2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: Invasive Species Advisory Committee

Report Run Date: 05/31/2025 12:37:14 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	

8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date
No	Executive Order 14109	

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 3

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

Number of Committee Reports Listed: 3

17a. Open 2 **17b. Closed** 0 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 2

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	

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 2

	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	$0.00	$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	$0.00	$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	$0.00	$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	$0.00	$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	$0.00	$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	$0.00	$0.00
18d. Total	$0.00	$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	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 reestablished through Executive Order 14048 on September 30, 2021.

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	12/26/2026	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	12/26/2026	Nevada Department of Agriculture	Representative Member
Elwell, Leah	12/23/2022	12/26/2026	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	12/26/2026	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	12/26/2026	University of California, Riverside	Representative Member
Hulcr, Jiri	12/23/2022	12/26/2026	University of Florida	Representative Member

Member	Start Date	End Date	Organization	Type
Igisomar, Sylvan	12/26/2024	12/26/2026	Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Dept. of Natural Resources	Representative Member
Lieurance, Deah	12/26/2024	12/26/2026	Pennsylvania State University	Representative Member
Long, Steven	12/23/2022	12/26/2026	National Plant Board	Ex Officio Member
Martin, Christy	12/23/2022	12/26/2026	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	12/26/2026	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	12/26/2026	National Assoc. of Conservation Districts	Ex Officio Member
Trifone Millhouse, Christie	06/04/2024	12/26/2026	North American Invasive Species Management Association	Ex Officio Member
Van Riper, Laura	12/26/2024	12/26/2026	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Representative Member
Zabaglo, Dennis	12/26/2024	12/26/2026	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Representative Member
Zajicek, Paul	12/23/2022	12/26/2026	National Aquaculture Association	Representative Member
Igisomar, Sylvan [Food Security Subcommittee]	05/09/2025	09/30/2025	Secretary of Land and Natural Resources, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands	Representative Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 26

Narrative Description

Effective September 30, 2021, the Invasive Species Advisory Committee was reauthorized in accordance with Executive Order 14048, after being administratively deactivated on May 3, 2019. In FY 2024, the ISAC held one in-person meeting on November

13-15, 2023, and two (2) virtual meetings on April 30-May 2, 2024 and August 22, 2024. Committee costs for FY 2024 are comprised of federal staff support for planning, coordination and administrative tasks required to facilitate not only the full committee meetings, but also the intercessional work of five (5) subcommittees to produce deliverables which provide advice as requested by the NISC.

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?
280

Number of Recommendations Comments
Over the course of FY2024, ISAC completed four reports on: 1) National Priorities for Invasive Species (November 2023); 2) Invasive Species and Climate Change Adaptation (November 2023); 3) Invasive Species Impacts on Underserved Communities (November 2023), and 4) Mission and Metrics of the National Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) Framework (April 2024). The recommendations within these reports (listed below) are included in the total number of recommendations above. ISAC has also been working on three (3) reports to fulfill the request of NISC for advice in the areas of: 1) Feedback on coordination and engagement on the National Early Detection and Rapid Response Framework; and 2) the Impacts of Invasive Species on Islands. Completion is expected on or about October/November 2024 (FY 2025). Once completed, each of these reports will include a series of recommendations, which will be added to the total number of recommendations above in the FY 2025 ACR. NATIONAL PRIORITIES FOR INVASIVE SPECIES (November 2023) 1) Review the priority issues addressed in this paper for further consideration by NISC, NISC member agencies, and/or ISAC. Herein, ISAC recognizes that appropriate resources and funding are critical for advancing priorities. UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES AND INVASIVE SPECIES (November 2023) 1) Engage with underserved communities so that Federal agencies may best understand local priorities, needs, and barriers, and provide meaningful assistance to overcome barriers, including through grant processes. 2) Articulate and embed the understanding of the interactions and synergies between invasive species and climate change in programs and outreach materials, including how the CEJST could best be used to support underserved communities related to preventing and mitigating impacts and supporting resilience and adaptation plans. 3) Continue to improve the CEJST to reflect underserved communities, such as those in Pacific territories and U.S. Affiliated Islands. 4) Identify and

add new datasets and potentially add new data collection/documentation initiatives by agencies already collecting some data (e.g., on hazard, harm, human disease/vectors). 5) Accelerate support for research and actions that prevent the introduction and establishment of new invasive species that could impact underserved communities.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND INVASIVE SPECIES (November 2023) 1) All Federal agencies and departments must explicitly incorporate invasive species into climate change adaptation guidance. 2) All Federal agencies and departments must explicitly incorporate invasive species into climate change adaptation guidance. 3) Integrate invasive species science and prevention efforts into climate related international treaties, agreements, conventions, practices, and policies. 4) Ensure early detection, rapid response, and safeguarding strategies account for up-to-date climate data, projections, and models across all geographies. 5) Increase investments for long-term management of invasive species threatening climate preparedness and resilience. MISSION AND METRICS OF THE NATIONAL EDRR FRAMEWORK (May 2024) QUESTION 1: RECOMMENDATIONS ON MISSION STATEMENT 1) Address how the mission statement relates to existing early detection and rapid response efforts, specifically those at the USDA. 2) Place emphasis on the second part of the mission statement. 3) Focus on conservation and management of natural resources and define what is meant by natural resources. 4) Is there a better word than investing, or are we investing in and implementing? 5) Should it include "expand our capability and capacity"? 6) Should it include preventing species from establishment? 7) Should it say something about the speed of the response? 8) Should "secondary" be removed from the mission statement, since it is jargony? QUESTION 2: RECOMMENDATIONS ON IMPLEMENTATION METRICS PARTICIPATION 1) Number of jurisdictions participating in the Framework a. Total count of organizations that have participated in Framework projects: commented on design or products; edited content or products; joined a listserv; or sat on communities of practice i. A high number suggests better engagement ii. Multiyear participation demonstrates true engagement and dedication/or that it works for the partners iii. Percent change over time indicated 2) Number of groups participating in the Framework (broken down into Federal, State, Tribal, Local, University, or non-governmental (NGO) groups) a. Count by organizations that have participated in Framework projects: commented on design or products; edited content or products; joined a listserv; or sat on communities of practice i. A high number suggest better engagement across Federal, State, Tribal, Local, University, or NGO groups ii. Multiyear participation demonstrates true engagement and dedication/or that it works for the partners iii. Percent change over time indicated 3) Activity in across diverse ecosystem types, habitats, and organisms, a. Descriptions of the ecosystem areas of focus for the Framework. The goal is good representation across the U.S. that includes freshwater, marine, and terrestrial ecosystems and species b. More ecosystems and species/taxonomic groups covered by the Framework projects the better

SURVEILLANCE 4) Framework surveillance (either informed by the Framework or funded surveillance) for non-native species that are not yet present/established in the United States, a jurisdiction, or watershed country or within a region, the continued non-establishment of those species a. Count of species/taxonomic groups with surveillance projects in the Framework not in the United States, State, watershed i. A higher number may not be the goal, look towards proportion of the high-risk species identified through the horizon scan and risk assessments from the Framework b. Surveillance type for organisms, damage/symptoms, and environmental DNA (eDNA) i. Good to see all types of surveillance 5) How many new species to the United States, a jurisdiction, or watershed are found due to the Framework surveillance or planning? a. Count of newly detected species found due to Framework information, projects or partners (surveillance, hotspots, horizon scans) b. Count of newly detected species found to the U.S., a jurisdiction, or watershed due to Framework information or projects (surveillance, hotspots, horizon scans) i. Higher number indicates the additional focus or investments in surveillance has provided more opportunities for detection 6) Number of high-risk invasion hotspots surveyed from Framework planning including pilot surveillance projects a. Count of hotspots (stream, lake, terrestrial) b. Proportion by number of hotspots in the watershed or State i. Higher number shows more effort on the ground for early detection 7) Surveillance triggered by hot spot analysis a. Number of target species or taxonomic groups b. Number of surveys and survey area coverage (acres, hectares, other) grouped by methods used c. Amount of resources and costs (labor, vehicles/boats, fuel, permits) included d. Number of organization(s) involved 8) Number of eDNA samples run through the Molecular Lab Network associated with the surveillance projects a. Utilization of the Molecular Lab Network is important for the eDNA detection portion of the Framework. A proportion of the funded samples vs. what was processed. The goal would be 100% of funded sample processing would be utilized. 9) Description of the locations, ecosystems and target species the READINET usage/use of loaner program was utilized a. General description of the areas the READINET system was used. i. More diversity the better 10) The number of verified positive detections for target species through the READINET system a. Count and description of verified positive detections found through the surveillance of READINET i. Not sure of a baseline for this metric, but verified detections would show the technology works. 11) Surveillance triggered by READINET a. Number of target species or taxonomic groups b. Number of surveys and survey area coverage (acres, hectares, other) grouped by methods used c. Amount of resources and costs (labor, vehicles/boats, fuel, permits) included d. Number of organization(s) involved EARLY DETECTION AND RAPID RESPONSE 12) Percentage of new species found due to Framework surveillance, planning and partners, and management action was initiated by the jurisdiction (control, additional surveillance, risk assessment, spread prevention) a. Proportion of all species found in total from question 4 b. Proportion of species found by

the jurisdiction i. The closer to 100% the better – response to all new finds 13) Percentage of new species found due to Framework surveillance, planning and partners, and jurisdiction is planning an eradication attempt through rapid response funds a. GOLD STAR metric – Count of species b. Proportion of all species found in total from question 4 c. Proportion of species found by the jurisdiction i. Higher numbers are better, but never will be 100% 14) Percentage of new infestations found due to the Framework surveillance, planning and partners, and management action was initiated by the jurisdiction (control, additional surveillance, risk assessment, spread prevention) a. Proportion of all infestations found in total from question 4 b. Proportion of infestations found by the jurisdiction i. The closer to 100% the better – response to all new finds 15) Percentage of new infestations found due to the Framework surveillance, planning and partners, and jurisdiction is planning an eradication attempt through rapid response funds a. GOLD STAR metric – Count of infestations b. Proportion of all infestations found in total from question 4 c. Proportion of infestations found by the jurisdiction i. Higher numbers are better, but never will be 100% 16) Continue to exhaust Rapid Response Fund a. Proportion of the available funds i. Want to use 100% of available funds 17) Number applications for the Rapid Response Fund a. Count of unique applications i. Higher diversity of groups using the Rapid Response Fund the better to show wide adoption and need for its continuation 18) Diversity of applications for the Rapid Response Funds a. Count of lead groups (Federal, State, and Tribal) and support groups (e.g., university and NGOs) associated with a proposal i. Higher the number better 19) Number funded Rapid Response projects (by project, jurisdiction, and species of focus) a. Count of projects, jurisdiction, and species of focus i. Higher diversity of groups using the Rapid Response Fund the better to show wide adoption and need for its continuation 20) How do we count actual eradications? Understanding timelines, etc. (not limited to rapid response fund) 21) Are we getting earlier detections and more responses? 22) Number programs utilizing other resources after the rapid response fund REPORTING 23) Reporting to Framework surveillance from individual databases – EDDMapS, Nonindigenous Aquatic Species (NAS) database, Wild Spotter, iMapInvasives a. Count of invasive species observations associated with Framework surveillance, including unique species and unique users i. More reporting is better 24) Reporting EDRR projects through SIREN website a. Count of reports associated with Framework or Rapid Response Fund i. More reporting is better USE OF TOOLS/ PRODUCTS 25) Traffic to SIREN website, USGS NAS website, INHABIT website, eDNA toolkit website, EDDMapS/Wild Spotter a. Total Number of Visits i. This metric tells you the total number of times your website was visited during a specified period: monthly, quarterly, or annually b. Total Unique Visitors i. Unique visitors are the actual number of people you reached c. Page Views i. This metric shows the total number of times any of your webpages loaded in a browser. So, even repeated page loads by the same user are counted. 26) Logins to SIREN website – different agencies

and organizations, regional use a. Total Number of Visits i. This metric tells you the total number of times your website was visited during a specified period: monthly, quarterly, or annually 27) How many species were added to genetic library a. Count of new taxa i. More is better 28) Integration of eDNA standards, designs, and error concerns in surveillance projects. a. Description of the process of inclusion of eDNA standards, designs, and error concerns into sampling plans for Framework projects b. Provides more confidence in the process and results by addressing concerns c. Number of grey or peer-reviewed papers documenting sample plan development, implementation, lessons learned 29) Usage of a catalog of sampling methods a. Number of grey or peer-reviewed papers documenting sample plan development, implementation, lessons learned 30) Adoption of metabarcoding standards by agencies and labs a. Count of labs and agencies adopting the new metabarcoding standards i. More is better, proportion of agencies and labs using eDNA with surveillance with the Framework BIG PICTURE QUESTIONS 1) Is the framework adaptive based on user feedback? 2) Do non-federal partners believe the framework is benefiting them, and they have a role in implementation? 3) Is the framework user-friendly? 4) Are there incentives necessary to encourage participation? 5) Are there mechanisms in the framework to show improvement on how we are doing EDRR in the United States? 6) Is the EDRR framework detecting species early and responding rapidly, or are we seeing the same rate of establishment? What percentage of new introductions are successfully detecting and responding to? 7) All metrics should be about improvement

What is the approximate <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Fully</u> implemented by the agency?
56%

% of Recommendations <u>Fully</u> 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 <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Partially</u> implemented by the agency?
27%

% of Recommendations <u>Partially</u> 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.