

# Wisconsin Invasive Species Council Meeting

Thursday, January 30, 2014

12:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

DNR Science Operations Center – Northwoods Conference Room  
2801 Progress Road, Madison Wisconsin

## Meeting Minutes

**Present:** Tom Bressner (Wisconsin Agribusiness), Danielle Johnson (Tourism, via phone), Jim Kerkman (Council on Forestry, via phone), Brian Kuhn (DATCP), Greg Long (Needles & Leaves Nursery, via phone), Todd Matheson (DOT), Pat Morton (TNC, via phone), Travis Olson (DOA), Ken Raffa (UW, via phone), Paul Schumacher (Wisconsin Lakes), and Jack Sullivan (DNR)

**Others Present:** Tom Boos (DNR via phone), JoAnne Cruse (USDA), Jennifer Feyerherm (DNR), Sylvia Shadman-Adolpho (USDA, via phone), Bob Wakeman (DNR), and Dreux Watermolen (DNR)

### **Call to Order and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order by Schumacher. Meeting attendees introduced themselves.

### **Approval: October 14, 2013 Council Meeting Minutes**

Kuhn motioned to approve the minutes of the October 14, 2013 meeting, with minor editorial corrections. Second by Matheson. Motion carried. Sullivan abstained.

The Council reviewed the status of tasks listed in the minutes:

- Question: Was the Invasive Species Strategic Plan shared with the legislature? Yes, it was shared last fall along with the annual legislative report.
- A Council committee was appointed to review the species assessment groups' efforts and do a "best practices" assessment. The group has not yet initiated the effort, but is working with DNR staff to obtain email contacts for SAG leads. A survey will go out prior to the next Council meeting.
- Sealy-Schreck's report on GLRI project is included in the updates document.
- Kuhn followed up on the internet trade questions and arranged for the briefing scheduled for later in this meeting. The follow up was with APHIS SITC, not animal health staff (minutes corrected to reflect this).
- Schumacher will draft cover letter introducing the Strategic Plan and summary documents to elected delegates in Washington, then will review with Heinen and Kluesner, then will share with Council.
- Boos has led discussion with IPAW but has not yet summarized what the Council can do to help address the insurance issues for CWMAs.
- Watermolen will discuss bait fish issues later in this meeting.

**TASK:** Watermolen will distribute a short written update on the department's fish passage prior to the next Council meeting.

## Updates: Invasive Species and Program Updates

An “Invasive Species and Issue Updates: January 30, 2014” document was distributed to the Council prior to the meeting. Watermolen highlighted several items from the written updates:

1. There have been discoveries of two new invasive species occurrences: the New Zealand mud snail and the Asian jumping worm.

DNR is actively engaged with partners to address the New Zealand mud snail and is applying a three-pronged approach that includes:

- Getting information out to keep stakeholders informed and on top of the issue
- Developing and implementing decontamination protocols
- Monitoring the species

Each of these things is happening contemporaneously.

Question: Will there be a presentation at the lakes conference? Wakeman stated that he believed there would be.

DNR is working with the UW to map out a plan to deal with the Asian jumping worms, and again it has been a three-pronged approach, all happening contemporaneously:

- Working together to develop BMPs to avoid spreading the worm via arboretum activities
- Educating arboretum educators to prevent spread
- Research going on in background to document its presence and review the literature

Question: How did it get there? Researchers guess it arrived in horticultural plantings. Staff are moving with a sense of urgency to identify all of the vendors and to contact them.

Question: Is there an identification protocol? Why does identification take so long? It depends on the species involved. Some invertebrates and some plants are particularly difficult to identify and require specialized expertise. For example, to identify the mudsnail, DNR went to the university and got genetic testing. In the case of the worms, we discovered them on a weekend in November during an ecological restoration conference. The next week DNR staff looked at the site and collected specimens that were sent to a taxonomist and now we are waiting for identification confirmation.

Question: Is there a concern about rapid response being held up because of identification? This is a legitimate concern. DNR staff can talk internally about establishing a formal procedure. For this particular case, we are on an acceptable timeline because the worms will not spread when the ground is frozen.

Question: Who identifies plants for the agencies? Kuhn indicated that at DATCP, first the species identification is confirmed at the state level and then it must be confirmed by a certified national identifier through APHIS in a prescribed protocol. Wakeman indicated that for aquatic identifications, DNR obtains two independent verifications. Sometimes that can take several months.

Sullivan expressed concern about the timing of identifications affecting rapid response activities. Schumacher agreed that a sense of urgency in taxonomy should be a focus.

TASK: Sullivan to ask DNR’s invasive species team to take up this issue and possibly formalize a process. The process could be informed by experiences with CWD.

2. Outreach activities have continued during the period of staff transition.

Pond owners: A major mailing went out to pond owners in the Lake Michigan basin. We have gotten lots of positive feedback and will be doing more along the same lines a little bit later in spring when people are ordering their plants.

Colleges and universities: DNR sent a letter to deans and provosts across the state, informing them about NR40 and offering to help them with any compliance issues. Again, the department has been getting a very positive response, for example:

- Marquette University committed to review all of its lab procedures
- A UW-La Crosse professor applied for a permit for his faucet snail research
- A UW-Stevens Point professor requested invasive species trainings for his classes at Treehaven

3. There have been no major legislative and policy issues since the Council's last meeting.

The only relevant state legislation since the previous Council meeting was the sea lamprey act signed by the Governor in December. At the federal and regional level, the only item is the Invasive Fish and Wildlife Prevention Act from last spring that would enhance the federal government's ability to respond to potentially invasive species in a more timely fashion. It has been referred to committee and is still awaiting action.

4. The Great Lakes-Mississippi River Interbasin Study (GLMRIS) report was released.

This U.S. Army Corps of Engineers study evaluates a range of options and technologies to prevent aquatic nuisance species movement between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River basins through aquatic connections. On January 6, the Army Corps submitted its GLMRIS Report to Congress. The report presents eight alternative plans that include general locations, conceptual design elements, estimated implementation times, and cost information. The report also includes potential mitigation measures to address impacts to uses of the Chicago Area Waterway System (CAWS) resulting from the implementation of the various alternatives. The GLMRIS Team is inviting public comment on the alternatives and is hosting a series of public meetings. More information is available on the GLMRIS website (links in updates handout). There was a well-attended public information meeting in Milwaukee. Attendees appreciated the reports' comprehensiveness. The Corps also provided a presentation and opportunity to ask questions to DNR staff. Currently, the main focus is determining what the DNR's position is. Wakeman is taking lead on helping DNR sort through alternatives and find best approach. DNR will likely talk with other Great Lakes states and try to identify an appropriate regional response. There has been no legislation to authorize the Corps to go forward, so at the moment their assignment is finished.

Question: When is the public comment period over? March 3. The Corps has said that they are not going to do anything with the public comments, so the priority is to get states and stakeholders to let congressional representatives know what they support and push them to move forward. Much additional work has to go in before specific projects can be tackled.

Watermolen noted that the report does have a "baseline alternative" consisting of all the things that we are doing now to address invasive species and expecting that that would continue. They costed out those current and ongoing efforts and they add up to a substantial financial investment.

Question: What is a secondary pathway? Are any of them in Wisconsin? Eight potential connections between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi River Basin were identified and ranked for

their potential to transfer species: Four were ranked medium and four were ranked low. VHS was the only species of concern identified as likely to cross between basins. Because our waterways are warm, DNR staff don't think VHS will be established in our tributaries, so there is no planned action to address this issue.

Schumacher noted that interstate cooperation on invasive species is critical, so it is good that the Midwestern Governors Association is talking about invasives. However, terrestrial invasives are conspicuous in their absence.

Question: Are there any suggestions on addressing terrestrial species? Have terrestrial species been mentioned at all in GLMRIS? The main focus of GLMRIS has been on Asian carp.

Question: Who is the official DNR representative to the MGA? Wakeman sits in on it, along with Dan Baumann from the western region. MGA has asked DNR's communications director, Bill Cosh, to sit in on phone calls starting this month.

### **Updates: Amaranth (*Amaranthus*) Update**

Articles about Palmer amaranth, an agricultural weed in the pigweed family, were distributed to the Council prior to the meeting:

University of Wisconsin Crop Weed Science news release <http://wcws.cals.wisc.edu/palmer-amaranth-identified-through-the-late-season-weed-escape-survey/>

Article from Huffington Post  
[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/28/palmer-amaranth-weed\\_n\\_4170699.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/28/palmer-amaranth-weed_n_4170699.html)

Kuhn provided verbal updates. Pigweed is found extensively in Wisconsin, though we have not dealt with this specific species in the past. Extension staff noted that it was found in Wisconsin in 2011 in Rock County and was not seen again until 2013 in Dane County.

It is probably native to south-southwestern United States where it is problematic in cotton production. Here, it can cut corn and soybean yields by 70-90% if left unchecked. It has developed multiple pesticide resistance, though is primarily resistant to glyphosate. Bottom line from other states is that growers will have to pay close attention to it and deal with it early.

Perhaps the biggest issue is that it is difficult to identify the species, especially because of its ability to hybridize with other pigweeds. Genetic testing had to be done on the Palmer amaranths found in Wisconsin to confirm their species.

The plant also grows rapidly, up to 2 inches per day, and can grow up to 7 feet tall. Individual plants can produce up to half a million seeds. The seeds are tiny and can be transported in feed, seed, farm equipment, and perhaps even manure. No one has been able to pinpoint the main vector.

It is a sunny, hot weather annual. Once it is established, it is darn near impossible to eradicate. There is no evidence of it moving into wooded or shaded environments.

Other states are treating it as agricultural weed, mainly addressing it through extension efforts and working with growers. Suggested practice is getting on top of it early, using a pre-emergent residual

pesticide. Delaware put it on the noxious weed list, but it quickly got out of hand because it is so hard to identify and manage.

DATCP has considered putting Palmer amaranth on the noxious weed list. That would require a multi-year rulemaking process. This year, DATCP will survey and sample seeds that seem to have potential to be a vector. UW-Extension has not seen it as an issue in non-crop areas. An eradication order would be really tough to manage. Economics will drive people to manage the species themselves.

Bressner reported that he sent email to his members and crop scouts to see what they have seen. They had heard the Rock County report from Vince Davis. His folks have not seen it in any Wisconsin production fields, but they know it is close because it has been seen in Sycamore. His folks confirm that waterhemp and giant ragweed are showing resistance right now. His members will let us know if they do see the species at any point.

Question: Would the rule process help address contaminated seed? What percentage weed seed is allowed? If the species is listed as prohibited, there is no tolerance for it in any seed mix. Native seed mixes present the highest risk because they are harder to clean than corn or soybeans.

Question: Is it expanding because of milder climate or because of transport? It is probably native to the west. There are male and female plants, so there is genetic variability and the plant is very easily hybridized.

Question: Is it likely we could see it in ground set aside for prairies or fallow farm fields? If it is inadvertently planted in the ground as prairies are being planted, it would be a huge problem. There is always a risk that gets into open disturbed area because there are a half million tiny seeds per plant.

Question: If we knew what we know now two years ago, would the SAGs have identified it and listed it as a prohibited species? In 2011, UW-Extension did find it in a field here, but were thinking of it as an agricultural weed rather than an invasive species.

Question: Will DATCP start listing it as a noxious weed? There hasn't been a broad DATCP discussion as of yet. Kuhn sees no problem with making it a prohibited noxious weed in the seed law as that seems like a pretty standard approach. DATCP does have emergency rule capability, but the emergency rule would expire before the permanent rule was in place. One strategy might be to wait a bit before enacting the emergency rule so that there is no regulatory gap.

Question: Is there anything DOT can do in this effort? DATCP will do some sampling of seeds this summer that should include any DOT seeds that are from high risk states or have high risk for some other reason.

### **Council Committee Reports: Education Committee**

Committee has met several times since previous Council meeting. Efforts have focused on Invasive Species Awareness Month (ISAM) events. ISAM is being conducted a little differently this year. There is no grant-funded staff support. DNR and other agencies are providing staff support.

There will not be a poster contest this year. Instead, we will conduct an online video contest. Tim Campbell from UW Sea Grant is coordinating that effort. The committee believes this will be a little easier and less onerous than a poster contest. Videos can be submitted online through the Sea Grant

website. They will be limited to 6 seconds in length. Contest winners will be recognized at Invader Crusader awards program.

The Invader Crusader awards program has been scheduled for June 5 at 1:00 at Olbrich Botanical Gardens in Madison, the same place as last year. If the Council meets that morning it would provide an opportunity for Council members to attend the awards ceremony if they would like. The nomination forms and an announcement will go out on February 14. The deadline for nominations is April 14. Long and Schumacher volunteered to serve as a judge.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> annual Invasive Species Education Summit will be held at Beaver Creek Reserve in Fall Creek on June 10. The agenda is shaping up to be in a similar format to what we had last year: formal presentations in the morning, breakout mid-day, lunch, and more breakouts and station-to-station round robin in the afternoon.

Some ISAM costs were funded through grants in the past, but this year grant funds were not pursued. If any agency or organization is interested in sponsoring any of these events, e.g., cake at invader crusader, or education summit, there is an opportunity to do so. If interested, contact Matheson or Feyerherm.

### **Council Committee Reports: Interagency Committee**

The Interagency Committee met at DATCP on January 10. Discussion focused on the process that DNR used to analyze their programs and priorities against key priorities in the invasive species strategic plan. Staff attempted to answer the question of what are we doing today that touches on or addresses each goal or action item in the strategic plan. The Interagency Committee agreed that each agency should go through a similar process, with the ultimate goal being able to look across agencies and identify how many priorities are being addressed. It will serve as a gap analysis. The Council can then use it with other organizations to see how their efforts fit in, if at all.

Agencies discussed the biennial budget process and potential budget initiatives. At that point, however, agencies had yet to receive budget directions.

The committee also covered a number of interagency coordination issues. Mark Renz provided updates on the UW-Extension first detection program. Training will kick off in March and April with the master gardener and master naturalist programs. The committee discussed possible participation in the Upper Midwest Invasive Species Conference.

Question: Has Research and Regulations Committee sent email to SAG members yet? Letter is being fine-tuned through email discussion. DNR will provide contact information info SAG leads. It is hoped the SAG leaders will distribute the letter so that we keep semblance of going through SAG leaders. Hope to have the letter out by February 10 and have some response by next meeting. Kuhn encouraged the committee to share the letter with the Council for review and suggestions before it goes out.

### **Update: NR 40 Rule Revisions**

An "NR40 Administrative Rule Revision Update" was distributed to the Council.

The day of the previous Council meeting, DNR received approval from Secretary to move forward with the economic impact analysis (EIA) and send it to the Natural Resources Board for review. Following the NRB's passive review, the document was released for public comment on October 28. DNR posted all

proposed rule revisions and the EIA online. The comment period extended though the end of December. The 27 comments received are summarized in handout. The back of the handout has a table of tasks and milestones associated with the rule process. We were at step 13 at the time of the Council's last meeting.

DNR received a request from the Village of Cecil to coordinate on the EIA. There is a provision for this in the statute. DNR staff will meet with the Village Board and find out their issues (scheduled to meet on February 11).

The current plan is to request authorization to go to public hearing at the April Natural Resources Board meeting. DNR hopes to hold hearings in late May or early June, if possible, but it may not be possible to hold them until later in June.

Question: With respect to the economic impact analysis, what are the next steps? It will be modified to address input received during comment period and will accompany the rule proposal when transmitted to the Natural Resources Board. It will be again subject to comment during the public comment period.

Watermolen noted that DNR did hear some things during the EIA comment period regarding the rule itself, and after public comment, we will want to adjust the rule language in response to those comments.

Schumacher encouraged Council members to review proposed revisions to NR 40 and provide comments to DNR as appropriate. At some point in this process, the Council will likely take a vote on supporting the revisions to the rule. That could happen in June in conjunction with the public hearings.

TASK: Watermolen will notify Council when hearings are scheduled.

#### **Discussion: Council Goals for 2014**

The Executive Committee felt it would be an appropriate time to examine goals for the coming year/biennium. The Executive Committee identified the following as points to consider:

- Council Objectives for Implementing Strategic Plan
- Council Role in NR 40 Revisions and Implementation
- Education Committee Priorities and Activities
- Bait Industry and Introduction and Spread of Invasive Species (from statute)
- Pet Industry and Introduction and Spread of Invasive Species (from statute)
- Mail Order and Internet Sales of Invasive Species (from statute)

Watermolen walked the Council through the exercise that DNR staff completed (see PowerPoint presentation slides). It was noted that the Council's working day last May produced a more refined overview of what needs to get done, but the output was still an overview that needed to be stepped down into an implementation plan. The staff exercise was intended to make implementation a little more concrete for DNR. It also allowed staff to see how current work aligns with the priorities identified by the Council at its last meeting (see minutes from past meeting).

The output of the DNR staff exercise provides a basis for the report back to the Council (see PowerPoint presentation slides), a template for other agencies and partners so that we can look across programs, and potentially input for the annual legislative report. It shows how DNR can use the Council's goals/priorities to help guide the department's Invasive Species Team's priorities and those can be reflected in work planning, budget priorities, etc. It also provides a higher level "gap analysis" (i.e. there appear to be gaps in the Rapid Response and Control areas). Now the team is in discussion about how these can best be addressed. How can we use this to guide future actions? Can we adjust our priorities, or are there base

operations that must be done that use all available resources? Agencies will begin the budget development process and there will likely be budget initiatives put forward to address needs/gaps. The combined analysis should aid in preparing these.

Question: Where are other agencies at in their similar processes? Kuhn indicated he had met with two DATCP section chiefs and that they are looking to use the DNR spreadsheets as a template/starting point. They are targeting March 3 for an internal meeting to review preliminary work, with the plan being to deliver a final draft by March 14 to feed into budget discussions, etc. Olson indicated DOA's efforts would be much simpler because they do not have as much invasive species work going on.

Question: Can we use a similar process to determine what other partners are doing related to invasive species? Could TNC, Gathering Waters, or local land trusts look at what they are doing as land stewards? It is unclear how staff could approach this, but it is clear that having such information could be a "key ingredient" when making proposals to the legislature. Showing how agencies and the Council are already involved with partners and how much is going on would be a benefit.

Schumacher noted that it is the Council's role to identify gaps and work with agencies to fulfill the unfulfilled objectives. Sullivan noted that all indications are that the budget proposal submitted in the last biennium just barely didn't make it. Agencies were told the governor liked it, but there just wasn't enough money available in that budget cycle. Schumacher noted the importance of building support in the Senate. Sullivan and Kuhn noted that the DNR and DATCP budgets have to be submitted to their respective boards in the fall. The board meetings provide an opportunity for the Council to weigh in on the budget discussions. Kuhn noted the importance of working with partners (e.g. CWMAs, IPAW, etc.) as we go forward with any budget proposals to see how we can bring them to the table not only for budget advocacy but also for how we leverage their expertise, manpower or whatever else they can offer. That will help things actually stay in the budget.

The Education Committee's priorities have been centered on Invasive Species Awareness Month (i.e. Invader Crusader awards, video contest, etc.). After June, the committee could take a fresh look at what the priorities for education should be.

Question: Have minutes from Education Committee meetings been posted on the website? Some have, but staffing limitations have prevented us from getting all of them up in a timely manner. DNR will work on this as staffing allows.

Little Council effort has yet gone into addressing the bait industry pathways. An update on the issue was included in the Council's meeting package. An internal DNR meeting has been scheduled. At the last Council meeting it was agreed that DNR and DATCP should have a discussion to identify and outline relevant issues. Watermolen and Kuhn have spoken and outlined a short-term plan. It was noted that key DNR personnel (Bill Horns, Mike Staggs) are retiring in the near future and this may impede our ability to move forward quickly.

Schumacher indicated that add one issue that he'd like to see discussed with bait dealers is why they import minnows into this state when we can perhaps raise our own. It was noted that there are challenges with aquaculture in Wisconsin. Bait industry representatives have been pretty candid regarding the hurdles and permit limitations in order to license, permit, and operate a fish rearing facility. Perhaps a review of those regulations should be a topic of discussion because if we can raise minnows in state it reduces probability of the industry as a vector. Schumacher reminded the Council that at its previous meeting, the Council formed a group to monitor progress and provide input on the agency's bait industry efforts.



Question: What is currently being done with bait shops? The aquatic invasive species program has been working with bait shop owner outreach as they are viewed as drivers of opinions. The outreach team is trying to empower bait shop owners to be spokespeople for AIS issues. Efforts began two years ago, through county AIS officers. There has also been some conservation warden efforts through group checks conducted primarily in Southeast Region. This has not been an extensive statewide effort. In some counties, county AIS staff also have done some outreach to bait shops.

The Council has interest in further work with the pet industry. Watermolen indicated that an interim final report for the recently completed GLRI project was submitted to u.S. EPA on January 15. EPA is given an opportunity to review the draft and provide feedback before the DNR finalizes and releases the report. The project is a year ahead of schedule. Out of that effort, there likely will be three technical manuscripts submitted to peer reviewed journals. Watermolen noted that working with DATCP on this project has been a success. He indicated that DNR was still working with a few pet stores to obtain compliance.

The Council has interest in further work with mail order and internet sales. The SITC presentation later in the meeting is intended to provide the Council with a look at what is currently being done. Great Lakes Restoration Initiative funding is being used in Ohio to develop a webcrawler. The most up-to-date information on that project is included in the minutes from the Council's last meeting.

For each of the three Council statutory charges (i.e. those related to the bait industry, pet stores, and mail order and internet sales), staff indicated that it would be most helpful if the Council could specify some goals for 2014. Staff can then build work plans around those goals, move beyond simple meeting updates, and perhaps be more responsive to what the Council hopes to achieve.

TASK: Schumacher will draft and circulate to the Council a proposal for what reasonable Council goals related to the bait industry, pet stores, and mail order and internet sales might be.

### **Discussion: Council Participation in Upper Midwest Invasive Species Conference**

The Upper Midwest Invasive Species Conference is scheduled for October 20-22 in Duluth, Minnesota. The conference co-chairs have approached Schumacher and asked if the Council was interested in being involved with the conference. In 2012, the Council was a cohost.

Discussion focused on state agencies collectively making financial contributions on behalf of the Council so the Council could be listed as a co-host. DNR and DATCP expressed a willingness to contribute and indicated that it would be acceptable if their logos did not appear in promotional materials as long as the Council received recognition.

Individual Council members can participate on various conference committees. Some have in the past and may be willing to again this year. Schumacher is serving on the Program committee. Morton agreed to serve on Volunteer committee.

Motion by Sullivan to confirm Council's participation in conference through agency contributions and via Council participation in committees. Second by Kuhn. Passed unanimously.

TASK: Agency representatives will determine what level of contribution their agencies can make and will work directly with conference organizers to make payment.

TASK: Schumacher to contact Kirkman to inquire if he would like to participate in one of the conference committees.

## **Scheduling: Future Council Meeting Dates**

Council has previously discussed moving to a quarterly meeting schedule. The next Council meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 5 at the DNR's Science Operations Center. Interest was expressed in holding future meetings in this same location.

The timing of the June meeting fits well with the Invader Crusader Awards presentation and the tentative plans for the NR 40 public hearings. A late August or early September meeting would allow the Council an opportunity to comment on DNR's and DATCP's budget proposals as they go to the respective agency boards. Meeting would likely occur right after Labor Day.

Long suggested considering a fall meeting held in conjunction with the Upper Midwest Invasive Species Conference. That would facilitate Council member participation in the conference and signal an interest by the Council in supporting the conference.

A mid-November meeting (possibly week of the 10<sup>th</sup>) could correspond with NR 40 proposal going to the Legislature for review.

TASK: Watermolen will conduct a Doodle poll later this spring for possible fall meeting dates.

## **Informational: USDA APHIS Internet Compliance Work**

Sylvia Shadman-Adolpho, Operational Analyst, USDA, Ft. Collins, CO, participated in the Council meeting via telephone. She provided an overview of the USDA's Smuggling Interdiction and Trade Compliance (SITC) work. JoAnn Cruse, State Plant Health Director, USDA, Madison, participated in the meeting in person and provided a state perspective on the SITC work, explained how SITC coordinates with DATCP, and answered questions. PowerPoint presentation slides from Shadman-Adolpho's presentation were shared with the Council.

SITC was formally established in 1999, following complaints of smuggled fruit. The mission of SITC is "To detect and prevent the unlawful entry and distribution of prohibited and/or non-compliant products that may harbor exotic plant and animal pests, diseases or invasive species."

Commodities regulated include: 1) animal products like fresh or dried meat, soup mixes, pet chews, etc., 2) insects/pests, 3) fruits, vegetables, and propagative material, and 4) fresh or dried plant products for various uses. Priorities lie in high risk items like eggs, fresh/frozen meat, fresh fruit and vegetables, and propagative material. In most instances, SITC does not have the resources to invest in low risk items.

Staffing is limited. There are currently 6 field analysts, 2 "hub analysts," and about 135 FTEs working in 30 states. SITC formed an internet team in 2009. It is composed of the two Hub Analysts. They handle all referrals for commodities sold via the internet. The analysts maintain relationships with various internet marketplaces (e.g., Amazon<sup>®</sup> and eBay<sup>®</sup>) to gain vendor compliance and shut down pathways. They initiate trace backs/trace forwards for internet sellers and buyers. It is important to understand that SITC has no legal authority to demand big sites/marketplaces cease sales because of the global market place. The onus to comply falls on the buyer not the seller.

SITC successes include: 1) shut down various internet sites, 2) assisted in bringing numerous vendors into compliance—prohibited items are often removed upon request, 3) Some sellers are now writing disclaimers on their sales that they can't ship to the US because of quarantine laws, 4) a large portion of high volume eBay vendors dealt with in past are no longer registered users, 5) major internet companies

are conducting a pilot program to systematically block five test commodities that are outright prohibited. SITC has also identified commercial connections, provided outreach to them, and obtained compliance.

Question: How does USDA decide what to regulate? Process is posted in Federal Register. Decisions are based on a pest risk analysis. Kuhn noted that Wisconsin also has a process to determine if a given species should be regulated.

Question: Should we be marrying the two lists so that state of Wisconsin has the same list as the federal government? Often the federal regulations are import requirements/restrictions, rather than possession or sales bans. Also, there may be things on state level that don't fit on the national list. It was suggested that a better way is to focus on whether something could be planted here and be invasive. This is what the SAG process addressed. All federal noxious weeds have been evaluated for inclusion in NR 40.

The Great Lakes Commission has received money through the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative for a project to track internet sales (referenced above). The minutes from the Council's October 2013 meeting include more information and a timeline for that project.

The Council thanked Shadman-Adolpho and Cruse for their participation.

### **Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

### **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 4:10.