

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES  
Thursday and Friday, May 12-13, 2005  
Key West, Florida**

Ron Lukens called the meeting to order at 9:00 am. The meeting began with introductions of the Panel members and guests. The following were in attendance:

**Members**

Phil Bass, Mississippi DEQ, Jackson, MS  
Harry Blanchet, LDWF, Baton Rouge, LA  
Paul Carangelo, Port of Corpus Christi Authority, Corpus Christi, TX  
Earl Chilton, TPWD, Austin, TX  
Steven de Kozlowski, SCDNR, Columbia, SC  
Dale Diaz, MDMR, Biloxi, MS  
Pam Fuller, U.S. Geological Survey, Gainesville, FL  
Scott Hardin, FFWCC, Tallahassee, FL  
Leslie Hartman, AL Marine Resources Division, Dauphin Island, AL  
Ted Hendrickx, Georgia DNR, Social Circle, GA  
Tom Herrington, FDA, Stennis Space Center, MS  
Tom Jackson, NOAA-NMFS-SEFSC, Miami, FL  
Herb Kumpf, Member at Large, Panama City, FL  
Jim Lester, HARC, The Woodlands, TX  
Jim Long, National Park Service, Atlanta, GA  
Ronald R. Lukens, GSMFC, Ocean Springs, MS  
Roberto Mendoza, Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo Leon, Mexico  
John E. Meyers, US Coast Guard, New Orleans, LA  
Steve Rider, AL Division of Wildlife and Freshwater Fisheries, Montgomery, AL  
Don Schmitz, FDEP, Tallahassee, FL  
John Teem, FL Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Tallahassee, FL  
Bruce Thompson, LSU Coastal Fisheries Institute, Baton Rouge, LA  
Jay Troxel, USFWS, Atlanta, GA  
David Yeager, Mobile Bay National Estuary Program, Mobile, AL

**Staff**

Nancy K. Marcellus, GSMFC, Ocean Springs, MS

**Others**

Jim Burney, FLEPPC, Riviera Beach, FL  
Chris Furqueron, National Park Service, Atlanta, GA  
Jeff Kline, Everglades National Park, Homestead, FL  
William Loftus, USGS, Homestead, FL  
Donald R. MacLean, USFWS, Arlington, VA  
Jonathan Moczygemba, Texas A&M University, Kingston, TX

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -2-

Glenn Rhett, Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, MS  
Stephanie Robbins, Naval Research Laboratory, Key West, FL  
Michele Tremblay, Northeast Aquatic Nuisance Species Panel, Boscawen, NH  
Bill Zattau, Jacksonville, FL

**Public Comment**

Lukens provided the opportunity for public comment. No public comments were received.

**Review and Adoption of Agenda**

Jay Troxel mentioned that he would provide an HACCP update since Bob Pitman was unable to attend the Panel meeting. A brown tree snake update was added to the agenda to be presented by Jonathan Moczygemba. Herb Kumpf asked that the discussion regarding the invasive species symposium be moved up on the agenda to accommodate early departures. Lukens indicated that the ANSTF update would be provided by Don MacLean, ANSTF staff. Revising state ANS management plans was suggested as another agenda item. **A motion was made by Bruce Thompson to adopt the agenda with the additions/changes noted. Paul Carangelo seconded the motion and the agenda was adopted without objection.**

**Review and Approval of Minutes (November 8-10, 2004, Biloxi, MS)**

Steve de Kozlowski emailed Lukens corrections to minutes. Lukens indicated that those minor corrections would be made to the final minutes. Troxel mentioned that Pat Carter should be removed from the members attending list. **With those changes noted, Jim Lester made a motion to approve the Minutes of the November 8-10, 2004 meeting held in Biloxi, Mississippi. Leslie Hartman seconded the motion, and without objection the minutes were approved.**

**Exotic Pest Plant Council Overview**

Jim Burney, Chairman of the Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council (FLEPPC) provided an overview of the Council and its mission. FLEPPC is a non-profit organization founded in 1985 comprised of dedicated volunteers whose objectives are to:

- facilitate communication and exchange of information regarding all aspects of exotic pest plant biology, distribution, control and management;
- provide a forum where all interested parties may participate in meetings and share in the benefits from the information generated;
- promote an understanding regarding exotic pest plants and their control;
- serve as an advisory council for the continued needs for funding, research, management and control of exotic pest plants;

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -3-

- provide expert advice for various interests concerned with exotic pest plants; review exotic pest plant management problems and activities; and provide updated information for specific management needs.

FLEPPC is not regulatory. One of the most important objectives of FLEPPC is education. Grants are awarded each year to students conducting research on the biology or control of exotic pest plants, and to individuals or organizations for public education and outreach projects.

FLEPPC:

- compiles invasive species lists that are revised every two years. Invasive exotics that are altering native plant communities by displacing native species, changing community structures or ecological functions, or hybridizing with natives are termed Category I invasives. Category II invasive exotics have increased in abundance or frequency but have not yet altered Florida plant communities to the extent shown by Category I species. Professional botanists and others perform exhaustive studies to determine invasive exotic plants that should be placed on the lists.
- funds research and education efforts through grant opportunities.
- develops exotic pest plant management plans.
- presents an annual symposium for the exchange of information and ideas.
- publishes *Wildland Weeds*, a quarterly magazine containing articles and news on all aspects of exotic pest plants and their management.
- maintains a state exotic pest plant sight-record database at the FLEPPC website: [www.fleppc.org](http://www.fleppc.org).

Burney also distributed a brochure “Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council’s 2005 List of Invasive Species.” The purpose of the list is to focus attention on 1) the adverse effects exotic pest plants currently have on Florida’s native biodiversity and the functioning of native plant communities, 2) the habitat losses from exotic pest plant infestations, 3) the impacts on endangered species via habitat loss and alteration, 4) the need to prevent habitat losses through pest-plant management, 5) the socio-economic impacts of these plants (e.g., increased wildfires in certain infested areas), 6) changes in the seriousness of different pest plants over time, and 7) the need to provide information that helps natural area managers set priorities for control programs.

**Ratify E-mail Votes**

Lukens indicated that this agenda item was to ratify votes conducted via email. The first vote was to endorse the Habitattitude outreach campaign. Harry Blanchet explained that due to his interpretation of agency procedure, he was unable to cast votes by email. It was his understanding that LDWF representatives could only cast votes in an open meeting. He was later informed that this was not the case. He asked that the record reflect that Harry Blanchet changed his vote from “no” to “yes” and provided an explanation. John Teem and Roberto Mendoza also indicated that they had

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -4-

provided “yes” votes by email. **Without objection the email vote endorsing the Habitattitude outreach campaign was ratified.**

The second vote to ratify was to accept South Carolina membership to the Panel. John Teem indicated that he had provided a “yes” vote by email. Herb Kumpf, Earl Chilton, and Ted Hendrickx also cast “yes” votes. **Without objection the email vote to accept South Carolina’s membership to the Panel was ratified.**

**Status of State Plans**

Florida - Don Schmitz reported that Florida has been conducting a survey on how much money the state agencies spend on invasive species. For FY 2003-2004, Florida spent \$89.7 million dollars.

Scott Hardin added that of 18 action items in their plan, 7 have been completed and 5 are actively in progress. That leaves 6 items to accomplish. They are now catching up to the original time line for the plan.

Alabama - Steve Rider reported that they had received a verbal “yes” from Governor to proceed with the ANS plan, but they have been unable to get other state agencies on board. They hope to have an official declaration from the Governor by June 1.

Mississippi - Phil Bass reported that according to the contractor (Tulane), they are making progress. They are using Louisiana’s plan and adapting it for Mississippi. They have held 3 meetings, and the contractors indicate it will be completed in 5 meetings.

Louisiana - Harry Blanchet indicated that there has not been a lot of progress since the last meeting. A meeting of the state task force was held and the plan was distributed to state task force members for review. Last year they received a request to import non-native sea worms to be used for fishing bait. "A permit from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service allows import or export of wildlife or wildlife products for commercial purposes. "Commercial purposes" includes such purposes as re-sale, processing, etc., but specifically does not allow release of wildlife or wildlife products into the wild. In the case of Louisiana, it was determined that selling worms as fish bait would result in release of living worms into the environment. The Fish and Wildlife Service permit does not preempt the authority of State fish and game agencies maintain the authority over release of non-native wildlife into their states. As a result, the Secretary of the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries did not issue a permit to allow importation of live sea worms. He noted that if a scientifically sound risk assessment would be provided for this introduction, and concurrence with that assessment is provided through appropriate procedures, he would re-consider that request. Information was gathered and a decision was made to reject that request.

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -5-

Texas - Earl Chilton reported that there has been a drastic increase of giant salvinia in Toledo Bend, too much to treat with herbicides. They are in the process of developing an Invasive Species Council for Texas. The TPWD Executive Director gave approval for TPWD to take the lead in this activity. They recently found apple snails in Texas. Apparently they have a number of species of apple snails so they are sending the specimen out for analysis. Texas has new legislation pending this year regarding the transport of illegal plants. There is also new regulation to allow permits to be issued to grow water spinach. A public hearing on this regulation will be held in the Houston area in June. They are also producing a brochure called "The Dirty Dozen".

Georgia - Ted Hendrickx reported that Georgia is interested in developing an ANS plan. They are currently talking to stakeholders and agency cooperators. Georgia has had its 5<sup>th</sup> case of giant salvinia. They have also received 3 separate reports of channel apple snails, but they are not sure of the exact species.

South Carolina - Steve de Kozlowski reported that South Carolina was selected as pilot state for IAFWA's communications project. This is a three year project. Hydrilla is still the number one concern for South Carolina. Water hyacinth is also a big problem in South Carolina.

Jim Long distributed a sticker "Don't Let it Loose! Be a Responsible Pet Owner." It was recommended that the creator of the sticker attend a Panel meeting and report on problems in the Everglades.

**5-Year Strategic Plan Discussion**

Ron Lukens noted that the references throughout the document do not reflect the panel name change and membership. He stressed that the 5-year plan is just a guideline or a tool to indicate where the Panel is headed and to inform the Task Force as to what issues the Panel will be addressing. This will not limit any activities by the Panel. There was no objection to using this document as guidance for the Panel.

**CEC Meeting in Mexico**

Roberto Mendoza provided a PowerPoint presentation highlighting Suckermouth Catfish.

CEC's Trilateral Meeting on Aquatic Invasive Species Risk Analysis was held February 22, 2005, Arlington, Virginia (Canada, Mexico and the United States)

1. Workshop in Mexico City
2. Meeting in Arlington
3. Future Meeting ?

# **GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MINUTES**

Page -6-

## **Conclusions:**

- The three countries agreed to have regional standards for risk analysis
  - Regional proposal for Risk Analysis considering the original proposal of USA
- Mexico considers a priority the issue of invasive species
  - Effects on biodiversity and commerce
  - Will take the advice of experts, but decisions are reserved to the government

## **Future Agreements:**

- Several federal agencies (CONABIO, SCT, SRE, SHCP, SEMAR, etc.) Under the leadership of SEMARNAT analyze internal procedures to sign an agreement on Ballast Water with the International Maritime Organization
- ASPAN - SPPNA (Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America)

## **Introduced Fish Research in South Florida Natural Areas**

William F. Loftus, USGS Florida Integrated Science Center, Everglades National Park Field Station in Homestead, Florida provided a presentation entitled “Introduced-Fish Studies in Southern Florida Natural Areas.”

## **Collaborators**

NPS - Jeff Kline - Everglades N.P.

University - Joel Trexler; Tim Collins - FIU

NGO - Jerry Lorenz; Jenn Rehage; Krissy Dunker - National Audubon Society

USGS - Leo Nico; Shawn Smith - Florida Integrated Science Center

Funding: NPS, USGS, USFWS, ACOE

ISSUE: Dozens of Tropical Freshwater Fishes Have Been Introduced into South Florida  
What are they? How did they arrive here? What are their effects? Why are they successful here? Can anything be done about them?

## **Introduced Fishes in South Florida**

- 31 introduced species reproducing in Florida’s waters (Shafland 2002); most are freshwater.
- Most are from tropical Asia, South America, and Africa
- Native freshwater fishes originate from temperate North America (35 spp.)
- 15 introduced species in South Florida natural areas; most in family *Cichlidae*.

## **Major Sources of Introductions**

- Planned Introductions

# **GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MINUTES**

Page -7-

- Food-fish Introductions
- Illegal or Accidental Introductions
- Unknown Source

## Sampling Methods

- Throw Trap
- Minnow Trap
- Electrofishing
- Visual

## Temporal Colonizations of the Everglades Region

1960s: Black acara

1970s: Oscar, walking catfish, spotted tilapia, blue tilapia

Mid-1980s: Mayan cichlid, pike killifish, peacock bass, Mozambique tilapia

Late 90s-00s: Jewel cichlid, jaguar cichlid, brown hoplo, banded cichlid, spotfinned spiny eel.

## Canal Inhabitants That Are Potential Future Colonizers of the Everglades

- C. salvini
- C. marulius
- O. mossambicus
- C. citrinellum

## Risk Assessment

*(Preventing future introductions rests in identifying potential problems in advance)*

- Perform taxonomic/life-history/ecology research to understand risks and vulnerabilities
- Model biology of existing pests to screen future introductions
- Identify new introduction vectors

## Community Effects

- Problem: Difficult to demonstrate effects in field with highly variable native fish populations. Effects may be lost in system “noise”.
- Field and mesocosm experiments will help understand mechanisms that give rise to patterns seen in field collections.

## Introduced Fishes in Short-hydroperiod Wetlands: Evaluation of Sampling, Status, and Potential Effects

- Use field studies and mesocosm experiments to test the effects of introduced fishes on native fauna
- Tests for predation, nesting disturbance, and indirect effects of introduced species in disrupting native fish behavior.

# **GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MINUTES**

Page -8-

## Control

- Existing control methods are ineffective in the open Everglades wetlands with connections to “reservoirs” of colonists.
- Eradication is presently impossible except in isolated water bodies.

Research on innovative control methods is needed!

## Pro-active Measures

- Educate public to discourage releases.
- Fund effective, coordinated monitoring.
- Engineer delivery structures that impede access to wetlands.
- Research innovative control methods, as with plants/insects.
- Understand biotic interactions and ecology by experimentation.
- Model existing pests to screen future introductions.

## Northeast Aquatic Nuisance Species Panel

Michele L. Tremblay, Program Manager for the Northeast Aquatic Nuisance Species Panel gave an overview of the Northeast Panel.

## The Panel’s Geographic Scope

7 states (New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Maine) and the Provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia.

## The Panel’s Geographic Participation

- Hosted by the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment
- Panel Co-Chairs: John McPhedran, ME Department of Environmental Protection and Judith Pederson, MIT Sea Grant
- Northeast Provinces and States: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Brunswick, New Hampshire, New York, Nova Scotia, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Quebec
- Plans for Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland

## The Panel’s Mission and Goals

- Mission Statement - “To protect the marine and freshwater resources of the Northeast from aquatic nuisance species through commitment and coordinated action.”
- Goals
  - Prevent introduction, establishment, and dispersal of aquatic nuisance species in the Northeast
  - Control the spread of aquatic nuisance species already introduced into the Northeast



**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -9-

- Mitigate the harmful ecological, economic, social, and public health impacts associated with the introduction, establishment, or spread of aquatic nuisance species in the Northeast
- Bylaws adopted May 17,2004

The Panel's Operational Framework

Objectives

- Regional coordination and leadership for programs
- Regional support for aquatic nuisance species policies
- Regional support for regulatory and legislative actions
- Increase public awareness on importance of prevention
- Support and foster basic and applied research
- Regional clearinghouse for information sharing

The Panel's Membership

- Government (federal, state, regional, tribal, provincial)
- Military
- Research and university
- Nonprofit and non-governmental organizations
- Private industry (with strategies)

The Panels's Committees and Staff

Committees

- Ballast Water  
Mihai (Mike) Balaban, Transport Canada  
Erik Beck, USEPA
- Communication, Education, and Outreach  
Mike Hauser, VT Department of Environmental Conservation  
Chuck O'Neill, NY Sea Grant  
Amy Smagula, NH Department of Environmental Services
- Policy and Legislation  
Anne Monnelly, MA Department of Environmental Protection  
Susannah King, NE Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission
- Science and Technology  
Jason Bake, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management  
Jim Straub, MA Department of Environmental Protection

Contracted Staff

- Michele L. Tremblay, Naturesource Communications

Selected Panel Accomplishments

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -10-

- Semi-annual meetings with “Spotlight on Species” and professional development features including legislation, media relations, and volunteer management
- *NEANS Panel Resource Digest*
- Fact sheet (under revision)
- Two traveling displays
- Website: *northeastans.org* with sub-sites
- Listserve: *panel-subscribe@northeastans.org*
- Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers floating key ring and companion website (second production run)
- Water Chestnut hand-pulling brochure with companion website
- Peer-to-peer coordination on state plan development/revision (MA, NY, ME, VT, & RI)
- Priority species list with control strategies and protocols
- May 2005 Early Detection Rapid Response workshop in Portsmouth, NH (follow-up from Bar Harbor, ME workshop in May 2003)
- Marine ID.org

Planned Panel Activities

- Development strategy
- NEANS Panel website revision with GOMC grant
- Regional ballast water initiative
- Outreach program for non-English speaking communities
- Distribute new order of floating key chains with companion website
- Revised ANS Legislative matrix
- Regional Early Detection - Rapid Response
- Fact sheet revision

Opportunities for Communication, Cooperation, and Collaboration

- Use our listserve: *anspanels@northeastans.org* to inform others of your meetings and workshops
- Reciprocal website links
- Consider reserving time on your agenda for other Panels
- Work together on regional initiatives such as rapid response and early detection or outreach tools
- Schedule time at ANS Task Force meetings for regional panel gatherings

Northeast ANS Sightings

- Eurasian Milfoil in ME
- *Hydrilla* found - and treated for the last two years in Limerick, ME
- Four tunicates found in Prince Edward Island
- MSX in Bras D’or Lakes, NS and PE
- Water Chestnut in MA and NH

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -11-

- *Corbicula* in the Charles River, MA
- Lone cane toad in Augusta, ME

Michele L. Tremblay, Program Manager  
Northeast Aquatic Nuisance Species Panel  
P.O. Box 3019  
Boscawen, NH 03303  
(603) 796-2615  
[mlt@naturesource.net](mailto:mlt@naturesource.net)

[www.northeastana.org](http://www.northeastana.org)  
[info@northeastans.org](mailto:info@northeastans.org)

**Risk Assessment Training Discussion**

One activity included in the current year's work plan is risk assessment training. At a previous meeting, Pam Fuller volunteered to begin work on that activity. Fuller outlined different risk assessments and made contacts with persons to conduct the training. A preliminary date of August 23-26, 2005 and the location of Pensacola, Florida, was selected for the training session. Fuller emphasized that the session would be hands-on and interactive. The Mississippi River Basin Panel indicated that they were also interested in conducting risk assessment training, so some of their members were invited to attend the training session. The strategy is to run concurrent training sessions, with about 40 participants.

Lukens proposed next steps regarding risk assessments:

- Hold additional training opportunities, as necessary
- Panel establish Risk Assessment Work Group
- Panel charge appropriate work group to develop a prioritized list of species and pathways for which risk assessments are needed
- Panel consider work group product and approve as appropriate
- Panel charge Risk Assessment Work Group to develop a plan to conduct risk assessments

After substantial discussion regarding the next steps, it was decided to go forward with the workshop. A report from the workshop will be given at the next Panel meeting. At that time the Panel will decide on next steps, including establishing a risk assessment work group.

**Public Comment**

No public comments were received at this time.

*Meeting recessed at 5:10 pm.*

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES  
Page -12-**

Friday, May 13, 2005

*Meeting reconvened at 9:00 am.*

Earl Chilton responded to the question regarding a ban on imported live oysters that are not native to Texas. There was no new legislation passed in Texas regarding oysters; it was a regulation change. It has nothing to do with retaliation to California banning Texas oysters. The only oyster that was banned previously was Pacific oysters. White list - eastern oyster and horse oyster - only ones legal to bring in live. No provisions for permits. Shucked oysters of other species can be imported.

**Public Comment**

No public comments were received.

**Gulf Invasive Species Symposium**

Herb Kumpf brought up 3 things to address:

1. What is the purpose of the symposium?
2. Do we have this as a separate venue or associate it with another symposium?
3. How do we bring this all about?

This activity is both in the strategic plan and the work plan. The symposium would be held to elevate the importance of the issue in the Gulf of Mexico.

After several Panel members questioned the timing of holding a symposium and whether the Panel was ready to move forward, Kumpf suggested that the Panel table the issue until there was more support within the Panel to proceed.

**2005 Operations Plan and Work Group Assignments**

The Gulf and South Atlantic Regional Panel on Aquatic Invasive Species develops plans to guide the work of the Panel and its established work groups on an annual basis, based on the Five-year Strategic Plan developed by the Panel in 2004. A list of tasks were planned for 2005, and Lukens requested input from Panel members on these tasks.

It was agreed to schedule a work group meeting for the Research and Development Work Group, and to hold a conference call for the Education and Outreach Work Group.

**A motion was made by Harry Blanchet to accept the 2005 Work Plan. The motion was seconded by Paul Carangelo, and with no objection the motion passed.**

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -13-

There was also a request to put the work group membership on the website.

**Administrative Report**

Legislative Update - The Panel was provided lists of Invasive Species Legislation, both federal and state, introduced during the 2005-2006 session. These lists were compiled by Marshall Meyers, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council.

Jonathan Champion, Northeast Midwest Institute, provided the following aquatic invasive species legislation update. The first bill to be introduced this session was S. 363, the Ballast Water Management Act Of 2005. This bill was introduced by Senators Inouye and Stevens on February 10. It only addresses ballast water, and mirrors the provisions of the IMO Convention pretty closely. The deadlines and timelines are the same as IMO. The bill's ballast water standard is actually more stringent than IMO. However, the bill also calls for a review of available ballast technologies prior to any standard going into effect; if no technology can meet the standard based on the outcome of that review, the ballast management program can be revised - i.e., the standard can be relaxed, the deadlines can be pushed back, etc. So there is a chance the bill's very stringent ballast standard may actually end up delaying any meaningful action. No hearings on the bill have been scheduled to date, and there is no House companion bill at this time.

The next item of note is the NAISA legislation. These bills were reintroduced on April 13. The Senate bill is S. 770, introduced by Senators Levin and Collins. The House version is again split into two bills - H.R. 1591 is the "Management" bill sponsored by Representative Gilchrest, and H.R. 1592 is the "Research" bill sponsored by Representative Ehlers. Overall, this is basically the same legislation that was introduced in 2003. Some technical edits were made throughout the bill in response to comments and feedback (changes to the bill's findings, definitions, screening provisions, rapid response provisions, etc.). Some more substantial changes were made to the bill's ballast water section. These were made in response to federal agency comments; they mostly sought to change the structure and mechanics of the ballast water program, but not its overall intent. The changes actually ended up making the ballast provisions more protective. No hearings are scheduled for NAISA at this point in any of the relevant committees.

It is thought that the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is planning to introduce a ballast water management bill. But apparently the majority and minority have not come to any sort of agreement on the approach the bill would take, how to draft it, etc. It is unclear when that legislation will be coming from them.

Committee staff informed them earlier in the year about the outlook for invasive species legislation this session. From what they said, both chambers would like to move an aquatic invasives bill this session. It is possible that would be in the form of a ballast water-only bill,

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -14-

especially in the House. Efforts are still going to be working to push a more comprehensive bill. The best hope for that is to try to move NAISA through the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. If a comprehensive NAISA bill can get through EPW and the Senate, and the House moves a ballast water bill, it might be possible to include all the other provisions - screening, rapid response, etc. - via the conference committee process.

NISC/ISAC Update - Provided by Anna Cherry, Public Relations for NISC

NISC / ISAC FACA-Chartered Task Teams/Subcommittees:

1. Leadership and Coordination
2. Communications, Education and Outreach
3. Control, Management and Restoration
4. Early Detection and Rapid Response
5. Information Management
6. International Cooperation
7. Research
8. Definitions
9. Prevention (Joint with ANSTF)
  - 1) Pathways
  - 2) Screening
  - 3) Risk Analysis

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS:**

1. To date, NISC staff has had some contact with more than 2000 individuals that are engaged on the issue.
2. About 300 federal/state/private programs, 140 groups & 170 organizations have at least some involvement with invasive species.
3. Approximately 35 federal agencies & 24 federal laws have some role/impact in invasive species.

**NISC AND ISAC 2005 ACTIVITIES HIGHLIGHTS:**

1. Revision of the National Invasive Species Management Plan (NISC Plan)
  - Starting Points established with input from NISC, ISAC, Government Accountability Office (GAO) and Office of Management and Budget (OMB)
  - Current plan should be retained as core document
  - Include discussion and clarification of “invasive species” definition
  - Plan should be more prioritized, streamlined and focused
  - Plan should be linked to Invasive Species Performance Based Crosscut Budget

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -15-

- Include measurable goals and set out “game plan” for action over next three (3) years
  - Emphasize leadership & coordination issues
  - Stress economic impact data and highlight outreach efforts
2. 5-Year Review Report of Executive Order 13112
    - As required in the Executive Order, a review of the effectiveness of the Executive Order that created NISC and ISAC will be prepared and submitted to OMB.
  3. Invasive Species Definitions Review and White Paper
    - ISAC subcommittee is working on a document to offer clarification on the issues surrounding the term invasive species and related terms, which is a priority due to increased concern, by certain constituencies that invasive species issues will lead to loss of property rights and incurred costs for landowners. The white paper seeks to clarify confusion regarding the use of terms which leads to misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the science and terminology.
  4. Federal Invasive Species Legal & Regulatory Analysis
    - Complete outline for analysis, review and seek resources for completion of report.
  5. Economic Analysis of Tamarisk
    - Multi-agency team working to produce a model economic analysis that can be used on other invasive species of concern.
  6. Review of Draft NEPA Guidance
    - As called for in the Executive Order on Invasive Species and NISC Plan, a draft guidance document is being developed and reviewed in conjunction with CEQ.
  7. Formalize subcommittee memberships and processes and continue their various projects
    - Develop operating guidelines and mileposts for subcommittees to ensure good use of time and resources in these endeavors. Subcommittees will provide critical input for NISC plan revision.

ANSTF Update - Don MacLean, USFWS, provided an ANSTF update. The ANSTF 2005 Spring Meeting will occur on May 24-26, in Monterrey, California. The meeting will be two and a half days in length and will include reports from the ANSTF ex-officio members on their ANS activities as well as the usual business such as: Regional Panel reports, Committee reports, Working Group reports, and ballast water updates. A special western regional panel session will be held on the second day and will include a presentation on Undaria (an invasive algae) in Monterey Bay Sanctuary as well as a field trip to the National Estuarine Research Reserve at Elkhorn slough. The meeting is open to the public and all are welcome to attend.

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -16-

The announcement for the position of Executive Secretary of the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force closed on April 18<sup>th</sup>. The ANSTF Executive Secretary, a USFWS employee, serves the ANSTF co-chairs and other ANSTF members in implementing the ANSTF Strategic Plan, provides technical support and policy analysis to implement provisions of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act, and provides analysis and recommendations on current and emerging aquatic invasive species issues. Unfortunately, after the position closed, a hiring freeze was placed on the USFWS. They are currently requesting an exemption from the hiring freeze to allow them to fill the position.

The ANSTF was recently asked to develop a revision process for state/interstate groups that already have an approved ANS management plan, but wish to update their plan. A draft process has been developed and should be presented for approval at the next ANSTF meeting.

ANS Grant - Lukens reported that the 2005 grant is in place. The prior grants, including 2005, were actually previous year money, therefore it is possible to have 2 grants at the same time.

2004 Annual Report - The Panel was provided with a copy of the 2004 Annual Report of the Gulf of Mexico Regional Panel on Aquatic Invasive Species. Only state agency information is contained in the report; no non-state or federal member information was included. Lukens hopes to receive better guidance from the Task Force on future annual report submissions.

**Discussion of Regional Panel Logo**

Don Schmitz contracted with Rob Gelhart to develop logos for the regional panel. Three logos were submitted to the Panel for consideration. Each member was asked to vote on the logo of their choice and submit that vote to Lukens. Lukens will contact the Panel regarding the final decision.

**Evaluating Ballast Water Treatment Systems**

A presentation entitled “Overview of NRL Ballast Water Test Facility” was provided by Stephanie Robbins, Research Biologist at the Center for Corrosion Science & Engineering, Naval Research Laboratory in Key West, Florida. (*elemieux@ccs.nrl.navy.mil*)

**Overview**

1.     NRL Background  
       NRL Role in Ballast Water Treatment  
       Ballast Water Treatment Test Facility
  - testing approach
  - supporting experimentation
  - vendor requirements



**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -17-

- other relevant programs
- things to consider

NRL Mission

2. Perform RDT&E in direct support of current and future fleet concerns for condition based maintenance and engineering programs
3. Provide long term engineering solutions and evaluation of materials for improved performance, cost savings and life cycle management
4. Provide corrosion expertise in areas of seawater cathodic protection, materials
5. Provide in-house expertise

Objectives for Ballast Water Treatment

6. Engineer, design & construct a ETV Test Facility capable of testing candidate technologies for ballast water treatment
7. Conduct scientific experiments and engineering design, test and evaluation to support validation of the ETV protocol
8. Perform a beta-test of the ETV protocol and process
9. Test facility to play the role, strictly of 3<sup>rd</sup> part test facility, not a technology certification, but to provide the objective data others will require to certify or authorize

NRL Facility Design for ETV Protocol Testing

- conformance to ETC DRAFT protocol for
- candidate treatment locations
  - during ballasting treatment
  - in tank ballast treatment
  - discharge treatment
- fluid storage
  - pre/post treatment tank
  - test tank
  - control test tank
- fluid handling
  - SW Supply: four 4" x 3", 30 hp pumps
  - Ballast Pumps: Two 6" x 4", 60 hp pumps
  - Pump supply to technology: 8" Nom , Sch 40 PVC piping

ETV Test Approach - Duration and Reliability (Current Protocol)

- modified approach for test duration and reliability
- six biological efficiency tests required to measure treatment effectiveness
- proxy measurements (e.g. Chl, turbidity, particle size, etc.) may be used during non-biological efficiency test cycles

ETV Test Approach - Duration and Reliability (NRL Proposal)

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -18-

- test plan approved and technology received at test facility
- identification and qualification of equipment as acceptable for testing by the test facility
- cooperative installation of the equipment by the Vendor and Test Facility
- start up of equipment
- certification of proper installation and operation by the vendor
- biological verification cycle

**Diagnostic cycles**

- biological verification
- diagnostic cycles of 600 m3/cycle
- biological verification cycle
- maintenance overhaul of ballast equipment

**Diagnostic cycles**

- biological verification cycle

**Instrumentation**

- System wide there are over 100 instrumented sensor for monitoring physiochemical properties at various locations
- System-wide there are also 96 manual, pneumatic and electrically actuated valves for various purposes
- Samples will also be acquired for the analysis of Chlorophyll, POC, DOC, and Nutrient Load

**Operator Control Sequence to Fill Discharge Tank**

- Operator selects system fill conditions
- System continually checks and displays configuration status required for next step in sequence. system also monitors previously established conditions to ensure nothing has changed.
- Operator must initiate each step of sequence once indicated conditions are met

**NRLKW Seawater Chemistry Properties**

**Local Marine Environment**

- TSS
- TOC and Chl\_a
- Bacteria
- Phytoplankton

**“Solving for the Pieces of the Pie” Associated Problems**

Validation & verification or qualification testing has not been done anywhere in the world at full scale, in a standardized format and with statistical rigor. Therefore, there are fundamental questions regarding “how to” perform the testing.

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -19-

On-going efforts: validations & baseline

Completed

- development and approval of ETV test plan to conform to the ETV
- formulations of QA/QC procedures and compliance with ETV requirements
- characterization of local waters via optical and microbiological methods for indigenous species
- determine baseline operating and performance facility properties
- tank holding time effects (1-5 days)

Ongoing

- sparse sample, sampling volume representativeness
- tank size effects
- tank mixing, organism recovery & population characteristics
- flow effects

Sampling Techniques

Zooplankton sampling

- maximize volume sampled and minimize organism loss
- reduce sample size from pipe and time averaged sampling

Pipeline Sampling

Vendor requirements and tech data package request

Requirements

- general requirements
- installation requirements
- operating and maintenance requirements
- system performance requirements

Selection criteria

- performance
- system availability
- installation requirements
- resources funding/cost sharing
- suitability for evaluation per the ETV Protocol

Next Steps

- select beta test vendor
- test “in-house” technologies
- formulate beta test plan
- conduct beta test
- mobile lab for shipboard verifications
- finish the “solving the pieces of the pie”
- re-evaluate and rewrite the test protocol

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -20-

Things to Consider

- analytical biological tools are paramount to economically feasible evaluations of treatment technologies
- surrogate identification and optimization work will require subsequent effort to scale-up and integrate
- mirror or comparable test sites are desirable and likely necessary for reliable and consistent testing in the future
- the testing consider here is geared to validation work and approval testing. Thus results must be
  - rigorous
  - perhaps legally defensible
  - comparable to some DISCHARGE standard

Species Report Update

Pam Fuller gave a PowerPoint presentation entitled “Species Report Update.”

New Crab Records

- Charybdis helleri
  - Sarasota Bay, Florida
  - Jacksonville, Florida
- Callinectes bocourti
  - Collier Co. (SW) Florida

New Frog Records

- Cuban Tree Frog
  - Gadsden County, Florida
- Greenhouse Frog
  - Oktibbeha County, Mississippi
  - Harrison County, Mississippi

Singletons

- Oscar
  - Edisto Drainage, South Carolina
- Pacu
  - Chattahoochee Drainage, Georgia
- Peacock hind
  - Palm Beach County, Florida
- Redtail catfish
  - Galveston Bay

# **GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MINUTES**

Page -21-

## Isolated Populations

- Spotfinned spiny eel
  - Everglades Drainage, Florida
- Nile tilapia
  - Pascagoula River, Mississippi

## St. Tammany Parish, Louisiana

- Rosy reds (fathead minnow)
- Jaguar Guapote
- Southern Platyfish
- Convinct Cichlid
- Green Spotted Pufferfish
- Black Tetra
- Unidentified Tetra
- Green Swordtail
- Oriental Weatherfish

## Other Records of Interest

- Suminoe Oyster
  - Albemarle Sound, North Carolina
- *Tilapia buttikoferi*
  - Ann Arbor, Michigan
- *Sorubimichthys planiceps* (Firewood (shovelnose) catfish)
  - San Francisco, California

## HACCP Update

Jay Troxel, USFWS, gave an HACCP Update.

## HACCP Planning

- Provides readily comparable MP's for similar management actions
- Documents the process for easy review and comparison
- Has the important "sign here" line
- The HACCP tool strategically guides planners to ask the right questions and formulate comprehensive preventative actions

## Support Available

- Fish & Wildlife Service's training academy, NCTC offers a course
- Regional training workshops available from Sea Grant & the Service
- Dedicated website support: *HACCP-NRM.org*

# **GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MINUTES**

Page -22-

Building a reference library of BMP's to remove non-targets from pathways...Why? Both ends of the pathway benefit.

- At the shipping end
  - Proactively prevents unintended species movements
  - Protects agency and stations by documenting efforts to prevent spread
- At the receiving end
  - Risks and prevention BMP's can be reviewed and evaluated BEFORE delivery and release. High risk pathways can be blocked.

## **Resource Allocation**

- HACCP planning is an excellent prioritization tool
- Helps managers manage funding and justify decisions.

*Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) planning is a management tool that provides a structured method to identify risks and focus procedures in natural resource pathway activities. Evaluating pathways and developing plans to reduce non-target species and prevent biological contamination is necessary to avoid unintended spread of non-native species and biological invasions. The website HACCP-NRM.org is intended to help natural resource managers create and implement HACCP plans. Everything you need to get started is available online.*

## **Brown Tree Snake Update**

Jonathan Moczygemba, a graduate student from Texas A&M, Kingston, gave a presentation on the North America Brown Tree Snake Control Team.

## **Why Be Concerned About Brown Tree Snakes?**

- Ecological - poses a threat to native wildlife due to biology and generalist diet
- Economic - on Guam causes power outages, but the costs associated with control run into the millions
- Human Health - limited to allergic reactions from bites, but certain individuals could have greater reactions

## **Injurious Wildlife List (Within the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981)**

- Illegal to acquire, receive, transport, or possess brown tree snakes in the United States

## **NABTSCT Formed (2002)**

- Compliment group of Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force

# **GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES MINUTES**

Page -23-

- Formed to inspire and facilitate communication, cooperation, and understanding within and between agencies and organizations and to provide coordination of efforts between agencies concerning brown tree snake issues

## **Mission**

“To prevent the invasion of brown tree snakes into continental North America through education and awareness and through rapid response assessments of potential sightings via a partnership of stakeholders”

## **Membership**

- Concerned individuals from numerous agencies
- Not official representatives of respective agencies

## **Membership Needed**

- Gulf Coast Regional Panel - ANS Task Force
- Western Regional Panel - ANS Task Force
- Zoos
- Herpetological Organizations
- NGO's; Ex: The Nature Conservancy
- Wildlife Control Organizations
- Professional Societies; Ex. The Wildlife Society
- Commercial Airlines
  - Continental
  - Northwest

## **What Does NABTSCT Do?**

- Maintains a coordinating website
- Develops educational material that can be downloaded from website
- Conducts rapid response to investigate potential brown tree snake sightings
- Represents NABTSCT at scientific meetings
- Provides a forum to share information between agencies, cooperators, and organizations

## **How to Become a NABTSCT Member**

- Website: *www.NABTSCT.org*
- Give business card to Jonathan.

## **Rapid Response Plan**

The Panel was provided a copy of the Rapid Response Plan for the Gulf of Mexico Region prepared for the National Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force. This is the final document which was submitted to Sea Grant per the agreement with them. This document will require

**GULF & SOUTH ATLANTIC REGIONAL PANEL  
ON AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES  
MINUTES**

Page -24-

continuous updates. An MOU would need to be implemented among the states. A Work Group could develop an MOU and include language regarding the rapid response plan. Any suggestions to streamline the document should be sent to Lukens.

**Next Meeting Time and Place**

The last week of October or the month of November 2005 was selected as a time frame for the next Panel meeting. A location of Corpus Christi, Texas was selected, and a location of Charleston, South Carolina was suggested for the next spring meeting.

**Public Comment**

Lukens again provided the opportunity for public comment. No comments were received.

***There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm.***