

Southeast Region ANS Action Plan

Based on results of the
ANS Regulations and Enforcement Workshop
Hilton Head, SC ♦ October 30, 2004

March 16, 2006



International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies



This project was funded by Multistate Conservation Grant #DC M-31-C, awarded by the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (IAFWA) in cooperation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as established by the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-408).

Table of Contents

Southeast Workshop

Implementation at Regional and National Levels

Priority Issues and Actions for the Southeast Region

Appendix A. ANS Workshop Participants

Appendix B. ANS Workshop Agenda

Appendix C. ANS Workshop Evaluation Results

Appendix D. Recommendation to Establish a SEAFWA ANS Committee

Appendix E. Regional ANS Priorities

Note: *This action plan was developed based on the Southeast Region ANS Workshop held on October 30, 2004. This version of the action plan was completed in August 2005. It was edited for consistent formatting in March 2006.*

Southeast Workshop

Workshop preparation

To prepare for the workshop, the IAFWA Project Team corresponded with 64 primary contacts in the Southeast, including state directors, fish chiefs, ANS coordinators, and representatives from NGOs, IAFWA and federal agencies. Preliminary work to identify and prioritize issues, as well as develop workshop structure, took place via telephone contacts, discussion at the Gulf of Mexico ANS Panel meeting on April 1, 2004, and online input.

Purpose of workshop

The purposes of this workshop were to: 1) confirm priority of issues; and 2) identify steps to draft an action plan to address priority issues. Actions could be undertaken by fish and wildlife and conservation law enforcement agencies at state and federal levels, and by associated governmental and NGOs, including SEAFWA.

Twenty participants represented fisheries and law enforcement interests from state and federal agencies. State representatives also provided input based on their involvements in other related organizations.

The workshop was a first step to identify and prioritize issues and enhance partnerships. Results of the workshop discussions were provided electronically to all project contacts for additional comments and recommendations via online surveys.

Workshop participants are listed in Appendix A. Workshop agenda is provided in Appendix B.

Highest priority issues for immediate action

At the Southeast Regional workshop, participants confirmed six issues as highest priority:

1. Locate funding for state and regional ANS management.
2. Coordinate ANS lists among Southeast states.
3. Describe and enhance regulatory authority within Southeast states and at regional and national levels.
4. Coordinate regional ANS management.
5. Generate support from external organizations by developing and distributing economic impact information.
6. Enhance state and regional capability for ANS detection and rapid response.

Workshop participants did not have time to address five additional issues described through online input and/or identified by workshop participants. However, most of those issues related to issues and actions that were discussed throughout the workshop. Therefore, the IAFWA Project Team folded all of these topics into the other issues as action items in the Action Plan.

Workshop evaluation

(Complete results from the workshop evaluation are in Appendix C.)

Ten of the 20 participants completed an evaluation of the Southeast workshop. All believed the workshop covered their major ANS concerns and issues. Several respondents indicated an interest in a workshop with more in-depth coverage of issues. Some of the issues mentioned included the degree of threat that ANS poses to aquatic resources and recreational or economic values in relation to other threats (e.g., water quality, overuse); results of the state survey that initiated these workshops; copies of state ANS plans, Great Lakes Panel plans, and an executive summary of the National Invasive Species Plan; presentations on progress made by various states within the southeast region on ANS issues; and discussions regarding funding.

Participants described the workshop as a beneficial first step in enhancing coordination within the region. They rated the workshop's overall success toward launching collective efforts among Southeast states in addressing ANS issues as an average of 7.5 on a 10-point scale with 10 as the highest score. They ranked the importance of state agencies in other regions attending similar regional ANS workshops at 9.5 out of 10.

Participants also provided additional recommendations for next steps:

1. Prepare a comprehensive ANS plan for the region.
2. Designate ANS coordinators to represent each state.
3. Establish multi-agency ANS task force in each state.
4. Encourage states to develop state ANS management plans.
5. Elevate the importance of ANS issues via IAFWA and state directors.
6. Assimilate Southeast states into an ANS panel.
7. Dialogue between states regarding implementation of state and regional plans.

To facilitate effective implementation of ANS strategic management, participants recommended extending this effort to include stronger representation from a number of groups (e.g., mid- and upper-level administrators, division chiefs and directors in all fish and wildlife agencies; law enforcement officers; representatives from the aquaculture industry; pet industry; U.S. Coast Guard and state agriculture agencies).

Development and implementation of the action plan

A draft of this Action Plan was distributed to workshop participants for review and revision. After that initial review, the Action Plan was distributed to SEAFWA members and other contacts throughout the region for additional review and action.

One of the key recommendations that will be instrumental in Action Plan implementation was the development of an Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) Committee for the SEAFWA. After the workshop, the SEAFWA approved establishment of a SEAFWA ANS committee and solicited nominees from the member states to serve on it. Shortly thereafter, the SEAFWA began a process to revise all committees, temporarily delaying implementation of the ANS Committee. The committee plans to convene in early 2006. The recommendation for action by SEAFWA directors is provided in Appendix D.

Implementation at Regional and National Levels

Coordinating nationally

Although each regional workshop was independent of the others, the four regional action plans come to many of the same conclusions. The regions are setting similar top priorities and have an opportunity to work together through IAFWA to be more effective. Each region has a better chance of successfully addressing national-level issues if they coordinate as a group through the IAFWA and other national organizations, as appropriate.

Highest priorities

All four regions ranked funding as the highest priority. Federal authority for addressing importation with screening and assessment tools also ranked high, in addition to coordinated ANS lists among the states. Most of the priorities are independent of each other, and few would suffer if another cannot be enacted. The exception to this is the funding priority. The regions have made it clear they do not have the staff and resources to take on new ANS tasks without increased funding.

A list of priority actions for each region is given in Appendix E.

Priority Issues and Actions for the Southeast Region

This Southeast ANS Action Plan provides highest priority issues and actions for the region and describes mechanisms for further progress in addressing these pressing ANS management needs.

Prioritization gives a general sense of where limited resources may be targeted. It does not imply that other issues are unimportant or should not be addressed if adequate resources and interest are available. "Who" (below) shows the entity that would undertake a particular action.

ISSUE 1. Locate funding for state and regional ANS management

Description: Funding is needed for state and regional ANS management programs, including regulation, policy and law enforcement programs.

I.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Obtain funding for state and regional ANS management programs (applies to both regulation/policy and law enforcement).
2. Obtain seed money for states to hire specific ANS staff and for law enforcement operations and training.
3. Establish an ANS committee in SEAFWA.

I.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Obtain funding for state and regional ANS management programs (applies to both regulation/policy and law enforcement).
 - a. Communicate with USFWS fisheries ARD and budget process.
 - b. Reauthorization of NAISA.

Who: [No one has been assigned to this action]

2. Obtain seed money for states to hire specific ANS staff and for law enforcement operations and training.
 - a. Obtain funding for Law Enforcement training, including handouts on ANS identification.
 - b. Identify potential new opportunities for funding, including compiling existing state funding sources in the southeast region. Funding sources may include:
 - i. ACOE aquatic plant control program matching funds.
 - ii. State gas tax, boating funds.
 - iii. Local sponsor cost-share.
 - iv. Increase political support and internal commitment for funds through state legislature.
 - v. Include ANS management in state Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategies (CWCS).
 - vi. ANS Task Force / USFWS small grant program (authorized at \$4 million).

Who: State agencies can review options for their use.

The following barriers exist:

- Eligibility for funding may limit availability for states.
- Matches may limit state participation.
- No USFWS money is available for plan development.
- Not enough money is available for full program; need sources other than Wallop-Breaux funds.

Technical and financial assistance may come from:

- SARP ANS management plan coordinator.
- Sea Grant program coordinators.
- Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy coordinators.
- ANS Task Force / USFWS small grants program.

3. Establish an ANS committee in SEAFWA

Who: Make a recommendation at the Directors Business Meeting (Col. Brantly). SEAFWA is in the process of revising all committees.

SEAFWA covers from MD to KY, MO, OK, TX and all southeast states (16 states), Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands. Regional associations have no formal relationship with, but cooperate with IAFWA. Some states are active in two regions.

Committee charges outlined as follows: [*See recommendation in Appendix D.*]

- a. Coordinate and making recommendations for action and elevation to the SEAFWA directors, then to IAFWA where appropriate.
- b. Ensure that saltwater issues get full attention in addition to freshwater issues.
- c. Coordinate mutual areas of interest with all committees.
- d. Coordinate between the SEAFWA and SARP.
- e. Address both law enforcement and fisheries by coordinating with Law Enforcement committee of SEAFWA, including training and operations.
- f. Coordinate work of the states through the ANS committee of SEAFWA, not the umbrella organization to make sure all ANS issues are served, but to.
- g. Coordinate with regional ANS Panels to:

- i. Appoint members of the SEAFWA committee from among state representatives to the various ANS Panels and states currently having no panel association.
- ii. Coordinate with state-specific ANS Task Forces, where states have established them.
- iii. Specifically address state agency needs and representation (Gulf of Mexico has very strong state agency representation; MRBP has broad mixture of states and NGOs)
- iv. Ensure that responsibilities don't overlap.
- v. Communicate actions by the ANS panels to SEAFWA.
- vi. Address southeastern issues across the various ANS Panels in the region.
- vii. Address regulatory authority needs through state directors (some panel issues such as regulation are specific to states).
- viii. Ensure that all state agency directors in the region understand ANS issues.
- ix. Review the ANS Action Plan to determine which actions can be taken by SEAFWA and coordinated with other organizations.

ISSUE 2: Coordinate ANS regulated species lists

Description: States connected by waterways or transport pathways may have different illegal species lists. Internet sales and other interstate commerce cannot be adequately controlled only at the state level and require regional or federal authority and action. The ANS regulated species lists from each state must be communicated between Southeast states to allow for coordination at the regional level, where feasible. This is especially critical for boundary waters and states, such as Louisiana, which is located at the downstream end of large river systems. Law enforcement officers, agency biologists and inspectors must be able to identify ANS in order to take appropriate action against prohibited species.

II.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Develop central list or summary of individual state ANS species lists; coordinate and communicate ANS lists between Southeast states; keep the lists current.
2. Develop conformity between state lists at the regional level, where feasible.
3. Enhance state authority to enforce compliance with ANS regulated species lists.

II.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Develop central list or summary of individual state ANS species lists; coordinate and communicate ANS lists between Southeast states; keep the lists current.
Who: Regional ANS Panels (MRBP, Gulf of Mexico, Mid-Atlantic Panels; and South Atlantic Coastal states: Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina). [*Note:* States of Georgia, North and South Carolina have since joined the renamed "Gulf and South Atlantic Regional Panel on Aquatic Invasive Species."]
2. Develop conformity between state lists at the regional level, where feasible, through:
 - a. Regional efforts between state agencies and USFWS to determine what species are listed by states.
 - b. Develop screening and risk assessment tools at a regional level.
 - c. Determine at the regional level which species will be allowed.
 - d. Develop a memorandum of understanding or other mechanism to make recommendations to states and federal injurious species lists.

- e. Recognize role of aquaculture industry.
Who: [No one has been assigned this action]
3. Enhance state authority to enforce compliance with ANS regulated species lists. [See also *Issue 3. Regulatory Authority*]
 - a. Compile information on state authorities.
 - b. Develop mechanisms for tracking and controlling Internet sales and other shipments.
 - c. Develop and implement law enforcement officer training opportunities regarding species identification.
 - d. Need to support development of taxonomic expertise for proper regulatory and enforcement responses, including development of a list of available taxonomists to call when unusual species are found.
 - e. Develop model legislation for state use.
 - f. Provide advice to directors.
Who: Gulf and South Atlantic ANS Panel is compiling state authorities.
SEAFWA ANS committee could provide advice to agency directors.

ISSUE 3: Develop regulatory authority

Description: Describe and enhance regulatory authority within Southeast states and at the regional and national levels. Regulation and policy approaches may differ, depending on definitions used in regulations and management. Fish and wildlife agencies can address ANS if it is positioned as a resource management issue, rather than or in addition to being identified as a pollution control issue. On traditional fisheries issues, marine and freshwater programs are currently managed separately in some agencies, whereas some ANS can be transferred between both environments (e.g., Asian carp in shrimp trawls; Rio Grande cichlids in estuaries).

III.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Share information on regulatory approaches in each state and develop regional “model legislation” as an example for state use with their legislatures.
2. Describe various policy approaches and definitions used in regulation.
3. Position ANS as a resource management issue, rather than a pollution control issue.
4. Clarify and enhance regulatory authorities for state and federal agencies.

III.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Share information on regulatory approaches in each state and develop regional “model legislation” as an example for state use with their legislatures.
Who: ANS Panels; SEAFWA ANS Committee.
2. Describe various policy approaches and definitions used in regulation (e.g., ANS, injurious, nonnative, exotics).
 - a. Review Executive Order.
 - b. NISC management plan.
Who: SEAFWA ANS Committee could standardize language
American Fisheries Society Introduced Fish Section
FWS definitions at national level
IAFWA ANS Advisory Work Group
National Invasive Species Council (NISC).
3. Position ANS as a resource management issue, rather than a pollution control issue.
Who: every state agency.
4. Clarify and enhance regulatory authorities for state and federal agencies.

- a. Compile information on state authorities.
- b. Effective communication of ongoing status of Federal ANS laws.
- c. Describe shared authority with agriculture and aquaculture.
- d. Provide advice to directors.

Who: Gulf and South Atlantic ANS Panel is compiling state authorities.

SEAFWA ANS committee could provide advice to directors.

5. Strengthen state and federal authorities, where needed.
 - a. Provide adequate resources to monitor compliance and prosecute violations.
 - b. Communicate economic impacts for legislative support.
 - c. Develop formal mechanisms to discuss and coordinate shared authorities with other agencies (e.g., state-level ANS Task Force), especially in development of state ANS management plans.

Who: every state agency.

ISSUE 4: Regional ANS management coordination

Description: Coordinate regional ANS management at the regional level. Mechanisms to coordinate interagency and regional organizations are necessary to adequately address interstate ANS issues and enforce regulations.

IV.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Provide examples of state ANS management plans and access to all plans in the region.
2. Coordinate plans within the region to create basin ANS plans with mechanism to enforce regulations.
3. Identify and discuss differences among the states about which species and uses are highest concern (e.g., aquaculture industry varies by state) to rank risks and determine region and state level management strategies.
4. Enhance interagency and regional communication and coordination between organizations that address ANS, including international cooperation in the Gulf of Mexico (Mexico, Caribbean nations).

IV.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Provide examples of state ANS management plans and access to all plans in the region.
 - a. Develop clearinghouse or library of all state ANS management plans within the region with ready electronic access.
 - b. Compile information on ANS issues in various state CWCS documents.
 - c. Develop a model state ANS management plan for the southeast region.
 - d. Use SEAFWA committee meetings to discuss issues between states as they arise, compare and review plans, make choices about agency actions within the region.

Who: SARP coordinator

ANS Panels

SEAFWA ANS committee

2. Coordinate plans within the region to create basin ANS plans with mechanism to enforce regulations.
 - a. Southeast Aquatic Resources Partnership (SARP) help states develop state plans.
 - b. States of Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia are invited to join SARP.

Who: SARP coordinator.

3. Identify and discuss differences between ANS perceptions among the states about which species and uses are highest concern (e.g., aquaculture industry varies by state) to rank risks and determine region and state level management strategies.

Who: each state; ANS Panels where they share pathways.

4. Enhance interagency and regional communication and coordination between organizations that address ANS, including international cooperation in the Gulf of Mexico (Mexico, Caribbean nations).

- a. Address NC, SC and GA involvement in panels.

Who: SEAFWA ANS Committee; South Atlantic states.

ISSUE 5: Economic impact data and external organization support

Description: Generate support from external organizations by developing and distributing economic impact information. More economic data would be needed to develop support for regulation and enforcement. Interest among fish and wildlife biologists and resource users may be very selective with attention limited to ANS species that impact only certain uses (e.g., duck hunting). There is a potential for involvement of external organizations, including NGOs and industry, in promoting ANS policy agendas. However, not all NGOs will be supportive of ANS positions desired by agency biologists.

V.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Generate, compile and use economic impact data to enhance public support.
2. Involve external organizations in promoting ANS policy and agendas, including NGOs, industry, agriculture, aquaculture, APHIS and Southern Governors Council.
3. Distribute ANS economic impact data through the partnerships with NGOs that will be developed in the State Wildlife Grant and CWCS processes.

V.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Generate, compile and use economic impact data to enhance public support:
 - a. Describe potential and actual impacts.
 - b. Generate interest in ANS issues and support of traditional sport fishing and hunting community.
 - c. Achieve adequate media attention before disasters happen (proactive outreach).
 - d. Bring balanced media coverage to ANS issues, including attention to issues that are seriously affecting natural resources.

Who: individual states

ANS Panels

ANS Task Force

FWS

2. Involve external organizations in promoting ANS policy and agendas, including NGOs, industry, agriculture, aquaculture, APHIS and Southern Governors Council.

Who: [No one has been assigned to this action]

3. Distribute ANS economic impact data through the partnerships with NGOs that will be developed in the State Wildlife Grant and CWCS processes.

Who: CWCS coordinators.

ISSUE 6: Enhance rapid response

Description: Enhance state and regional capability for ANS detection and rapid response. Establishing systems for rapid response before an event occurs would be useful for fisheries management and law enforcement.

Southeast Region ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

VI.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Develop lists of contacts, including a database of all agency and organization positions addressing ANS.
2. Develop protocols for rapid response (e.g., communication, verifying legal authorities, media response).
3. Utilize warning systems that notify when a species is detected.
4. Enhance capability within a state to respond rapidly to species detection, including protocol, resources, responsibilities and authority.

VI.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Develop lists of contacts, including a database of all agency and organization positions addressing ANS.
Who: Gulf and South Atlantic ANS Panel is developing a list of contacts.
2. Develop protocols for rapid response (e.g., communication, verifying legal authorities, media response).
Who: individual states; ANS Panels.
3. Utilize warning systems that notify when a species is detected.
Who: USGS Website and email
4. Enhance capability within a state to respond rapidly to species detection, including protocol, resources, responsibilities and authority.
 - a. Maintenance of the electrical barrier in Chicago was given as an example of a situation where interagency coordination was needed to ensure funding, construction and operation in a timely manner.
Who: individual states.

Appendix A. ANS Workshop Participants

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
D.L. Abernethy	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Not available
Stan Cook	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	334-242-3471
Jeff Williams	Arkansas Game and Fish Commission	870-424-5927
Mike Armstrong	Arkansas Game and Fish Commission	501-223-6372
Scott Hardin	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	850-488-4068
Ted Hendrickx	Georgia Department of Natural Resources	770-918-6418
Bennie Fontenot, Jr.	Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries	225-765-2330
Mark McElroy	Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries	225-765-2330
Scott Van Horn	North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission	919-528-9886
Kim Erickson	Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation	405-521-3721
Dale Theiling	South Carolina Department of Natural Resources	843-953-9390
John Frampton	South Carolina Department of Natural Resources	803-734-4007
Scott Powell	South Carolina Department of Natural Resources	803-608-2359
Steve de Kozlowski	South Carolina Department of Natural Resources	803-734-9114
Bob Brantly	Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies	850-893-1204
Bill Reeves	Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency	615-370-8483
Frank Jernejcic	West Virginia Department of Natural Resources	304-825-6787
Joe Starinchak	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	703-358-2018
Rebecca Elliott	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	843-727-4707
Jim Preacher	U.S. Geological Survey	703-648-4095

Appendix B. ANS Workshop Agenda

- 9:00 Introduction and expectations (Dave Case)
- 9:15 Welcome to South Carolina (John Frampton; Col. Bob Brantly)
- 9:30 Background information and scope of major issues
- Background for the project (Joe Starinchak)
 - Report from South Carolina as the Southeast Pilot State (Steve de Kozlowski)
 - Federal injurious species listing process presentation (Kari Duncan / Joe Starinchak)
- 10:00 Preliminary identification of issues (Gwen White)
- Add or modify issues list
 - Affirm or modify prioritization based on online input
 - Define the charge for breakout sessions
- 10:15 Break
- 10:30 Breakouts: What regulatory, policy and enforcement actions would address these issues?
- Identify and explain 1-3 highest priority actions for each issue
- 12:00 Lunch (on your own; facilitators will summarize discussion)
- 1:00 Potential partners in the Southeast region
- FWS Law Enforcement (Rebecca Elliott)
 - Gulf and South Atlantic ANS Panel, ANS Task Force, etc.
 - Sea Grant, PIJAC / Habitattitude™, The Nature Conservancy, etc.
- 1:30 Group discussion: Reports from breakouts on highest priority actions
1. What highest priority actions need to be taken to address these issues?
 2. What can the Regional Association (SEAFWA) do to accomplish these actions?
 3. What external organizations can be involved as partners for these actions?
 4. Who in these organizations will be responsible for implementing these actions?
 5. Who will take the lead in articulating these issues and actions to decision-makers within SEAFWA and other organizations?
- 3:00 Break
- 3:15 Group discussion: Where to from here?
- What barriers exist to achieving these actions?
 - How can SEAFWA and its partners organize to pursue this ANS action agenda?
 - What would motivate continued involvement in this process?
 - Next steps
- 5:00 Adjourn: *Reminder to complete written or online evaluation – Thank you!*

Appendix C. ANS Workshop Evaluation Results

NOTE: We had 10 responses for all quantified questions below

A. Regarding the topics covered at the workshop:

1. Did the topics discussed cover your major ANS concerns and issues?

100% = yes, 0% = no, 0% = don't know/no opinion

2. Please list any issues you are concerned about related to ANS (biology, control, eradication, etc.) that were not discussed in the workshop:

* There was no information regarding the degree of threat that ANS poses to aquatic resources or their recreational or economic values. This lack of information makes it difficult to quantify the ANS problems in relation to other known threats, i.e., water quality, overuse, etc.

* Many were listed but time prevented their discussion. Still reasonable coverage of the issue was attained.
--

* Funding to develop the plan is needed

B. Regarding the materials used at the workshop:

3. Were the materials used at the conference:

90% = adequate, 10% = inadequate, 0% = don't know / no opinion

4. Please list any other materials that could have been presented to workshop participants:

* See above

* Names, address, email, phone numbers of attendees.
--

* 1) FWS survey results. 2) Great Lake or other panel or state ANS plans. 3) Workshop participant listing.
--

* A copy of a state or regional plan; executive summary of NISP

C. Presentations delivered at the workshop:

5. Please indicate if the following workshop presentations were useful and should be repeated at future regional ANS workshops:

a. History and background that lead to this project (FWS)

90% = useful (repeat it) 0% = not useful (skip it) 10% = don't know/no opin.

b. ANS issues identified by workshop participants prior to the workshop

90% = useful (repeat it) 10% = not useful (skip it) 0% = don't know /no opin.

c. USFWS injurious listing process (FWS)

80% = useful (repeat it) 20% = not useful (skip it) 0% = don't know /no opin.

d. Informal explanation of FWS law enforcement jurisdiction

100% = useful (repeat it) 0% = not useful (skip it) 0% = don't know /no opin.

6. Was the overall amount of background information presented in the beginning of the workshop: 20% = too little 80% = just right 0% = too much

7. Please provide any suggestions about background information we should add or delete for the next regional ANS workshop:

*More information as how ANS programs are, would or could be coordinated at all levels and encompassing all programs, particularly regional association efforts and the IAFWA.
* Consider having state agency personnel present any progress they have made. In Florida, we have already covered the topics being faced by the states participating in this workshop.
* National ANS Task Force. One example of a state plan.

D. Facilitation

8. Was the workshop's facilitation:

100% = adequate 0% = inadequate 0% = don't know / no opinion

9. Please provide any suggestions regarding facilitation that could improve future regional ANS workshops (agenda, discussion management, etc.):

* Make sure ANS Regional Panels are represented.
* Too cold in room.

E. Attendance

10. Were the necessary people in attendance to meet goals

50% = yes 40% = no 10% = don't know/no opinion

11. If you answered "No" to the question above, please list who else, or which other agencies, should have been in attendance and how to reach them:

* Need more mid and upper level administrators and agency directors, if possible. Make direct contact with agency administrators via snail or email. Provide more emphasis on importance of workshop by regional and national leaders, i.e., regional presidents and IAFWA president and staff. There should have been representation from the IAFWA to show support and provide information.
* More law enforcement officers were needed.
* Many fish chiefs were there who are not as familiar with this issue as technical reps from the states. Both should attend.
c. * Gulf or other panel reps. Aquaculture agency rep. Pet rep absent. Not enough money available for full program; need sources other than Wallop-Breaux funds. CONVFWS fisheries rep absent.
* Coast Guard, State Agriculture Agencies and more enforcement

F. Next steps

12. What would be the most important next steps in the process, including state or regional actions?

* Preparation of a comprehensive ANS plan, including defining problems and actions and strategies for their resolution. Elevate the issue of ANS to a high priority with agency administrators by defining its degree of threat to aquatic resources and associated values.
* 1) States designate an ANS Coordinator to focus on the issue and attend regional panel meetings. 2) States establish multi-agency ANS Task Forces and identify regulatory authorities and needs.
* As discussed and resolved, meeting of technical reps from states and regional panels to identify which species/pathways/outreach/research qualify for regional consideration.
* Formation of SEAFWA committee on ANS.
* Direction on the development of a plan, who the players should be and how to start.
* Elevate the importance of the ANS issues through IAFWA and state directors. Organization of the SEAFWA Committee.
* Assimilation of all the southeastern states into an ANS panel. Completion of state plans. Dialogue between states and panels toward implementation of plans.

G. Overall Outcome:

13. On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the workshop's overall *success towards launching collective efforts* among SEAFWA states in addressing ANS issues:

___ / 10 (score with 1 representing the lowest score and 10 being the highest)

Avg: 7.5
Mode: 8.0
Median: 8.0

14. On a scale of 1 to 10, please rank the *importance of state agencies in other regions attending similar regional ANS workshops*:

___ / 10 (score with 1 representing the lowest score and 10 being the highest)

Avg: 9.5
Mode: 10
Median: 10

Appendix D. Recommendation to Establish SEAFWA ANS Committee

The participants of the ANS Workshop held on October 30, 2004, in Hilton Head, S.C., recommend the establishment of an Aquatic Nuisance Species Committee.

The charge of the Committee shall be to address issues and matters concerning management of aquatic nuisance species and proper use of introduced aquatic species which are or may be relative to members of the SEAFWA to address their responsibilities for the protection and management of their states' fish and wildlife resources.

The committee charge shall include but not be limited to:

1. Law enforcement;
2. Fisheries and aquatic plant management;
3. ANS program funding;
4. Both salt and fresh water; and
5. Coordination and communication between member states concerning ANS matters.

It is further recommended that the members of the Committee be appointed from state personnel with ANS responsibilities, and specifically, personnel who are state representatives to regional or basin ANS Panels.

Appendix E. Regional ANS Priorities

Northeast Priorities

1. Funding
2. Regulated species lists
3. Internet sales and other shipments
4. Screening and risk assessment tools

Western Priorities

1. Funding
2. Training on species identification
3. Involve external organizations
4. Screening and risk assessment tools
5. Internet sales and other shipments
6. Rapid response
7. Organizational structure
8. Regulated species lists
9. Understanding federal ANS laws

Southeast Priorities

1. Funding
2. Regulated species lists
3. Enhance regulatory authority
4. Coordinate regional ANS management
5. Economic impact information
6. Detection and rapid response

Midwest Priorities

1. Funding
2. Prevent new ANS introductions and spread (regulatory authority; screening and risk assessment)
3. Early detection and rapid response
4. Economic impact information
5. Understanding of federal ANS laws
6. Partnerships and cooperation
7. Model legislation and definitions
8. Internet sales and other shipments
9. Regulated species lists
10. Training on species identification
11. International cooperation
12. Control and management