Humane Society has paid for billboards that say “You, Governor O’Malley, Can Save the Mute Swan”.

- **US Coast Guard** – Lt. Matthew Denning: The Coast Guard is continuing to work on ballast water surveys and enforcing ballast water discharge laws. There are mandatory requirements for record keeping and discharge. Each ship keeps a record of its ballast water discharge. Ships must discharge ballast in the middle of the ocean before entering ports or chemically treat the water. Both options are expensive to merchants as chemical ballast water treatment is expensive and deep sea discharge is also expensive as it requires the ship to slow down to release and uptake ocean water delaying the ship's arrival time. In an extreme example, one ship in an effort to make the best time possible while still deep-sea, discharged hastily ballast resulting in an immense increase in pressure on each side of the ship causing the ship to essentially break in half. Despite examples such as this, merchants seem to be obeying the ballast laws as per ship audits of ballast water discharge logs.

## Working Group Updates

Julie Slacum reported on the Education and Outreach Work Group for Ann Faulds who could not make it to the meeting. The group has produced the Panel brochure and poster, which were displayed at the meeting. Ann has been working with Matt Denning from the Coast Guard on an “Eyes on the Water” campaign. The plan is to utilize the Coast Guard to distribute outreach materials on AIS to boaters. Ann is also thinking about developing web based AIS training for Coast Guard. Julie Slacum also updated the Panel on the Science and Management working group. Jonathan McKnight is still working on the AIS Species of Note maps but still needs input from the different states. It was suggested that the comprehensive species list created for the mapping project may be used to populate a MAP watch list. Sarah Whitney reported that the Policy Workgroup has not met and the committee has shrunk in membership. The policy working group survey was completed and should be packaged by Sea Grant. Sarah also suggested that if anyone else wanted to be chair of the Policy Working Group, she would willing to relinquish the position to another member.

Julie Slacum proposed that we disband the working groups due to a lack of participation and form ad hoc work groups to work on issues and projects.

**Action: Send E-mail out to the membership to get feedback on disbanding working groups.**

## IV. Nominations for Panel Chair and Vice Chair

Nominations for Panel Chair and Vice Chair will be email-driven as there were not enough members in attendance to meet quorum.

## V. Next Meeting:

The next Panel meeting will be held in Virginia. Options are northern Virginia to look at snakehead (*Channa argus*) field work, eastern shore of Virginia to look at phragmites work, or the middle peninsula in Gloucester. The week of April 8-10 worked best for most members.

**Action: Julie Slacum E-mail membership to determine final dates and location for spring meeting.**

## ACTION ITEM SUMMARY

**As of 11/13/07:**

**ACTION = Completed**

**ACTION = Pending**

---

**Action: Recommend that the ANSTF assemble a table of prohibited species for each state and post on their website. Also, list Federal authorities that would be applicable for state or regional rapid response plans being developed =COMPLETED at 11/07 Task Force meeting.**

**Action: Julie Slacum to contact Ann Faulds to discuss the incorporation of some changes on future prints of the Panel poster and brochures. Also, send Jim Heicher a laminated copy of the poster=PENDING.**

**Action: Fredrika Moser to research the difference between overhead and indirect costs to better assess the requested funding for RFP's and make recommendations on an approach to the MAP proposal review committee (those present at this discussion)=COMPLETED 9/19/07.**

**Action: Kevin Heffernan will E-mail the Panel the link to VADCR Aerial Photography website=PENDING.**

**Action: Julie Slacum E-mail membership to determine final dates and location for spring meeting=PENDING (E-mail sent out on 10/31/07).**

**Action: Provide University of Richmond contact to ELI=PENDING**

**Action: Fredrika will send Kevin contact information for ELI report to send to University of Richmond=PENDING**

**Action: Fredrika will send Rob Emens a list of essential components for a state management plan=Completed 9/21/07**

**Action: Send E-mail out to the membership to get feedback on disbanding working groups=PENDING (E-mail sent out on 10/31/07).**

---