

Alaska Invasive Species Working Group audio Conference

Thursday June 29th, 1pm to 2 pm

Hosted via NRCS bridge number

Participants:

Larry DeVilbiss- AK Dept. of Natural Resource, Palmer

Gino Graziano-AK Association of Conservation Districts, Wasilla

Michele Hebert- UAF Cooperative Extension Service, Fairbanks

Deena Jallen- UAF Cooperative Extension Service, Fairbanks

Larry Johnson-AK Dept. of Transportation, Fairbanks

Lisa Ka'aihue- Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council, Anchorage

Denny Lassuy- US Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage

Rachel Petro-AK Dept. of Natural Resource, Anchorage

Bob Piorkowski- AK Dept. of Fish and Game, Juneau

Linda Robinson- Prince William Sound Regional Citizens' Advisory Council

Linda Shaw- National Marine Fisheries Service, Juneau

Agenda: Items to discuss

- AISWG Strategic Plan
- Critical Species lists and criteria
- MOU Progress
- Next meeting for the AISWG
- Additional Resources

AISWG Strategic Plan

The Marine Group of the AISWG evaluated strategic plans from several organizations, and recommended plans from Virginia and the National Park Service (see Additional Resources for links). These have strong organizational structures and were good examples of strategic plans. Bob Piorkowski has volunteered to draft an outline for a strategic plan by October. It was suggested that Bob work with the CNIPM board in the development of an outline.

Before writing the Alaska Invasive Species Strategic plan, it was agreed upon that an assessment is needed. The state of Idaho completed a well structured assessment of its invasive species programs. An assessment would serve to identify gaps in invasive species programs, jurisdictional conflicts, and available resources. This information would be valuable in highlighting areas of need for agency leaders and legislators.

So far, assessment information can be gathered from the Alaska Aquatic Nuisance Species Plan, CNIPM documents, ADF&G Rodent Management plans, USDA Forestry Forest Health Reports, Alaska Natural Heritage Program, and other documents.

The goal for the Assessment document is to have a skeleton available for review by the October AISWG Meeting. Bob Piorkowski will head the effort to assemble the assessment, and may receive help from the CNIPM board and other individuals. It was also suggested that the plan include grading of efforts, as a quick way to assess coverage (ie. Triffid Management Plan gets an A, Martian import regulations get a C).

Critical Species lists and criteria

Bob Piorkowski has sent out draft criteria for evaluating critical species to the Marine Group. In addition to the tentative top ten invasive marine species, the Alaska Heritage program is working on a top 100 worst species list. See Additional Resources for draft version of the criteria.

MOU Progress

The MOU has been reviewed by the participating organizations. Changes were incorporated, and approved. One concern is that the MOU is vague, but the group agreed that it works as a draft, and that it

should proceed forward in the approval process. Issues with FACA (Federal Advisory Committee Act) have been brought up, but as the state will be leading the AISWG effort, FACA will not be a problem.

Rachael Petro will now take the MOU to the next meeting of the Natural Resources Commissioners Cabinet. After they have the chance to make suggestions, the MOU will come back to the AISWG for approval. Once approved, Michael Shephard from USDA Forest Service will lead the effort to get signatures from the participating agencies. If anyone has questions for the Commissioners, they should email them to Rachael Petro at, rachael_petro@dnr.state.ak.us

Next Meeting for the AISWG:

Tuesday August 1st, 1 pm. NRCS Bridge number 907-271-1405.

Additional Items:

- Union of Concerned Scientists

<http://www.ucsusa.org/>

- UCS Alaska assessment

http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/invasive_species/Alaska_invasives_1.pdf

http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/invasive_species/Ak_naisa_1.pdf

- Alaska Natural Heritage Project

<http://aknhp.uaa.alaska.edu/>

- CNIPM (Alaska Committee for Noxious and Invasive Plants Management) strategic plan

<http://www.cnipm.org/strategic.pdf>

- Forestry information about Invasive exotic insects and plants. For SE plants - see the 2004 condition report.

The 2005 Conditions Report focused on Invasive Plants in SC Alaska.

http://www.fs.fed.us/r10/spf/fhp/cond_rept_links.htm

- Idaho Invasive species home page <http://www.idahoag.us/index.php>

- Idaho state invasive species assessment Executive Summary

<http://www.agri.state.id.us/Categories/PlantsInsects/InvasiveSpeciesCounsel/documents/Idaho%20Assessment%20Executive%20Summary.pdf>

- Idaho invasive species assessment

<http://www.agri.state.id.us/Categories/PlantsInsects/InvasiveSpeciesCounsel/documents/Idaho%20Assessment.pdf>

- Virginia invasive species management plan

http://http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/dnh/vaisc/documents/VISMP_final.pdf

- National Park Service Plan

http://www.nature.nps.gov/biology/invasivespecies/strat_pl.cfm

Invasive species worst list criteria

DRAFT A--Criteria for Invasive Species Designation/Ranking in Alaska (by rjpiorkowski adapted from MA invasive species program)

Must meet these four base criteria to be considered for designation/ranking

1. Non-indigenous to an area of Alaska but broadly distributed elsewhere (can adapt to a wide range of conditions and or exists under similar conditions found in Alaska)
2. Has the biologic potential for rapid and widespread dispersion and establishment in minimally managed habitats. (out-competes and replaces native biota, free from predators/diseases)
3. Have the biologic potential for dispersing over spatial gaps away from site of introduction (closely associated with human activities)
4. Have the biologic potential for existing in high numbers in either disturbed habitats or undisturbed habitats (self compatible, short juvenile periods, high reproductive potential, several reproductive stages).

Potential Invasive- meet criteria #1 thru #5

5. Established in Alaska (persists without additional introductions)

Invasive- meets criteria #1 thru #5 and at least one of #6 thru #9

6. Widespread in the Pacific Northwest or the Yukon, or at least be common in habitat type(s) found in Alaska.
7. Have many occurrences of numerous individuals in localized areas of Alaska; high numbers of individuals in minimally managed habitats
8. Out-compete other species in the same natural biotic community.
9. Demonstrates rapid growth, high production and dissemination, and establishment in natural biotic communities.

Likely invasive- meets criteria #1-5 and at least one of #10 thru #12

10. Have at least one occurrence in Massachusetts that has high numbers of individuals forming dense stands in minimally managed habitats
11. Have the potential, based on its biology and its colonization history in the northeast or elsewhere, to become invasive in Massachusetts.
12. Be acknowledged to be invasive in nearby states but its status in Massachusetts is unknown or unclear. This may result from lack of field experience with the species or from difficulty in species determination or taxonomy.

POTENTIAL INVASIVE—meets criteria #1 thru #4 and #13 thru 15

13. The species, if it becomes established in Alaska, based on its biology and biological potential, would pose an imminent threat to the biodiversity of Alaska **and**
14. Its establishment is possible, **and**
15. The species has a documented history of invasiveness in other areas with climates ecosystems similar to Alaska.

An addition to the previous list. There are two other criteria that should be incorporated into the scheme at a future date.

1. Are other invasive species present that would facilitate this species establishment (positively correlates with invasiveness)
2. Are there native species present of the same genera that occupy similar niches (negatively correlate with invasiveness)