

## **Alaska Invasive Species Working Group: Marine Subcommittee audio Conference**

Wednesday June 28, 2006 9am to 10am

Hosted via NMFS bridge number

### **Participants**

Linda Shaw- National Marine Fisheries Service, Juneau

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

Deena Jallen- UAF Cooperative Extension Service, Fairbanks

Lisa Ka'ahue- Prince William Sound Citizens' Advisory Council

Dan Gilson- Prince William Sound Citizens' Advisory Council

Sherry Miller- Prince William Soundkeeper

Michele Hebert- UAF Cooperative Extension Service

### **Agenda: Items to discuss**

- Discuss the format of the Alaska Invasive Species Management Plan
- Discuss the top 10 worst Marine Species list
- Set next meeting time

### **Format of the Alaska Invasive Species Management Plan**

The marine group reviewed management plans from several states and organizations. The two most popular were the National Park Service Invasive Species Management Plan located at:

[http://www.nature.nps.gov/biology/invasivespecies/strat\\_pl.cfm](http://www.nature.nps.gov/biology/invasivespecies/strat_pl.cfm)

And the Virginia Invasive Species Management Plan

[http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/dnh/vaisc/documents/VISMP\\_final.pdf](http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/dnh/vaisc/documents/VISMP_final.pdf)

(links to the plans will follow in the Additional Resources section)

Both of these plans have a very strong structure. The Virginia plan presents an overview of 7 goals, and has key actions identified as crucial to implementation. It also has a good introduction that spells out what an invasive species is, and why the issue is important. The Virginia plans organizes prevention goals by pathway, and risk assessments by species.

The Marine group agreed that formulating a comprehensive invasive species management plan will be important for generating support from the state. Bob Piorkowski will generate an outline, and the entire AISWG will be asked for individuals wishing to assist with the outline. Comment and support for the outline process will be sought at the June 29<sup>th</sup> AISWG teleconference. The goal is to have a skeleton for the Alaska Invasive Species Management plan ready for the October meeting of the AISWG.

### **Discuss the top 10 worst Marine Species list**

Criteria for selecting species for the top ten list has been sent out by B. Piorkowski, and will be discussed further at the next meeting. (see Additional Resources)

### **Next Meeting for the AISWG Marine Subcommittee:**

The next meeting is scheduled for 9 am, Tuesday July 25<sup>th</sup>. 907-586-7060 (allow line to ring until another party picks up, long distance charges apply)

### **Topics to discuss:**

- Discuss Top Ten list Criteria
- Update on Invasive Species Management Plan outline progress
- Set next meeting time

### **Additional Resources**

#### **Links to Strategic Plans**

<http://haccp-nrm.org/> Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point plans that prevent invasives from being transferred by work activities

<http://www.agri.state.id.us/Categories/PlantsInsects/InvasiveSpeciesCounsel/StrategicActPlan.php>  
Idaho Invasive strategic plan website

[http://www.nature.nps.gov/biology/invasivespecies/strat\\_pl.cfm](http://www.nature.nps.gov/biology/invasivespecies/strat_pl.cfm)  
NPS strategic plan for invasives

[http://http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/dnh/vaisc/documents/VISMP\\_final.pdf](http://http://www.dcr.virginia.gov/dnh/vaisc/documents/VISMP_final.pdf)  
Virginia strategic plan

<http://www.dep.state.fl.us/lands/invaspec/2ndlevpgs/pdfs/2003%20Strategic%20Florida%20Plan%20-%20Fed.pdf>

Florida strategic plan

[http://www.adfg.state.ak.us/special/invasive/ak\\_ansmp.pdf](http://www.adfg.state.ak.us/special/invasive/ak_ansmp.pdf)  
Alaska Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan

**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 the previous email. 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)

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)