



Fall 2008 MAP Meeting
Draft Agenda

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Chesapeake Bay Field Office
177 Admiral Cochrane Drive
Annapolis, MD. 21401

Tuesday, September 9, 2008

9:00 am Welcome and Introductions (Jonathan McKnight, Chair)

9:15 am Regional Rapid Response Plan Update (Fredrika Moser and Jessica Smits)
-Plans for moving forward and closing out grant
-Discuss decision tree framework to determine whether a response is warranted

10:00 am Regional Invasive Species Workshop Update (Fredrika Moser)

10:20 am Species of Note Mapping Update (Jonathan McKnight)

10:35 am Break

10:50 am Policy Survey Packaging Presentation and Discussion (Liana Vitali and Sarah Whitney)

11:10 am Update on Didymo in MD (Jonathan McKnight, MDNR)

11:40 am Update on Funded Projects for 2008 and Progress of 2007 Projects

12:10 pm Lunch

1:10 pm Environmental Law Institute Report on Invasive Species Prevention Efforts in the Chesapeake Bay
-discussion on how Panel/CBP can move forward recommendations

2:00 pm Break

2:15 pm Mitten Crab Update (Carin Ferrante, SERC)

2:30pm Discuss budget, administration of the budget, and potential projects for 2009

3:45 pm Discussion on reauthorization of NAISA/Role of TNC Communicating our Regional Needs (Stephanie Flack, TNC and Jonathan McKnight, MDNR)

4:45 pm Date and Location for Spring Meeting

5:00 pm Unfinished Business/Adjourn



Fall 2008 MAP Meeting

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Chesapeake Bay Field Office

177 Admiral Cochrane Drive, Annapolis, MD 21401

Tuesday, September 9th, 2008

Document and presentations for this meeting can be found at:
<http://archive.chesapeakebay.net/calendar.cfm?EventDetails=9772&DefaultView=2&RequestDate=09/12/2008>

Attendance

Name	Affiliation	Contact
Steve Minkkinen, Vice Chair	US FWS	Steve_minkkenin@fws.gov
Julie Slacum, Coordinator	US FWS	Julie_thompson@fws.gov
Liana Vitali, Staff	CBP	Vitali.liana@epa.gov
Fredrika Moser	MD Sea Grant	moser@mdsg.umd.edu
Jessica Smits	MD Sea Grant	smits@mdsg.umd.edu
Sarah Whitney	PA Sea Grant	swhitney@psu.edu
Ray Fernald	VDGIF	Ray.ferald@dgif.virginia.gov
Stephanie Flack	TNC	sflack@tnc.org
Jil Swearingen	NPS	Jil_swearingen@nps.gov
Marek Topolski	CBP/LRSC	mtopolski@dnr.state.md.us
Cathy Martin	DE Fish and Wildlife	Catherine.martin@state.de.us
Read Porter	ELI	porter@eli.org
Carin Ferrante	SERC	ferrantec@si.edu
Greg Ruiz	SERC	ruizg@si.edu
Dave Heicher	SRBC	dheicher@srbc.net
John Christmas	George Mason University	

Action Items:

- All Panel Members** to encourage their states to adopt the Model Rapid Response Plan and inquire about interest in attending an ICS training workshop sponsored by MAP in their state.
- Fredrika Moser** to draft timeline and scope of work for February/March regional workshop on AIS vectors.
- Sarah Whitney and Liana Vitali** to continue work on the policy survey circulation materials and work with Julie Slacum to upload the results on the MAP website.
- Julie Slacum** to add Didymo information to the MAP website.
- Marek Topolski** to draft a list of MAP priorities using the ELI report to develop specific recommendations and email to the MAP listserv for comment.
- Steve Minkkinen** to provide Greg Ruiz with information and locations of Maryland dams and culverts for Chinese mitten crab surveillance.
- Stephanie Flack** to send the House Bill language regarding the Non-Native Wildlife Invasion Prevention Act to Julie
- Greg Ruiz** to speak with Kevin Sellner, Director of CRC, about housing MAP funds (Completed).
- Cathy Martin and Steve Minkkinen** to research meeting location option for the Spring MAP meeting including the new nature center in Milford, Delaware and options at Bombay Hook, Delaware.

Welcome and Introductions, *Steve Minkkinnen, FWS and MAP Vice Chair*

Vice chair Steve Minkkinnen welcomed members and said Jonathan McKnight will not be in attendance due to an illness.

Regional Rapid Response Plan Update, *Fredrika Moser and Jessica Smits, MD Sea Grant*

Delaware and Maryland have been active partners in the Rapid Response Plan process. Based on their input and comments solicited from the Spring MAP meeting, Jessica has revised the plan and Sea Grant is forwarding the final product to the states to utilize. Greg Ruiz, SERC, helped Sea Grant to create a decision tree to the Plan that helps identify if action is needed on a species/incident at the time of sighting.

Jessica began a discussion of the decision tree outlining each step and the reasoning behind it. Fredrika feels this is a good addition to the plan and addresses the concerns members had at the spring meeting about when to speak to high level management about an incident. She asked if the plan was too heavy with Incident Command System language. Ray Fernald stated that it will be a challenge in some of the states to get them to buy in to the ICS process. Fredrika added that she strongly feels there is a role for this plan and decision tree in state and non-governmental organizations. Specifically, a document such as the decision tree provides authenticity to the decisions made regarding invasive species and beyond that, it's a strong document to guide agencies at a higher, more complicated level to respond to an incident.

Steve Minkkinen asked if there is a nexus between federal and state agencies regarding this plan as the states are usually in charge of addressing incidents and making the decisions. Fredrika added to the question by asking what Fish and Wildlife Service field biologist do if they encounter invasive species in the field. Julie said the biologists would contact the states and private landowners who often times report invasive species would likely contact the states as well.

Fredrika said those involved in the initial decision-making process involving the tree could contact appropriate experts to answer questions that may arise during the initial discussions. She recommended adding to Step 2 or at the top of the document a sentence that reads, "This process may involve contacting select regional experts to assist in the decision-making process". Sarah Whitney, PA Sea Grant, questioned the word 'historically' in Step 2 and asked for a clarification of the definition of that word as some invasive species become naturalized after so many years. Members discussed how different states have different regulatory processes and defined 'historical' in different contexts.

Jessica says the plan is ready to move forward and so far, Delaware and Maryland have completed the process. She will resend the documents the states need to fill out to join in the process to the MAP members and also plans to send an official letter via email to the heads of the state agencies in an effort to put these plans on their agendas. Fredrika suggests sending the email to the appropriate MAP representative before sending to the state heads and it will be distributed via MAP and Sea Grant and will hopefully have Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANSTF) support. As the letter goes to the state heads, it will arrive on MAP letterhead with a Sea Grant logo and signed by Jonathan and Fredrika or her superior. The state plans will also be posted on the MD Sea Grant and MAP websites with multiple linkages as the MD Sea Grant is very Google-friendly and most users are directed to MD Sea Grant if searching for tags related to invasive species. Fredrika and Jessica are also planning a press release in Maryland and Delaware.

John Christmas, George Mason University, asked how this fits in with the management plans states already have. Fredrika said the MAP Rapid Response plan is complementary to existing state plans and is specifically geared to addressing new introductions and not necessarily state plans designed for existing invasive species. John mentioned that the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) has a 1993 policy regarding invasive species that the state rapid response plans would complement. Julie will look into the policy for the exact wording and to possibly include in some of the letters to particular state heads. Julie asked Marek Topolski, MD DNR, if the CBP Living

Resources Subcommittee would be interested in this information. Marek suggests talking with Tom Parham, chair of the Living Resources Subcommittee.

Finally, Fredrika said Jessica has done wonderful work in drafting the plan and the fact that the plan was created with participation and input from state invasive species experts and includes Incident Command System procedures only strengthens its value. Fredrika also suggested this plan should be circulated to other panels and eventually should be presented to the ANSTF. Ray Fernald, VDGIF, asked when the letter to the state heads regarding the plan will be distributed. He mentioned that 2009 is his governor's "Year of the Environment" and since adopting this plan in his state would be essentially free, it is likely he will be able to rally support. Fredrika said Jessica will be creating a unique letter for each state and then they will require feedback on the letter from the state representatives, which could push back distribution of the letter for a few months. Ray discussed how he can present the Plan to his states Invasive Species technical committee in the next few weeks and give them a relative timeline for the future of the plan. He said by getting the thoughts of his technical committee ahead of time, it would prime the state for the mass distribution of the letter and rapid response plan in the future.

Julie asked what some of the obstacles in Pennsylvania are regarding this plan. Sarah said PA state agencies aren't comfortable with ICS language and formalities. The agencies like the concepts but want to modify the plan so the field biologists can more easily apply the actions. Looking at the decision tree, she says this document in particular is helpful to have as well as the decision flow chart and PA would likely create their own spin on the plan. Jessica mentioned the value of ICS is its universal language and that there is money left in the grant to provide ICS training to make the various agencies more comfortable with the language and concepts. Julie said other options for the leftover money included creating a mock invasion workshop but providing ICS training might be a better use of the money. Originally, the ICS training was directed to those states who have already signed on to the plan but perhaps focusing on the states that are still deciding on the plan and providing the training to help increase the comfort-level with the language and concepts would be advantageous. Fredrika asked members around the table to gauge interest in their states regarding an ICS training workshop and if there is interest, MAP can push forward with the training. Especially in PA where MAP has provided funding to perform a mock invasion, it would especially advantageous to have MAP-sponsored ICS training before the mock invasion to reinforce ICS concepts and utilization of the plans. Julie added that Jessica could present the plans at the upcoming Virginia technical committee meeting and ANSTF.

Action Item: All Panel Members to encourage their states to adopt the Model Rapid Response Plan and inquire about interest in attending an ICS training workshop sponsored by MAP.

Regional Invasive Species Workshop Update, Fredrika Moser, MD Sea Grant

Fredrika is planning a February or March workshop and due to the discussion the membership had at the spring meeting, she believes it would be most beneficial to focus on vectors. The workshop would examine how aquatic invasive species prevention can focus on vectors as opposed to single-species management of aquatic invasive species after they are already introduced. The workshop discussions could be split between vectors and vector policy/regulations (or lack there of). She stated that she acknowledged the other option for a workshop, which was to gather regional invasive species councils. She believes more can be gained by focusing partners and members on a specific area rather than share projects and progress from regional councils. She added that we could bring the invasive species council representatives together for several hours at the end of the workshop to talk.

Steve questioned if the policy discussion would focus on jurisdictions or federal policy as he feels some overarching federal policy behind the discussion would be valuable. Fredrika agreed and said she is looking for feedback on questions such as that but she doesn't want the discussion to focus on a single topic like ballast water introductions. Ray suggested making it known that ballast water would not be discussed exclusively at this workshop. Sarah asked if there would be an opportunity at this workshop to discuss risk analysis which has been a recent topic of interest in PA. Fredrika has prioritized booking a risk analysis speaker at the workshop. Ray warned that VA would likely not be able to participate if the workshop is out-of-state due to state funds. Stephanie Flack, TNC, asked about web conferences and Julie said she has the capability to do so and will look into it. Steve also warned that attendance at web conferences are often less than

face-to-face conferences so participation could decrease if the workshop was web-based. Julie reminded members that we need to decide which vectors we wanted to focus on. During the spring meeting, members discussed focusing on bait and the live seafood trade. Fredrika said the Environmental Law Institute would likely prefer to focus the vector discussion to current policies surrounding vectors. Last spring, members discussed whether to focus on one or two vectors or multiple vectors but Fredrika preferred narrowing the scope and exploring a few vectors. She will draft a timeline and scope of work in the coming weeks and work with her administrative staff at MD Sea Grant to work out meeting logistics. Julie voiced her concerns of deciding who MAP should invite and other fundamental decisions regarding the workshop that have yet to be made. Fredrika emphasized the importance of providing a workshop with a compelling topic and Julie said it's been at least 5 years since the last invasive species workshop. Julie asked if Fredrika could focus on having the scope and timeline drafted by mid-October and include a plan to organize a small committee to organize the workshop. Fredrika asked if there are any recent papers or projects regarding vectors and Julie mentioned SERC was involved in a related project. Fredrika volunteered to speak to Greg Ruiz about it.

Action Item: Fredrika to draft timeline and scope of work for February/March workshop on AIS vectors.

Policy Survey Packaging Presentation and Discussion, Liana Vitali, CBP and Sarah Whitney, PA Sea Grant

Chesapeake Bay Program and MAP staff, Liana Vitali, presented various graphical depictions of the policy survey data that was collected in 2006 and 2007 and potential uses of data including adding a page to the MAP website regarding the results and a one-pager to fax or mail to policymakers informing them of the survey results.

Fredrika said she really liked the presentation of the data and thinks this is on the right track. Some of the suggestions from members present included:

- Send one-pager to state and federal partners as well as policymakers
- Try to get on the ANSTF agenda and present findings
- Make survey available to partners to use within their own state and organizations
- Include text and references with all the graphics

Julie said the ultimate intent is to upload the information obtained from the survey onto the web. Fredrika suggested adding more information on the website about why invasive species research is important and provide information on how to obtain literature.

Action Item: Sarah and Liana to continue work on the policy survey circulation materials and work with Julie to upload the results on the MAP website.

Update on Didymo in Maryland, Julie Slacum, FWS

Julie walked members through the MD DNR Didymo website (www.dnr.state.md.us/dnrnewsrelease/pressrelease2008/050608c.html). Didymo is a species that has not yet been discussed within MAP and has been found in many of the states in the regional panel. It appears the non-native algae has not been spreading rapidly but has a potential to disrupt ecosystems in waters it invades by choking out bottom-dwellers and removing food organisms for game and other aquatic species. Felt bottom boots and waders are the common vectors for spreading the algae. Salt stations in affected areas have been successful in eradication efforts.

Julie asked if this should be added to the MAP website and members agreed that it should. It was asked if Didymo is a new infestation or a new discovery of an existing infestation and Steve thinks it's a new infestation. So far VA, WV, PA, MD and likely NY have all recorded Didymo sightings. Julie asked if anyone knew how it arrived and no one was certain. Members discussed new alternative waders on the market and a good policy would be to encourage state biologists to adopt the new waders.

Action Item: Julie to add Didymo information to the MAP website.

Discussion of MAP Website, Julie Slacum, FWS

Julie brought up the website and the Panel discussed what needed to be changed. Fredrika stated that documents should be in PDF format and not Word. There should be a link to the Environmental Law Institute report on AIS Prevention Efforts in the Chesapeake Bay, and an update on mitten crab and Didymo. We need to put the survey and associated graphics on the site, and the model rapid response plan. We also need to put the species of note maps up when they are completed. We also need to post our tri-fold brochure for the Panel. We need to link to state invasive species councils in the region, and update some success stories. A member suggested taking off "How do you like our new look" on the main page.

Update on Funded Projects for 2008 and Progress of 2007 Projects, Julie Slacum, FWS

Julie provided an update on what projects the Panel funded for the 2008 RFP. The following projects were funded: 1) Tracking Invasive Species in Pennsylvania (\$9,000); 2) Aerial GPS Census of Phragmites in Virginia (\$10,000); 3) Publication and Dissemination of AIS Prevention Literature in Pennsylvania (\$9,989); 4) Eradication of Water Chestnut on Delmont Lake (\$9,031); and 5) Maryland Department of Natural Resources Invasive Species Matrix Team Public Outreach Project (partially funded at \$1,100 for rusty crayfish signs). The total amount of funds utilized for projects was \$39,120. Julie also provided an update on on-going projects funded in 2007. Those projects are: 1) AIS Prevention Signs for Pennsylvania; 2) Conducting an AIS Early Response Exercise in Pennsylvania; 3) Biological Control and Nutrient Enrichment: Investigating the Effectiveness of Purple Loosestrife Control Using *Galerucella californiensis*; and 4) Current and Projected Distribution of the Invasive Rusty Crayfish. Sarah Whitney talked about the first two projects. For the signs project, they may go with laminated paper signs with a message such as "Clean your gear and boat". For each waterbody they may customize the signs to address problem species in that area. Sarah stated that there was a rapid response exercise in Erie, PA as part of the Great Lakes Basin Commission. Sarah will work with this group to formulate another mock invasion.

State Updates (added to the agenda)

Julie stated that we have a new member from New York. His name is Marcelo Del Puerto. He will be contacted in the near future.

Julie also stated that the new West Virginia representative is Bret Preston. Bret said that WVA will be unable to actively participate in the Panel but would like to receive e-mails and updates. It has been a struggle to get New Jersey engaged in the Panel. One of the members suggested that we may want to have a meeting there to solicit more interest in the Panel.

Susquehanna River Basin Commission, Dave Heicher: They are finding more zebra mussels in New York. They are updating their comprehensive plan for the Susquehanna River, which will include a section on invasives.

National Park Service, Jil Swearingen: The National Capital Region of NPS awarded the University of Georgia's Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health (CISEH) funding for a three year project for development of an Invasive Species Early Detection Mapping System (EDDMapS) for the Mid-Atlantic region. This will include all species, aquatic and terrestrial. Jil would be willing to give a talk about the database at the next meeting. The project won't officially start until Oct. 1, 2009. The project will rely on gathering existing information and bringing it into the EDDMapS plus reports of species occurrences submitted by individuals throughout the region. Jil acknowledged that this will be a huge undertaking. The toughest part will be getting people to prepare and submit reports. The Principal Investigators at CISEH will be working with Jil on an implementation plan for this project during Winter 2009. Fredrika suggested that the Panel could work with Jil to help populate the database.

Maryland, Marek Topolski (MDNR): Marek began by reporting that the signs for Didymo and rusty crayfish are printed and laminated. Some signs are tributary specific and others are more general and will be placed at key river access points. There is informal diet work being performed on blue catfish to determine if juvenile alosids are a main diet. They are finding that they are foraging mainly on benthic invertebrates but at this time sampling has only occurred in tidal areas. Finally, there was continued removal of water chestnut this summer on the Sassafras and Gunpowder Rivers, and the largest infestations were roughly 2-50 x 50 m plots, some of the largest on record.

Julie asked if there was any information at DNR about water lettuce and he said he hadn't heard the latest. She said last fall there were sightings on the Potomac but there hasn't been much talk about it since then. He also said there hasn't been much information regarding rusty crayfish through the Maryland Biological Stream Survey.

Pennsylvania, Sarah Whitney (PA Sea Grant):

Sarah informed MAP members of the new state invasive species coordinator, Ashley Walter. She has started assisting the state with developing a comprehensive species management plan and remodeling the website. PA has a finalized AIS plan but the challenge is bringing the terrestrial sector up to the same level. PA is also focusing on divers and intentional introductions. The PA Fish and Boat Commission has a new policy coordinator and AIS has been getting more attention lately.

Delaware, Cathy Martin (DE Fish and Wildlife):

Cathy informed Panel members of the DE Invasive Species Council annual meeting scheduled for Nov 7th in Dover, Delaware. The Phragmites Control Program is underway as well as the landowner incentive program that offers cost-share funds for landowners that undertake invasive species removal. This past March, a multi-agency invasive species workshop was conducted focusing on on-the-ground work for the agencies and published a field guide to give to workshop attendees. An outcome of the workshop was a guided AIS tour that takes participants into the field to identify AIS such as hydrilla and parrotfeather, etc.

Virginia, Ray Fernald, VA Department of Game and Inland Fisheries:

Ray stated that the VA Invasive Species Workgroup meeting will occur in December. The technical committee will meet in September to discuss how to update the website. VGDIF is wrapping up a plan for mute swans in VA. The technical committee is also working on a rapid response plan which will hopefully incorporate the MAP model rapid response plan. They also want to develop a short list of immediate AIS threats to VA. There is one position at DCR dedicated to supporting the invasive species workgroup and none of the other agencies really have staff. VA successfully eradicated their zebra mussel infestation using potassium chloride. The chemical should remain stable in the treated areas for up to 30 years and biologists have not found any leakages of the chemical to any other areas than the treated areas. All other invertebrates are not affected by potassium chloride.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Steve Minkkinen

Steve reported that Arkansas now has a reproducing population of northern snakehead in the Piney Creek water drainage. They fear that it will spread into the Mississippi drainage and they are trying to eradicate them. In New York, snakeheads were also sighted in a series of ponds that lead into a tributary of the Hudson River. Eventually, snakeheads could be present in many of the major tributaries of the continental US. MD DNR is performing surveys and questionnaires at fishing tournaments and other events to gain information from the large mouth bass industry about how many snakeheads are caught. They have been collecting observational data on spawning and growth rates for snakeheads as well and have been electrofishing in the Potomac River to assess growth and feeding habits. Biologists have also radio-tagged two adult snakeheads to record migration during winter months. Recently, the Calvert Maritime Museum created an invasive species display and wanted to put together signage mentioning obligate air-breathers, including snakeheads. However, recent MD experiments that prevented juvenile snakeheads from access to open air, found them surviving for over 40 days. Therefore, juveniles are not obligate air-breathers.

Environmental Law Institute Report on Invasive Species Prevention Efforts in the Chesapeake Bay, Read Porter, ELI

Read presented the results and six recommendations of the ELI's Report on Invasive Species Prevention Efforts in the Chesapeake Bay to the MAP membership. Throughout each recommendation, Read offered various actions MAP can take to encourage the adoption of the recommendations. He acknowledged that all of the recommendations might not materialize but there are many opportunities where MAP can get involved.

He stated that there is no federal movement toward prevention efforts. We need to focus on what states can do and what regional bodies can do. We need to look at pathways for introduction. Barriers to cooperation are that there are a lot of different agencies and interests and different states have different economic interests. All states have a similar regulatory approach, the use of clean or dirty lists. Enforcement, however, is a big issue. How can we move forward and harmonize regulations between the states.

Recommendations included: 1) regional body coordination; 2) seek CBP LRSC responses to MAP recommendations; 3) support river basin commissions in AIS planning; and 4) seek full headwater state and agency representation. The report also recommends consolidating, harmonizing, and strengthening AIS lists. MAP's role could be to identify candidate species for listing, develop information for listing, and increase our focus on aquatic plants. The Bay region also needs to quantify impacts from vessel borne invasions, study new enforcement tools, determine predictive adaptive management needs such as impacts of climate change, sea level rise, and effects of new invaders. With regard to regional prevention efforts, the report suggests developing a regional AIS prevention plan.

Greg Ruiz, SERC, was interested in the reason for the present motivation/political will and discussed how some of the issues mentioned in Read's presentation have been long-standing issues. He asked what the triggers are that would advance the framework laid out. Read responded by saying that certain pathways, such as ballast water, reach a tipping point when media coverage begins. Media outreach coupled with identifying high risk invasive species in the Chesapeake Bay that are likely transmitted through ballast water might catch the attention of the eastern senators.

Steve Minkkinen said the legislative authorities in MD are vague regarding aquatic plants and asked if Read would agree that the regulatory structures in place are lacking. He agreed and said that the authorities tend to overlook aquatic plant species and appropriations are limiting. Julie followed by saying the vector-based workshop that invites the different states to attend could be a good forum to discuss the state regulations. Read mentioned horticulture and water garden industries are the most common vectors for plant AIS introduction and it is a mostly unregulated industry.

Stephanie Flack asked if MAP ever engaged with the Department of Defense (DOD). Greg said he is unaware of any collaborations but MAP has been involved with the US Coast Guard. Julie mentioned that DOD works substantially with terrestrial issues which is likely why the Coast Guard has been more of a focus for MAP. Greg agreed it would be reasonable to consider a partnership with DOD. Read also mentioned that public health is usually associated with non-native introductions such as cholera so this can also be an option. It was asked if DOD was involved with ANSTF but members weren't aware of any relationships. The Army Corps of Engineers has been involved in the past.

Stephanie then asked if there have been any entities volunteering to take the lead on any of the recommendations presented. Steve said the workshop may address one of the recommendations. Fredrika says she would like to see MAP become more formally tied to the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) in regards to recommendations and response.

Julie reminded the members that she had circulated the 2007 panel priorities that included ELI recommendations. She feels that during and after the vector workshop, MAP can tangibly pursue a majority of the ELI recommendations. It was asked how these recommendations can be presented to CBP and ideally, presented to the CBP Implementation Committee. Fredrika commented that even if CBP cannot act on the recommendations, at least it will be recorded that MAP brought their recommendations to their attention.

Liana Vitali reported that she believes the reorganization of the CBP should be mostly completed by the 2008 Executive Council Meeting at the end of this year and preparing MAP priorities and recommendations during this time and coupling them with the findings from the vector workshop in February would likely be a good strategy to follow since CBP should be more stable at the time and better prepared to hear MAP priorities and needs. For example, biologists can not access public lands which inhibits progress in invasive species managements; this is an ideal topic to discuss with the upper level management of CBP. Greg asked the formal process for CBP reauthorization and Read said CBP was authorized through the Clean Water Act.

Action Item: Marek Topolski to draft a list of MAP priorities using the ELI report to develop specific recommendations and email to the MAP listserv for comment.

Mitten Crab Update, Greg Ruiz, SERC

SERC scientists are still answering the overarching question of whether the Chesapeake Bay watershed populations of Chinese Mitten Crabs are stable, dying or growing. Their goal for 2008 was to develop and expand their reporting system to the entire Atlantic coast. They would like to have a web based reporting system. The past two years they have conducted surveys in Maryland and have not detected any mitten crabs. Delaware and Chesapeake Bay reports have come solely from the citizens and not fisheries. To date, SERC has verified 25 mitten crab sightings. Almost all recorded sightings this year have come from northern New Jersey and New York. Any Maryland, Delaware and New Jersey sightings have come from crab pots. However, New York sightings have come from a scientist studying eel passage. SERC is developing a Google Earth site to log crab sightings which will be launched during the next several weeks. The smaller carapace size of the crabs sighted in New York suggests a recruitment period and a thriving population. However, all the crabs in Maryland and Delaware are fully mature adults. Studies regarding crab genetics have shown the crabs found in the Chesapeake Bay watershed are more closely related to the European mitten crabs and not the California crabs. Overall, Greg said he was surprised this year at the habitats in New York that the crabs have colonized and showed images of rocky waterfalls that the crabs would have had to traverse to arrive at the locations in which they were sighted. Ray asked how deep their burrows are. Greg said it's determined by the substrate, but 1-2 feet is not uncommon.

This fall, SERC plans to increase shore walks and field visits to sight crabs. Greg wants to focus on dams and culverts that might have aggregations of crabs and Steve said he could provide that information easily. It is still unknown whether the population in New York is sustainable but current data suggests so. Steve asked if Greg knew how old the crabs can get and he said the literature suggests 5 years however the crabs have been found to survive after reproduction which their Asian counterparts do not.

Action Item: Steve Minkkenin to provide Greg Ruiz with information and locations of Maryland dams and culverts

Discussion of reauthorization of NAISA/Role of TNC Communicating our Regional Needs, Stephanie Flack, TNC

Stephanie thanked MAP for having her and began her presentation of her work with The Nature Conservancy and its possible connections to MAP priorities. Stephanie is working on Chesapeake Bay initiatives for TNC. They want to deal with some of the threats to the Bay, and this includes dealing with AIS. TNC can lobby and draft legislative provisions, they are trying to get feedback from different regions on AIS legislation. At the conclusion of her presentation, Stephanie asked what the greatest gaps are given past and proposed/pending legislation, particularly for this region? Sarah said the lack of full funding for AIS management plans. Overall, MAP would be most interested in Rapid Response, Early Detection and Priority Pathway Management Program and Screening of Planned Importations of Live Aquatic Organisms Sections of NAISA. TNC will be engaging with other invasive species panels to gather multiple views and opinions. Greg warned of the umbrella effect because involving so many panels can dilute the importance of some sections and asked what TNC's timetable is regarding NAISA reauthorization. TNC plans to work on legislation reauthorization and to make this a priority for the coming Congressional season. Stephanie asks if MAP could pick the top three areas of focus for MAP. Fredrika responded with Rapid Response, specifically a fund for rapid response, and screening of planned importations of live aquatic organisms. Read felt strongly that the Non-Native Wildlife Invasion Prevention Act will pass successfully and MAP and TNC should focus attention there. It was questioned whether plants were included and Read didn't think so. He mentioned the Environmental Coalition is working on recommendations for the new

administration. Also, he added that other financial responsibility tools may be implemented to create a rapid response fund such as imposing an import fees for bringing in live aquatic organisms. Collected fee money would be sent to a fund pool for rapid response. Julie updated the members that the new Farm Bill limits the funding for invasive species control to farm producers. Greg also added that rapid response is tied tightly to monitoring and monitoring program funding has continued to decrease throughout the region. Stephanie summarized the feedback she received from MAP members that included exploring sustainable financing for rapid response and exploring the ELI recommendations TNC can help with, helping to pursue grants for MAP projects when priorities are listed such as watershed planning grants.

Action Item: **Stephanie** to send the House Bill language regarding the Non-Native Wildlife Invasion Prevention Act to Julie

Discuss budget, administration of the budget, and potential projects for 2009, Julie Slacum, FWS

Julie began by saying that an extra \$50,000 will become available now that the coordinator funds are released, however, that money needs to be housed somewhere. She said that Jonathan McKnight, MD DNR and MAP Chair, had suggested that MDNR could hold the money but another plan would be welcome. Stephanie wasn't sure if TNC could hold the money but Julie offered a small percentage for holding the money. Greg asked how other panels handle this situation and Julie responded by saying some panels utilize their marine fisheries commission but Julie hasn't been able to coordinate that with ASMFC. CBP is the administrative host for this panel but does not directly deal with the finances of the Panel. Steve discussed the advantages with working with non-profits to administer funds via MOU's and MOA's. Greg mentioned the Chesapeake Research Consortium might be interested in administering the funds but he has to ask what the percentage would be. Sarah also mentioned SRBC might be interested as well.

Julie also discussed how the Fish and Wildlife Service may be able to staff the panel in-kind as part of a position and she will be working with ANSTF and FWS to fulfill this need. In the interim, Julie and Liana will support the position.

In the past, the panel experienced difficulty spending funds but the recent RFP has been very successful in spending funds. She asks the members if they approve of the RFP process and feel it's an intuitive way to spend panel funds. Fredrika, Steve and Sarah both commented on their satisfaction of the RFP process. Julie recommended MAP move forward again with an RFP by the end of December and note in the RFP that projects should be \$10,000 in financial scope and the panel has up to \$50,000 to spend on projects. Fredrika suggests sending out an email with the old RFP and solicit comments from MAP members, i.e. are the priorities still correct and up-to-date, etc.

Jil Swearingen, National Park Service, suggested a project for MAP regarding a field guide for biologists involved in riparian work. She said that EPA employees put a similar guide together very quickly and thought this could be a good project for the RFP. Sarah asked if Jil had seen the Maine Aquatic Plant guide which shows all the plant species and identifies which are native and non-native. Fredrika suggested making it mobile such as a key chain or Jil suggested a laminated brochure. Jil also added that the project can include other signage options as well. Julie mentioned that Jil helped FWS with other invasive species communications materials that are still quite popular. Stephanie asked if the guide would have a purpose such as eradication techniques if a species is found or even a link to the MAP sighting form or National Park Service database. Greg said he wasn't sure if there was a gap in invasive plant species sighting guides but if there is a gap to fill, it would be worth pursuing. Jil added that the University of Georgia is currently working on an early detection plan including all species in the mid-Atlantic for the National Park Service. Fredrika added that if this guide can be linked to an information database or an entity to report to, it would add value to the project. Jil responded that she would prefer to list MAP members as contacts on the guide but Fredrika asked if the states would be prepared to receive that type of information. Ray said VA and PA will be entering into the iMap program when its fully-functioning and these projects might be overlapping. Fredrika reminded members of the list of priority species the MAP came up with and its applicability to Jil's project. Ray said that specific information on the species is needed to provide a meaningful sighting report and then it turns into something less mobile such as a guidebook. Greg suggested identifying the users which will in

turn determine the format of the ID guide. Ultimately, Jil still needs to identify the audience and ultimate use of the guide/reporting tool and she will outline this in her RFP.

Action Item: Greg to speak with Kevin Sellner, Director of CRC, about housing MAP funds (Completed).

Date and Location for the spring MAP meeting, A//

Members suggested New Jersey, New York and Delaware. Milford, DE has a new nature center opening. Cathy offered to look at availability for March 31st-April 1st or April 14th-15th. She also suggested Milford Lodge but warns it's quite rustic. Steve also mentioned Bombay Hook as a possibility and Julie offered to look into that.

Julie asked for member's opinions on the one day format. Commuting members preferred the one day format however Sarah suggests the content of the meeting should determine its length. Sarah also suggested if members were interested in one-day meetings and field trips that the field trip be scheduled the afternoon before the meeting so that if there isn't much interest, the field trip can be cancelled and the meeting would go on as scheduled.

Action Item: Cathy and Steve to research meeting location option for the Spring MAP meeting including the new nature center in Milford, Delaware and options at Bombay Hook, Delaware.

Update: The meeting will be scheduled for March 31st-April 1st in Milford, DE at the DuPont Nature Center.

Unfinished Business/Adjourn

Julie wanted to update the membership that she is no longer working on the Oyster EIS. The draft should be released October 10th and she encouraged any of the states and NGO's that might be impacted by this to look at it.

Julie Slacum will no longer be the MAP Coordinator. Fredrika commented on her work and dedication over the years and presented her with a framed picture as a token of the Panel's appreciation. Julie reminds members that she's not leaving the panel but still participating as a panel member and feels her role as a member will have a better impact on the panel and there is still grant administration work that she will be assisting with. She really enjoyed working with all the members and executive committees and looks forward to supporting the panel as a full-time member.