

Final Agenda-MARP Organizational Meeting

March 31 and April 1, 2005

US Fish and Wildlife Service, Chesapeake Bay Field Office Conference room

177 Admiral Cochrane Drive

Annapolis, MD. 21401

March 31, 2005

10 a.m. Welcome and Introductions

Jennifer Greiner, USFWS liaison to Chesapeake Bay Program

-housekeeping-bathrooms, lunch order, sign-in sheet

-support staff for Panel

-members and interested parties

10:20 a.m. Overview of the Chesapeake Bay Program and its Role in Hosting the Panel

Mike Fritz, Coordinator, Living Resources Committee, Chesapeake Bay Program

10:50 am Overview of the ANS Task Force

Don MacLean, US Fish and Wildlife Service

11:20 am The Great Lakes Regional Panel experience

Kathe Glassner-Shwayder, Great Lakes Commission

11:50 am The Gulf Of Mexico Regional Panel experience

Ron Lukens, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission

12:20 pm Discussion and questions from members

12:30 pm Lunch

1:30 pm Priority aquatic nuisance species in the Chesapeake Bay watershed

Kerrie Kyde, Maryland Department of Natural Resources

2:00 pm Priority aquatic nuisance species in the Delaware Bay watershed

Ann Faulds, Pennsylvania Sea Grant

2:30 pm Priority aquatic nuisance species in North Carolina

Rob Emens, NC Division of Water Resources

3:00 pm Discussion of regional priorities

3:20 Break

3:35 ANSTF Education and Outreach Initiatives

Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers

Joe Starinchak, US Fish and Wildlife Service

Habitatititude

Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council

4:20 pm Discussion of regional endorsement of ANSTF Outreach and Education Initiatives**4:30 pm Adjourn**

April 1, 2005

9:00 am Discussion of Panel Organization and Operation**Julie Thompson, Panel Coordinator**

- Housekeeping-sign-in sheet, lunch order
- ANSTF Regional Panel Roles and Responsibilities
- Discuss draft organizational structure of the Panel
- Elect Chair
- Discuss membership gaps
- establish workgroups and workgroup membership

10:00 am Overview of Budget

Jennifer Greiner, US Fish and Wildlife Service liaison to Chesapeake Bay Program

10:20 am Break**10:40 am Environmental Law Institute****Lisa Goldman, Staff Attorney**

Presentation on what they do and how they can work with the Panel

11:10 am Work Plan Development

Jennifer Greiner, US Fish and Wildlife Service liaison to Chesapeake Bay Program

- review ANSTF guidance
- review memo with suggestions for work plan from CBP
- Panel discussion of tasks of first year work plan and workgroups charged with tasks

11:45 am Lunch**12:30 pm Break-out into workgroups**

- elect chair
- discuss workgroup tasks and activities

1:30 Present proposed workgroup tasks and activities to Panel**2:30 Discussion of next meeting date and location****2:45 Public comment**

3:00 Adjourn

Mid-Atlantic Regional Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species Meeting Minutes

Thursday and Friday, March 31-April 1, 2005
Annapolis, MD

March 31st, 2005

Welcome and Introductions-Jennifer Greiner (interim chair) called the meeting to order a 9:10 am and began by thanking everyone for attending the first meeting of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Panel. She stated how it has taken several years for the Chesapeake Bay Program to get to this point and that many people in the room were integral in making the Panel a reality. Greiner introduced the Panel staff and then welcomed all in attendance to introduce themselves.

Presentations: All presentations can be accessed on the Mid-Atlantic Regional Panel website, <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/marp.htm> (click on “Current Projects and Info”)

Mike Fritz, EPA Chesapeake Bay Program

Mike Fritz stated that he was standing in for Matt Fleming, the chair of the Chesapeake Bay Program, Living Resources Subcommittee. Fritz has been the coordinator for the LRSC for several years. He explained that his talk would focus on how a regional entity can work together to get things accomplished.

Mike Fritz discussed how the multi-jurisdictional Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) is able to work with its partners to achieve goals to restore the Bay. He stated that it is important to define what problem(s) the group is dealing with, to cultivate a partnership, to establish commitments, to describe a vision, to synthesize the science, to set measurable goals with timelines, develop and implement plans, and measure and report progress.

In defining the problem, he gave the example of cleaning up impaired waters of the Bay that have low dissolved oxygen levels and other problems related to nutrient pollution.

He described the CBP partnership which consists of EPA, MD, PA, VA, and DC, and the Chesapeake Commission. The headwater states (DE, NY, and WV) have a MOU linked to water quality goals.

In 2000, the CBP Executive Committee signed the Chesapeake 2000 Agreement, which guides the jurisdictions in their combined efforts to restore and protect the Bay. Chesapeake 2000 outlines 103 commitments detailing protection and restoration goals critical to the health of the Bay watershed.

In describing a vision, the CBP characterizes a restored Bay as a body of water with fewer algae blooms and better fish food, clearer water and more SAV, more oxygen and improved habitat for aquatic organisms.

In synthesizing the science, Fritz provided the example of oxygen requirements for different aquatic animals in different habitats of the Bay.

In setting goals, Fritz noted that they should be quantitative and practical to measure with timelines. He provided dissolved oxygen criteria as an example.

In developing and implementing plans, you need stakeholder involvement and outreach, prioritization of measurable objectives, and a proposed budget. For measurable objectives, Fritz used nutrient cap load allocations as an example. He noted that a previous director of CBP used to say, “Nobody ever funded anything that wasn’t first proposed.”

Progress can be measured by looking at stressors and response. He used non-tidal nitrogen load and river flow values from 1990-2003 as an example of a stressor and mainstem bay summer dissolved oxygen concentrations from 1985-2004 as an example of the response.

He concluded by recommending that the Panel exploit the power of consensus and science, to propose goals and budgets, and to communicate in terms that will resonate with stakeholder values.

“Overview of the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force”-Don MacLean, US Fish and Wildlife Service

In response to Fritz stating in his presentation that CBP is not FACA bound, Maclean started off by stating that the regional panels are FACA bound but workgroups are not.

Don MacLean provided an overview of the Task Force, its structure, and activities. He explained that the establishment of the Task Force was required under the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Species Prevention and Control Act of 1990. In addition to establishing the Task Force, the 1990 Act included many other components to address aquatic nuisance species including: Ballast water components (acquisition of National ballast water management information, the Armed Services ballast water program, and the ballast water demonstration program); establishment of the Aquatic Nuisance Species Program; facilitation of regional coordination through the establishment of regional panels; establishment of the state ANS Management Plan; and emphasis on the Great Lakes.

The 1990 Act was reauthorized in 1996 as NISA (National Invasive Species Act). The reauthorization included: increased coordination and other responsibilities related to ballast water and shipping; expanded role and scope of regional panels; broadened focus outside the Great Lakes.

The ANSTF was officially established a year after the original 1990 act was passed. The Task Force provides a forum to discuss aquatic invasive species issues, engages and involves governmental and non-governmental entities, and allows for coordination of aquatic invasive species issues across jurisdictional boundaries. There are 9 Federal

members of the Task Force. Ex-officio members are non-voting members of the Task Force. The Task Force completed a strategic plan several years ago that it is now starting to implement. The plan includes: prevention, monitoring and control, and education. The strategic plan has 4 goals and 16 objectives. The goals include: reducing the threat of introduction of ANS; minimizing harmful effects of ANS already in US waters; cooperating in global efforts to reduce ANS harm; and maximizing the organization effectiveness of the ANSTF.

MacLean spoke about the structure of the Task Force. There are six regional panels and 5 subject committees: control; detection and monitoring; communication, education, and outreach; and the combined ANSTF/NISC Prevention Committee. Each of the committees, regional panels has numerous working groups beneath them that report directly back to their committee/panel whom report directly back to the Task Force as a whole.

Section 1203 of NANPCA (with amendments) authorized the Task Force to establish regional panels to facilitate regional and local involvement in aquatic nuisance species activities. The regional panels are set up as official committees of the Task Force. Participation on the regional panels include: Federal, State, and local agencies, private and commercial interests, education institutions, and NGOs. The responsibilities of regional panels include: identifying priorities for the region with respect to aquatic nuisance species; make recommendations to the Task Force regarding programs to carry out the Aquatic Nuisance Species program; coordinate ANS activities in the region; provide advice to public and private individuals on controlling ANS; submit an annual report to the Task Force describing ANS activities. There are currently 6 regional panels: the Western Regional Panel, Mississippi River, Great Lakes, Gulf and South Atlantic, Northeast, and Mid-Atlantic.

On behalf of their individual interests Regional Panel members are welcome to: testify before Congress; present information about the Panel and Task Force at meetings and conferences; request other Panel members to endorse invasive species related proposals. Regional panel members are discouraged from: testifying before Congress on behalf of the ANSTF, unless testimony is cleared by the Administration; representing ANSTF as a whole, unless specifically authorized; generating and disseminating unauthorized correspondence on behalf of ANSTF, Regional Panels, committees; making final recommendations in any other forum other than officially sanctioned meetings or conference calls.

Regional panel member duties include: attending and actively participating in most regional panel meetings; effectively representing their organization or constituency; participate in at least one working group; be open to considering varied points of view; have a “broad perspective” on invasive species; be considerate to other meeting participants.

The ANS Program of the Task Force is housed within the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The Service provides staff to implement Task Force activities through the ANS program.

The ANS program focus areas are: prevention; detection and monitoring; control; research; education; and technical assistance. The public awareness campaigns “Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers” and “Habitattitude” were noted for ANSTF outreach efforts. The Task Force has control and management plans for *Caulerpa* sp., green crab, Chinese mitten crab; Eurasian ruffe, and brown tree snake. Plans for Asian carp, Asian swamp eel, New Zealand mud snail. The Task Force provides technical assistance to the States to help them develop State or Interstate ANS Management Plans. Once developed, the Service funds the plans through a grant program. The process empowers states to start dealing with their own ANS issues. However, with each new plan that is approved, the funding is spread across more states and thus each state receives less money. There are 16 state plans that have been completed and approved and 11 plans under development. MacLean concluded by announcing that the ANSTF Executive Secretary position is being advertised, described job responsibilities, and noted that the job announcement closes on April 18, 2005.

“The Great Lakes Regional Panel Experience”-Kathe Glassner-Shwayder, Great Lakes Commission

Swayder spoke of the enabling legislation for the Panel (NANPCA) and stated that institutional support is provided by the Great Lakes Commission (GLC), a multi-state compact agency (eight Great Lake states and Ontario and Quebec). The strategic goal of the GLC is to restore and protect the ecological and economic health of the Great Lakes by preventing the introduction of new invasive species and limiting the spread of established populations. The GLC has priority actions to support: advocacy (federal legislation on ANS prevention and control; funding for state management plans and regional panel; Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal Dispersal Barrier); Education/Information, Research Coordination and Policy (outreach to raise awareness on Great Lakes invasions and risks posed by ecological and economic impacts; ballast water management for maritime vessels; model rapid response plan for Great Lakes); Aquatic Invasive Species program coordination (Great Lakes Regional Panel; International Joint Commission; Great Lakes Regional Collaboration.

Swayder mentioned aquatic nuisance species of concern in the Great Lakes region. She also talked about regional panels that exist across the country and responsibilities of the Panel under Section 1203 of NANPCA. Panel membership consists of Federal; state/provincial; regional/binational; tribal authorities; local; environmental groups; user groups; commercial interests; and university/research representatives. At-large membership provides a mechanism to keep the Panel equipped to address emerging ANS issues. Criteria for selecting at-large members: ability and effectiveness to represent constituency; expertise on current and/or emerging issues regarding ANS prevention and control; ability to fill important unmet needs. In the Fall of 2001, Panel staff conducted an election for at large membership. Panel members were asked to vote keeping the criteria in mind. At large members have a three year membership term. Swayder described the structure of the Panel: chair, vice chair, and administrative staff. She noted that the chair must be from a state natural resource agency and the vice chair can be anyone that is a voting member. Panel committees consist of an Executive Committee

(Panel officers-Chair, Vice Chair, and Committee Chairs); Information/Education; Research Coordination; Policy/Legislation.

The Panel has operational guidance, which has a mission statement (identifies problem and measures progress); defines roles and responsibilities of membership; support: funding for base support and project support; staff support roles and responsibilities; committee structure and function; executive committee roles and responsibilities, election of Panel officers and eligibility, and duration of terms; meeting conduct including pre- and post activities; communication through list serve, website, and mailings; decision-making consensus based but a formal vote, if necessary, by only primary members of the Great Lakes Panel, or in their absence, designated alternates; minority or dissenting opinions should be developed when there is less than full consensus on a decision or recommendations.

Swayder then went on to describe the Panel's regional initiatives, which can be found on the Panel's website at www.glc.org/ans/panel.html. She discussed in more detail components of a rapid response plan and a strategy for implementing state ANS plans.

There was a question from MARP member Jim Bean about commercial interests being able to provide funding for Panel activities and projects. There was also discussion among the Panel about having individual state plans in addition to regional plans and whether the plans should tackle terrestrial issues in addition to ANS issues. It was mentioned that some states are doing both. However a state plan is being developed (aquatics alone or combined with terrestrial) we need to make sure that the budget is itemized for aquatic if you want the ANSTF to adopt it and provide funding.

“The Gulf of Mexico Regional Panel Experience”- Ron Lukens, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission

Lukens skipped the first several slides because MacLean and Swayder had already covered the topics (i.e, Federal authorization for the panels and roles of the Panels). He mentioned that reauthorization of National Aquatic Invasive Species Act was scheduled to be re-introduced the following week. This is of interest to the Panels and states because it would increase authorizations for spending money for state plans and regional panel support. Presently, the panels have to get money from other sources to do things. The Panel is a committee of the Task Force so we have to answer to the Task Force, are subject to FACA, cannot send letters to Congress, have to provide an opportunity for public comment and meetings must be announced in the Federal Register. He recommended that the Mid-Atlantic Regional Panel establish Panel Operating Procedures (POPs) and to use other Panel's POPs as an example.

The Gulf of Mexico Regional Panel was established in late 1999 under the administration of the Gulf of Mexico Program. In late 2001, there was a proposal to transfer administrative responsibility to the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. In September 2002, the transition was complete.

The Panel's workgroups consist of: Pathways/Prevention (currently inactive); Control/Eradication/Restoration (currently inactive); Research and Development; Education and Outreach; Early Detection/Rapid Response; and Information Management.

The Research and Development group is: reviewing lists of research needs from other groups; developing a list of recommended research needs; and maintaining and updating the list of recommended research and development needs. Proposed activities in 2005 include: examining appropriate partnership opportunities for conducting research or collecting data; reviewing ISAC risk analysis process; compiling a list of existing natural resources grant programs; and identifying opportunities for multi-agency proposals.

The Education and Outreach Workgroup is: reviewing existing education and outreach materials and activities; developing guidelines for the use of non-native/invasive species in school science fair projects (completed in 2004); developing a brochure for high priority invasive species and issues in the Gulf region; developing a Kids/Teachers corner to add to the website; developing a newsletter. Proposed activities in 2005 include: developing and formatting content for ANSTF Annual Report; examining appropriate partnership activities for outreach; identifying public outreach opportunities and establishing methods to distribute panel information.

The Early Detection/Rapid Response workgroup will develop a Gulf wide rapid response plan. The group used guidance from Great Lakes Panel. Proposed activities in 2005 include: compiling a list of ongoing state and Federal monitoring programs for early detection and developing a taxonomic experts database.

The Information Management Workgroup is: reviewing and revising the Gulf of Mexico Invasive species website hosted by the GSMFC; providing guidance for maintaining and updating the website on an ongoing basis; assisting in the development and maintenance of a web-based non-native/invasive species database for the Gulf of Mexico. Proposed activities in 2005 include: compiling a list of websites that should have links on Panel website and compiling a list of external websites that should have links to the Panel website.

The Pathways and Prevention Committee is: conducting regional and state-by-state pathways analysis; identifying regional priorities for pathways and species using a survey; conducting an inventory of state/Federal watch lists.

The Eradication and Control workgroup is conducting an inventory of existing state and Federal species prevention plans.

Lukens also noted that the Panel is developing a 5 year strategic plan which will assist the Panel in producing an annual operations plan.

Lukens provided the status of state plan completion for states in the Gulf Regional Panel. He stated that state plan implementation is key to moving forward with Panel activities.

He concluded by giving the new website address for the Gulf Regional Panel:
<http://nis.gsmfc.org>

“Priority Aquatic Nuisance Species in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed”-Kerrie Kyde, Maryland Department of Natural Resources

Kyde discussed the six species of concern in the Chesapeake Bay watershed in which regional management plans were written. The six species are: zebra mussel, nutria, mute swan, water chestnut, common reed, and purple loosestrife. Kyde discussed ecological effects associated with each of the species and talked about their distribution in the watershed.

For nutria, she talked about a study that examined nutria related economic damages related to Maryland’s Chesapeake Bay commercial fisheries, hunting, and wildlife watching. Kyde also described the nutria eradication program that is occurring in Dorchester County, MD. The Maryland Nutria Partnership was formed in 1997 and has 26 federal, state, and private partners. Phase I of the nutria eradication project was research conducted to estimate densities, monitor behavior, and evaluate reproductive health in Dorchester county nutria. This research was completed in 2002. Phase II of the project, which began in 2003, consisted of trappers evaluating various trapping techniques to determine efficacy. The US Army Corps of Engineers began feasibility studies and launched restoration projects in Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge in 2003. To fully implement the program in 2005, partners will need to address a funding deficit of approximately \$250,000.

There are close to 4,000 mute swans in the Maryland portion of the Chesapeake Bay. Swans are problematic because they can consume millions of pounds of submerged aquatic vegetation annually. They also displace native waterfowl from breeding and foraging grounds and can physically injure wetland birds. Agriculture crop losses from mute swan have been reported in New Jersey. The Maryland Mute Swan Task Force published management recommendations in early 2001. Egg addling began in 2002 but was halted by lawsuits from animal rights groups. The US District Court of Appeals for District of Columbia in the Hill vs. Norton case, finds the mute swan to be protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The Migratory Bird Treaty Reform Act of 2005 excludes birds introduced by humans from being protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The mute swan is one of 125 species that the US Fish and Wildlife Service list as not covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The Maryland Department of Natural Resources will recommence activities under the Maryland Mute Swan Management Plan, which call for: increasing public awareness of mute swan impacts; preventing escape or reproduction of captive mute swans; reducing swan-human interactions; monitoring swan populations and management technique effects; investigating non-lethal control methods such as enclosure and hazing; and removing swans from “swan free areas” by reducing Maryland’s feral mute swan population through egg addling and lethal control of adult mute swan.

Water chestnut has been found in Harford and Kent counties in Maryland. Water chestnut can injure humans and restrict recreational water use; compete with and crowd out Bay grasses; reduce desirable habitat for native wildlife; and creates breeding grounds for mosquitos. Water chestnut was discovered in the Bird and Sassafras Rivers in 1999. Instead of chemical use, the agency utilized mechanical control. Annual control efforts in both tributaries resulted in negligible populations by 2002.

Phragmites alters the structure and function of native marshes; alters hydrology and reduces wildlife habitat; increases the potential for marsh fires, especially in the winter; inhibits mosquito population monitoring and control; presents aesthetic problems for humans. Invasive and native genotypes can be easily confused. Kyde showed a key for identifying the native genotype. Maryland has a state cost-share program through the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). The program is legislatively mandated and began in 1995. The program offers 50% cost share to private landowners that want to control phragmites on their property. Control is primarily accomplished through helicopter application. In 2004, MDNR contributed almost \$50,000 in chemicals and costs associated with applications for more than 600 landowners on approximately 1700 acres of public and private land.

Purple loosestrife forms dense, monotypic stands and replaces native vegetation, reducing wildlife food and shelter. Purple loosestrife can clog ditches, canals, streams and can change hydrology by promoting silt deposition. The plant can affect wetland nutrient levels, changing input to spring and summer detritivore communities. MDNR has submitted a National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Pulling Together Initiative to train volunteers to recognize and report purple loosestrife infestations; develop geo-referenced database of infestation sites housed at MDNR; for different locations, determine different methods for control; organize and train volunteers for purple loosestrife removal days; release *Galerucella* beetles as appropriate; monitor to track population sizes and spread rates.

“Priority Aquatic Nuisance Species in the Delaware Bay Watershed” – Ann Faulds, Pennsylvania Sea Grant

Faulds stated that there has been no concerted effort to prioritize aquatic invasive species management in the Delaware Bay watershed. Pennsylvania Sea Grant developed a survey to determine what species represent a potential ecological and economic threat to the aquatic communities of the Delaware estuary. A list of potential species was given to the respondents, species of concern were marked with an X. From the list of species the respondent was then asked to rank the top three plant species that represent the greatest ecological and economic threats to the Delaware estuary. The survey questioned if the respondent’s organization had a control or prevention plan for the three species they listed. The respondents were asked to describe existing programs and approximate funding for those programs allocated in 2001. They were also asked whether volunteers contributed to the program and the number of hours they volunteered. Respondents included colleges and universities, Philadelphia government, a private land conservancy, Federal government, Interstate Commission, a private water company, Pennsylvania

agencies, and a watershed association. Faulds described the results of the survey. Plants and animals of overall concern were ranked and then a separate weighted rank was provided for the top three plant species of concern. The two separate rankings were then combined for an overall ranking. For the combined rank the priority plant species were phragmites, purple loosestrife, and Japanese knotweed. The top three animals were zebra mussel, resident Canada goose, and flathead catfish.

Faulds described a Pennsylvania Sea Grant poster entitled, "Aquatic Supertramps of the Delaware Valley". More information can be found on the Pennsylvania Sea Grant web page, <http://www.pserie.psu.edu/seagrant>

Faulds noted that Pennsylvania's state management plan is in the initial stages of development. She also mentioned that New Jersey now has an Invasive Species Council and will be required to develop a statewide invasive species management plan. Delaware has a statewide invasive species management plan which covers terrestrial and aquatic invasives. She concluded her presentation by listing the State of Delaware "restricted and invasive" list, which included the following aquatic plants: marsh dewflower, purple loosestrife, and reed canarygrass. Widespread and invasive aquatic plants in Delaware include common reed and hydrilla.

"Priority Aquatic Nuisance Species in North Carolina"- Rob Emens, North Carolina Division of Water Resources

Emens stated that North Carolina (NC) has no invasive species management plans. He sent out an E-mail survey to natural resource agencies to determine what species were considered invasive in NC. Survey responses included: nutria, beavers (indigenous to NC), water moccasins (indigenous to NC), alligator (indigenous to NC), red lionfish (predator of native fish species on coral reefs), flathead catfish (threaten native catfish), red shiner, snakehead, black carp, Asian clam, Hydrilla, and Giant salvinia.

Emens noted that nutria were introduced to Currituck and Dare counties in the 1970s. All introduced fish, with the exception of the lionfish, are freshwater varieties. Flathead catfish and red shiner are fish species of highest concern. Snakehead and Black carp are banned in NC. The Asian clam is the dominant mollusk in most NC rivers.

Hydrilla and Giant salvinia are Federally listed noxious weeds. State listed noxious weeds are alligator weed and creeping waterprimrose. An unlisted but problematic aquatic plant is parrotfeather. Emens described the different control methods available for aquatic plant control. Hydrilla is a submerged perennial introduced to NC in 1981. Problems with hydrilla led to the creation of an aquatic weed control program in NC. The program uses triploid grass carp for control of hydrilla. This has been the most cost effective management tool. Alligatorweed is an emergent or floating perennial. It is widespread throughout coastal North Carolina and demands most of the field work time from the aquatic weed program. Flea beetles and herbicides have been used to control alligatorweed. Giant salvinia is a floating aquatic fern. The plant grows rapidly and is able to double its biomass in less than one week. It was recently introduced to NC in

1998, 1999. There are isolated infestations where eradication is possible. There is a Giant salvinia Task Force, who coordinate eradication efforts. The largest area infested is a 30 acre wetland but the plant is mostly found in small ponds. Some weevils have been released for control. Creeping waterprimrose is an emergent and mat forming perennial. The plant is a prolific seed producer and can also reproduce by fragmentation. The plant was likely introduced as an ornamental. Emens showed a slide of the plant completely covering a waterbody in Greensboro, NC. Parrotfeather is a submersed plant with emergent floral spikes. It spreads quickly in a waterbody like all the other plants mentioned. There is about 100 acres of parrotfeather in NC and it is often mixed in with pennywort. The plant can be found in up to 15 feet of water. Emens concluded his presentation by stating that many areas in which these plants have invaded where terrestrial areas that were converted to aquatic areas when dams were built.

“Discussion of Regional Priorities”- Facilitated by Jennifer Greiner

The Panel was asked to start thinking about what species or issues they want to make a priority for 2005 Panel activities. The following issues and priorities were captured:

- 1) Panel funding for projects, we need to develop criteria such as cost and feasibility;
- 2) Focus on issues and species that are common throughout the Mid-Atlantic region;
- 3) Jim Grazio noted that we need consensus among the group on what we are talking about (definition we want to use such as aquatic invasive species, aquatic nuisance species); his comment was triggered by the North Carolina presentation when Rob Emens noted that natural resource managers in NC consider several indigenous species invasive. Don MacLean stated that NANPCA has definitions and that we should go by those definitions. He went on to read some of the definitions. John Christmas also noted that he has a document which has introduced species terminology. It was suggested that we keep the definitions as open as possible.
- 4) The states in the panel need to develop state plans (that will inform the focus of the Panel); the state plans will define what the species of concern are, not the Panel
- 5) Joe Starnichak mentioned that the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Association outlines regional priorities in a document
- 6) Ron Lukens stated that the Panel should be as inclusive as they feel comfortable with; we don't have to focus on things strictly defined as Aquatic nuisance species
- 7) Development and implementation of state plans is a priority
 - The Pennsylvania state plan is in the initial stages of development; Virginia will have a state plan developed under state legislation but this could be adapted to an ANSTF state plan; Maryland has no state plan
 - John Christmas stated that the 6 individual species regional management plans developed by CBP were not in format to be approved by ANSTF; Mrs. Thompson replied that they can be used as tools by the workgroup to develop goals and objectives
 - it was suggested a committee move the single species management plans forward in a way that they will be utilized; they could be incorporated into the state plans.
- 8) What do the states in the Panel have in common?
- 9) Look at vector management (How are things getting here?)
- 10) Identify management actions that overlap in the six CBP plans to prioritize funding
- 11) Look early at funding mechanisms, make a list
- 12) build on existing tools/sharing resources

- 13) identify impacted stakeholders; foster advocacy on their part
- 14) pull priority species list together
- 15) what tools are needed for managers to monitor and prevent aquatic nuisance species-pool resources/information on what exists (tools, techniques); consider manager training or some other course for state and local agency officials
- 16) regional plan needed for rapid response; pursue funding options (ex: VA has no money to eradicate zebra mussels from a quarry)
- 17) Best Management Practices for control methods
 - mediation tools/mechanisms to reach consensus as regional group and state by state conflict of interest
 - (example=grass carp)
- 18) develop standard operating procedures for Panel
- 19) risk assessment training: state agencies/universities; use panel support to accomplish
- 20) “watch card” approach vs. “scientific approach” to management
- 21) HACCP training: part of prevention, FWS and Sea Grant sponsored workshop in PA, NCTC teaches a course, Panel could sponsor at watershed level??
- 22) Education and Outreach:
 - Existing tools: Stop aquatic Hitchhikers, Habitattitude, Coastal America, others??
 - How can MARP use these tools?
 - Habitattitude and Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers-regional endorsement (action: do we want to endorse these two outreach campaigns); if we sign up need user agreement
 - other social marketing tools that exist?
 - Great Lakes Panel-have “Biological Invasions” document (this was distributed by Kathe Glassner Swayder), recreational users guidance

“Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers™”- Joe Starinchak, US Fish and Wildlife Service
 Starinchak described the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers!™ campaign. It is a national public awareness and partnership campaign that addresses aquatic invasive species. The campaign targets recreational users of aquatic resources to raise their awareness and seek their ownership for the issue of aquatic invasive species. The campaign uses a themed brand that has a distinct visual identity and provides a strong call to action. The Service will evaluate the effectiveness of the campaign by working with 4 pilot states to measure peoples’ awareness before and after the campaign is introduced into a state. Agencies and organizations can become members of the campaign. By becoming a member, you receive a membership packet. Members can access marketing materials and multiple versions of the Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers brand. The website for the campaign is: www.protectyourwaters.net
 Members are encouraged to integrate campaign into existing marketing materials, provide a link to the campaign on their website, and promote the campaign at trade shows, open houses, club meetings, and schools.
 -Other panels have endorsed this campaign.

Habitattitude™-Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council

Pets are an important part of our culture. Over 13 million households maintain aquaria and there are thousands more in offices, restaurants, etc. Water gardens are becoming

increasingly popular. Collectively, these sectors contribute significantly to the U.S. economy. There have been long standing adversarial relationships between government and industry. There has been no unifying agenda and confusing, competing, and incorrect messages conveyed to consumers. An increased frequency of pets, fish, plants, and other organisms associated with the pet industry are found in the environment. These organisms have the potential to cause adverse effects. This translates into increased scrutiny and negative public perceptions about the industry. Habitattitude™ is another Task Force outreach initiative. The campaign targets the pet and aquarium trade and the nursery and landscape industry. Habitattitude™ also utilizes a social marketing approach by the use of a brand. The campaign links environmental messages with beneficial actions and is designed to reach targeted audiences. Objectives of the campaign are to: change traditional thinking that it's easier to ban than educate; unify government, academia, and industry to address the issue with as little negativism as possible; employ social marketing techniques; start with the aquatic segment of our industry since it has a high profile and historically has been a target; demonstrate accountability for outreach activities. Partners of the campaign are the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and NOAA's Sea Grant. By integrating the campaign's prevention messages and cooperative marketing materials into retail store displays, manufacturers' packaging and coverage in hobbyist magazines, the campaign partners plan on exposing millions of hobbyists to the campaign brand and directing them to the campaign website for more prevention tips. Components of the campaign include: a partnership packet; a website (www.habitattitude.net); brand and brand standards manual; guidelines and alternatives for release; exhibit displays; in-store signage; partnership certificates; decals; magazine ads; CD camera ready artwork; and powerpoint presentations. There has been great industry support of the campaign. Materials appear in over 2,000 retail stores. The brand has appeared on over 20 million fish bags and over 4 million fish boxes. Starter kits are available for small, independent retailers or nurseries.

Actions identified for March 31st

Julie Thompson will work on these actions

- determine whether commercial interests (members) can provide funding for Panel activities, projects
- need for national (ANSTF) guidance content for annual report
- guidance on advocacy (Kathe Swayder Glassner had discussed advocacy in her talk)
- obtain definitions non-native species terminology from NANPCA and publication that John Christmas has
- obtain International Association of Fish and Wildlife Association document that discusses regional priorities for invasive species

Actions will be addressed by May 13, 2005

April 1st, 2005

Jennifer Greiner went over what the group needed to accomplish by the end of the day.

Goals for the day include determining: 1) the scope of the Panel (informs Panel mission); 2) the structure and operation of the Panel (Chair and workgroups); and 3) Elements of the panel Workplan (with 2005 priorities)

Discussion of Panel Organization and Operation

Julie Thompson went over the ANSTF Regional Panel Policies and Procedures document drafted May 18, 2004. Copies of the document were provided to Panel members and a PDF version is available on the MARP website. Thompson presented examples of the organizational structure of other regional panels around the country. The group then discussed MARP organizational structure, membership gaps, and the establishment of workgroups.

- The structure of the Panel should be along the lines of actions/priorities
- John Christmas suggested that the chair be a representative from a regional entity and provided the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission as an example
- Kathe Swayder Glassner stated that the Great Lakes Panel always has chair from a state
- MARP presently has an interim chair
- We could rotate among state representatives for the chair (2-3 yr. term)
- State travel budgets could be an issue(someone mentioned that some state people are restricted from out of state travel)
- Chairing is a big time commitment
- Northeast panel has 2 co-chairs (freshwater/saltwater)

How we operate:

- Consensus is ideal

When voting necessary:

We need to develop a mechanism for voting: E-mail ballot or other suitable ways for voting

- Lay out the range of options

Motion: For approving the structure of the Panel and election of chairs, two E-mail ballots will be used for the purpose of electing officers and will include a description of nominees' backgrounds and an explanation of alternative structures for panel operations. (use survey software-Boomerang; PA Sea Grant could assist).

-It was suggested by a member that we put structure first (operational procedures) and then have separate ballot for electing officers

-The motion was unanimously approved

-There was a question about whether at-large members can vote

-There was also a question concerning who is eligible to nominate within the Panel for chair?

Some Panel members voiced concerns over the unequal number of votes among states/federal agencies on the membership list.

Who

Interim committee-assist administrative host (Julie Thompson and Jennifer Greiner) in setting up early decisions via an E-mail ballot

- Jim Bean
- Bob Tichenor
- Jim Grazio

- Tim Sinnot (advisor)
- Fred Kern
- Sarah Whitney

How

E-mail and conference call

What

Two chairs (chair and chair elect) with overlapping terms

- initial officers- chair 2 yrs, 3 yr vice-chair; thereafter 2 year terms
- allow chair to be re-elected if they want to serve another term
- strive for diversity
- re-elect or elect by ballot end of term
- if one can't continue term we will fill vacancy by ballot election to fulfill the remainder of the term

Discussions:

Co-chair vs. vice chair

- co-chairs make decisions together
- a member suggested using a co-chair interim to see how well it works
- panel unanimously supported 2 yr chair, 3 yr. vice chair (1st term)

Jennifer Greiner suggested continuing discussion about organizational structure and operation of the Panel after lunch so that we could provide Lisa Goldman, from the Environmental Law Institute, the opportunity to talk about how the Institute could work with the Panel.

The Environmental Law Institute is a non-profit, non-partisan entity. The group works on invasive species issue through their Biodiversity program. She spoke about the publications that the group has produced that address invasive species. ELI developed a report entitled, "Halting the Invasion" in 2002. The report analyzes existing state laws and regulations that address invasive species. It provides policymakers with information on how to strengthen their own invasive species control programs. "Making a List" provides an overview of state invasive plant programs in the Great Lakes region and evaluates the effectiveness of listing in the Great Lakes states and provides recommendations for improving listing in the Great Lakes and beyond. "Filling the Gaps: Ten Strategies to Strengthen Invasive Species Management in Florida" outlines gaps and conflicts in the federal and state legal framework for invasive species management in Florida, with a particular focus on the Everglades. "Invasive Species Control: A Comprehensive Model State Law" provides the statutory framework for a comprehensive state program to detect, control, and manage invasive species across all taxa. ELI is currently conducting a gap analysis of federal laws for the National Invasive Species Council. ELI could do similar analyses for the states in the Panel. ELI is dependent upon government and foundation support. They are currently looking for new sources of funding. ELI's website is www.eli.org and Lisa Goldman's E-mail is goldman@eli.org

Panel Budget-Jennifer Greiner

Greiner went over the 2005 Panel budget. Every Panel receives \$50,000 each year. \$25,000 is being used for the Panel coordinator salary, \$16,500 for projects, and \$6,000 for travel. The budget slide can be accessed on the MARP website.

Work Plan Development-Jennifer Greiner

Greiner went over Panel roles under the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force and then went on to discuss Chesapeake Bay Program recommendations for developing a 2005 Workplan. Communication between the CBP and the Panel will occur through the Living Resources Subcommittee (LRSC). The Panel coordinator will be a standing member of the LRSC. Initial activities of MARP could include: outreach aimed at prevention; monitoring to assess abundance and effects of priority species; development and implementation of regional rapid response plan; addressing the spread of aquatic nuisance species from recreational boaters through outreach and adaptive management; development of early detection and monitoring programs that utilize citizen monitoring; annual review of Panel membership to ensure diverse interests and that regional aquatic nuisance species issues are addressed. Greiner described the questionnaire and criteria CBP used to determine six priority aquatic nuisance species in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Regional management plans were developed for these six species (mute swan, nutria, phragmites, water chestnut, zebra mussel, and purple loosestrife). The LRSC is submitting the Draft regional management plans to the Panel with comments and is hopeful that they will be utilized in developing 2005 Work Plan priorities.

John Christmas reminded the group that these six plans are not approved by the Task Force.

Discussions from earlier in the day continued to address the scope and structure of the Panel.

Scope of Panel

Narrow vs. inclusive

-our mission should address support of state activities/action; this empowers the states to effectively control Aquatic nuisance species

Long term goals

Short term goals

1. review 6 regional management plans to determine if we will utilize management actions for panel priorities, workgroup strategies
2. identity building/network of support-"broadening our base"
 - identity beyond Chesapeake Bay
 - Strong message that this is a panel focusing on Mid-Atlantic issues
3. Publication/Inventory project-to see what other panels are doing so we aren't re-inventing the wheel

Structure of Panel

Greiner provided examples of how other Panels are structured.

Great Lakes: Executive Committee, Information/Education, Research, Policy/Legislation

Gulf of Mexico: Pathways/Prevention, Control/Eradication, Research and Development, Education/Outreach, Early Detection/Rapid Response

Western Regional Panel: Rapid Response, Research, Inland Waters, Coastal
Greiner provided a draft working group structure for the Panel:

- Rapid response
- Outreach (prevention)
- Control/Eradication: Panel ID and support building
- Research/Monitoring: additions to lists/scientific support
- Management Plans
- Policy/Regulations/Legislative

The group decided to focus on: Policy, Outreach and Education, and Science and Management

Panel members participated in one of the three working group sessions. The groups were asked to address the following:

- 1) short and long term focus;
 - 2) existing resources to tap;
 - 3) one doable accomplishment for 2005;
 - 4) establish cost for doable accomplishment;
 - 5) Group leader (to participate in Interim committee);
- Sara Whitney (Policy)
 - Anne Faulds (Outreach and Prevention until Sept. 30)
 - Jim Grazio (Science and Management)

Break-out group reports

Outreach and Education: (Ann Faulds-lead)

Participants: Rob Emens, John Wright, Jill Swearingen, Bob Tichenor, Jim Cummins, Jim Bean, Harley Speir, Fredrika Moser

Long term goals:

- 1) Develop a coordinated approach to outreach
- 2) Identify resources among the states and what invasive species outreach exists among the members
- 3) Support the other working groups in their outreach needs
- 4) Changing practices through education and awareness that can help prevent invasive species introduction and change risky behavior (mission statement)
- 5) Inventory of outreach materials (NISC task that needs to be looked at)

Short term goals:

- 1) Identify MARP and its long term objectives-get our links put on all the state web sites. Get the information out that MARP exists.
- 2) work on expanding website to provide links, promote existing programs and ideas from all the states, including current publications, citizen groups, communication strategies
- 3) Identify partners and outreach centers (state agencies, Fish and Game Public relations, Coastal America Learning Centers at aquaria)
- 4) Provide outreach support to state management plans
- 5) Review CBP regional management plans to pull out common outreach themes

- 6) Who we are and what we hope to do needs to be written up and put on the website; include partners and links
- 7) Produce a simple MARP statement, put into website, consider writing up for a flyer or brochure
- 8) Identify distribution areas for our outreach information
- 9) Develop a logo
- 10) Develop the mission statement

Action items:

- 1) Get the website up and improved with text and information from all the working groups (\$3,000)
- 2) Consensus on what overlap in outreach actions exist for the six regional management plans and what action we will take based on those items. Identify the overlap, long term and short term actions, and set a priority list by agreement through E-mail or conference call and put in the annual report (Fredrika Moser agreed to do this)
- 3) Look into buying a domain name
- 4) Create a brochure or flyer for domain name
- 5) Inventory of outreach materials tied to development by NISC
- 6) Logo

Science and Management (Jim Grazio-lead)

Long term goals:

- Development of state plans
- review of national snakehead plan
- Interstate plan coordination
- Monitoring program needs
- taxonomic experts list

Short term goals:

- Identify research needs/priorities (list)
- Identify state plans and programs in development or existence
- Identify ANS databases
- identify aquatic invasive species within the boundary of MARP
- develop a ranking document to identify priority species to the MARP
- Identify existing resources (Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Chesapeake Bay Program, Delaware Bay)
- Identification of monitoring programs (BRD Exotic Species Database)

Policy: (Sara Whitney-lead)

Participants: Fred Kern, Kerrie Kyde, Dave Heicher, Marshall Meyers, Melanie Wertz, Tim Sinnott, Sarah Whitney

Short term:

1. Develop an action plan that states could sign onto (ex.-Great Lakes (<http://glc.org/ans/pdf/7-01GLactionplan.pdf>, <http://glc.org/ans/pdf/7-01GLaddendum.pdf>) to encourage state leadership to recognize importance of AIS issues and facilitate regional buy-in.

2. Develop a reference listing for points of contact (so that MARP can become the “go to” group for AIS issues in the region)
3. Identify and recruit state legislative staff (staff from environmental committees, governor’s staff, legislative research services, key legislators, etc.) to participate in Panel
4. Go through existing CBP AIS management plans and pull out coming themes regarding policy issues

Long term:

1. Adopt #1 above
2. Create a state by state reference of existing AIS laws and regulations for the Mid-Atlantic region. Identify strategies for funding AIS prevention and control efforts with applicability in the Mid-Atlantic region. (anticipated cost \$3,000-\$5,000, work to be conducted by environmental law school intern).
3. Workshop to help states develop management plans; this would probably cost \$3-5,000
4. Research species’ specific economic impacts (also could be accomplished by intern)

Next Meeting

The group decided on two days within the first weeks of September. We could put potential dates in ballot.

Potential places mentioned:

- The Nature Conservancy (Shelter Island, NY)
- NCTC Shepherdstown, WV (might cost too much)
- Tincum National Wildlife Refuge-Philadelphia, PA
- Question came up on whether commercial representative could pay for a meeting space
- Patuxent National Wildlife Refuge
- free places in Raleigh, NC
- Wilmington, DE
- if we pick a place, ask if most people in the Panel can travel to that location and leader will determine location and dates
- Workgroup meetings will occur mostly by conference call
- there was discussion about the cost of meeting space and whether we wanted to use limited Panel funding for this
- Possible Sea Grant assistance in funding and hosting a meeting in one of the Sea Grant states

Action items for April 1st

1. Determine whether at-large members can vote
2. Identify membership gaps, issues, and revise as appropriate (Julie will lead this);
3. Membership-include tribal interests (Native American Fish and Wildlife Society); invite KellieWestervelt as member and identify alternate; include DE River Basin Commission which is based in New Jersey
4. Interim committee will draft a strategy for Panel operation and structure

5. Determine whether commercial interest members can assist with paying for meeting space
6. Look into developing a list serve for Panel and committees
7. Fredrika Moser will look into the possibility of Sea Grant hosting and funding a meeting in one of the Sea Grant states

Julie Thompson will address actions 1-6 by June 6, 2005

Fredrika will address #7 by July 29.

Attendees

Rob Emens, Rob.emens@ncmail.net, NCDENR Division Of Water Resources
 Mike Fritz, fritz.mike@epa.gov, US EPA Chesapeake Bay Program
 Sarah Whitney, swhitney@psu.edu, PA Sea Grant
 Ann Faulds, afaulds@psu.edu, PA Sea Grant
 Jim Grazio, jagrazio@state.pa.us, PA DEP
 Don MacLean, don_Maclean@fws.gov, USFWS
 Barbara Doll, barbara_doll@ncsu.edu, NC Sea Grant
 David Heicher, dheicher@srbc.net, Susquehanna River Basin Commission
 Fred Kern, fred.kern@noaa.gov, NOAA/NOS
 John Wright, John.s.wright@usace.army.mil, ACOE
 Melanie Wertz, mwertz@pa.state.us, PA DEP
 Barnaby Watten, bwatten@usgs.gov, USGS
 Jim Bean, beanj@basf.com, BASF Corporation
 Jim Cummins, jcummins@icprb.org, Interstate Commission of the Potomac River Basin
 Karl Blakenship, bayjournal@earthlink.net, Bay Journal
 Timothy Sinnott, tysinnot@gw.dec.state.ny.us, NYSDEC-DFWMR
 Jerry Griswold, jgriswold@chesapeakebay.net, USDA NRCS
 Ron Lukens, rlukens@gsmfc.org, Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission
 Tom Smith, tom.smith@dcr.virginia.gov, VA Department of Conservation & Recreation
 Steve Minkkinen, steve_minkkinen@fws.gov, MFRO USFWS
 Sheila Eyler, Sheila_eyler@fws.gov, MFRO USFWS
 Fredrika Moser, moser@mdsg.umd.edu, Maryland Sea Grant
 Greg Ruiz, ruizg@si.edu, Smithsonian Institute
 Marshall Meyers, mmeyers@pijac.org, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council
 Bob Tichenor, tichenrh@mda.state.md.us, MD Invasives Species Council
 Karen Eason, easonk@si.edu, Smithsonian Environmental Research Center
 Jil Swearingen, jil_swearingen@nps.gov, NPS Center for Urban Ecology
 Cathy Martin, Catherine.martin@state.de.us, DE Fish & Wildlife
 Kellie Westervelt, Kwestervelt@delawareestuary.org, DE Estuary Program
 Richard Orr, Richard_orr@ios.doi.gov, NISC
 Kerrie Kyde, kkyde@dnr.state.md.us, MD Department of Natural Resources
 Matt Fleming, mffleming@dnr.state.md.us, MD Department of Natural Resources
 John Christmas, johnchristmas@franklin-environmental-ltd.com Franklin Environmental
Staff
 Jennifer Greiner-Interim Chair, Annapolis, MD
 Kenna Oseroff-Chesapeake Bay Program fellow, Annapolis, MD

Julie Thompson-Panel Coordinator, Annapolis, MD