

Aquatic Nuisance Species State Management Planning: Great Lakes Regional Perspectives

Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force Meeting

Tom Ridge Environmental Center at Presque Isle
Erie, Pennsylvania
May 9, 2007

Welcome and Introduction

Mamie Parker, Co-chair of the Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) Task Force, welcomed meeting participants and introduced Kathe Glassner-Shwayder, Senior Project Manager (Great Lakes Commission (GLC)), to introduce the day's session on state management planning for ANS, specifically work completed under the National Sea Grant-funded project *A Collaborative Approach to Advance Implementation of State Management Plans for the Prevention and Control of Aquatic Nuisance Species in the Great Lakes Region*. Others who also welcomed participants and made introductory remarks included Jim Grazio, (Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Protection (DEP)); Cathleen Curran Myers, Deputy Director for Water Management (Pennsylvania DEP); and Tim Eder, Executive Director (GLC).

Regional Perspectives

Regional Perspectives: State Management Planning for Great Lakes Aquatic Invasions
<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/Shwayder-ANS-SMP-RegionalPerspectives-ANSTF-Meeting.pdf>

Shwayder opened the session explaining the purpose of the day's plenary session: to share experiences and lessons learned by the Great Lakes states in development and implementation of state management plans (SMPs), including the benefits of taking a collaborative approach in development and implementation of the plans. This information would then be used to guide break-out discussions on successful strategies for SMP development and implementation, challenges in the SMP process and strategies to address them, creative funding strategies, the feasibility of regional management planning, and ways the regional ANS Panels can work together with each other and the ANS Task Force to more effectively advance the SMP process.

Shwayder described the GLC's mission and related institutional capacity for regional governance, as well as the GLC long-term commitment to addressing problems associated with Great Lakes aquatic invasions. In this role, the GLC has conducted several projects on ANS prevention and control, including the regionally based SMP project in efforts to advance progress on this issue in the Great Lakes states. Giving further weight to this project, she also provided an overview of the federal legislative framework for developing state ANS plans, noting the associated challenges that the states are dealing with regarding the development and implementation of their SMPs. The value of the SMP process was noted in the following areas:

- engages agencies on a multijurisdictional level, including a wide array of stakeholders;
- reinforces collaboration on a federal, regional, state and local level to prioritize and resolve ANS problems;
- facilitates information sharing, development of consistent messages, coordination and complementary plans, reduction of duplication of efforts
- raises awareness on ANS issues to leverage action on ANS prevention and control.

Under the regional SMP project, state-specific workshops were conducted in the Great Lakes region to help them address these challenges, with the focus of each based on the status of that state's ANS management plan. The six states included Wisconsin, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio. Shwayder highlighted several successes of the project which included increasing public awareness on ANS issues, determining SMP strategies for their successful development and implementation, and partnerships established across jurisdictional lines. Also discussed was how the process of consensus

building conducted during each workshop led to the engagement of participants in the process of identification of ANS priorities.

Shwayder gave a brief discussion on the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration (GLRC) and recommended priorities for ANS prevention and control. She noted several GLRC recommendations supporting a vector-based approach to ANS management as listed below:

- Maritime commerce—Elimination of ship- and barge-mediated introduction and spread of ANS in the Great Lakes
- Canals and waterways—Enactment of federal, state, and local measures to ensure that the region's canals and waterways are not vectors for ANS
- Organisms in trade—Prevention of introduction and spread through trade and potential release of live organisms
- Evaluation—Development and evaluation of cost-effective vector-specific outreach and education programs

Shwayder proposed areas for future work on ANS management, including promoting vector-based management as a systematic approach for developing strategies to prevent and control aquatic invasions, identification of high risk ANS vectors and associated species, assessment/evaluation of current management efforts addressing these vectors, and the development of tools to strengthen vector-based management. Emphasized was the need for cooperation, coordination, and collaboration, given the realities of limited resources. Meeting participants were encouraged to build partnerships and brainstorm ideas during the break-out sessions to leverage action on ANS state management planning.

State Management Planning in the Great Lakes Region

<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/EJensen-SMPPresentation.pdf>

Erika Jensen, Sea Grant Fellow (GLC), gave a presentation discussing the collaborative SMP project in more detail. She gave a brief overview of the status of state management planning in the Great Lakes region and the framework for the project. Jensen explained the involvement of the three project partners: the GLC; the Great Lakes Sea Grant Network; and state agencies. The project partners were brought together and designated roles under a Memorandum of Understanding. Each of these entities brought various strengths and experience to the project:

- State agencies—have the authority to develop and implement management strategies; workshop focused on their needs
- Sea Grant programs—have outreach and awareness resources and expertise; able to reach a broad spectrum of stakeholders
- Great Lakes Commission—has coordinative and consensus-building expertise; provides a regional perspective

Workshops were held with the six states between October 2005 and April 2007. Jensen gave a brief description of each workshop, providing an introduction for the state presentations which would occur next. She also provided information on an SMP briefing paper, originally drafted in 2005, that is undergoing review and will be brought up to date for release during the summer of 2007. The 2005 draft and other project materials, including workshop agendas and summaries, are available online at <http://www.glc.org/ans/initiatives#advance>. Jensen encouraged people to access and read the final briefing paper when it becomes available online and directed the group to the executive summary, included in the conference packet provided by the GLC.

Great Lakes State Perspectives

Progress in Wisconsin on the State Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan

<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/Moy-WI-SMP-ANSTF-Meeting-May-07.pdf>

Phil Moy (University of Wisconsin Sea Grant) reported that the Wisconsin Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Management Plan (ISMP) was finished in 2003. The focus since completion of the ISMP has been on distribution of an AIS resource handbook. The handbook was developed by the Wisconsin Department of

Natural Resources, in coordination with University of Wisconsin Sea Grant and Extension. It lists AIS resources (people, websites, and other), includes information on management/control and educational programs, and empowers conservation district managers and lake association members in their efforts to prevent and control AIS.

As part of the GLC project, Wisconsin Sea Grant held a series of 4 workshops in the fall of 2005 that were used to distribute the handbook and increase awareness on AIS issues in Wisconsin. The workshops were attended by over 140 people representing 111 entities, agencies or regional offices. In addition, this series of handbook workshops were followed up by a grant-writing workshop, based on interest expressed by participants. Moy expressed the value of these workshops in engaging and educating a broad spectrum of stakeholders.

Moy next described several projects being implemented as part of Wisconsin's AIS program, including watercraft inspection; outreach/awareness efforts; monitoring efforts for zebra mussels, Eurasian watermilfoil, spiny water fleas, rusty crayfish, and the toxic blue-green alga *Cylindrospermopsis*; purple loosestrife biocontrol; research (focusing on predictive models); and AIS grants pertaining to education, early detection and rapid response, and control of established populations.

Progress toward a Comprehensive Invasive Species State Management Plan for Minnesota
<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/Moy-WI-SMP-ANSTF-Meeting-May-07.pdf>

Doug Jensen (University of Minnesota Sea Grant) described Minnesota's efforts to develop an SMP, which have been continually stalled until recently. With leadership from the Minnesota Invasive Species Advisory Council (MISAC), funding from the GLC, and stakeholder input gathered at the SMP workshop, the Minnesota SMP is now almost complete.

Minnesota's efforts to develop an SMP are somewhat unique in that the state has been working to develop a comprehensive plan for invasives that includes both aquatic and terrestrial species. Jensen explained that a comprehensive SMP was undertaken for a number of reasons, including supportive language in the National Invasive Species Act (1996); statutory requirement for both Minnesota DNR and Minnesota Department of Agriculture; desire for a common structure for coordinating and guiding state response; establishing similar goals and strategies for all types of invasive species; creating common vocabulary (e.g., detection, inspection); strengthening relationships and bringing in new partners to collaboratively respond to invasive species; and sharing lessons learned from aquatic and terrestrial arenas. Toward this end, an ad hoc drafting team of MISAC representatives developed a systematic approach for writing and reviewing the SMP. The draft plan includes four elements: prevention, early detection and rapid response, management, and leadership and coordination.

Jensen then discussed the workshop held October 24, 2005, in Roseville, Minn. as part of the GLC project. Goals of the workshop included assisting in the development and implementation of a comprehensive state plan for managing invasive species. Approximately 70 stakeholders from federal, state, tribal, and local agencies, academia, environmental, conservation, industry, and lake associations attended the workshop. Workshop sponsors wanted to provide an opportunity for further review and comment on a framework for the draft plan and determine which actions organizations could contribute to or what resources they could provide. Jensen noted that break-out sessions provided an excellent forum for achieving those goals. Workshop evaluations completed by participants also suggested that the workshop was successful.

Based on the Minnesota experience, Jensen encouraged other states to develop plans to include terrestrial and aquatic invasives and to utilize frameworks of other plans to help drafting teams better understand approaches to invasive species management. He described several significant outcomes of the workshop, including stronger and new partner relationships; closer to having a final plan; identification of potential funding and collaboration; and the bridging of gaps. Jensen indicated that, with only a couple more steps, the final aquatic portion of the comprehensive plan can be submitted to the ANSTF for approval later in 2007.

Pennsylvania Aquatic Invasive Species SMP in the Context of a State Invasive Species Council
<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/Grazio-SMPSummitPA-ANSTF-Meeting-May-07.pdf>

Jim Grazio (Pennsylvania DEP) discussed the efforts of Pennsylvania in prevention and control of AIS, especially a number of high-risk invasive species of concern in the state. To address these species, state

Executive Order 2004-1 created the Pennsylvania Invasive Species Council, made up of seven state agencies, academia, and industry, and to advise and direct the development and implementation of a comprehensive (aquatic and terrestrial) SMP. Despite this directive, efforts to develop a comprehensive SMP languished and interested parties thought a workshop could renew energy for developing Pennsylvania's SMP. The workshop, held as part of the GLC project, was conducted October 26 and 27, 2005, for approximately 65 participants.

The workshop divided participants into several work groups to brainstorm on a number of issues such as the goals and purpose of a Pennsylvania SMP, long and short-term needs, and priority strategies and tasks. Grazio described workshop outcomes significant to the ANS management plan, including determining goals, objectives, and priority actions, as well as establishing a definition for ANS. Despite a lack of action in 2004, the aquatic section of the plan was finished in Oct. 2006, thanks to help from the GLC and its collaborative approach. The plan was signed by Governor Rendell in Nov. 2006, and approved by the ANSTF in Feb. 2007. Grazio indicated the aquatic plan will likely serve as model for the terrestrial plan. He said the development process helped them to understand that individuals are key to the process, clear language is needed, and to be careful what you wish for.

Cathy Curran Myers (Pennsylvania DEP) commended John Booser (Pennsylvania DEP) for his contributions to this process and indicated now that the plan is approved, she will make it a state and regional priority.

Invasive Species Regulation in Michigan: Stakeholders Workshop

<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/Swinehart-Invasive-Species-Regulation-In-Michigan-May-07.pdf>

Carol Swinehart (Michigan Sea Grant) reported on invasive species regulation in Michigan, initiated by the approval of the Michigan SMP in 1996 and bolstered by the Transgenic and Invasive Species Act of 2005, which included lists of prohibited and restricted species that legislators considered invasive. In addition to the list and several other requirements, the act created the Invasive Species Fund, supported by collection of fines for possession, as well as the Invasive Species Advisory Council (ISAC), covering both aquatic and terrestrial species. Members of ISAC are representatives from the Michigan Dept. of Natural Resources (chair), Dept. of Environmental Quality, and Dept. of Agriculture. ISAC representatives are also members of the preexisting ANS Council, which provides oversight to the implementation of Michigan's SMP, although that group includes other entities as well. Swinehart said the two groups have been meeting jointly since October 2006 and may be integrated at some point. The ISAC is responsible for reviewing the list of prohibited and restricted species and recommending additions to and/or deletions from the lists. Swinehart said the current regulation does not define "prohibited" and "restricted" species and provides no process or criteria for listing or de-listing species. This gap provided the focus for Michigan's workshop under the GLC project.

Swinehart described the Michigan workshop which was designed to elicit stakeholder perspectives on the development of a process for listing/de-listing prohibited and restricted species, as part of a regulatory approach to invasive species management. The workshop was held September 21, 2006, in Bath, Mich. with over 40 representatives from a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups. The format included plenary presentations providing background to workshop participants and then break-out sessions to gather input and recommendations for developing a listing/de-listing process.

Swinehart indicated that feedback on the workshop was generally good, although some people were disappointed that the workshop discussion wasn't designed to actually draft the process. However, based on workshop outcomes, ISAC staff developed a draft process and information guide. Sea Grant also held a follow-up meeting and invited workshop participants to present comments on the draft documents to the ISAC staff. Only five sets of comments were submitted, indicating that not everyone who was initially interested carried through with feedback. ISAC staff will now consider comments and discuss the final process and information guide, which will likely be incorporated when Michigan's SMP is next updated. Swinehart highlighted lessons learned from the process, including the importance of flexibility to accommodate changing contexts for ANS management; constructive engagement of stakeholders are crucial to success of planning and implementation; and the value of strengthening relationships among all those involved.

Indiana Digs into the Aquatic Plant Trade

<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/Swinehart-Invasive-Species-Regulation-In-Michigan-May-07.pdf>

Kristin TePas (Illinois–Indiana Sea Grant) and Doug Keller (Indiana Dept. of Natural Resources) provided an overview of Indiana’s workshop under the GLC project and its role in helping Indiana develop strategies to manage organisms in trade, a significant mechanism of ANS introduction and spread. Indiana has had recent detections of hydrilla in Lake Manitou (an inland lake in Northern Indiana about 50 miles from the Michigan border) and Brazilian elodea, both aquatic plants in trade, and thus the workshop was ideal to address this vector of ANS spread and introduction.

TePas described the workshop which took place at the annual Indiana Green Expo and included several informational presentations, after which people participated in break-out sessions to discuss important components of a various approaches to ANS management. The approaches considered were regulatory, voluntary best management practices that the plant industry could adopt, and helpful outreach and education strategies for businesses and consumers. TePas summarized results of the break-out sessions, which were consistent among the various groups, as well as next steps for an Indiana Invasive Aquatic Plant Working Group formed as a result of the workshop. These results highlighted the need to address the Indiana aquatic invasive plant issue through a combination of regulation, best management practices and outreach. The ultimate goal of the process is to develop black list / white list (regulated / unregulated) of plants known to be in trade, however, the Working Group will help determine best management strategies or outreach efforts that can be implemented to reduce the potential for introduction of plants not invasive enough to warrant regulations.

Keller then discussed Indiana’s current SMP and the progress of associated ANS management activities. The Indiana SMP was approved in 2003, and to date, Keller has had primary responsibility for tracking its implementation. Although other states’ plans are more general, Indiana focused its plan on the plant trade. He explained how the state has been implementing activities regarding rapid response, early detection and monitoring, control of established ANS, outreach, and regulation. Much of Indiana’s efforts have been focused on rapid response to respond to new infestations of hydrilla and Brazilian elodea, and funding for these efforts has “cannibalized” other state programs. Keller expressed his frustration that federal agencies have provided little if any funding, despite the status of hydrilla as a federally regulated plant and it’s presence in Indiana as the forefront in the range of established populations in the U.S.

Development of Ohio’s Rapid Response Plan for ANS

<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/Navarro-Braig-Ohio-SMP-Wksp-RRP-May-07.pdf>

John Navarro (Ohio Dept. of Natural Resources) and Eugene Braig (Ohio Sea Grant College Program) provided an update on the progress of state management planning in Ohio. Ohio’s ANS state management plan was approved in 1997, and the state is now developing a rapid response plan as a component of an update to the plan. Navarro provided a brief overview of the SMP and the need for rapid response plan. Braig provided an overview of the process for developing the plan, which includes gathering public input through their workshop held as part of the GLC project. The workshop was attended by approximately 50 participants representing Sea Grant advisory committees, citizen groups, watershed groups, soil and water conservation districts, industry and federal, state and local agencies.

The workshop included a plenary session featuring several presentations, followed by break-out sessions. Braig described the Nominal Group Process which was used to gather, organize and prioritize the ideas generated by workshop participants. He then reviewed results from each group which resulted in the identification of a number of ideas, including the following six priorities: 1) establish a “war chest” of designated funding; 2) develop a framework or flowchart for problem solution; 3) have formalized monitoring programs; 4) continue prevention activities; 5) establish an approved set of tools for rapid response situations; and 6) prioritize species on which to focus response efforts.

Navarro indicated that information gathered from the workshop will be used to draft a rapid response plan, after which it will be incorporated into Ohio’s revised SMP. He also mentioned the reconvening of an ANS Advisory Committee to review those documents.

Common Themes from Great Lakes SMP Workshops

<http://www.glc.org/ans/documents/Shwayder-ANS-SMP-CommonThemes-ANSTF-Meeting.pdf>

Shwayder thanked presenters for sharing lessons they had learned through respective state-specific workshops as part of the SMP collaboration project. She provided a summary presentation to bring the focus back to the broader issues associated with SMP development and implementation activities and provide a foundation for the afternoon break-out discussions. In efforts to provide broad and easy access to the workshop activities and outcomes, Shwayder said session presentations and a final project report will be available on the GLC website, assuming permission from presenters.

She summarized common themes from the Great Lakes SMP workshops in building a framework for regional ANS management, highlighting beneficial workshop outcomes, including:

- Advancing SMPs at various stages in the process while accommodating the differing priorities and contexts among the states (one size didn't fit all);
- Providing a framework for further SMP-related activities;
 - Ohio rapid response advisory group (in development)
 - Indiana invasive plant work group (in development)
 - Michigan public meetings on species listing
 - Pennsylvania follow up meeting to complete SMP
 - Minnesota follow up meetings
 - Wisconsin DNR AIS grant writing workshops
- Providing an educational forum
 - Raising awareness and understanding among stakeholders on ANS issues
 - Dissemination of educational materials
 - Advertising existing resources
 - Laying groundwork for regulations
 - Engaging stakeholders in the SMP process to promote buy-in through breakout session to discuss and prioritize issues;
- Strengthening partnerships among state agencies, Sea Grant programs, and regional entities; and
- Streamlining the sharing of resources among the lead organizations.

Shwayder emphasized the value of the project at establishing/strengthening partnerships within the state between agencies, Sea Grant and the GLC, facilitated by a Memorandum of Understanding which clarified roles and responsibilities; provided a mechanism for pass through of funds; facilitated dialogue between the sponsoring organizations; and laid the groundwork for future SMP work. She also said the project workshops helped to identify gaps and unmet needs to address in the future, such as vector-based analysis, developing a mechanism to measure progress under the SMP process, and enhancing relationships between states to facilitate regional ANS management planning.

Two recommendations were forwarded to the ANSTF: 1) encouraging the ANSTF to work with partners to obtain authorization for additional funding for regional panel; and 2) pursuing federal assistance (such as equipment and people) to implement state-led control and response strategies.

Break-out Sessions

ANSTF and audience members were invited to participate in two rounds of break-out sessions to brainstorm on strategies to improve and advance the SMP process, with the first session focusing on state ANS management planning and the second on enhancing the regional and federal role in the planning process. Break-out discussions were guided by 2 sets of questions developed by the project team that included representatives from state agencies and Sea Grant programs. The discussions were held in 3 groups facilitated by Kathe Glassner-Shwayder (Group 1), Rochelle Sturtevant (Great Lakes Sea Grant Network, Group 2), and Frank Lichtkoppler (Ohio Sea Grant, Group 3). Meeting participants were randomly assigned to groups by numbering off. At the conclusion of both rounds of discussion, a

spokesperson from each group reported back to the whole. *Priority recommendations are identified below, for a complete listing, please see attached.*

Session I: State ANS Management Planning

The following questions were provided to guide discussions during the first break-out session:

1. Identify strategies (e.g. planning tools, stakeholder involvement, management practices) used by the Great Lakes states contributing to successful development/implementation of SMPs.
 - a. How can these strategies be communicated to other jurisdictions working on ANS management planning?
 - b. What can we learn from each other across jurisdictional lines (state, provincial, federal) regarding this SMP process?
2. Identify challenges in SMP development and implementation and strategize ways to address these challenges. Please extend this discussion beyond 'insufficient funding.'
3. If your state has received federal funding to implement an ANS SMP, how was the money put to use?
 - a. Which funded activities were of the greatest value in terms of accomplishing SMP goals/objectives?
 - b. If more resources were available, how could they best be utilized?
 - c. What guidelines can we recommend in terms of SMP funding allocation on a state and federal level?
4. The ANSTF has asked for perspectives on:
 - a. Are the current state management plan development and implementation guidelines useful? Outdated? Too prescriptive?
 - b. How should state management plans be apportioned? Equal shares for each plan? A larger share for new plans? Funded only for a set period of time?

The following priority recommendations were identified and reported out from each group:

Group 1

- Regarding funding allocation, consideration should be given for a set number of years that a state can receive funding at a given amount (a new approach to funding with a sunset clause).
- Regional panels should have their members review the SMP guidelines and identify which priorities to keep. The reviewed guidelines should be forwarded to the Executive Secretary, who could then write a draft revision of the guidelines to send out to the ANSTF and regional panels for comment.
- Key guiding principles to help the states begin developing their plans are the following: dedicated funding (seed money), a dedicated person, stakeholder buy-in (through simple economical analyses of who will benefit or be harmed by ANS), and an expert from a neighboring state that has a completed or nearly completed plan.
- Economic analysis of invasive species will help gain political support.

Group 2

- Use cost-sharing programs, which have been successful in some states.
- Go beyond environmental impacts and use economic impacts to sell the issue.
- Share success stories, such as situations where people successfully prevented zebra mussel introductions.
- Promote prevention through public education, watercraft inspections, early detection and monitoring, and enforcement.
- Find key constituencies to support SMPs, such as The Nature Conservancy, lake groups, and others who can influence legislators.
- Develop a structure that coordinates reporting among different levels in the management chain.

- Revise guidelines to accept terrestrial as part of comprehensive plans, even though ANSTF funding could be used only for aquatic SMPs.

Group 3

- Sharing experiences, such as through state-to-state mentoring, is key for guiding others.
- Groups could share their success stories for how they found creative funding solutions, leveraged funding, involved all stakeholders, and avoided “turf wars” among agencies.
- Apportionment of SMP funding must recognize that all stages of the process have real funding needs. Equal distribution is the fairest way to apportion existing funds. If more funding is available, rapid response might drive additional apportionment of funds.

After group priorities were shared, the floor was opened to discussion. Two main issues emerged: framing public outreach to leverage desired outcomes regarding ANS prevention and control and finding additional funding. It was noted that, to date, the approach taken for ANS outreach efforts has been “fear-based” in conveying information on ANS problems. Concern was expressed that a negative approach may not be most effective when asking people to invest and measure success by the amount of money garnered. It was suggested that there be a shift to frame the discussion in terms of positive outcomes to stakeholders, whether they are regular taxpaying citizens or legislators: show them how they can benefit from an SMP and activities to prevent or control ANS.

People suggested a variety of ways to find additional funding. Some consultants work with environmental organizations to develop long-term funding strategies and financial management plans. Other federal grant programs can be potential sources of funds if it is shown how they fit with an SMP. The regional panels have started to leverage private funding sources as well, a strategy that also gives corporations opportunities to advertise their environmental stewardship. The Sea Grant Program, which does have a lobbyist, can pursue more of its appropriation, so those having anything to do with Sea Grant should be talking to their directors.

Session II: Regional ANS Management

The following questions were provided to guide discussions during the second break-out session:

1. Based on the successes and challenges identified in the previous session, would it be beneficial and/or feasible to coordinate ANS management plans on a regional basis to address any broad-scale issues? Examples include of broad scale issues early detection/monitoring, rapid response, communication, funding, among others.
2. How can the ANS Task Force and Federal agency capabilities assist in the development or implementation of ANS management plans at the state and regional level? (e.g., communication, research, permitting issues, screening process)
3. How can the Regional ANS Panels work together with each other and the ANS Task Force to more effectively advance the SMP process?

The following priority recommendations were identified and reported out from each group:

Group 1

- A listserv approach should be used for regional communication among ANS panels.
- Efficiencies in resource allocation are needed (such as pooling resources to address a regional priority). The following examples were offered as a regional approach to leveraging resources: the regional rapid response plan for zebra mussel invasions of the Columbia River Basin in the Pacific Northwest; species-specific plans developed by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation; and a regional monitoring program using a standardized approach.
- More voices from a regional ANS group are needed to leverage funding from federal agencies, Congress, and others.

Group 2

- Develop a regional rapid response plan such as that for the Columbia River Basin.

- Use individual SMP strengths to identify ideas for a regional approach.
- Get federal agencies involved at the local level and discourage excessive representation from any one department.
- Have liaisons among the regional panels.

Group 3

- People shouldn't jump into regional planning until state plans are all in place. If funding is diminished, it is better to stay with state plans. There is a need to strengthen consistency among state plans. Given that each plan is submitted separately, they are not reviewed for consistency collectively.
- The ANSTF needs to look at what the federal agencies can provide in in-kind contributions.
- Groups are sharing their experiences. Federal involvement in regional panels is important for knowing federal counterparts and maintaining lines of communication.

Discussion following group reports highlighted several major points regarding funding for SMPs, improving management and the role of regulation. With regards to funding, the group asked for strong federal leadership to increase the amount of funding provided for SMP work and thought it was important to demonstrate a promising outcome when attempting to secure funding investments for priority ANS issues, as well as to have a financial plan to aid in identifying potential funding sources. Participants recommended states prioritize vectors and high risk species based on criteria (e.g., ecological, economic impacts, feasibility of management) and develop an evaluation process to ensure funding is spent wisely and states can communicate success. Needs were also identified to determine the value and feasibility of developing a combined plan of aquatic and terrestrial invasive species plan and to improve preparedness to respond to ANS invasions. Discussion regarding a regulatory approach to ANS management suggested that a strong foundation of support is needed to establish the enabling legislation (e.g., listing process for prohibited ANS) and that states and federal representatives need to work together on regulatory issues.

There was also discussion on sun-setting funding for SMPs (which would also lead to sun-setting reporting to the ANS Task Force) and measuring results. The Co-Chairs of the ANS Task Force, Mamie Parker and Timothy Keeney, commented that they would further discuss information garnered through these sessions and come back to the Task Force with a response.

It was also decided that the regional panels will develop recommendations for the ANS Task Force regarding SMP guidelines, regional approaches to management, and SMP funding approaches. Shwayder reiterated that results of the break-out sessions would be posted to the GLC website along with an associated session summary, the SMP briefing paper and presentations.

Attachment: Break-out Session Notes

Group I – Break-out Session I

Strategies/Approaches

1. Multi-stakeholder approach is necessary
2. Partnerships between state/local stakeholders
3. Trust in communication
4. Economic analysis can support strategy
5. Sea Grant as a valuable and important partner for coordination and outreach
6. Non-regulatory partners are valuable (e.g. Extension programs)
7. Industry participation helpful and valuable
8. Priority issues/problems should drive process
9. Funding for facilitation to get process started
10. Agency/political champion to help drive process (e.g. Executive Order)
11. Use regional panels to help states communicate with each other

Communications/Learning

1. Communications should be facilitated by regional panels
2. Up front buy-in by stakeholders

Challenges

1. Working together gives us a bigger bang for our buck (e.g., The SMP initiative, based on partnerships between state agencies, Sea Grant and the Great Lakes Commission, led to significant progress on the SMPs in each state with a relatively small amount of funding).
2. Need to develop creative approaches for funding; including incentives for private sector investment in solutions to ANS problems whenever possible (e.g. power company involvement in KS, NY). Regional ANS Panel should pool expertise to help develop of a funding strategy.
3. Critical to get all the right stakeholders around the table
4. Determine how to establish political will for passage of ANS legislation, such as NAISA. (Examine how global climate change has risen to the top as an environmental priority)
5. Economics drives political action – need socio-economic analysis approach to determine economic losses occur with ANS invasions
6. Issue needs to become more “real” for politicians (imminent)
7. Tie in how ANS impacts affect people’s daily lives
8. Educational challenges

Funding

1. Once funding is received, there needs to be dedicated staff assigned to work on ANS, fragmentation of staff needs to be avoided
2. State management plans elevate the importance of ANS at both the federal and state levels
3. Assign funding (cost estimates) to address priority needs
4. Plan provides accountability to the legislature
5. Funding must be shared between federal and state agencies
6. SMP needs to be used to in providing a focus in raising money (i.e. cost figures need to be assigned to priority needs, use SMP as a tool to provide accountability to state legislature)

Management plan development/implementation

1. Develop incentives to acquire other funding
2. Funding allocation: Allocate federal funding in larger amounts for new plans for specified period of time to get plan off the ground; see what it can accomplish (Rationale: provide a larger sum of money during the initial phase of SMP implementation, allowing for more progress, giving state agency incentive to take ownership in terms of future funding)
3. Build programs to be sustainable over time
4. Provide formal feedback to ANSTF on state management plan guidelines using workshop outcomes as guidance
5. Regional panels should review current ANSTF Guidelines and subsequently recommend the ANSTF Executive Secretary revise those guidelines

Group I – Break-out Session II

Regional ANS Management

1. More voices talking to federal agencies, Congress, etc.
2. Regional monitoring can provide valuable information (use standardized approach)
3. Coordinated information, education and outreach (use consistent message)
4. Efficiencies in resource allocation (e.g. pooling resources to address a regional priority)
 - a. Examples: rapid response plan developed by Pacific Northwest and species-specific plans done by Chesapeake Bay Foundation
5. Regional priorities may help secure funding
6. Regional planning should not supplant state planning
7. Opportunities for regional panels to communicate/coordinate (use a Listserv)

Group 2 – Break-out Session I

Lessons Learned

1. Grant funding for SMP
2. Executive approval, local/user and agency manager buy-in
3. Get a line item in the budget for “Implementation of SMP”
4. Find a key constituency to support SMP
5. Find new money; create dedicated funding
6. Secure top level support to find new funding
7. Create an information matrix of current funding sources (state and Federal)

Challenges

1. Coordinating structure for reporting and communication between different levels of management
2. Follow-through after plan development; find a way to maintain interest without funding
3. Getting people to the table
4. ANS is not seen as a problem in some states
5. Selling the need for prevention
6. Taking an ecosystem approach
7. Involving/getting buy-in from private sector
8. Proving success

Strategies

1. Partnering with local groups to secure support and more funding
2. Involve all parties in an advisory capacity
3. Have a dedicated staff person (e.g. ANS Coordinator)
4. Trans-boundary or watershed approach (e.g. cross-jurisdictional)
5. Work group formation for monitoring and facilitating implementation after plan development
6. Brainstorming new ideas not already in use
7. Focus on pathways; plans should be pathway-oriented
8. Constituent and public involvement at every stage for fostering buy-in
9. Interstate and international planning to address multi-jurisdictional waters
10. Contain current invaders (prevent spread) and prevent new invaders
11. Strategies for getting buy-in and funding for plans
12. Prioritize actions and look at multiple funding sources for those list of actions
13. Cost-sharing programs as part of partnerships with local groups
14. Use seed money to leverage funding and local projects
15. What do we promise in a management plan? Need a promised outcome for people to invest in
16. Try to accomplish smaller tasks with the funding you do have (e.g. focus on 3 top priorities)
17. Focus on priority species and/or vectors
18. Use social marketing (e.g. “poster” cases)
19. Document and communicate negative impacts of ANS (ecological, economic and human health)
20. Go beyond just environmental impacts and focus on economic impacts to sell the issue
21. Connect tourism boards to managers
22. Show success of others states to promote need for a plan despite limited funding
23. Partnering with NGOs

24. Tax on user groups (e.g. registered boaters) to increase/create funding
25. Establish volunteer programs (e.g. Clean Boats Clean Waters) to advance prevention
26. Identify the outcomes, positives, successes, etc., related to SMP development
27. Bring in businesses that rely on clean water to carry the message of ANS prevention/control
28. Get serious about enforcement
29. Work with users (e.g. fishing tournament organizers)
30. Prevention through public education; water craft inspection; monitoring and early detection; and enforcement of regulations (public education can work)
31. Enable key constituency to lobby state legislators for funding

Guidelines and Distribution of Federal funds

1. Create a timeframe for distribution of funding from federal level
2. Take out guidelines that are no longer applicable
3. Clarify what the requirements are for plan approval
4. Keep certain minimum requirements/criteria
5. Streamline reporting process
6. Important to document successes
7. Equal shares and equity among state management planners
8. Should be based on state need
9. Revise guidelines to accept terrestrial (comprehensive) plans as well as aquatic, recognizing that funding is only provided for the aquatic portion of the plan

Group 2 – Break-out Session II

Regional ANS Management

1. Coordination is already occurring on a regional level through the regional panels
2. States have common themes but separate interests—presents a challenge for regional planning
3. Some situations (e.g. rapid response), regional coordination could benefit from further regional planning (example: the Columbia River Basin Rapid Response Plan)
4. Regional planning should be conducted on a basin level with support from regional panel
5. Regional plans could have more impact on policy issues for the region
6. Could facilitate a more unified message focused on pathways
7. Get state plans done and then work on coordinating them
8. Work off of individual plans strengths that may work in other states
9. If there are legal consequences in one state for an ANS related action, should try to create those same legal consequences in other states
10. Create a plan to improve regional communication
11. Develop a matrix of response strategies for basin—pick and choose for different situations
12. Unified information/message so that the region is working from the same page (one voice)
13. ICS / unified command system should drive rapid response planning
14. Connecting pathways make the case for communication and coordination for those states
15. Need all federal agencies to be involved at the local level
 - a. ANSTF could help to get other agencies involved (e.g. DOD, Forest Service and BLM)
 - b. Reach out to constituency to write letters to Congress
 - c. Policies are in place but are not being carried out
 - d. Build relationships with district/local offices to increase responsiveness
 - e. Concern over the number of DOI agencies on the ANSTF may be why some other federal agencies are not involved
16. Regional panels can identify overlapping responsibilities
17. Have a process (assessment) that could be run on a regional scale that would benefit the states and reduce duplication of effort
18. Joint meetings between panels (esp. panels with overlapping states)
 - a. May be a challenge for panels without similar structures
19. Would help if Panels gave more than a paragraph report to Task Force at meetings (i.e. more face-to-face dialogue) and improved the distribution/dissemination of the Panel Annual Reports
20. ANSTF trying to do more reporting to Congress
21. Regional panel heads could meet to coordinate recommendations to the ANSTF

22. Recommendations can be forwarded to the ANSTF at anytime, not just at meetings (e.g. Great Lakes Panel submitted a recommendation on the canal barrier in January)
23. Coordination with State Wildlife Action Plans could help to finance activities under the SMP
 - a. Should meet to identify common issues
24. Meeting between regional panel heads to compare notes and identify opportunities, there may be further opportunity for collaboration between or among Panels
25. Create liaisons to Panels, or invite other Panel representatives to their meetings
26. Have a designated person to receive other Panel's Listservs
27. Develop a mechanism for Panels to work with others working on the State Wildlife Action Plans

Group 3 – Break-out Session I

Communication of Successful Strategies/Approaches

1. SMP project was recognized as a successful model for sharing lessons learned on ANS state management planning, allowing for state to state mentoring to facilitate a regional approach
2. Detailed transcript/proceeding of SMP workshops and culminating session valuable to document this regional approach to state management planning
3. Web posting of detailed planning process, presentations with notes
4. Send reports/presentations to regional Panels – active contact
5. A useful planning and implementation tool – include contact information
6. Use regional Panels with Sea Grant help

Lessons Learned Across Jurisdictions

1. Canada can learn from US (ensure province representatives on Panels (Mexico))
2. Meetings of the ANS Task Force
3. Outside state review helpful
4. More valuable to have in-house staff (than contracting work out)
5. Small working group can most effectively develop draft SMP
6. Stakeholder involvement is important
7. Non-state entities may not fully understand complexities of plan development

Challenges/Strategies

1. Menu of other states options
 - a. Use comprehensive wildlife management plan to advance implementation
 - b. Settlement money (e.g., polluter pays)
 - c. Corporate trust funds
 - d. Increase out-of-state license fees
2. Success stories online
3. Getting all players involved
 - a. Agency group and stakeholder group
 - b. 'Turf' wars need to be avoided

Funding

1. Use of funding – getting more funds
 - a. coordinated lobbying effort
 - b. authorizations without appropriations
 - c. use creative ways to leverage more funding for implementation; look at non-programmatic funds (e.g. grants)
 - d. catalogue of domestic federal assistance (e.g. grants.gov)
4. Use ANSTF baseline funding on an equitable basis among states as currently allocated
 - a. Use any new funds (e.g. "war chest") for rapid response
 - b. Look to non-traditional opportunity (e.g. Michigan passes bonds for funding)

ANSTF Guidelines:

1. Helpful for development – some states use, others not
2. Keep funding equal at base level; possibly more if new money becomes available and additional work is proposed

Group 3 - Break-out Session II

Regional ANS Management

1. Beneficial, but funding is problematic because it is distributed on a state by state basis
2. Watershed approach should be considered
3. Feasibility: develop compacts (e.g. interstate fish commissions), priority for multi-state projects
4. If important issue (case), state to state more likely than regional (e.g. Mississippi Basin)
5. Cross border issues lead to federal involvement

ANSTF/Federal Assistance

1. The 'plan' is not the goal, ANS management is the goal
2. How do we get more states to get a SMP?
 - a. Demonstrate that having a plan is beneficial
3. Federal assistance in the form of people, equipment, expediting permits
4. Plan ahead

Regional Panels

1. Regional chairs meeting before ANSTF meetings
2. Benefit of regional SMP coordination is sharing experiences, lessons learned
3. Web links to other Panels
4. Regional Panel coordination with Federal agency regions
5. Federal involvement in regional Panels helps