

Midwest Region ANS Action Plan

Based on results of the
ANS Regulations and Enforcement Workshop
Indianapolis, Indiana ♦ December 12, 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

Midwest Workshop

Implementation at Regional and National Levels

Priority Issues and Actions for the Midwest Region

Appendix A. Resources

Appendix B: ANS Workshop Participants

Appendix C. ANS Workshop Agenda

Appendix D. ANS Workshop Evaluation Results

Appendix E. Recommendation to Establish a MAFWA AIS Committee

Appendix F. Regional ANS Priorities

Note: *This action plan was developed based on the Midwest Region ANS Workshops held December 12, 2004. This version of the action plan was completed in March 2005. It was edited for consistent formatting in March 2006.*

Midwest Workshop

Workshop preparation

The IAFWA Project Team corresponded with over 110 primary contacts in the Midwest region in preparation for the workshop. A preliminary list of issues and actions was produced through online and telephone discussions with the Midwest contacts (state directors, fish chiefs, ANS coordinators, law enforcement, etc.), nongovernmental organizations, IAFWA staff, and federal agencies, in addition to input provided at the Great Lakes ANS Panel meeting in Ann Arbor, MI, on April 26-27, 2004.

During the Great Lakes Panel meeting, project contacts indicated that many state employees are restricted in travel to the Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference. Therefore, the workshop process was structured to make sure there was opportunity for them to be involved by email, list serve or website if they could not attend the actual workshop.

Workshop conducted: The Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA) and IAFWA jointly hosted a workshop in Indianapolis, IN, on December 12, 2004. This meeting was the fourth of four workshops to develop a regional assessment of ANS regulation and law enforcement issues that can be addressed through enhanced coordination and communication actions. The primary purpose of this workshop was to: 1) confirm the prioritization of issues; and 2) identify specific realistic actions in preparation for drafting an action plan to address these priority issues. Actions could be undertaken by fish and wildlife and conservation law enforcement agencies in the southeast region, at both the state and federal levels, and associated governmental and nongovernmental organizations, including MAFWA.

Over 20 participants variously represented fisheries and law enforcement interests in state and federal agencies, NGOs, universities, IAFWA, Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies and memberships in related committees and panels. Workshop participants are listed in Appendix A.

The group discussed several potential partners that could act at the regional level to address ANS issues. Survey respondents listed the IAFWA as the primary organization to coordinate follow-up activities after the workshop with the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basin ANS Panels in second and the MAFWA at a close third. Contractors and others were given lower rank for this responsibility. Respondents also stressed that implementation should be a collaborative effort between all pertinent organizations.

Suggested funding sources for action implementation were:

- 100th Meridian.
- Governors Associations.
- USFWS Great Lakes.
- Sea Grant Network.
- ANS Panels.
- IAFWA.
- MICRA.
- Northeast-Midwest Institute.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

- International Joint Commission.

The agenda for the workshop is provided in Appendix B.

Highest priority issues for immediate action

Partners in the Midwest region will continue to identify ANS regulation and enforcement issues and refine an action plan for addressing them. At the workshop, participants confirmed 11 issues as having the highest priority for immediate action.

Prioritized list of ANS issues for purposes of preliminary input and workshop discussion:

1. Funding.
2. Preventing new introductions and spread of ANS.
3. Early detection and rapid response.
4. Economic data and public education.
5. Understanding federal ANS laws.
6. Partnerships and coordination.
7. Model legislation and definitions.
8. Internet sales and shipments.
9. Regulated species lists.
10. Training on species identification.
11. International cooperation.
12. Control and management.

Additional issues: Workshop participants suggested highlighting a number of additional issues related to the prioritized issue list:

- Improving federal regulations (e.g., ballast water).
- Review relationships between regulations among agencies (e.g., fish and wildlife, agriculture, NEPA).
- Understanding Federal ANS laws and laws in adjacent states.
- Collection and movement of fish by organized naturalist / hobby groups.
- Cultural significance and influences on fish release.

The IAFWA Project Team folded these topics into the other issues for the Action Plan discussion.

Workshop evaluation

Fourteen out of over 20 participants completed an evaluation about the Midwest workshop. Sixty-nine percent felt that the workshop covered their major ANS concerns and issues. Several respondents indicated an interest in a longer workshop with more in-depth coverage of the issues, including more background on species biology, enforcement strategies, coordination of ANS control between states and actions against AIS importation regardless of political or cultural concerns.

Participants described the workshop as a beneficial first step in enhancing coordination within the region. They rated the workshop's overall success towards launching collective efforts

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

among Midwest states in addressing ANS issues as an average of 7.1 on 10-point scale, with 10 as the highest score. They ranked the importance of state agencies in other regions attending similar regional ANS workshops as a 9.4 out of 10.

Participants recommended extending the effort to include stronger representation from a number of groups (e.g., Sea Grant, enforcement officers, division chiefs and directors, all state fish and wildlife agencies in the region). They provided additional recommendations for next steps, which are included in the synopsis below.

Complete results for the workshop evaluation are in Appendix C.

Development and implementation of the action plan

The action plan will be developed further and implemented by regional partners through electronic communications and other avenues, as applicable portions are integrated into the strategies of partners throughout the region. The IAFWA Project Team provided an initial draft of the Midwest Action Plan to workshop organizers for review and revision. After their review, the action plan was distributed to the MAFWA members and other contacts throughout the region for additional review and action.

One of the key recommendations that may be instrumental in making progress on the action plan was for creation of an Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Committee within the MAFWA (Appendix D). The MAFWA Executive Committee reviewed the proposal during their March 16, 2005, meeting in Crystal City, Virginia, followed by a discussion with the Midwest Directors at their annual business meeting, July 10–13 in Huron, Ohio.

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 Midwest Region

This Midwest Action Plan provides highest priority issues and actions for the region and describes mechanisms for further progress in addressing these pressing ANS management needs. The Project Team corresponded with up to 110 contacts in the Midwest region through preliminary online input to develop initial prioritization and an understanding of the organizations that are active in ANS issues in this region.

Over 20 participants attended a workshop on December 12, 2004, and used preliminary input to create a draft Midwest Action Plan for further electronic review by all contacts in the region. The October 2004 draft of the *Policy and Legislation Priorities on Aquatic Invasive Species* as recommended by the Policy and Legislation Committee of the Great Lakes Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species was particularly valuable as a starting point for discussion of potential priority issues and actions.

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. 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. Support for NAISA.
2. Tax pathways of introduction at federal level (create dedicated accounts) - may alienate or provide an incentive.
3. Identify funding sources for state use (boat license surcharge, grants, in-kind, partners, etc).

I.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Support for NAISA, including support for state management plans.

Who:

- a. MAFWA.
 - i. Become active in Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basin Panels as official ANS entities rather than recreating new entities.
 - ii. MAFWA formal seat on panel, attend meetings, be on mailing lists, provide input and support for implementation.
 - iii. Meets once a year for 1-2 days; may meet second time in conjunction with Midwest F&W Conference; executive committee meets 6 times per year (6 members); strategic planning process to identify top issues, articulate policy, and agency needs; top administrators of fish and wildlife agencies.
 - iv. Encourage every state to develop a state ANS management plan (recommendation to MAFWA).
 - v. Grassroots connection to Congress, hire a professional lobbyist to work on ANS issues.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

- vi. Recognize ANS as important relative to other F&W issues; convince state directors to the point of changing priorities; consensus at IAFWA level; translate to influence at policy level.
 - b. External partners.
 - i. Industries moving ANS: connection with tackle, sea food, cultural groups; outreach and legitimacy for environmentally responsible corporations and consumer behavior.
 - ii. Industries impacted by ANS: charter boats.
 - iii. TNC tracks invasive legislation, has an invasive alert system in place, shares information with Congressional and other partners.
 - iv. Connection between MAFWA and (Midwest) Governors Associations to raise awareness at national level with governor's offices.
2. Tax pathways of introduction at federal level (create dedicated accounts); may alienate or provide an incentive.

Who:

 - a. MAFWA.
 - i. Lobby Congress within a bill proposal (IAFWA level; partner with others).
 - ii. Identify what entity within Congress can be effectively lobbied, then contact those groups to achieve momentum regionally and elevate it to the national level.
 - b. External partners.
 - i. Potential supporters don't recognize the threat; agencies have historically been part of the problem of species introductions.
 - ii. Ask National Academy of Sciences to study the threats of ANS; increase perception of threat to motivate funding.
 - iii. Don't take this option lightly.
3. Identify funding sources for state use (boat license surcharge, grants, in-kind, partners, etc).
 - shifting funds from other priorities within state agencies.
 - funds outside of government agencies.

Who:

 - a. MAFWA.
 - i. Send a questionnaire to identify range of potential funding sources in various agencies, especially among entities in addition to F&W agencies.
 - b. External partners.
 - i. Tax the real cause of the problem (industry) rather than the users (hunters and anglers); recognize that hunters and anglers also spread ANS.

ISSUE 2. Preventing new introductions and spread of ANS

Description: Development of and emphasis on the most efficient means of controlling ANS by preventing the introduction of new species and expansion of introduced species into new ranges.

II.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Improve federal regulations.
2. Improve state regulations.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

II.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Improving federal regulations.

a. Screening and risk assessment .

Develop a method for evaluating species to determine if they should be listed (allowed into the country or state).

Who:

i. MAFWA.

1. IAFWA resolution adopted in support of screening legislation.
2. Seek new legislation or explore existing authority to implement screening processes.
3. Promote shifting burden of proof on injuriousness to the importer; provide credible information on potential impact; leads to a clean list approach rather than justifying prohibited list approach (federal government).

ii. External partners.

1. University researchers developing risk assessments.
2. Develop and implement industry standards for majority of pet sellers that are in an organization; address issues with independent sellers.

b. Interstate transport.

Who:

i. MAFWA.

1. Cooperation between bordering states to determine laws in surrounding states (live fish, bait).
2. Discuss feasibility and structure of laws among states in the region.
3. Discuss potential trade in species.
4. Outreach by communicating about different state programs.
5. Promote consistency among states in terms of what to expect in interstate transport.

ii. External partners.

1. Aquaculture, bait industry involvement in developing legislation; promote interest in maintaining healthy aquatic resources; parasites and disease raised attention due to destruction of industry; regulations maintain industry through certification.
2. Identify industry sectors with a vested interest in interstate transport (e.g., tourism) to promote ANS management.
3. Department of Transportation – outreach through license bureaus.
4. Boat dealers – new boat owners receive video; information with boat permitting license.

c. Ballast water (federal regulations).

Who:

i. MAFWA.

1. Support Great Lakes initiative - regulation.

ii. External partners.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

1. Council of Great Lakes Governors – engage congressional delegations to reauthorize NISA.
- d. New injurious wildlife legislation.
 - Who:*
 - i. MAFWA.
 1. Provisions under Lacey Act are limited; need to develop new legislation with provisions for restitution, civil provisions, unintentional transport, transport within states, etc.
 - ii. External partners.
 1. Federal ANS Task Force – craft language and support passage; input from all regions.
 2. Attach to bioterrorism issues, regulations and procedures for inspection.
 3. Request for additional funding for inspection due to responsibilities related to homeland security.
 4. In process of inspections, will find potential invasive species;
 5. Funding for threats - natural invasives tied to agriculture and aquaculture threats (e.g., hosts for soybean aphid).
2. Improve state regulations.
 - a. Screening and risk assessment.
 - b. Interstate permitting.
 - c. Intrastate regulations on ANS and infested waters.
 - d. Provide authority for rapid response and long-term mgt of ANS.

ISSUE 3. Early detection and rapid response

Description: Develop protocols and lists of contacts for rapid response, including a database of all agency and organization positions addressing ANS.

III.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Establish special provisions in federal law to help facilitate rapid response (CWA, NEPA, FIFRA, etc).

III.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Establish special provisions in federal law to help facilitate rapid response.
 - a. Identify which laws are involved (e.g., CWA, NEPA, FIFRA).
 - b. Establish provisions.

Issue 4. Economic data and public education

Description: Compile and use economic impact data to generate interest in and support for ANS issues from traditional sport fishing and hunting community.

IV.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Produce economic data on ANS impacts.
2. Educate public and policy-makers.

IV.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Produce economic data on ANS impacts.
 - a. Get hard facts through research economists involvement.
 - b. Range of impacts (e.g., industry, trade, aquaculture, hunting and fishing).
 - c. National Academy of Sciences study.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

- d. Get economic data from other parts of the world on impacts.
- e. Land grant university develop alternative use of natives in aquaculture.
2. Educate public and policy-makers.
 - a. Use information to convince Congress.
 - b. Generate interest in and support for ANS issues.

ISSUE 5. Understanding of federal ANS laws

Description: Effective communication of ongoing status of Federal ANS laws and enhancing state's understanding of federal authorities.

V.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Clarify priorities and interpretations by regulating agencies.
2. Understand relationships between agencies.
3. Assure implementation.
4. Clarify and coordinate roles and actions of fish and wildlife agencies.

V.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Clarify priorities and interpretations by regulating agencies.

Who:

- a. Federal permitting authorities.
 - i. Presentations by federal permitting authorities in each state.
 - b. NISC.
 - i. Make coherent whole of various agencies.
2. Understand relationships between agencies.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Articulate the different perspectives of fish and wildlife, agriculture, other agencies.
 - ii. Determine where agencies may perceive competing jurisdictions.
3. Assure implementation.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Provide adequate resources.
 - ii. Long review times.
 - iii. Commitment from agents at state and federal level).
4. Clarify and coordinate roles and actions of fish and wildlife agencies.

Who:

- a. IAFWA.
 - i. identify and articulate priorities.
 - ii. have a representative on ANS Task Force and NISC.

ISSUE 6. Partnerships and coordination

Description: Involve external organizations in promoting ANS policy and agendas, including NGOs and industry, in promoting ANS policy agendas.

VI.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Cooperate to prevent movement at all levels (i.e., state, region and nation).
2. Expand coordination and attention to regional ANS issues.

VI.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

1. Cooperate to prevent movement at all levels (i.e., state, region and nation).

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Identify agencies involved in species movement (e.g., Department of Transportation).
 - ii. Communicate with other agencies that affect species movement.
 - iii. Attach conditions to regulatory permits to prevent movement and require reporting.
 - iv. Emphasize prevention as top priority.
2. Expand coordination and attention to regional ANS issues.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Extend involvement beyond Great Lakes and Sea Grant states (ex. MRBP).
 - ii. Increase knowledge of university research and needs for information exchange.

ISSUE 7. Model legislation and definitions

Description: Clarify definitions in regulatory and policy approaches; position ANS as a resource management issue, rather than a pollution control issue; and develop or implement regional “Model Legislation” for state use with their legislatures.

VII.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Position ANS as a threat to economics and way of life.
2. Compile statutes from states in region.
3. Mandate a minimal level of coordination to provide effective consistency.

VII.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Position ANS as a threat to economics and way of life.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Describe worst case scenario (e.g., vulnerability).
 - ii. Link to agricultural impacts.
2. Compile statutes from states in region.

Who:

- a. Environmental Law Institute with links to IAFWA.
 - i. List of regulations and models on website.
3. Mandate a minimal level of coordination to provide effective consistency.

Who:

- a. Federal agencies.
 - i. Link ANS control to federal funding.
 - ii. Require adequate enforcement and education.
 - iii. Provide adequate federal funding (no unfunded mandates).

ISSUE 8. Internet Sales and shipments

Description: Develop mechanisms for tracking and controlling internet sales and other shipments; educate dealers regarding ANS regulations.

VIII.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Develop a better understanding of commerce (wholesale and retail).

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

2. Improve effective regulation of pet industry.
3. Enhance effective enforcement (i.e., control over illegal sales).

VIII.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Develop a better understanding of commerce (wholesale and retail)

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Internet commerce.
 - ii. Commercial and private sales of live species.
2. Improve effective regulation of pet industry.

Who:

- a. USFWS.
 - i. Clean list for voluntary compliance and to alleviate misidentification.
 - ii. Align outreach and communications about prohibited species with permitting function.
 - iii. Conduct inspections of deliveries.
3. Enhance effective enforcement (i.e., control over illegal sales).

Who:

- a. Industry.
 - i. Develop industry standards (e.g., biological supply houses, children's toys).
 - ii. Qualification, certification or licensing of dealers using a clean list for sales.
 - iii. Prevent misidentification by seller (e.g., inadvertent, unintentional sales).
 - iv. Public tip line to report violations.
- b. APHIS and USFWS.
 - i. Apply standard mechanisms for managing Internet commerce.
 - ii. Software to detect and track illegal sales.
 - iii. Link to illegal sales of endangered species.

ISSUE 9. Regulated species lists

Description: Coordinate and communicate regulated species lists between Midwest states and develop an information clearinghouse that provides current regulatory lists for states.

IX.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Coordinate among all interests to develop a common regulatory voice.
2. Compile and review state lists.
3. Develop federal guidance for uniformity between states.

IX.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Coordinate among all interests to develop a common regulatory voice.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Incorporate other groups with an economic interest to generate public support.
2. Compile and review state lists.

Who:

- a. Environmental Law Institute with links to IAFWA.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

- i. Conduct a state-level analysis on regulatory authorities, permit needs and requirements.
 - ii. Establish a website with all states prohibited species lists.
 - iii. Develop a three-tiered list (i.e., clean, regulated, and prohibited).
 3. Develop federal guidance for uniformity between states.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Account for state-specific interests (e.g., ethnic markets).
 - ii. Recognize danger of lowest common denominator of state risk.

ISSUE 10. Training on species identification

Description: Law enforcement officer training regarding species identification and impacts; and support development of taxonomic expertise for proper regulatory and enforcement responses, including development of a list of available taxonomists.

X.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Develop guides.
2. Establish a team of taxonomic specialists available to law enforcement.
3. Provide training.
4. Use technology to transfer information.

X.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Develop guides.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Biological dichotomous keys with emphasis on:
 1. High priority species and pathways.
 2. Species that are poised to enter a state.
 3. Difficult to identify (e.g., fruiting bodies on aquatic plants).
 4. Species not described by science.
 - ii. Mass-produce tools to compare species characteristics.
2. Establish a team of taxonomic specialists available to law enforcement.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Include university taxonomists.
 - ii. Similar to CDC model.
 - iii. Give authority for inspection to team of taxonomists.
 - iv. Know who to call for follow-up.
3. Provide training.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Elevate ANS within law enforcement priorities (internal marketing).
 - ii. Provide training to all field staff and law enforcement.
 - iii. Expand to other officers in addition to F&W conservation officers.
 - iv. Cross-training with parks employees, others beyond LE.
 - v. Provide training for dealers and distributors.
4. Use technology to transfer information.

Who:

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Issue cell phones with cameras to staff.

ISSUE 11. International cooperation

Description: Enhance interagency and regional organizational structure for addressing ANS, including international cooperation in the Great Lakes (e.g., US, Canada, international shipping).

XI.A. Priority actions at the regional level

1. Enhance interagency and regional organizational structure.
2. Increase international cooperation.

XI.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

1. Enhance interagency and regional organizational structure.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Great Lakes.
 1. United States and Canada.
 2. International shipping.
 - ii. Mississippi River Basin.
2. Increase international cooperation.

Who:

- a. *[organization?]*
 - i. Consider AIS in free trade agreements.
 - ii. Develop treaties.
 - iii. Develop cooperative programs among foreign governments.

ISSUE 12. Control and Management

Description: Develop adequate regulatory tools to allow control and management of established ANS (e.g., use of quarantines, piscicides).

XII.A. Priority actions at the regional level

Actions:

None identified. Participants focused on the need to emphasize prevention. Some participants also felt that control and management were less clearly related to regulation and enforcement issues covered in the workshop.

XII.B. Process for implementation

Actions:

None identified.

What are barriers to achieving these actions?

- Time frame: Too optimistic to begin with given complexity of issue; plans identified complexities, need to realistically go back to time table to determine reasonable priorities.
- Feel overwhelmed and tend to move on to something else; break problem into smaller, feasible tasks; may be trying to take too many actions at once.
- Majority of states still don't have a state ANS management plan; this reflects level or lack of state buy-in and willingness to devote resources. Put all states plans together to get buy-in and build base for IAFWA involvement; implementation of state plans.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

- Lack of broad involvement of all affected entities; now have panels to cover entire country. If every state and organization went to Congress at the same time to request action on a few high priority actions, there would be support.
- Intensive lobbying action at a specific time to work with Congress (terrestrial lobbying effort; use same technique for aquatic issues).
- Directors don't have time to work on all issues, need to pass a resolution that can be moved through MAFWA at regional and national level.
- Staff with multiple duties cannot focus adequately on ANS; need staff with primary ANS responsibility.
- Need to integrate ANS throughout the agency, especially across competing interests; make it a part of everyone's responsibility.
- Crosslink aquatic and terrestrial issues and programs.
- Judges have discretion in dealing with cases and need understanding of significance of ANS impact.

How can MAFWA and its partners organize to pursue this ANS action agenda?

- Offer recommendations to Midwest directors, which can be forwarded to the IAFWA, which will be more likely to act if issues are proposed through regional directors (e.g., MICRA delivered screening proposal through the MAFWA to the IAFWA).
- Incorporate invasive species into Comprehensive Wildlife Strategies as a threat to native species. MAFWA could review all state's plans regionally after October 2005 to identify high priority invasives that affect native species in this area (broad regional recommendations). MAFWA could connect ANS issues to Teaming With Wildlife/CWS state and federal funding.
- Communicate that invasives problems are larger than just state issues.
- NFWF (National Fish & Wildlife Foundation) has committed \$700,000 per year for regional efforts to implement CWS; prefer regional association requests; setting up review board for proposals; could submit a MAFWA grant request; no state match required.
- Eleven MAFWA committees currently exist (e.g., private lands, public lands, fish and wildlife health, MICRA) – could recommend the development of an ANS or invasive species committee; historically, aquatic issues have been weaker in MAFWA which has specialized in Farm Bill issues (private lands committee).
 - Mississippi River Basin Panel developed from MICRA committee.
 - Recommendation: Establish a MAFWA Invasive Species Committee.
 - Have speakers talk about ANS problems at MAFWA meetings, which will encourage directors to address issues.
 - Connects issues at the director level.
 - Complementary to MICRA and transcends Mississippi River and Great Lakes basin.
 - More buy-in if it includes terrestrial and aquatics issues.
 - Provides a mechanism to forward invasives issues to other committees (e.g., private and public lands committees, MICRA).

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

- Elevates invasives issues on the directors' agenda.
- Increases relevancy among Midwest directors; enhance connections with committees; motivate regional federal partners to attend meetings and network with each other and states.
- Send recommendation to other regional associations.
- Charge to:
 - Compile invasives issues from all state CWS in the Midwest region.
 - Prepare grant request for NFWF.
 - Support invasives symposia at the Midwest conferences.
 - Maintain contact with ANS regional panels.
 - Develop a resolution to increase work on invasive issues.
 - Break the complexity down into manageable components and address highest priority issues to develop and implement actions.
 - Host and attend conference calls, meetings, and summits that develop personal relationships and improve working associations.

What would motivate continued involvement in this process?

- Orient actions according to the charters of each organization and build it into their existing work plans.
- Encourage the lead person in an agency to make invasive issues a top priority so that resources are focused on these issues.
- Filter priorities through ANS Task Force to FWS and regional panels.
- Identify invasives as a key issue at the association level.
- USDA Forest Service has a nonnative invasive framework with a working group that has an individual or team of people as primary contacts for aquatic invasive issues, working in association with the botanists.
- Report back from agencies at every meeting on what has been accomplished regarding invasives issues (post page on website for all MAFWA committees).

Next steps

- Develop a specific recommendation from this workshop to the Midwest directors to recommend that they establish a committee and identify their charge with action items.
 - Submit to Steve Gray, President, possibly through Glen Salmon as the state agency director hosting the workshop.
 - Executive Committee meets January 11 by teleconference; Glen Salmon could present the issue on the call.
- Distribute results of workshop:
 - Article in *ANS Update* (Great Lakes ANS Panel news).
 - Present at the North American conference.
 - Through ANS Panel coordinators.
 - Don't assume that other organizations are aware of IAFWA and this project.
 - Summarize results of pilot project and workshops and promote findings through other groups.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

- State and regional actions (from workshop and evaluation responses):
 - Continue coordination by:
 - Assigning specific tasks at the state, federal and regional level.
 - Follow through on having all information received and provide additional comments.
 - Implement action items under "Next Steps" of last portion of workshop.
 - Develop a technical task force, such as an invasive species committee for MAFWA.
 - Present results, particularly recommendations from workshop to:
 - Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies to carry forth the action plan.
 - Market findings through avenues that reach as many AIS groups as possible.
 - Interagency elevation of ANS issues.
 - Promote ANS programs at the state level, particularly enforcement programs.
 - Support development and implementation of state ANS management plans. Support regional panel and other groups working on ANS. Support development at ANS / AIS committees at the MAFWA and IAFWA.
 - While planning to improve future policy, look at what can be done right now.

Appendix A. Resources

Invasive Species Research Strategic Plan for the Upper Midwest Environmental Sciences Center. Draft. May 2004. UMESC, La Crosse, Wisconsin.

National Strategy and Implementation Plan for Invasive Species Management. US Forest Service, USDA Department of Agriculture.

Non-Native Invasive Species Framework for Plants and Animals in the U.S. Forest Service, Eastern Region. April 11, 2003. R9 Regional Leadership Team. US Forest Service, USDA Department of Agriculture.

Policy and Legislation Priorities on Aquatic Invasive Species. As recommended by the Policy and Legislation Committee of the Great Lakes Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species. Draft: October 2004. Great Lakes Commission, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Appendix B. ANS Workshop Participants

First	Last	Organization
Michael	Enright	Five Rivers Metro Parks
Katherine	Glassner-Shwayder	Great Lakes Commission
Jill	Finster	Great Lakes Fishery Commission
		Great Lakes Fishery Commission
Nancy	Leonard	Michigan State University
Neil	Serdar	Illinois Conservation Police
Tom	Flatt	Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Katie	Gremillion-Smith	Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Glen	Salmon	Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Brad	Feaster	Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Steve	Hunter	Indiana Department of Natural Resources
John	Bacone	Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Kim	Bogenschutz	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Richard	Jordet	Iowa Department of Natural Resources
Nate	Davis	Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks
Kristen	Hase	Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks
Mark	Van Scoyoc	Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks
Ryan	Waters	Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks
Gerry	Buynak	Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources
Tom	Goniae	Michigan Department of Natural Resources
Jerry	Rasmussen	MICRA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
		Midwest Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies
Ollie	Torgerson	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Jay	Rendall	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
Ron	Dent	Missouri Department of Conservation
Lynn	Schlueter	North Dakota Game and Fish Department
Kevin	Ramsey	Ohio Department of Natural Resources
Fred	Snyder	Ohio State University Extension – Sea Grant
Ellen	Jacquart	The Nature Conservancy
MaryJane	Lavin	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Michael	Hoff	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Robert	Schmal	U.S. Forest Service
Anne	Timm	U.S. Forest Service

Appendix C. ANS Workshop Agenda

- 8:30 Introduction, expectations, and desired outcomes (Phil Seng)
- 8:45 Welcome to the workshop (Glen Salmon, IDNR; Ollie Torgerson, MAFWA)
- 9:00 Background information and define the scope of the issues
- Background for the project (Joe Starinchak)
 - Report on Missouri as the Midwest Pilot State (Ron Dent)
 - Federal injurious species listing process presentation (Kari Duncan)
- 9:45 Preliminary identification of issues (Gwen White)
- Add or modify issues list
 - Affirm or modify prioritization based on online input
- 10:00 Break
- 10:15 Breakouts: What regulatory, policy and enforcement actions would address these issues?
- Identify and explain 3-5 highest priority actions for each issue.
- 12:00 Lunch (on your own; facilitators will summarize discussion)
- 1:00 Potential partners in the Midwest region
- State and federal law enforcement (MaryJane Lavin, R3 Special Agent in Charge, FWS LE)
 - Great Lakes ANS Panel (Kathe Glassner-Shwayder)
 - Mississippi River Basin ANS Panel (Jay Rendall)
 - *Habitattitude*TM, Sea Grant, Great Lakes Cities Initiative, and other organizations
- 1:45 Breakouts: Implementation of highest priority actions
1. What can the Regional Association (MAFWA) do to accomplish these actions?
 2. What external organizations can be involved as partners?
 3. Who in these organizations will be responsible for implementing these actions?
 4. Who will take the lead in articulating these issues and actions to decision-makers within MAFWA and other organizations?
- 3:00 Break
- 3:15 Group discussion: Where to from here?
- What are barriers to achieving these actions?
 - How can MAFWA and its partners organize to pursue this ANS action agenda?
 - What would motivate continued involvement in this process?
 - Next steps
- 4:30 Adjourn: *Reminder to complete written or online evaluation – Thank you!*

Appendix D. ANS Workshop Evaluation Results

NOTE: We had 14 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?

69.2% = yes, 15.4% = no, 15.4% = 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:

Biology, control, eradication, how to treat spread
Coordination with states on control implementation.
Did not discuss a lot of biology.
enforcement strategy
If more time, it would be useful to cover these issues in more depth - at least background material in describing each issue.
Procedures related to control using pesticides, herbicides, related to NEPA and lead agency issues on public land.
Specific enforcement impediments. How should enforcement officers combat ANS with the current tools - what enforcement needs are there?
We must take stronger action against AIS importation regardless of political or cultural concerns.

B. Regarding the materials used at the workshop:

3. Were the materials used at the conference:

85.7% = adequate, 0% = inadequate, 14.3% = don't know / no opinion

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

A list of all the plans and websites relative to efforts on aquatic nuisance species. I would like to keep up with the work being done with the PET industry.
More background on each of the priority issues.
Should have sent out the issues ahead of time.
Summary sheet on organizations - who they are, what they do - (IAFWA, MAFWA, Great Lakes Commission)

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)

78.6% = useful (repeat it) 14.3% = not useful (skip it) 7.1% = don't know/no opin.

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

78.6% = useful (repeat it) 7.1% = not useful (skip it) 14.3% = don't know/no opin.

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

c. USFWS injurious listing process (FWS)

92.9% = useful (repeat it) 7.1% = not useful (skip it) 0% = don't know /no opin.

d. Informal explanation of FWS law enforcement jurisdiction

76.9% = useful (repeat it) 7.7% = not useful (skip it) 15.4% = don't know/no opin.

6. Was the overall amount of background information presented in the beginning of the workshop: 35.7% = too little 57.1% = just right 7.1% = too much

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

A summary of problems currently happening.
Case histories with states are helpful and shows that some things can be accomplished. Don't assume that everyone know the commonalities e.g. I don't know all what the ANIS is about.
I would have liked to have heard more about where IAFWA is going with this information and why they sponsored the workshop.
more on activities of regional task forces.
More on legislative differences between states.
Would have liked to develop our own action items for each issue rather than prioritizing the large number provided.
You should consider taking more time (1.5 days) to cover issues in more depth.

D. Facilitation

8. Was the workshop's facilitation:

76.9% = adequate 23.1% = 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.):

More focused discussion of key points that the group could resolve - too much information to digest and come up with constructive recommendations.
Need to encourage facilitation to be more assertive to cover issues.
No specific enforcement issues/discussion were presented.
Things need to move along more quickly.
Too large room. Not adequate time for breakouts. Need to have issues provided ahead of time for breakouts.

E. Attendance

10. Were the necessary people in attendance to meet goals

28.6% = yes 50.0% = no 21.4% = 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:

10-15 more individuals would help. Stronger representation needed from SG (Sea Grant). To improve acoustics - needed smaller room. Representatives needed from
--

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

commercial groups that would ultimately be regulated.
Enforcement officers.
Higher level attendance. Division chiefs or directors. Not enough enforcement personnel.
KS Dept Wildlife and Parks, Jason Geckler, Nate Davis, Doug Nygren, Mike Hayden, director
Many left early.
Most state agency people, OH, WI
Need more knowledge experts on process, how to get lists, how make changes so basic information on how to implement
Need more states to attend.
Would liked to have had each state agency within the Midwest represented.

F. Next steps

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

Continue coordination. Assigning specific tasks at the state, federal and regional level.
Follow through on having all information received and provide additional comments/feedback. Implement action items under "Next Steps" of last portion of workshop.
Get an invasive species committee for MAFWA.
Interagency elevation.
Market findings through avenues that reach as many AIS groups as possible.
Present results particularly recommendations from workshop to Midwest A F&W agencies to carry forth the action plan.
See #2 (biology, control, eradication, how to treat spread.)
Support development and implementation of state ANS management plans. Support regional panel and other groups working on ANS. Support development at ANS/Invasive committees at the MAFWA and IAFWA.
Technical/task force to implement
There is a need to "sell" the ANS programs at the state level. Especially Enforcement programs.
We respond best to assignments
While planning how to improve future policy, we need to look at what we can be done right now.

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 MAFWA states in addressing ANS issues:

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

Avg	7.1
Mode	8.0
Median	7.5

Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Action Plan

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	9.4
Mode	10.0
Median	10.0

Appendix E. Recommendation to Establish a MAFWA AIS Committee

The participants at the Midwest ANS Regulation and Enforcement Workshop held on December 12, 2004, in Indianapolis, IN, recommend the establishment of a MAFWA Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Committee.

The charge of the Committee shall be to address issues and actions concerning management of aquatic invasive species and proper use of introduced aquatic species for the protection and management of the fish and wildlife resources in the Midwest states within the Great Lakes and Mississippi River Basins.

The committee charge shall include but not be limited to the following actions:

- Elevate AIS issues among directors of Midwest fish and wildlife agencies.
- Break the complex issues down into manageable components and address highest priority issues to develop and implement actions.
- Develop a resolution to increase work on invasive issues.
- Host and attend conference calls, meetings, and summits that develop personal relationships and improve working associations.
- Support symposia on invasive species at the Midwest fish and wildlife conferences.
- Maintain contact with other relevant committees (e.g., private and public lands committees, MICRA, regional ANS panels).
- Compile invasive species issues from all state Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategies in the Midwest region.
- Prepare grant requests to external organizations, such as NFWF, on behalf of state and federal agencies.

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

Appendix F. 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