2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: Invasive Species Advisory Committee

Report Run Date: 11/25/2026 04:09:11 AM

1. Department or Agency	2. Fiscal Year
Department of the Interior	2025

3. Committee or Subcommittee	3b. GSA Committee No.
Invasive Species Advisory Committee	5314

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	01/11/2024	01/11/2026	09/30/2025

8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date
Yes	Executive Order 14354 "Continuance of Certain Federal Advisory Committees" signed by President Trump on September 29, 2025.	09/30/2025

9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?
Continue	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Presidential

12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Commitee Type	14c. Presidential?
Executive Order 13112, as amended by Executive Order 13751 and reestablished by E.O. 14048	02/03/1999	Continuing	No

15. Description of Committee National Policy Issue Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of Reports 7

16b. Report Date	Report Title	
10/23/2024	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - Island Resilience is American Resilience: actions Towards Reducing the Impacts of Invasive Species on U.S. and U.S.-Affiliated Islands	
10/23/2024	Island Resilience is American Resilience: Actions Towards Reducing the Impacts of Invasive Species on US and US Affiliated Islands	
10/23/2024	Recommendations from the Invasive Species Advisory Committee (ISAC) to the National Invasive Species Council on the National Early Detection and Rapid Response Framework	
09/11/2025	Invasive Species Threaten American Food Security	
09/11/2025	Opportunities for Improved Marine Biosecurity	
09/11/2025	Invasive Species Threaten American Food Security	[Food Security Subcommittee]
09/11/2025	Opportunities for Improved Marine Biosecurity	[Marine Biosecurity Subcommittee]

Number of Committee Reports Listed: 7

17a. Open 4 **17b. Closed** 0 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 4

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
The purpose of the in-person meeting on Monday, October 21, 2024, through Wednesday, October 23, 2024, was to convene the full ISAC to finalize and formally approve deliverables developed by its subcommittees on two (2) topics requested by NISC: 1) the impacts of invasive species on islands; and 2) feedback on the National Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) Framework. The committee participated in a field trip to He`eia State Park, and visited with local organizations including Kko`o `iwi and Paepae o He`eia to observe on-the-ground efforts in wetland restoration and invasive species management.	10/21/2024	10/23/2024
The purpose of the virtual meeting on Friday, May 9, 2025, was to convene the full ISAC to orient new members to the NISC mission and their role as ISAC members, provide an overview of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), and discuss ISAC engagement on Administration priorities.	05/09/2025	05/09/2025
To review and provide input on current work of the subcommittees on food security and marine biosecurity.	07/25/2025	07/25/2025
Finalization and adoption of white papers providing advice on Food Security and 2) Marine Biosecurity	09/09/2025	09/11/2025

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 4

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	$139,235.50	$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	$0.00	$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	$37,795.49	$0.00

18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	$14,436.31	$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	$0.00	$0.00
18c. Administrative Costs (FRNs, contractor support, In-person/hybrid/virtual meetings)	$0.00	$0.00
18d. Other (all other funds not captured by any other cost category)	$7,296.00	$0.00
18e. Total Costs	$198,763.30	$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	1.03	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Invasive Species Advisory Committee (ISAC) has at least one in person meeting per year with additional consideration for virtual meetings. In addition, members communicate frequently by e-mail, fax, and phone with other ISAC members and additional experts and stakeholders to formulate and provide advice to the National Invasive Species Council (Council) on matters pertaining to invasive species policy and resources.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Membership is balanced among geographical, professional, regional, and subject discipline expertise, as well as other factors. Members are knowledgeable on invasive species issues in a broad range of communities of interest e.g., aquaculture, plant industries, weed science, fisheries science, rangeland management, forest

science, plant and animal pathology, invasion biology, conservation biology, agriculture, ecosystem ecology, international trade, and laws and regulations relevant to invasive species policy. Membership includes: individuals from private industry, conservation organizations, academica, and state and tribal governments.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

At least one meeting is held each year. Most meetings are held within the Washington DC commuting area. However, some meetings may be held virtually or outside the Washington DC commuting area to facilitate broader public input and understanding of regional issues and concerns. Meetings are the primary means for members to exchange information, discuss policy issues with senior officials, to complete the review and formulation of advice, and to share that advice with the National Invasive Species Council.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This Committee provides advice from a broad range of stakeholders and subject discipline experts to the senior-most officials of 12 Executive Branch Departments/Agencies and four Executive Offices of the President. The extensive depth and range of expertise represented by the membership of the Invasive Species Advisory Committee is not available from any other single source.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

To date, no meetings have been closed, and a public comment period is provided within the agenda of each meeting.

21. Remarks

The Committee was terminated on September 30, 2025. The Committee was not included in Executive Order 14354 "Continuance of Certain Federal Advisory Committees" signed by President Trump on September 29, 2025.

Designated Federal Officer

Stanley Burgiel Executive Director of the National Invasive Species Council

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Angeli, Nicole	06/15/2023	06/14/2025	U.S. Virgin Islands Department of Planning	Ex Officio Member
Bargeron, Charles	12/23/2022	12/23/2024	University of Georgia	Representative Member
Barney, Jacob	12/26/2024	09/30/2025	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Representative Member
Brewington, Laura	12/23/2022	12/23/2024	Arizona State University	Representative Member
Brown, Meghan	12/26/2024	09/30/2025	Nevada Department of Agriculture	Representative Member
Elwell, Leah	12/23/2022	09/30/2025	Invasive Species Action Network	Representative Member
Franklin, Slade	12/23/2022	12/23/2024	Wyoming Dept. of Agriculture	Representative Member
Greenwood, Leigh	12/23/2022	12/23/2024	The Nature Conservancy	Representative Member
Grosholz, Edwin	12/26/2024	09/30/2025	University of California, Davis	Representative Member
Hicks, Jack	12/23/2022	12/23/2024	Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	Representative Member
Hoddle, Mark	12/26/2024	09/30/2025	University of California, Riverside	Representative Member
Hulcr, Jiri	12/23/2022	09/30/2025	University of Florida	Representative Member
Igisomar, Sylvan	12/26/2024	09/30/2025	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Dept. of Natural Resources	Representative Member
Lieurance, Deah	12/26/2024	09/30/2025	Pennsylvania State University	Representative Member
Long, Steven	12/23/2022	09/30/2025	National Plant Board	Ex Officio Member

Martin, Christy	12/23/2022	09/30/2025	University of Hawai'i	Representative Member
Pegos, David	12/23/2022	12/23/2024	California Dept. of Agriculture	Representative Member
Reed, Mitzi	10/03/2023	09/30/2025	Invasive Species Coordinator	Ex Officio Member
Rodgers, LeRoy	12/23/2022	12/23/2024	South Florida Water Mgmt District	Representative Member
Seebacher, Lizbeth	12/23/2022	12/23/2024	Pacific NW Invasive Plant Council-University of Washington	Representative Member
Simshauser, William	12/23/2022	09/30/2025	National Assoc. of Conservation Districts	Ex Officio Member
Trifone Millhouse, Christie	06/04/2024	09/30/2025	North American Invasive Species Management Association	Ex Officio Member
Van Riper, Laura	12/26/2024	09/30/2025	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Representative Member
Zabaglo, Dennis	12/26/2024	09/30/2025	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Representative Member
Zajicek, Paul	12/23/2022	09/30/2025	National Aquaculture Association	Representative Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 25

Narrative Description

The Committee was terminated on September 30, 2025. The Committee was not included in Executive Order 14354 "Continuance of Certain Federal Advisory Committees" signed by President Trump on September 29, 2025.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
Improvements to health or safety	✓
Trust in government	✓
Major policy changes	✓
Advance in scientific research	
Effective grant making	✓

Improved service delivery	✓
Increased customer satisfaction	☐
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	✓
Other	☐

Outcome Comments

ISAC helps NISC fulfill its duties as the interdepartmental body charged with providing federal leadership on invasive species from a whole of government perspective. In particular, ISAC provides advice on high-level policy and program issues relevant to invasive species.

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	☐
Unable to Determine	✓
Under $100,000	☐
$100,000 - $500,000	☐
$500,001 - $1,000,000	☐
$1,000,001 - $5,000,000	☐
$5,000,001 - $10,000,000	☐
Over $10,000,000	☐
Cost Savings Other	☐

Cost Savings Comments

The over 30 federal agencies and bureaus that are overseen by the members of NISC spend over $3 billion annually on invasive species. Because this committee operates at a broad level and provides advice to a wide range of federal action, science, and natural resource management agencies it is not possible to identify specific areas of cost savings. For additional invasive species budget information please visit the NISC website, https://www.doi.gov/invasivespecies.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

365

Number of Recommendations Comments

Over the course of FY2025, ISAC completed four reports on: 1) Impacts of Invasive

Species on Islands (November 2024); 2) Feedback on Coordination and Engagement of the National Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) Framework (November 2024); 3) Impacts of Invasive Species on Food Security (September 2025); and, 4) Impacts of Invasive Species on Marine Biosecurity (September 2025). The 85 recommendations within these reports (listed below) are included in the total number of recommendations above. ISLAND RESILIENCE IS AMERICAN RESILIENCE: ACTIONS TOWARDS REDUCING THE IMPACTS OF INVASIVE SPECIES ON U.S. AND U.S. AFFILIATED ISLANDS (October 23, 2024) 1. Expand Federal Support of Invasive Species Coordination: Invasive species concerns, concepts, and actions must be fully integrated into efforts to address climate resilience, food security, economies, cultural concerns, and biodiversity, as well as international assistance and geopolitical strategies around U.S. and U.S.-affiliated islands. The existing strengths of Federal, State, and local partnerships should be formalized and amplified through agreements with greater attention to island specific biology, culture, jurisdiction, capacity, and cross-coordinating bodies. a. Federal agencies should support, participate in, and in some cases convene integrated Federal-State-local councils or similar bodies on each island that can address invasive species concerns with self-determination and autonomy. They should formalize their participation in these coordinating bodies with MOUs (or similar) and seek opportunities to fund interventions that are identified. In some cases, this body may be an island-specific invasive species council; in others, another mechanism or body may be appropriate. The creation and/or increased support and funding of integrated councils (e.g., the Guam Invasive Species Council) will ensure Federal investments are efficient and cost-effective, and better leverage existing expertise, funding, data management, and authorities. It will also elevate the profile of these councils' importance. The existing Regional Response Teams for environmental incident response that are co-chaired by the EPA and the Coast Guard could serve as further precedent for a national standard on coordination. b. We recommend empowering invasive species councils to co-create island specific risk assessments for pathways, invasive species of concern, or inbound commodities, wherein both current situational analysis and future climate modeling is integrated. In addition, we recommend a gap analysis of what resources are available for invasive species management on the U.S. continent that are currently not being collected or created for islands—and we recommend timely action to fill those resource gaps. c. We recommend that Federal agencies actively engage with and champion the relevant entities described in existing international and regional compacts, strategies, and communiques to advance shared priorities. These include Strategic Action Plans from the 2022 Pacific Ecological Security Conference, the Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii (RBP), and the Greater Caribbean Safeguarding Initiative (GCSI), which call on agencies (USDA, DOI, DOD, Department of Commerce, the United States Agency for International Development, and DHS) to support and advance invasive species prevention and

management efforts to protect U.S. and U.S.-affiliated islands (U.S. Department of the Navy, 2015; PESC, 2022a, 2022b, 2022c; Micronesian Islands Forum, 2023; Micronesian Islands Forum, 2024; U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2024). d. We recommend that the U.S. State Department, USAID, DHS, the Peace Corps, and other relevant Federal agencies work together to incorporate, prioritize, and fund invasive species actions in their climate change strategies, development planning, and diplomatic goals in island regions worldwide. This is urgent and impactful given the notable high-level importance of invasive species to Pacific Island Country and Territory Leaders (Micronesian Islands Forum, 2024) for climate resilience, food security, cultural resources, quality of life, and sustainable development goals. e. We recommend that the Department of Health and Human Services, USDA, DOI, DHS, and other relevant Federal Departments and Agencies work together and with local partners and agencies to incorporate invasive species goals and actions into existing public health and biodefense strategies. It should be recognized that microbes and their vectors can often be invasive species. f. We recommend cross-agency collaborative opportunities be identified, and appropriate mechanisms established (e.g., MOUs or similar agreements), to maximize efficiency, efficacy, and capacity. On Guam, for example, this could include an interagency agreement enabling the cross-training of brown tree snake detection dogs for inspections for more than one target (e.g. CRB, little fire ant [Wasmannia auropunctata], etc.). The National Island Restoration MOU between 10 Federal and non-Federal signatories to promote an integrated and coordinated approach to protecting, managing, and restoring islands provides an example of such cooperation around shared objectives (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2024b). g. We recommend that USDA acts to enable the United States to become an active nation and/or official member, in the two Regional Plant Protection Organizations that are relevant to the U.S. and U.S.-affiliated islands, the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) and the Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO). The interests of Hawaii, Florida, and the Gulf states would be best served not just by State and Territorial participation, but also Federal participation and membership. The existing strengths of the U.S. Federally led GCSI should be advanced via engagement within the CAHFSA, as a member organization of the GCSI, and the needs within and between Caribbean islands and nations would be more thoroughly met with this multilevel approach. h. We recommend that a non-competitive rapid response fund for Federal and State entities to engage in island-based response be established and maintained. For any invasive species established on an island where the tools and capacity for eradication or active management are feasible elsewhere, we further recommend that a full effort at parallel eradication or parallel management on the affected island be supported by a strong Federal response. Eradication or active management of invasive species on a single island should be considered prevention for other islands and the continental United States due to secondary infestations. This recommendation

benefits not only the islands themselves, but also the most likely (due to climatic matching) continental regions to be affected by primary establishments on islands, such as California, the Gulf states, and the southeastern Atlantic states. 2. Enhance Programs, Partnerships, Tools, and Place-based Efforts for Prevention: Islands should be empowered to implement better protections from invasive species arriving via passenger travel, cargo and conveyances, military affiliated actions, and household moves, regardless of international or domestic points of origin. Prevention efforts should match the scope and scale for the unique island context. a. We recommend CBP, APHIS, and other Federal agencies enhance services and actions, inclusive of entering into new or renewed MOUs where requested with local border protection entities, for prevention from foreign sources. On other islands, Federal agencies should prioritize the renewal and enhancement of necessary MOUs. On some U.S. and U.S.-affiliated islands where Federal agencies have jurisdiction over inbound and transshipped foreign goods, there are few or no locally based Federal agency staff to conduct inspections or take regulatory actions. b. We recommend mandatory inspection of domestic inbound and outbound goods and traveler possessions through interagency collaboration, MOUs, facilities sharing, and other mechanisms. The USDA APHIS inspection program for pre-departure from Hawaii to the U.S. continent is an example of the support that is needed by the Federal Government for goods and visitors arriving to the territories and Hawaii. c. We recommend that APHIS, CBP, USFWS, and other relevant federal agencies identify sharable information and create a data access system (protected informational portal), data use agreements, and communications plan to exchange information with appropriate State and Territory-based agencies. In addition, existing port of entry information systems, such as sharable parts of Emergency Action Notifications generated by CBP and APHIS, would be highly useful to island governments and agencies in real time. The current barriers to sharing information, including ineffective and irregular systems, could be improved if mutually workable solutions were collectively prioritized. Information sharing among and between Federal inspection agencies and State and Territorial agencies will improve the ability of all parties to respond to an invasive species of local concern as early and effectively as possible. These should be integrated into the National Early Detection and Rapid Response Information Network (SIREN) to respect the needs of legal issues (e.g., Protected Trade Information) while allowing a channel of clear and timely communication. d. Pest risk committees should be established, have a standing Federal agency representative membership inclusive of DHS, DOD, NOAA, USDA, USFWS, and have a regular meeting schedule as part of all major port of entry standard operating procedures. They should incorporate state priorities into Federal agency priorities for mutual situational awareness and represent each island port or grouping of ports. e. We recommend that mechanisms that allow Federal port of entry agencies the ability to implement and enforce island-specific prevention priorities (e.g., FRSMP) be updated and

streamlined to allow for greater responsiveness to island needs. For those jurisdictional spaces where no such program exists, the responsible Federal entity should scope and implement new programs that would allow for the Federal recognition of state- and island-managed programs for that taxa or spatial environment. Third, we recommend that the Hawaii Ant Policy be used as an exemplar of a policy allowing Federal inspection agencies to stop foreign imports containing ant species and a broad suite of potentially harmful species. f. We recommend the funding of the Coastal Aquatic Invasive Species Mitigation Grant Program authorized by VIDA, to assist all jurisdictions with inspection, monitoring, and enforcement programs, as also suggested by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (Turner, 2024) and the Aquatic Invasive Species Commission (AIS Commission, 2023). There is a significant lack of Federal, State, and Territorial capacity available to co-enforce once VIDA is enacted. g. We recommend that additional improvements be made to DOD operations, including the drafting and implementation of specific biosecurity plans for all existing and planned U.S. and U.S.-affiliated island installations and operating locations, with protocols for operations and training exercises, as well as for, contractors, military and civilian personnel, and dependents. DOD should continue to address capability gaps and invest in sufficient and consistent biosecurity-related infrastructure and capabilities to ensure cleanliness standards are met for all inbound and outbound military materiel at all military installations and operating locations in the Indo-Pacific (e.g., Armed Forces Pest Management Board, 2021). h. We recommend that other federal agencies evaluate, adopt, and implement DOD's robust cleanliness standards, biosecurity protocols, and on-site mitigations as exemplars for prevention and risk management. 3. Address Gaps in Federal Authorities for Prevention, Early Detection, and Rapid Response: There are regulatory gaps where one jurisdiction ends and another begins. This problem is especially acute with regard to a lack of authority to regulate the importation of multiple marine invertebrate taxa (Jewell, 2020), as well as some non-agricultural terrestrial species (e.g., invasive earthworms) and freshwater species. a. We recommend that the National Invasive Species Council (NISC) work with the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force and others to clarify regulatory gaps in authorities for prevention into the United States. These groups should clearly articulate a path forward to fill gaps that are identified. b. The USFWS and the Department of Commerce/NOAA should engage with U.S. and U.S.-affiliated islands to determine how the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 could be utilized for cooperative law enforcement efforts to prevent the introduction of invasive species that are prohibited or restricted. c. We recommend, the USFWS, CBP, DOD, and other relevant Federal agencies support islands' enforcement efforts by sharing information and working together to enforce local invasive species and wildlife offenses, similar to the 2019 MOU signed by the Great Lakes St. Lawrence Governors & Premiers (Great Lakes St. Lawrence Governors & Premiers, 2019). d. We recommend that NISC and member agencies continue the development of

the National EDRR Framework, including securing permanent annual funding for EDRR to protect wildlife and habitats. 4. Develop Control Tools for Reducing the Impacts of Established Invasive Species: Control tools for invasive species that are established on U.S. and U.S.-affiliated islands must support the needs of those islands. This may require research and development of new biologically based control mechanisms, new safety and efficacy testing for pesticides and herbicides, increased chemical control registration flexibility, automated early detection tools such as machine learning or AI-based image recognition, or different implementation and regulatory mechanisms. a. We recommend Federal agencies take the lead in the research and registration of chemical, mechanical, and other control tools for the prevention (e.g., in-water cleaning with capture and treatment to proactively manage biofilm) and control of marine, terrestrial and freshwater invasive species related to islands (e.g., soft corals, pathogens and fungi affecting native forest species). While development, testing, and registration of terrestrial chemical and mechanical control tools are largely borne or subsidized by agriculture and forestry industries or public health agencies, there is little to no parallel research and development pathway for control tools for use in the marine environment. b. We recommend that USDA and other Federal agencies continue to identify and address shared challenges and opportunities for biological control, including implementing the Pacific Biological Control Strategic Action Plan (PESC, 2022a) and taking parallel actions to address biological control needs for Puerto Rico and the USVI. Federal leadership, research, and infrastructure to expand the use of biological control technology is urgently needed to adequately address the impacts of invasive species specific to tropical ecosystems on U.S. and U.S.-affiliated islands. Islands will also benefit from Federal engagement on the development and use of advanced biotechnologies (Executive Office of the President, 2022a), as well as other novel control technologies for widespread harmful invasive species, such as malaria-vectoring mosquitoes, CRB, ants, rodents, and reptiles. Federal agencies should deepen their commitments to collaborating on the science and implementation of biological controls, including advanced biotechnologies, addressing these problematic groups of invasive species. c. We encourage the NISC to assess and address barriers and needs for increasing the use and availability of biological controls as tools, with particular attention to islands that are heavily invaded. This may include a new biological control white paper (e.g., Invasive Species Advisory Committee, 2015, 2016). d. We recommend that the EPA and USFWS incorporate the beneficial impacts of pesticides for protecting endangered species and associated habitats into the Section 7 consultation process for the registration and re-registration of pesticides. Because the testing of pesticides for continental systems does not factor in local island conditions or varying jurisdictional authorities, we recommend increases in local technical capacity to ensure sound science and regulatory expertise in these situations. Unintended consequences could occur if there is not flexibility in procedures, especially in local use areas where

invasive and endangered species intersect. 5. Meet Island-Specific Needs for Restoration and Long-term Recovery: Well-funded research and the infrastructure to implement long-term restoration and recovery are core components of being able to reduce and manage invasive species impacts on islands. Infrastructure should have ample and flexible use of space, be modernized to meet current best practices, and should not be centralized, as actual local conditions are part of the required natural infrastructure. a. We recommend new and upgraded infrastructure and long-term staff capacity be created and co-designed according to the needs of island communities and governments. Facilities should take local ecological conditions into account, be integrated into the local communities to create long-lasting workforce opportunities, create ecological and disaster resilience redundancy for threatened and endangered species, and use inter-agency agreements such as MOUs to share resources and layer local initiatives under a One Health Approach. 6. Improve Education, Outreach, and Communication: There is inconsistent usage of Federally backed programs such as “Don’t Pack a Pest” across all U.S. and U.S.-affiliated jurisdictions, both on islands as well as continental areas. Ongoing research and data would better inform what programs are being utilized or should be expanded, or to identify voluntary programs that are not being utilized and thus other investments would be more effective. a. We recommend that preventative programs like “Don’t Pack a Pest” and “Hungry Pests” be institutionally supported, expanded, improved with the use of ongoing social science research, and made consistent in terms of their presence at all island-relevant and continental ports of entry for air and sea travelers. We also recommend expanded Federal focus on the “Don’t Let it Loose” message and programs, including greater attention to marine aquarium and pet trade audiences. b. We recommend a consistent outreach program covering all taxa associated with civilian, federal service, and military household moves be created and directly integrated into the requirements and self-certifications processes for household moving and shipping companies, inclusive of all U.S. military contractors and DOD documentation. Currently, passenger-based education (see Recommendation 5a) does not suit this pathway’s needs. USDA and State-led programs oriented to household moves, such as those directed at specific continental invasive species (e.g., spongy moth [Lymantria dispar], spotted lanternfly [Lycorma delicatula]), should be evaluated and harmonized, or potentially consolidated, into this broader and more consistent approach. c. We recommend that Federal agencies improve invasive species awareness and outreach through tailored “tabletop” exercises with the relevant response groups (e.g., regulatory authorities, non-profits, academic institutions, Federal agencies outside of their typical professional space). This would provide staff and scientists with ongoing professional training and support. d. We recommend that Federal agencies provide support for professional educational opportunities for islanders (e.g., “train the trainer” activities and career pathways). The Office of Insular Affairs’ Pacific Island regional biosecurity training

program is a successful example of Federal assistance across complex jurisdictions (State, Territory, Freely Associated State) to achieve professional training, communication, and coordination. Additional training opportunities and support for professionals are needed for best management practices in control and eradication. 7. Understand and Support Island Community Needs a. We recommend that agencies support social science research and outreach to increase local awareness of invasive species impacts and address concerns about the removal or eradication of invasive species, as well as the efficacy and current safeguards on control mechanisms. This should include the contributions of Indigenous knowledge and will encourage co-creation, mutual understanding, and collaboration around management efforts, and ensure environmentally just outcomes pursuant to Executive Order 14096 (Executive Office of the President, 2022b; Executive Office of the President, 2023). b. We recommend federal agencies enable local capacity by making available professional translation assistance, grant writing and administration technical assistance, match waivers, and direct assistance programs for grants and agreements in jurisdictions where these barriers are an impediment to accessing federal programs and funding (Invasive Species Advisory Committee, 2023). These programs will be most successful if accompanied by effective communication strategies to ensure they are not underutilized. FEEDBACK ON THE DOI EARLY DETECTION AND RAPID RESPONSE FRAMEWORK (October 23, 2024) Recommendation 1: Establish a National EDRR Task Force as recommended in Safeguarding America's Lands and Waters from Invasive Species (DOI 2016). The task force would be composed of Federal entities and representatives of states, tribes, and regional initiatives, that would serve as a standing body to facilitate nationwide coordination and communication among and between Federal agencies and non-Federal partners in existing and new early detection and rapid response efforts. The Task Force would play a key role in the identification and assessment of priority invasive species, identification of critical EDRR tools and technologies, drafting of protocols and other guidance, and determination of priorities for emergency response and preparedness activities. The Task Force would also help identify roles and responsibilities of various entities and decision-making criteria within the context of the EDRR Framework. An effective EDRR framework requires focused coordination across the range of federal and non-federal entities to fund and implement preparedness, early detection, rapid assessment, and rapid response activities. That coordination requires an organizational structure with well-defined roles and responsibilities, as well as the means to ensure that those roles are implemented. The subcommittee reviewed existing groups and determined that a new group was necessary to bring together the range of federal and non-federal entities engaged in invasive species preparedness and rapid response across the entire range of invasive species interests. The intent of the group is to facilitate preparedness and rapid response in a coordinated structure with well-defined roles and

responsibilities with federal and non-federal partners working hand in hand. Members may include representatives or their designees from: • Federal entities such as USDA, DOI, Armed Forces Pest Management Board, NOAA, U.S. Army Corps, U.S. Coast Guard, and EPA • National Plant Board • Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies • National Association of State Foresters • Native American Fish and Wildlife Society • Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force There was significant discussion around including representatives from the following entities: • Eastern Plant Board, Central Plant Board, Western Plant Board and Southern Plant Board • Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA), Midwest Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (MAFWA), Northeast Association of Fish & Wildlife Agencies (NEAFWA) and Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (SEAFWA) • Southern Group of State Foresters, Northeast-Midwest State Foresters Alliance and Council of Western State Foresters • Great Lakes Regional Panel, Western Regional Panel, Gulf and South Atlantic Regional Panel, Northeast Aquatic Nuisance Species Regional Panel, Mississippi River Basin Regional Panel and Mid-Atlantic Regional Panel • Western Weed Coordinating Committee • National Plant Diagnostic Network • American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians • National Association of Conservation Districts • North American Invasive Species Management Association Ultimately the decision was made to only keep single national representatives from some of these organizations to keep the national task force a reasonable size, but additional consideration should be given to representing regional interests in a national task force or on suggested subcommittees. Once the task force is formed, an appropriate organizational structure will be developed to achieve outlined objectives. Recommendation 2: Compile and disseminate a list of federal, state, tribal, and territorial entities who have resource management and/or environmental protection authorities based on various jurisdictions and species types. The output will facilitate communication between and among these entities, enable inclusive implementation of the EDRR framework, and identify regulatory gaps. Recommendation 3: Fund and facilitate additional state, tribal, territorial, or regional rapid response tabletop preparedness exercises for non-agricultural species detections in order to build on and enhance current USDA efforts. Tabletop exercises should work through authorities, roles, and responsibilities and include relevant jurisdictions and collaborators to identify and address gaps in response efforts. Recommendation 4: Create a subcommittee of the National EDRR Taskforce focused on NEPA-compliant processes, environmental impact analyses, pre-permitting, and other regulatory compliance issues to support and achieve Rapid Response. Designate agency teams within each federal region to create NEPA compliant Environmental Assessments, Environmental Impact Statements, categorical exclusions, and template permits for rapid response actions. Develop incidental take permit templates for ESA species in advance of potential response actions. RECOMMENDATION 5: Create a subcommittee of the National EDRR Taskforce focused

on communication. Generate mechanisms to promote reporting, early detection, and rapid response by ensuring we are using cutting-edge communication methods, utilizing consistent communication messages and campaigns, and employing experts in communication and marketing. Communication should include both information about the EDRR Framework to practioners and partners and on EDRR in general to the public. RECOMMENDATION 6: A subcommittee of the National EDRR Taskforce focused on data sharing should be created. The subcommittee should work to improve, encourage, and support data sharing among existing databases, including databases containing occurrences, horizon scans, risk assessments, models, experts, species information, taxonomy, species lists, and regulations. Recommendation 7: Funding for the EDRR Framework should continue beyond the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, including the expansion of the Rapid Response Fund for Aquatic Invasive Species to include terrestrial species. The Task Force should be utilized to prioritize focus and use of funding. INVASIVE SPECIES THREATEN AMERICAN FOOD SECURITY (September 11, 2025) 1. Horizon scanning, pre-clearance, and offshore based prevention of threats through engagement with foreign countries protect American food security. The most cost-effective prevention is found through increased investment in scanning and screening for unknown threats; preventative actions in source countries before foreign threats reach the United States; safeguarding global trade to protect U.S. food and farms; and strengthening the U.S. approach to harmful contaminants on trade. 2. Biosecurity actions at U.S. ports of entry can better protect American food security through strengthening agency authorities; increasing staff capacity; and innovating to meet new challenges. ISAC recommends initiating a NISC Principal led ad hoc committee to resolve ongoing problematic gaps in regulatory authorities; improving detection and targeting technologies and data sharing; deepening engagement and education opportunities of passenger travelers to reduce the risks presented by this demographic; and addressing emerging food security risks via e-commerce and international mail through enhanced technology and enforcement. 3. The early detection and rapid response (EDRR) recommendations provided by ISAC across several papers and responses since 2022 enhance and support detection networks, planning processes, and frameworks necessary for food and national security. Existing ISAC recommendations provide critical insight into strengthening food security through national priorities, early pest detection and rapid response, and necessitating coordination between stakeholder approaches. 4. U.S. food security is enhanced by strategic impact reduction of established invasive species. The return on investment is significant when mitigation actions reduce and contain spread. Cooperation between regional, state, and Federal partners more efficiently mitigate impact. OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVED MARINE BIOSECURITY (September 11, 2025) 1. Conduct a comprehensive economic analysis of the impacts of marine invasive species via specific pathways on the U.S. marine economy and its foundations.

(Department of Commerce [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration] and other relevant agencies.) 2. Support research, development, and independent verification and validation testing efforts for innovations in biofouling prevention and management approaches. These include ship hull and niche area non-biocidal coatings and safe and effective in-water-cleaning systems that do not release biotic or abiotic materials above acceptable levels, which can serve as the basis for practicable performance standards and successful policy. (Department of Defense [Naval Research Laboratory], Department of Homeland Security [U.S. Coast Guard], Department of Transportation, Environmental Protection Agency, and other relevant agencies.) 3. Invest additional resources to address biofouling of aquaculture production equipment, including through research and development of tools, technologies, the improvement and dissemination of best management practices, and where necessary, improved regulations. (Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration], Department of Health and Human Services [Food and Drug Administration], Department of the Interior [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service], Environmental Protection Agency, other relevant agencies, and interagency entities such as the Subcommittee on Aquaculture within the National Science and Technology Council.) 4. Conduct internal reviews to identify where threat analyses of novel marine invasive species can be incorporated to reduce risks, which may relate to changing trade patterns and geopolitics. These analyses should be completed in a timely fashion, and the results should support regulatory or programmatic approaches and be used to educate industry sectors and the public. (Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration], Department of Homeland Security [Customs and Border Protection], and the Department of the Interior.) 5. Collaborate with researchers and interested parties to use horizon scanning to identify and prioritize high-risk marine invasive species and introduction pathways most relevant to each major region, archipelago, and basin of the United States, including its territories. Results should be used to guide management, programmatic, and policy actions for high-risk species and pathways to prevent the introduction and establishment of high-risk marine invasive species. (Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration], Department of Homeland Security [Customs and Border Protection], Department of the Interior, and other relevant agencies.) 6. Develop and implement procedures to better collect data on and manage the species utilized in the marine aquarium industry and other purposeful importation of potentially invasive species, as well as the pathogens and parasites that may arrive with these species. (Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration], Department of Homeland Security, Department of the Interior [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service], and other relevant agencies.) 7. Clarify the gaps in legal authorities that may prevent agencies from restricting or taking regulatory action to prevent a

high-risk marine invasive species from entering the United States and identify options to streamline inefficiencies and fill gaps, in coordination with NISC and the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force. This aligns with Recommendation 2h found in the 2025 ISAC white paper, Invasive Species Threaten American Food Security and reiterates Recommendation 3a from the 2024 ISAC white paper, Island Resilience is American Resilience: Actions Towards Reducing the Impacts of Invasive Species on US and US Affiliated Islands (ISAC, 2024). (Relevant agencies.) 8. Conduct, invest in, incentivize, and dedicate resources for the research and development of new tools and technologies that can make the United States a global leader in marine transportation and marine biosecurity. Focus efforts on more accurate and faster identification tools (e.g., molecular and point-of-use tools) coupled with morphological verification and improved survey tools (e.g., underwater and aerial drones) for the highest-risk species and pathways. Efforts should continue to support the development of much-needed control tools for marine invasive species, including the testing of existing tools such as ballast-water management systems. Work on organismal life history and other factors that are essential for safe and effective deployment is also needed. These tools would support a strategic and efficient approach to mitigating the threat posed by multiple invasive species at once. (Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration], Department of Defense [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers], Department of the Interior [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Survey], Department of Transportation, and other relevant agencies.) 9. Work collaboratively with states, Tribes, territories, research institutions and organizations, and industry experts to review available regulatory models; evaluate best model programs; and identify, prioritize, and fill knowledge gaps that address the major marine biosecurity pathways. Continue to engage in regional and international work to better address major pathways and advance the interests of the United States. (Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security [U.S. Coast Guard, Customs and Border Protection], Department of the Interior, Department of Transportation [U.S. Maritime Administration], Environmental Protection Agency, and other relevant agencies.) 10. Expand and improve outreach programs to increase awareness of the risks of marine invasive species and the desired behaviors to prevent their introduction and spread. These efforts should target stakeholder groups related to each major pathway, such as vessel operators and related maintenance businesses, aquarium industry and suppliers, recreational boaters, marine aquaculture businesses, and aquarium hobbyists (Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including the National Sea Grant College Program], Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security [Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Coast Guard], Department of the Interior [U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service], Department of Transportation, other relevant agencies, and in collaboration with partners.)

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?
43%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments
NISC staff estimates that at least 56% of ISAC Recommendations have been fully implemented. Challenges to further implementation have included limits in funding and staff capacity, the lack of clarity on the advice provided, and the inability to garner substantial support from multi-federal agencies and/or non-federal partners in a timely manner. Note: Implementation is tracked at the overall Departmental/Agency level since this is the level of NISC membership.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?
21%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments
Implementation of most ISAC recommendations requires on-going inter-departmental efforts among NISC members, and often involves non-federal partners. Few recommendations call for discrete actions or reporting on implementation.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?
Yes ☑ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments
Agencies have the opportunity to provide feedback to ISAC at their regular meetings and in written reports. Agencies are encouraged to respond to all ISAC recommendations that specifically concern their programs and/or actions. Agencies are also invited to request additional information or clarification from ISAC concerning their recommendations before responding to ISAC or NISC.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

	Checked if Applies
Reorganized Priorities	☑
Reallocated resources	☑
Issued new regulation	☐

Proposed legislation	☐
Approved grants or other payments	☑
Other	☐

Action Comments

ISAC exists to support NISC in achieving its duties. Numerous white papers and associated recommendations have been provided to NISC since its establishment in 1999. These papers are available on NISC's website, https://www.doi.gov/invasivespecies/isac-white-papers.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

ISAC does not review grants. To date, ISAC has not advice concerning grant processes, gaps or areas of need, and award criteria.

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

	Checked if Applies
Contact DFO	☐
Online Agency Web Site	☑
Online Committee Web Site	☑
Online GSA FACA Web Site	☑
Publications	☐
Other	☐

Access Comments

All final documents generated by ISAC are available on the NISC Website, https://www.doi.gov/invasivespecies/isac-white-papers.