



PO Box 3019  
Boscawen, NH 03303  
603.796.2615 • [info@northeastans.org](mailto:info@northeastans.org)  
[www.northeastans.org](http://www.northeastans.org)

**Meeting Summary Draft • May 11-12, 2009  
Doubletree Burlington, South Burlington, VT**

**Panelists in attendance:** Nancy Balcom, CT Sea Grant Extension Program; Ann Bove, VT Department of Environmental Conservation; Kevin Cute, RI Coastal Resources Management Council; Karen Hahnel, ME Department of Environmental Protection; Bill Harman, NY State Federation of Lake Associations; Bill Hyatt, CT Department of Environmental Protection; Susannah King, NE Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission; Don MacLean, US Fish and Wildlife Service; Mark Malchoff, Lake Champlain Sea Grant; Leslie Matthews, VT Department of Environmental Conservation; Paul Marangelo, The Nature Conservancy; John McPhedran, ME Department of Environmental Protection; Meg Modley, Lake Champlain Basin Program; Judith Pederson, MIT Sea Grant College Program; Isabelle Simard, Ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune; Amy Smagula, NH Department of Environmental Services, Jan Smith, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management; Jim Straub, MA Department of Conservation and Recreation; and Leslie Surprenant, NYS Division of Fish, Wildlife, and Marine Resources.

**Others present:** Leo Demong, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation; Tom Flannery, MA Department of Conservation and Recreation; Ellen Marsden, University of VT; Adrienne Pappal, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management; and Michele L. Tremblay, NEANS Panel ANS Program Manager (naturesource communications).

**Full Panel meeting: welcome, introductions, review of meeting agenda, and updates by Co-Chair** – Susy King, New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**ANS updates and Panel business:**

- The Panelists and guests introduced themselves and their organizations.
- The Panel accepted the November 2008 meeting summary.
- *NEANS Panel Business and November 2009 meeting scheduling* – Michele Tremblay indicated that the May 2009 meeting rotation falls in the State of Massachusetts. Michele suggested Salem or Boston. Salem is the consensus. Invasive friends will be asked to provide any possible date conflicts in response to upcoming email polling that Michele will distribute via the [panel@northeastans.org](mailto:panel@northeastans.org) listserv.

**Action: Michele Tremblay will begin work on finalizing a date and securing a facility for the November 2009 meeting.**

- ANS Task Force (ANSTF) action items and other updates – Susy and Michele are going to the meeting in Bozeman, MT. Michele provided the Panel with an update on the concerted effort to get more funds appropriated for the state management plans (SMPs). There is a parallel effort for Panel funding. Don MacLean indicated that US Fish and Wildlife Service has been trying to secure additional funds for the Panels and the SMPs. The USFWS is working on a service needs document that includes additional funds for the Panels. The \$50K for all of the Panels appears

secure for the near future. The Panels all sent letters to the ANSTF but the Panel cannot directly provide this input or request to its seven Congressional delegations. However, it can provide information sessions for its delegations. Panel state agencies can also provide information to include in their respective Hill visit information packets. Michele spoke with several states that were very receptive to working with the Panel. Michele pointed out that the seven NEANS Panel states had a large number of ranking people that could help. She said that Allegra Cangelosi from Northeast-Midwest Institute had convened a regular series of conference calls to help coordinate invasive legislation awareness and support. She felt that it was very effective and hoped that there could be a similar effort now. Kevin worked with Judy Pederson to draft a letter but received feedback that this may not be an effective avenue for that mode of input.

- National Invasive Species Advisory Council – Nancy just returned from the Tucson meeting. The Council passed a 2008-2012 plan to help it meet the strategies and actions in the plan. Biofuels is a new priority with many agencies but the biomass (e.g. algae) often contains or is invasive species. There are many aspects of this issue including escapees and abandoned projects. The message is that if a funding request is made, the suggestion on what must be sacrificed should be included in the proposal. Microbes and invasive species management are the priority focus areas.
- Susy opened the floor to nominations for Panel marine co-chair. Meg nominated Jan Smith. Kevin Cute seconded the motion. Jan has been involved since the Panel's inception in 2001 and is currently one of the Science and Technology Committee's co-chairs. He is now working more directly in habitat issues with the MA Office of Coastal Zone Management. Jan was elected as marine co-chair.

**Highlights from Vermont** – Leslie Matthews presented the Vermont highlights. Since November, the budget shortfalls have been over \$60MM this year and \$75MM next year. There have been 400 positions cut since last year and 300 more are proposed. The legislature passed a budget this week that the Governor is likely to veto. Metal signs are posted at access areas with an increase in requests for additional placements. There are 55 on Lake Champlain alone with 209 on inland waters. The second annual lake access greeter program training is being held this month. There are 22 programs on several lakes with public access. They provide voluntary boat inspections and information to boaters. They are working on more coordinated messaging and promoting additional sites. The citizen weevil rearing program may be eliminated. There is a concern to maintain their genetic integrity. The fishing derby (nonprofit organization) on Lake Champlain received \$15K to conduct outreach activities on which VTDEC is coordinating awareness and messaging. The Department is providing consultation and control on 50 waterbodies including one reference point pristine private pond. Water Chestnut (21 infested waterbodies) management continues in collaboration with several state and federal agencies and organizations and is threatened by severe budget cuts. Handpulling remains the most commonly used control method. There is some mechanical harvesting on Champlain. The aquarium dealer program may not continue due to budget cuts. Two southern VT dealers had been identified as selling Variable milfoil. Rapid response on variable leaf milfoil continues. The species was discovered in the fall Hall's Lake in Newbury. Benthic matting and suction harvesting permits are in process along with herbicide applications. There is hope to eradicate it because it is nowhere else in the state. DEC continues to provide grant awards for control projects at the local level. Didymo is in

the Mad, Battenkill, White, and Connecticut watersheds. Didymo cells are fairly well distributed in the Battenkill in VT but nuisance blooms have only been observed in the NY part of the watershed. Johnson State College is conducting a research project on early detection monitoring on when to see cells in the water column and if nets can be used to gather samples. VTDEC plans to work with the National Park Service on genetic research on different populations to nuisance vs. non-nuisance blooms. Comprehensive Aquatic Nuisance Species was introduced in the legislature (based on a previous bill from last year). It included a mandatory boat (including kayaks, canoes, and out-of-state vessels) sticker to fund nuisance species program. It was not supported by DEC because of the mandatory funding mechanism. It would have also made it illegal to transport all invasive plants (Zebra and Quagga mussels are still included). That bill has passed the House. An amended version passed the Senate.

## **Northeast ANS Roundtable**

### **Maine**

*John McPhedran, ME Department of Environmental Protection*, reported that there is some interest from non-agency groups to increase the sticker fee. The Department had an additional \$60K this year because of a merger but the increase will not be repeated and inflation will likely reduce it. There is \$170K available for prevention and control grants (50/50). There is a federal earmark effort to obtain funding for control efforts. Eighty sites offer courtesy boat inspections. There were key saves at several lakes. The Department distributed a request for proposals for a rapid response contractor to be available on an on call basis. There are several ponds receiving treatment. The Department is diving for Eurasian milfoil. A flyfishing organization is setting up three Didymo wash stations with saline solution.

*Sarah Kirn, Gulf of Maine Research Institute (GMRI)*, reported that the Didemnum trap project of Maine Marine Invasive Working Group (MMIWG) and GMRI. They have two lobster traps that have been retrofitted for the cause. They will install in each six settling plates of approximately 18" by 13" with two horizontal in the middle flanked by two vertical on each side. Deployment will follow ASAP at Casco Bay sites; and hopefully more traps to follow. The Vital Signs spring investigations are underway, with six of the program's fourteen teachers heading outside to collect invasive species and habitat observations. The website will have minimal functionality and content by very early June to allow students to submit their data. Work on the site will continue throughout the summer, with a final completion goal of late July. GMRI is convening two Vital Signs institutes this summer, July 29-31 and August 19-21. Their goal was to have 30 teachers, and so far 32 have expressed interest. The GMRI is actively seeking scientists and citizen scientists for two opportunities with Vital Signs: supporting field trips and participating in the online Vital Signs community. The online part will include checking students' species identifications. Experts will be able to confirm or suggest alternative identifications from the comfort of their own office.

*Peter Thayer, ME Department of Marine Resources, (via email)* reported that the MMIWG is investigating further the possibility of implementing a diver fall Didemnum survey, funded possibly by Casco Bay Estuary Partnership, and Maine ANS funds; and conducted by an independent contracted party. A run of the poster "New England's Marine Invasion" is near the printing stage, for distribution to pertinent locations; funded and supported by IF&W, NE Sea Grant, Maine Coastal Program, and Maine's ANS funds. The MMIWG hosted an informational booth at the annual Fisherman's

Forum in Rockland, Maine in March 2009. Various publications were distributed; as well as information disseminated through conversation.

### **Massachusetts**

*Jim Straub, MA Department of Conservation and Recreation*, reported that there is a second case of Hydrilla in MA. The DCR is using its own agency funding to combat it. The Town of Pembroke is also using its funds to conduct chemical treatment. They are concerned about fish and will electrofish the pond to determine populations including baitfish. This pond and Long Lake on Cape Cod have restricted access to try to contain the invasion. In western MA, the DCR is conducting a five-site Zebra monitoring program and is loaning equipment including dissecting microscopes. A boat with dead zebra mussels was found in the area. The DCR merger with the state drinking water agency has allowed it to provide information and training at the boat ramp gates. There is a concern about zebra mussels clogging the Quabbin Reservoir system (water supply for Boston). They are conducting water chestnut monitoring with USFWS including hand-pulling and mechanical harvesting. Residents of a pond in Natick are fighting herbicide application into an urban lake. Tom Flannery is now working with the DCR. He made an appeal to set up a field demonstration of suction/vacuuming. There will be groups in Vermont and Maine that will have opportunities to view it.

*Jan Smith and Adrienne Pappal, MA Office of Coastal Zone Management*, indicated that they are expecting to partners with up to nine groups, MA, NH, ME, and RI. They are working on an evaluation of red algae. Shift message to target industry. The MIMIC moves citizens from education to action. There is a movement to with area groups to get individuals more involved and to advocate for increased funding.

### **Vermont**

*Meg Modley, Lake Champlain Basin Program*, reported that the Program has brought its rapid response plan to the executive committee. If they approve it, they will decide on next steps to form a task force, obtain funding, and other actions. In the basin, there are no new Didymo occurrences. There is one river stewardship grant to provide training. The Program developed aquatic invasive species identification guide that is in its first printing. Alewife in the basin are impacting Atlantic Salmon. Early mortality syndrome has been observed. Hatcheries that are groundwater fed will only stock inland lakes due to VHS infestations. Smelt populations are crashing because of Alewife. The VT Invasive Plan Committee (primarily focused on terrestrial species) met to discuss to MA and NY plans and are considering including other taxa. The boat launch program will be staffed with eight stewards. They will continue to work with Paul Smith College and other partners. The Canal Corporation is supportive of the plan language to conduct feasibility studies. Chinese mitten crabs are in the Hudson watershed and are a species of concern.

*Ellen Marsden, University of VT*, reported that her program is documenting species and how they got here including canals as a vector.

### **Québec**

*Isabelle Simard, Ministère des Ressources naturelles et de la Faune*, reported that they produced fact sheets on aquatic invasive plants. They have developed a Code of best practices for government employees, to give a good example to the public and make sure that government employees are not vectors for the spread of invasive species

(terrestrial and aquatic guidelines). The Ministère is pursuing its Didymo monitoring: 60% of the Bas Saint-Laurent-Gaspésie Rivers have Didymo cells. Less than 50% of them have developed blooms. The monitoring for VHS is continuing this summer. Still no sign of the virus in Québec's waters. The Ministère is working on priority species lists. The Water chestnut eradication program in Southern Québec is also continuing. They will work on a new five-year financial agreement between the partners to continue the program.

### **Connecticut**

*Bill Hyatt, CT, Department of Environmental Protection*, reported that the Long Island Sound plan is in a revised draft. A new Invasive Plant Coordinator was hired last year and was then laid off this year. The position has since been reinstated. The Department is continuing to work with UConn to eradicate Hydrilla from Silver Mine watershed in southwestern CT using hand pulling and chemical treatments. Northeast fish guidelines have been developed and approved by all Northeast states with the states now working on compliance. There are sometimes challenges with importation and aquaculture regulated by several state departments of agriculture. Water chestnut work continues in the Connecticut Rivers watershed.

### **Rhode Island**

*Kevin Cute, Coastal Resources Management Council*, reported that there are two projects underway resulting from the state management plan. There is a volunteer-based ANS program with the Marine Invader Monitoring and Information Collaborative (MIMIC). Adrienne Pappal will provide training in three shipping harbors for monitoring this summer. Kevin is supportive of regional projects and is happy to bring MIMC to RI. The state is creating a mitten crab costume for an interactive performance in schools and other groups. The costume will be available for loan. Kevin is working with a charter school to create a marine curriculum. Kevin is working to form a partnership between the New York Aquarium and the NEANS Panel. He is willing to make the Aquarium's resources available to the Panel if some NEANS Panel funding. The funding could be provided to the Aquarium and would leverage other funds to obtain support for aquarium programs. He provided to the Panelists a letter and invited others to work with him to form a proposal for the Steering Committee.

***Action: Kevin will bring to the next NEANS Panel meeting the mitten crab costume.***

### **New Hampshire**

*Amy Smagula, NH Department of Environmental Services*, reported that the Lake Host Program is now stationed at 81 sites and is entering its fifth year. No invasive species have been caught yet this year. There is no change on the Didymo infestations. The Department provided 25 grants for control projects in NH: half are herbicide treatments and half are for diving removal projects. The program has been cut and it is challenging to meeting its required 70/30 match. One research project is to determine seed viability of variable milfoil with the Army Corps of Engineers. The study includes applications on root and root crown. The North American Lakes Management Society (NALMS) is meeting in New England in 2009 with abstracts are due this week. There is a bill in the NH legislature to increase by \$2.50 boater registrations with \$1.50 going to

control projects. One dollar will fund prevention grants to expand the Lake Host Program.

### **New York**

*Bill Harman, NYS Federation of Lake Associations*, reported that they have completed the *Diet for a Small Lake* publication targeted to lake associations who wish to write management plans. The University is approving a master of science in lake management degree. They are working with NALMS for certification for lake managers.

*Leslie Surprenant, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation*, reported that it closed a large budget gap that includes 20,000 staff layoffs (6.5% for each agency). Two new waters are now infested with *Didymo* including a tributary to the Battenkill. Another is in a controlled creek that is in the Schoharie watershed. There is an effort to obtain funding through the stimulus package to help combat these infestations. Chinese mitten crab has been found in NJ near NYC. The DEC has imposed ballast water conditions for an EPA general permit, which is currently in litigation. Funding was granted to Paul Smith College for four stewards this season. Phragmites research is ongoing at Cornell University. So far, the organisms aren't proving viable in captivity. The invasive species plan released a request for proposals for a comprehensive plan that includes identifying policy and recreation gaps.

*Mark Malchoff, Lake Champlain Sea Grant*, reported that he has been working on an education and outreach project on spiny water flea in the Sacandaga, Hudson, and Glens Falls areas. There is a project to examine how VHS moves between fish. There is a workshop on transmissibility this fall and next spring. Mark has been involved in bass fishing tournaments outreach, working with participants who travel great distances and are on some waterbodies for less than an hour, several times a day or over a period of days. "Interdimension" research on these competitive bass anglers will gain knowledge of what they know, what they don't, and their behaviors relative to invasive species.

### **Federal and nonprofit**

*Susy King, New England Interstate Water Pollution*, waived her time to time constraints.

*Paul Marangelo, The Nature Conservancy*, reported that TNC are not immune from funding difficulties. They have lost their policy advocate for invasive species issues. His own travel funds are severely restricted. TNC will continue to stay involved in water chestnut and other issues and work on basin linkages.

### **Discussion on NEANS Panel long-term planning and regional coordination**

Susy reported that about 35 individuals responded in less than a week and she thanked those who have provided their input. The survey close date will be extended to DADSFADSF. The Steering Committee reviewed the responses and identified key issues to discuss today. The SC will take the survey results and today's discussion to draft a bylaws proposal for early fall review, conduct a conference call/webinar, and then vote at the fall Panel meeting.

- How many state representatives from each state? The response was two but John McPhedran indicated that some states may need three or perhaps four because

there are four different agencies that manage freshwater plants and animals and marine plants and animals.

- How should they be chosen? Each state will determine.
- Should states be able to designate proxies? Yes
- Who should designate? Official Panel member
- Should there be a marine/freshwater balance? Mostly yes
- Should a third year be added to a co-chair's term as "immediate past co-chair" with limited duties? Mostly yes.
- Should Steering Committee have geographical balance? Yes.
- Geographically representative? Yes.
- How would committees work groups interact? Panel updates with interim reports to the SC.
- Do you understand Panel Council relationship? Mostly no.
- Major decisions, who should vote? Mostly entire Panel.
- Is committee communication adequate? No.
- Most valuable part of meeting is sharing ideas (but see above where there is lack of communication).
- Financial support for meetings? Mostly yes said that they need it and could use it.

How to deal with agency requests if there is word that the Panel will pay? Concerns? Why was it originally decided?

The third year for the co-chair came up because when Kevin proposed changes, his term was just ending and couldn't be on the SC for continued discussion of the governance issues. It would be more of an ex-officio role vs. an active management role. It's primarily for guidance and "corporate memory." Kevin indicated that he would have been willing to serve in that capacity. One comment was that the immediate past co-chair could attend the ANSTF meetings.

There was not clear agreement on

- How should non-state agency panelists be chosen?  
History on formation and for current process from me. One posited, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it?" Panelists asked why was this issue raised. Because some asked how the process as worked and some survey respondents indicated that they weren't sure if they were official panel members. Should the Panel specify what is an active member? Some felt that elimination based on number of meetings at which they have or haven't participated might be overly restrictive.

- Must panel and/or committee co-chairs be official Panelists  
Currently, committee co-chairs are not always official Panelists. The consensus was not to change it. There may no longer be Committees.

- Who serves on Steering Committee (SC)?  
The majority favors a geographic balance (a combination of the first two survey options). Will this work in a practical sense? There are at least one member from each state who is participating on the Panel so it seems that the SC would enjoy the same geographic representation. Currently, there are states such as NH, which are not represented on the Steering Committee. Currently, committee co-chairs are doubly burdened because they have to lead their committees and they have to serve on the SC. If a geographic option is chosen, there would be a loss of the committees' connections with the SC. Are there enough people to go around? Any of the options provide roughly the same number of people on the SC. If someone is

currently a committee co-chair and they are the state representative, they would be serving at the same level now vs. with the new proposal.

Currently, some states are not able to vote on financial or other issues (such as the bylaws) because they are not on the SC. The SC could actually get smaller with some serving dual roles such as Jan being Panel co-chair and the MA representative.

- Form work ground in addition to or instead of committees

The survey was evenly split between in addition to or in place of. The committees were created for formulate ideas and create work plans? Is it working? Some felt that it was: Work groups wouldn't formulate ideas but would instead work on initiatives. Committees formulate ideas. Currently, the committees form the work plans and implement the projects. A committee could present an idea but then a work group would be formed to implement the project. Some felt that the Panel should generate the project ideas. For instance CEO had few members while S&T had a large group generating ideas—some of them that encompassed education and outreach strategies. An example was the proposal for the Panel to participate in the Boston Flower Show and then a work group was formed to investigate the idea and possibly implement a strategy and projects. The New York Aquarium idea is another example where the Panel would decide on a project and then involved education, outreach, science, and technology. A work group would be a time-limited group formed to implement a project. Don indicated that the other regional panels have had this same discussion. Some have formed time-limited working groups. The committees were formed to give those with specific interests a group where that expertise was best utilized. There is a concern that projects fit a committee budget but that might not serve a regional or Panel purpose and integrate with other priorities. Work groups could include bringing in others from outside the Panel and expanding resources to implement projects. One Panelist indicated that while her expertise was outreach and education, her interest was in marine issues so choosing between the CEO and SH Committees was not an easy decision. There is concern that committees are “domains” where money resides. There was a concern raised that the committee structure promoted communication and that would no longer be the case under the proposed structure. Should the Panel choose the project and then a group is formed to address all of the various parts of it including policy, science, technology, education, and outreach. Some committee proposals were small because the amounts of money available were too small to holistically complete the project. With ST, committees and work groups have already been formed. The Panel is the idea generator and if it is small, will there be enough expertise to form the work groups? Could there be a two-hour session on the first day of the meetings and have it be an earlier and more integrated part of the Panel meetings? In this scenario, the committees would no longer exist but there would be more Panel planning and then the opportunity to work in smaller but integrated groups. There is a similar structure that ISAC uses for their projects. The Panel could work on brainstorming and then vote on one project or project(s) and then spend more time during the same meeting to work on implementation. Would the “home” that committees provide for Panelists and others be lost? Could the work groups be placed above the committees and be a groups that is named as the project lead? There may not be time for SC, committees, and work groups in the current Panel meeting structure and schedule. Elimination of the committees? Caucuses.

- How to make decisions

Consensus, over 50% majority, or 2/3 majority. My explanation of consensus including buy in compared to split votes. Some felt that with a small organization such as ours, consensus was the way to proceed. There would be official votes on record for funding and bylaw changes but the consensus process would prepare the group for that decision.

- Steering Committee composition conflict of interest funding

Mostly felt it was an issue but it was split. Again, this issue may be moot if the committees are disbanded and the Steering Committee composition changes to geographic composition. Some felt that proposing a project shouldn't disqualify one from voting for it. Others felt that voting for someone else's proposal might detract from voting for another because it could mean less funding for the someone #1. What defines a conflict of interest? Is it only personal gain, gain for one's organization, or other connections? What is a Panelists brings forward a proposal that benefits his/her state? Would he/she have to recuse his/herself from all votes? Some felt that the amounts of money haven't been large enough to merit a conflict of interest discussion. Some felt that with greater collaboration, there may be projects with multiple participation so the potential pool of those with a perceived conflict might grow. The Panel would now decide on projects vs. the current composition of the Steering Committee and would provide all jurisdictions with an opportunity to vote. The Panel can provide a bigger, better "think tank" to better grow ideas and specify projects.

- Strive to have projects serve region

This may not be practical and may stifle opportunities and emerging opportunities, for instance a specific species invasion. Some felt that this could benefit the entire region as an early detection model and preventative measure.

- Frequency duration of meetings?

Options evenly split but those at the table discussed keeping the structure as is vs. adding to it. Others felt that with some of the new structure considerations, more time might be needed. The second day could be extended. Some felt that with two meetings per year, they are willing to spend more time to get more done. Others felt that their agencies might restrict them from staying overnight more than one night. Some suggested that the first day of the meeting start earlier on the first day vs. staying later on the second day. This would affect the current structure where the Steering Committee meets the morning of the first day. Others felt that lengthening the first day by starting at 10:00 AM and the second day until 3:30 PM was all right. The Steering Committee members felt that they needed to face-to-face at least twice each year. The Steering Committee could meet at 10:00 and then the Panel meeting could start at 11:30 AM or 12:00 PM.

There was a question about the relationship between the Council and the Panel. Michele provided a brief background on the Northeast Aquatic Nuisance Species Council's purpose, history, relationship with the Panel. The Panel was formerly hosted, from its inception, by the US Gulf of Maine Association, the fiscal agent for the Gulf of Maine Council on the Marine Environment. This relationship began because Susan Snow-Cotter, one of the founders and first NEANS Panel c-chairs was a long-term Gulf of Maine Councilor and Working Group member. Michele wrote all of the

contracts and reports for the Panel but the Association accepted and expended funds. The Panel felt that the indirect rate that the Association charged was relatively high and decided to form its own fiscal agent. The formation of the Council also allows for other functions such as advocacy and application for foundation and other funding. The Council is governed by five directors, currently Kevin Cute (chair), Karen Hahnel, Jan Smith (treasurer), Jim Straub (vice-chair), and Michele Tremblay. The Council manages the Panel's funds according to its direction. Michele formed the organization as a New Hampshire and IRS 50(c)(3) corporation and provides bookkeeping and other financial and nonprofit management services at no charge to the Council.

The governance discussion will be continued on the second day of the meeting.

### **Committee updates (committees will be preparing and submitting detailed work plans and funding proposals)**

*Communication, Education, and Outreach (CEO) Committee* - Karen Hahnel and Leslie Matthews, Co-chairs

Karen updated the Panel on the online guide project. The CEO is developing a marine and freshwater species list (#10 each). The CEO requested image files including photographs and drawings for the chosen ten species. The images will be credited but must be public domain. They must be printable so should be high resolution (approximately 1-3MB TIF or JPG).

***Action: The CEO will distribute to the Panel the list of twenty freshwater and marine species so that they can know what species will be needed for the first part of the online guide.***

***Action: Michele will create an FTP folder and send the address to the CEO co-chairs.***

*Science and Technology (ST) Committee* - Jan Smith and Meg Modley, Co-chairs

Meg reported that Jan will be stepping down and Adrienne will be stepping forward. The S&T plan includes organizing a "Spotlight on Species" meeting sessions (no funding) and has four recommendations: Guadalupia, Chinese Mitten Crab, Canadian Risk Assessment (November meeting), and Spiny and Fish Water Flea. The second action item, MIMIC, is completed. Adrienne would like to make a presentation at the November 2009 meeting with local participants providing their perspectives on the program. The "Three Most Wanted" species poster (\$2,000 in Panel funds) is in process. A half-day workshop on freshwater monitoring protocols was held in May. The results are now posted on NortheastANS.org. New project ideas include *Grateloupia turuturu* mapping and eradication, other states and provinces database sharing and possible importation into one receptacle and using a mapping tool with all lakes and species in them, looking at states' and provinces' guidelines on circumventing species spread, and sponsoring a HAACP training. The incident command response relative to rapid response might be revisited.

***Action: The ST will work on the "Three Most Wanted" [species] poster.***

***Action: There will be an S&T Committee conference call in September for the HIP work group.***

***Action: Michele will add Adrienne to the Steering Committee listserve.***

### **Spotlight on Species: Snakehead Eradication effort**

The featured presenter was Leo Demong who provided a case study on an eradication effort in New York State (contact Michele for a copy of the presentation).

## **Champlain Basin regional rapid response plan**

Meg Modley presented the Basin's plan with several case studies and the stakeholder and partnership roles (contact Michele for a copy of the presentation).

## **NEANS Panel structuring and bylaws revision discussion (continued)**

**SC composition and Workgroups or committees or both** - Some were concerned that each state wouldn't be able to get someone "at the table." Currently, there are some states that have multiple people at the table because of the committee co-chair membership structure. States can exercise their prerogatives and not participate. Two federal (other USFWS) or non-governmental representatives would have to be chosen. How would they be chosen? What about the provinces? Can they participate on the Steering Committee? They cannot vote on any US federal funding issues but they can on other discussions. The discussions proposed included adding one representative per province. Some are worried about too large a Steering Committee while others felt that the larger potential pool. The Panel may wish to define the quorum as simple majority or those participating vs. those defined. What about the marine and freshwater balance? Will this new structure address it? The current role of the Steering Committee is to develop budgets, allocate funds, and conduct the Panel's day-to-day business. In the new proposal, the Panel would make project funding decisions. There is concern that committee leadership would be lost. They could be on calls to make proposals but not be part of the decisions to fund projects. The issue was raised that the Panel should hear the proposals and decide on priorities. The committees or work groups would then implement projects with the Steering Committee overseeing that work. The committees will continue to exist but the role changes to one of visioning (generate ideas) vs. implementation (that would now be a work group function). The Steering Committee will need to develop budgets to provide direction for operations and to determine what is available for Panel projects. Committee co-chairs may no longer be required in this proposed structure. A point person for each committee might be useful. These work groups can include committee members and others. The full Panel would decide on projects and funding. Don indicated that other Panels don't have a structure where one committee takes full ownership of a project. There was a concern that the new structure could work without committees but that they should continue during the first year to continue to groups to generate ideas and implement existing initiatives.

***Consensus: Structure the Steering Committee for geographic representation with one representative for each state and province, one representative from USFWS, and two nongovernmental or non-USFWS participant(s) who would be chosen by the Panel.***

***Consensus: The Steering Committee will discuss how the current committees will or will not be included in the new governance structure.***

## **Other business and public comment period**

There were no comments from the public.

***Action: Michele requested that each state send to her a hard copy of their current management plan. She would also appreciate hearing if any revision is planned and if so, what is the target date for completion.***

*Meeting summary prepared by Michele L. Tremblay, ANS Program Manager, NEANS Panel*