

# *Indiana Invasive Species Council*

*Public Meeting  
Garrison Conference Center  
Fort Harrison State Park Inn  
Indianapolis  
April 5th, 2011*

## Meeting Minutes

### I. Call to order

Dr. Steve Yaninek called to order this public meeting of the Indiana Invasive Species Council (IISC) at 10:00AM on Tuesday, April 5, 2011, at the Garrison Conference Center at Fort Harrison State Park in Indianapolis, IN.

### II. Roll call

- Bill Fielding, Indiana Department of Transportation
- Sandi Norman, Indiana State Board of Animal Health
- Doug Keller, Indiana Department of Natural Resources' Division of Fish and Wildlife
- Phil Marshall, Department of Natural Resources' Division of Entomology and Plant Pathology
- Steve Yaninek, Purdue University, Council Secretariat
- Philip Gramelspacher, Past President, Indiana Forestry and Woodland Owners Association
- Kristopher Krouse, Shirley Heinze Land Trust
- Stuart Lowry, Indianapolis Parks and Recreation
- John Jachetta, Dow AgroSciences

Also present were:

- Ellen Jacquart, Indiana chapter of The Nature Conservancy
- Jodie Ellis, Purdue University
- Laura Hilden, INDOT Environmental Services Director
- Larry Bledsoe, Purdue University
- Kallie Bontrager, Indiana DNR

### III. Old business:

- A. A motion was made to adopt minutes from the November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010 public meeting and unanimously accepted and approved by the Council.
- B. John Jachetta presented an update on the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issue.
  1. In January, 2009, the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court struck down the EPA's 2006 published Rule (National Cotton council v. EPA) and mandated that certain pesticide applications do fall under the Clean Water Act (CWA) and can require NPDES permits.
    - a. Typical uses covered by the EPA and State Pesticide General Permits (PGPs)
    - b. Control of mosquitoes and other aquatic nuisances
    - c. Control of aquatic weeds and algae in or near lakes, rivers of conveyances (such as canals and ditches)
    - d. Control of forest pests (most in forest canopies, but some in forests).
    - e. Control of aquatic nuisance animals such as fish and zebra mussels.
    - f. Other uses (varies widely: e.g. intrusive vegetation in ROWs)
  2. Most parties agree that PGP provides no environmental benefits over existing FIFRA and state requirements. They also agree that EPA has greatly underestimated the financial cost and burden of the program.
  3. PGP will:
    - a. Impose time-consuming performance, record keeping and reporting requirements on top of existing law.
    - b. Impose compliance and clerical costs.
    - c. Complicate owner-advisor-applicator-banker-regulator relationships.

- d. Expose permit holders to legal risks for paperwork violations and citizen suits.
- e. Full PGP compliance requirements will include:
  - 1. Notices of Intent (NOI).
  - 2. Maintenance and calibration of equipment, and proper storage and handling.
  - 3. IPM, scouting, determination of pest thresholds, and consideration of alternatives.
  - 4. Pesticide Discharge Managements Plans.
  - 5. Surveillance, monitoring, mitigation, and recordkeeping.
  - 6. Reporting of spills and adverse incidents.
  - 7. Annual reports.
- 4. The Court did agree to grant EPA a two year Motion for Stay of the Mandate so implementation is delayed until April 9, 2011. The draft PGP was published on June 2, 2010 and opened for public comment until July 19, 2010. The EPA received more than 750 sets of comments during this time.
- 5. The EPA requested an additional six months from the court to complete the draft PGP and allow the States to prepare. The Sixth Circuit Court granted the EPA's request to stay the mandate in the National Cotton Council case until October 3, 2011. (There are no NPDES permits required for pesticide applications to, over, or near water until October 31, 2011). EPA stated that "It is intended to help states in developing their own permits and for the regulated community to become familiar with the permit's requirements before it becomes effective."
- 6. The House Agriculture Committee's panel on nutrition and horticulture was not swayed by the additional time the appeals court had given EPA.
- 7. House legislation (HR-872) was introduced to exempt pesticide applications from the permitting requirements of CWA and to solidify FIFRA as the ruling law. This rule passed on March 31, 2011 by a vote of 292 to 130.
- 8. Opponents of HR-872 say the bill is a purely symbolic gesture since the Democratically-controlled Senate is unlikely to take up the bill.
- 9. Key members of the Senate Agriculture Committee recently met with EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson and Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack and said they do not intend to resolve their concerns over the permit through legislative means. Representative Peter DeFazio (D-OR) said March 30 on the House floor that improving the permit to ensure that it is not excessively burdensome would be a better way of addressing concerns with the NPDES general permit than by pursuing HR-872.
- 10. On April 1, 2011, EPA posted a pre-publication version of its draft final PGP. In an effort to respond to critics' concerns, the agency has expanded the annual treatment area.
- 11. For mosquito control, the NOI threshold was raised from 640 acres a year and 20 acres of open water to 6,400 acres and 80 acres of open water.
- 12. The 20 linear mile threshold remains unchanged.
- 13. The States are taking widely varying approaches to their own permitting processes.
- 14. These States will need to get approval of their plans for permitting with EPA regional offices. The fact that States will take widely varying approaches increases the compliance challenges for operators who work in multiple states.
- 15. States which have CWA NPDES permitting authority have the option of adopting the EPA's PGP and adding any state-specific conditions.
- 16. The States may also develop their own PGP which must meet the minimum CWA requirements of the EAP permit, but can be even more stringent.
- 17. States' opinions regarding the permit vary widely.
- 18. Many appear to not want to be bothered and will likely just adopt the PGPs that come from the EPA, while some States will likely consider permits that are more stringent.
- 19. Some States have modest requirement for all; coverage provided automatically without NOI (e.g. NE, LA, SD, MD, and VA).
- 20. Some have extensive requirements for governments, agencies, and other entities above thresholds, but modest requirements below thresholds (e.g. FL, IA, OH, SC, PA, and OR).
- 21. Some States' PGP have very extensive requirements for all dischargers (e.g. NY, KY, WA, CA, and WI).
- 22. CA will implement the permits this season even though the decision was made to delay the implementation on a national basis.
- 23. After the presentation, it was noted that:
  - a. Indiana needs an Aquatic Plant Management Web site linked to the IISC site.
  - b. Marshall noted that the IISC should talk to the Indiana Department of Agriculture to see if they can persuade the Governor's office and our local contacts (Bob Burke, Jack Seifert) to see if Congress will look into this bill. JJ: There is some interest on the hill about this bill.

24. A comment was made that California is so regulated that they will doubtless go forward with this. The State of California lost its own lawsuit 10 years ago; they have been living under this since then.
25. The following discussion ensued:
  - a. The Weed Science Society of America (WSSA) is education-based. They need to develop and provide information about pest control issues to Congress.
  - b. The IISC should become educational too. We need to add resources addressing this issue to our Web site.
  - c. The IISC can recommend funding, rules, and laws. Yaninek will talk with the legislative contact to find out the process for this. But is merely being informed enough at this point for a good outcome?
  - d. Stuart Laurie suggested that the IISC draft a letter for Senator Lugar that stating that the PGP has no environmental benefit; the IISC supports the EPA; and the IISC urges him to support the concepts of HR 872.
  - e. John Jachetta moved the IISC draft a letter for elected representatives in the Senate to support FIFRA and avoid implementation of the NPDES general permit. He further pointed out that:
    1. The letter should be sent to points of contact in each office or be sent to each individual congressional member. The controversy in this issue seems to be motivated by environmental activists who are against pesticides in general, and by lawyers and agencies looking to collect fines and fees.
    2. People who are working with invasive species in riparian corridors will now have to get permits to do their work.
26. Marshall commented that he is concerned by the nozzle issue. This is a different issue than its use in agricultural applications. It seems that people working on projects will be the most affected.
27. Jachetta offered to start on the letter's first draft and provide a background document for the IISC. Kristopher Krouse asked for clarification as to whether this would include comment on the use of herbicides in addition to pesticides and was informed that it would.
28. There was a question about The Nature Conservancy's (TNC) position on this issue is. Ellen Jacquart reported that she met with the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) a week ago. TNC is very interested in this topic; they are not in favor of it going forward but they realize that they must be prudent and carefully position themselves.
29. A comment was made that IDEM seems to be going after large volume applicators more than smaller operations.
30. A question was posed as to what the IDNR is doing to prepare for these new rules.
31. Keller commented that members of the IDNR's Division of Fish and Wildlife are in discussion about this topic. The draft IDEM rule would require DFW to cover all treatments that DFW issues permits for under one notice of Intent (NOI). DFW vegetation control permitting primarily takes habitat into consideration rather than water quality.
32. Gramelspacher stated that Anne Hazlett, Chief Counsel of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry in DC and formerly Indiana's Agriculture Director, was working with Senator Blanche Lincoln from Arkansas on many agriculture policies. Phil wondered if Anne could assist the IISC in this matter.
33. Marshall wondered who should be cc'd on the proposed letter and cautioned against contacting too many as the effort could be viewed as lobbying.
34. Yaninek wondered what the reaction of the National Plant Board (NPB) was and was informed by Marshall that NPB meetings are held later in the summer. Marshall, a member of NPB, says that they talked about the issue but not in depth, and said that he would bring it up to Karl Schultz on a future call.
35. Yaninek requested more background information and said that he will need to discuss the topic with Purdue's Dean as there are strict rules against lobbying at Purdue.
36. Jachetta agreed that everyone needed to make sure that their organizations can support this without overstepping bounds.
37. Krouse suggested that perhaps a letter of concern is a compromise as an initial approach, to which Jachetta commented that in the end the Council should clearly communicate the action that it recommends.
38. Yaninek suggested that the motion on the table might be premature and that the IISC needs to consult with more organizations to discover their thoughts and ideas. He suggested tabling the motion pending a draft.
39. Jachetta made a motion to prepare a letter that will ultimately go to Indiana Senators regarding House Bill 872. A draft of the letter and all supporting documents will first be reviewed by the IISC and then

vetted by all the members' organizations before the final letter is sent to the Senators. The amended motion passed.

40. Keller stated that IDEM is doing the permitting at the state level. Most of the burden falls on DNR. Some of the States have wide coverage of certified applicators, but even state applicators will need permitting. He suggested that the IISC submit comments to IDEM suggesting that ALL State Chemist certified applicators using FIFRA's label pesticides are exempt from Notice of Intent (NOIs). This would relieve DNR of the burden of managing the NOI and place it back in the State Chemist's office. There is a table on their Web site that describes who has to submit a notice of intent. At present, a person licensed and certified by the State Chemist's office doesn't have to submit a NOI, nor do people in research and development. But DNR doesn't fit in here because it is an entity, not an individual. DNR is being treated differently.
  41. Jachetta suggested that the Council needs more background information before a letter can be drafted, and that it might be best to first create a series of bulleted points listing concerns.
  42. Keller requested that Jachetta provide the council with information from some of the other States that have more relaxed policies. Jachetta responded that there is a good summary doc that has been developed by RISE, from Crop Life America's aquatic working group. It contains a spreadsheet of all the states, action levels, etc. He will send this out to the Council.
  43. Marshall pointed out that the permits are only good for five years in any state. The permitting issue can be put in place by an Emergency Rule which then goes on to a General Permit. But going through the full rule-making process takes a long time as it involves several agencies and public hearings, etc.
  44. Keller agreed to put some notes together to share with the Council and discuss them at the next public meeting.
  45. Dave Scott of the State Chemist's Office is interacting with IDEM because of their mutual legal authorities.
- C. Jodie Ellis demonstrated the generic Power Point presentation for the IISC message on the Website at [www.entm.purdue.edu/IISC](http://www.entm.purdue.edu/IISC)
1. The presentation was created as a template that any member of the Council can use to introduce the IISC at meetings.
  2. Ellis requested that suggestions and comments on the presentation and Web site be sent to her directly at [ellisj@purdue.edu](mailto:ellisj@purdue.edu).
- D. Creating an invasive plant list for the state (Doug Keller, Ellen Jacquart, and Larry Bledsoe)
1. Keller reported that the Rule is drafted and is awaiting endorsement by the DNR Executive Office. Afterwards it will be sent to the Advisory Council.
  2. This rule should not have any problem being accepted, especially since there is almost no cost.
  3. The Rule lists 22 species of prohibited invasive plants (those not yet in Indiana or with limited distribution – eradication is possible.).
    - a. Several on the list are Federal noxious plants.
    - b. Four of them are actively traded.
    - c. Water chestnut is not in trade and is not Federal noxious.
  4. Restricted invasive aquatic plants are those plants that cannot be possessed in hand or traded.
    - a. These plants are already here; some are widespread.
    - b. Eradication of these plants is not required.
    - c. The purpose is to assure that they are not in trade to prevent further dissemination.
    - d. An example is Eurasian water milfoil, which is highly invasive and was removed from trade voluntarily. However, yellow flag iris and narrow leaf cattail are still in trade.
  5. Marshall suggested that the Council prepare information for the Executive Office before the Council proceeds with this issue.
  6. The next opportunity to take this before the Advisory Council will be this June, so it could go to the DNR Commission in July.
  7. The Rule will not be in full effect until spring 2012.
  8. Keller stated that the Council may not need to take any more action until the preliminary adoption's call for comments. He suggested that the Council could draft a letter of endorsement when it is time for adoption to be presented at the DNR Council meeting.
- E. Asian carp issue (Doug Keller) AC
1. John Goss, the Federal Asian carp director, is coming to Indiana to discuss the Asian carp issue.

2. Keller reported on an emerging issue: A fish hauler from Peru, IN was found in December moving live bighead carp into Canada. He apparently picked them up in Arkansas, placed them on ice to kill them, but five or six survived. The IDNR Division of Fish and Wildlife was very concerned but noted that the hauler was not doing anything illegal either in Indiana or in the US. The listing of bighead carp under the Lacey Act only came into effect last week after the confiscation occurred. In this case, however, Canadian laws were applied. Keller noted that there is a huge market for Asian carp in Canada as a food item and that live fish are much preferred.
  3. Yaninek requested a draft of the report by the next meeting.
- F. Best Management Practices (BMPs) for terrestrial invasive plants for implementation by government agencies (Ellen Jacquart and Tom Tremaine)
1. Jacquart reported that the BMP Committee looked at the Wisconsin example, which consists of extremely detailed BMPS concerning invasive plants in regard to:
    - a. Public rights of way
    - b. Outdoor recreation
    - c. Urban forestry
    - d. Rural forestry
  2. It was observed that the levels of detail and redundancy in the Wisconsin document are high.
  3. The BMP used for the Division of Forestry for Water Quality (IDEM) is a good example of a successful BMP and will serve as the model for the Committee's endeavors. The BMP Committee sorted through unique ideas and placed them in categories (planning, equipment, etc.) and prepared a rough draft that is out now.
  4. The next step is to go to agencies with a draft and discuss which BMPs are appropriate for their missions. The selected BMP will then be revised by the Committee and brought to the IISC.
  5. Timeline: the Committee will start making appointments within the next month with state agencies, and should have something back to the IISC by late fall.
  6. The first agencies to be contacted are INDOT, land managing agencies within DNR, and possibly IDEM regulators. The current audience is state agencies, but it is possible that this will eventually expand to private landowners, and maybe eventually to relevant federal agencies.
  7. These BMPs, if properly implemented, will reduce incidents of invasive species. State agencies will voluntarily decide to what degree and under what conditions to apply the BMPs. the State of Wisconsin asks for compliance to best of the agency's ability. It will be up to the IISC to say if these BMPS are suggestions or should be mandatory.
  8. Yaninek asked if it is known what other states have learned from their endeavors.
    - a. An official in Wisconsin said that there was grant funding to develop the Wisconsin BMPs as templates for other states, and that Wisconsin has shared many things such as "what to do differently", etc.
  9. It was suggested that the IISC should host some listening sessions with affected stakeholders to see to what extent to make the BMPs mandatory.
  10. Jacquart commented that the Committee is encouraging stakeholders to join in the work so they will be able to influence the results. Reception of this idea varies as all stakeholders view these issues from different perspectives.
    - a. Those who are interested in lessening their impact will be the ones most likely to cooperate. If the BMPs are mandated, there will need to be a lot more stakeholder input.
    - b. The IISC will recommend this strategy to those who do have regulatory authority (since the Council itself does not have regulatory authority.)
  11. Marshall commented that the Division of Forestry's strategic plan includes the goal of building incentives to boost implementation of BMPs. They want to develop a "Bad Actor" law. There is a BMP committee, consisting of Marshall and Bill Hoover, in place. Because of increased concern about green laws, it is likely that these BMPs will be mandated.
- G. Winter and spring invasive species meeting updates
1. Bill Fielding and Ellen Jacquart reported on the 97<sup>th</sup> Annual Purdue's Road School, which was held on January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011.
    - a. Although there was low attendance, several Division Directors were there.
    - b. There were three main speakers: Jacquart of TNC, Leighanne Haun of the Indiana State Chemist's Office, and Zachary Lowe of Purdue University)
    - c. It was noted that the IISC needs to speak to this group periodically but promotion of our involvement should be better.

- d. There was some debate at the meeting as to whether invasive species issues have anything to do with roads or road engineers. The Council needs to determine who its targets are in this group, including relevant departments from cities and towns.
  - e. There may be some inventories being planned with GPS pucks; there is an effort to get DNR to check if the software is compatible with other programs.
  - f. Overall, INDOT does not appear up-to-date on invasive species. Perhaps this is because they are not required by law to be involved. However, the permitting issues could make it easier to change laws.
  - g. The Council should determine what topics would be appropriate to bring to INDOT? Perhaps speakers from NERFA could attend the next meeting.
2. Haggard and Yaninek reported on the Indiana Green Industry Expo, which was held January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011, in Indianapolis.
    - a. The IISC was invited to be part of their program on an ongoing basis.
    - b. Attendance was low (~40) but there was interest and questions.
    - c. It is believed that attendance could be improved for the IISC presentation if Continuing Education credits are offered.
    - d. About 2,000 people attend the event each year.
    - e. A comment was made during the presentation that IISC should include information on topics that are in the public eye such as feral hogs, etc.
  3. Jachetta reported on the Second Annual National Invasive Species Awareness Week, held February 28 - March 4, 2011, in Washington, DC.
    - a. The event is put on by the National Invasive Species Council (NISC) and the Weed Science Society of America (WSSA). The event was organized by Lori Wilkins of the National Invasive Species Council. This will now be an annual event.
    - b. These gatherings have become increasingly important in view of decreased federal funding.
    - c. The event was very successful, with about 200 people attending from local and state groups.
    - d. The formation of partnerships was heavily emphasized.
    - e. John Goss, the Asian Carp Director, was in attendance.
    - f. There was a reception at the National Botanic Garden which several Senators and other legislators attended.
    - g. This was the first year of the collaborative event; in the previous year it was run solely by Weed Scientists.
    - h. Representatives from the American Fish and Wildlife Association came and spent most of their time on the Hill trying to prevent further loss of funding.
  4. Other meetings
    - a. There will be a Forest Stewardship Committee in January, 2012.
      1. Jack Siefert heads this meeting but there are diverse members.
    - b. There is a Review of the Statewide Forest Assessment for FS Farm Bill Funding coming up.

#### IV. New business:

- A. Marshall reported that the IISC letter of support for IDNR application (Indiana Terrestrial Invasive Species Survey & Mapping Initiative) was sent to the FY2011 Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry Competitive Allocation
  1. The letter was shared with Council members.
  2. The Council is still waiting on a response.
- B. State and Private Forestry recently went to using a competitive process, which has caused some unrest.
  1. In the middle of March, projects were reviewed and prioritized, but the results are not yet available.
  2. Everyone is waiting for the Federal budget to be passed; there is a fair amount of anxiety about this.
  3. Indiana has asked for \$1.5 million per year; this would include funding for mapping Thousand Cankers Disease (TCD).
  4. The future is unclear; everyone will have to wait to hear what happens with Continuing Resolution.
- C. Marshall distributed a handout regarding the IISC memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Indiana West Central Cooperative Weed Management Area
  1. Bob Eddleman, former Indiana State Conservationist for the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, asked Marshall to present this information to the Council.
  2. The purpose of the MOU is to encourage and formalize the cooperative relationship necessary to address the short and long term effects of invasive species across jurisdictional boundaries within 27

west central Indiana counties that comprise the West central Indiana Cooperative Weed Management Area (CWMA).

3. INDOT recently sent a letter of support for the MOU.
  - a. The letter supports information, education, and awareness. They asked for support and consideration from the IISC as well as a partnership to address information and education.
4. The next step for the IISC is to decide whether to sign on to the MOU.

*The following discussion ensued:*

5. Jacquart reported that TNC has signed the MOU and that “the plant and weed” people would like a letter of support from IISC as well.
6. It was suggested that a letter of support might be sufficient without signing on to the MOU, but it was also pointed out that signing it might strengthen their ability to get grants.
7. A concern was brought up that if the IISC does sign it, the Council might have to cooperate in future plans.
8. It was agreed that more information is needed and that a member of the Council should present an in depth look at the MOU. This could set a precedent for future requests.
9. Marshall volunteered to present more information on the MOU at the next meeting after talking to Bob Eddleman. He added that the Council needs to clarify if it wants to sign the MOU or provide a letter of support.
10. The issue of how the IISC should interact with groups requesting its support was brought up. It was agreed that all such groups must have missions in line with IISC’s legislative mandate, which might be determined by reviewing their strategic plans. Also, the groups should be able to handle federal grant dollars.
11. In addition, the Council members discussed how to handle such support in terms of public notice and disclosure. Letters could be posted on the IISC web site, and the IISC meetings are public.

#### D. WORKING GROUP REPORTS

1. Report Committee: A written report due to Natural Resources Study Committee, July 1, 2011 (Yaninek, Sara Christensen, and appointed stakeholder representative to be determined).
  - a. Yaninek suggested that the yet-to-be-appointed stakeholder representative and another person (maybe not an IISC member) should be assigned to help with Reporting Activities. Stuart Lowry volunteered to take part.
    1. Beginning July 1, 2011, the Council shall issue a written report to the Natural Resources Study Committee (IC 2-5-5-1) in every odd-numbered year, including information on:
      - a. The Council's activities and progress.
      - b. Performance of the council's duties.
      - c. Efforts in the state to identify and manage invasive species.
      - d. Recommendations of the council.
    2. The following discussion ensued about components of the report:
      - a. *Development and sharing of information resources to target management in a cost-effective manner.* Sharing BMPs and methods of data collection should also be included.
      - b. *Coordination with other Midwest state governments as well as regional and Federal agencies and other relevant organizations on common invasive species issues to increase consistency and effectiveness of programs.* It was agreed that the IISC is not ready to undertake this quite yet.
      - c. *Work with agencies and organizations to coordinate a comprehensive education and outreach effort to share new information and best practices, including convening or supporting invasive species meetings.* It was suggested that for the Education and Outreach component, a Council member from Purdue Extension would be of great help, but unfortunately this was not mandated.
      - d. *Improve the consistency and efficiency of State agencies’ invasive species policies and procedures.* An example of this topic is when one agency plants autumn olive and another one kills it as an invasive plant. This scenario can only be prevented through communication.
      - e. *Allocate appropriate resources to invasive species efforts to improve prevention, early detection, and control and management in Indiana in a*

- cost-effective manner.* It would be helpful to find a source of funds for an Executive Director of the IISC and a cost-sharing program, but both possibilities were cut before the IISC was formally convened. However, the IISC should look for funding sources in the upcoming budget session.
- f. *Amend statutory language to allow more effective implementation of invasive species regulations.* This is regarded as an open topic that is partly completed. It is anticipated that within two years, the IISC will have more to add here in the form of Invasive Plant Lists, BMPs, etc. An example of something that needs accomplished – noxious weed laws tend to occur at the township level. The IISC needs to make a recommendation here. This information goes to individual agency representatives through board meetings, cabinet meetings, and circulated updates. In INDOT, such communications often come too late and the issue becomes a corrective problem.
3. Further discussion ensued:
    - a. The question was posed as to whether the IISC should ask for \$2K to produce a handout from the Commission, possible targeting legislators. A comment was made that funding for outreach should probably come from the agencies themselves, not the Commission.
    - b. It was noted that the final position on the Council needs to be filled ASAP. Another attempt has been made to ask the Governor’s office about this. Ideally, the IISC should include members from IDEM and the State Chemist’s Office. This could be accomplished through the strategic planning process.
    - c. Timeline of the report:
      - i. The report is due on July 1, 2011.
      - ii. A draft should be submitted in June.
      - iii. Jachetta volunteered to serve as an editor for the draft and report.
      - iv. It was agreed that reports from working groups should be ready by May 15, 2011 and that by June 15; the final draft should be submitted for approval of the IISC.
  2. Communications and Web site Working Group - Ellen Jacquart, Jodie Ellis, and Phil Marshall
    - a. The IISC Web site is up and running at [www.entm.purdue.edu/IISC](http://www.entm.purdue.edu/IISC)
    - b. Submissions and suggestions should be directed to Jodie Ellis at [ellisj@purdue.edu](mailto:ellisj@purdue.edu)
  3. Conference Working Group (Bill Fielding, Rick Haggard, Ellen Jacquart, Phil Marshall, Doug Keller)
    - a. Marshall requested a conference call to work on this item before the next IISC public meeting.
  4. Data Collection and Management Working Group - Larry Bledsoe/CAPS, Phil Marshall/DNR, Ellen Jacquart/TNC
    - a. The group recently met and went over the topic of data management.
    - b. A question as to who will be the lead receiving state agency for invasive species data is still unresolved.
    - c. The goal of the group is to link databases together with an agreed-upon service provider.
    - d. A discussion of CERIS, and NIISC ensued.
      1. CERIS collects and processes, stores, and archives data for several organizations.
      2. CERIS created bridge that lets data be downloaded to a central repository to interconnecting agencies. This could be a component of IISC’s objective of uniting several agencies in Indiana.
    - e. There is a need for a project coordinator to handle data and develop a useable Web site.
      1. The Web site should have an area that the public can access.
      2. State agencies could have a password protected area of the Web site.
    - f. An important issue will be establishing rules for data entry and determining the protocol for entering data. The basic criteria must be in place before any meaningful database can be operational.
      1. The Working groups needs to devise recommendations as to which agency or agencies should lead this endeavor.
      2. Expenses and costs must be covered for the agency managing the database.
    - g. A question was posed as to whether it is ideal to have one source handling all the data.
    - h. The database will contain both historical and new data on such topics as:
      1. Arthropods



2. Invasives of concern to Boards of Health
  3. The Purdue Entomology Research Collection
  4. The Notre Dame database on mosquito
  5. Diseases and plants of concern to PPDL
  6. Mammals
  7. Forestry plants and pests
  8. Etc.
5. Invasive Species Advisory Committees:
- a. Invasive Plants Advisory Committee – Kris Krouse, Ellen Jacquart
    1. The Invasive Plant Advisory Committee provided an update on the invasive terrestrial plant list based on a new assessment of species not in trade, focusing on the three categories of Terrestrial Invasive Plants named in older Invasive Plant Species Assessment Work Group (IPSAWG) assessments.
    2. Highlighted ones have been updated by the IU student working with TNC and they will be posted on the DNR website when done
    3. A standard format is still needed.
    4. There are about 22 new plants to be assessed by IPSAWG assessments.
      - a. There have been 70 reports received involving these 22 species.
      - b. Eight of them had good information and were prioritized. These 8 are quite a mix, some all over the state, some just emerging, some important in trade, etc.
      - c. The group has sent requests for formal reports for preliminary assessments including new assessments for about 20 species not in trade that are not bought or sold
      - d. The group wants to adapt the assessment tool fused in New York
      - e. The Indiana University student will go through the list, and the group will have a meeting to review for approval of the Advisory Committee.
  - b. Aquatic Invasive Advisory Committee – Doug Keller
6. Outreach and Education Committee
- a. There was an Editorial in the NY Times on April 3, 2011 (“Mother Nature’s Melting Pot” by High Raffles, Hugh Raffles, an anthropologist at the New School, is the author of “*Insectopedia*.” [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/03/opinion/03Raffles.html?\\_r=3](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/03/opinion/03Raffles.html?_r=3)).
  - b. The article seemed to be advocating the value of invasive species in providing benefits to new ecosystems by comparing their arrival with immigration of people to a new country. From a biological standpoint, the article contained false analogies, incomplete assumptions, a disregard of time frames, etc.
  - c. The New York Time’s motivation for printing this is unknown.
  - d. The Nature Conservancy has drafted a letter to the newspaper in response and has offered to take reporters on a tour of damage from invasive species.
  - e. The IISC might want to comment on this as well.

**3:20 PM Adjourn**