

# Executive Committee Conference Call Minutes

## WRP Executive Committee Meeting

Thursday, May 8, 2003

### Minutes

**Members Present:** Tina Proctor, Scott Smith, Al Van Voren, Mark Sytsma, Nate Dechoretz

**Members Absent:** Blaine Parker, Dwight Williamson, Ted Grosholz, Jim Athearn, John Chapman, Susan Ellis, Mike Stone

**Next Call:** Thursday, June 12, 2003

### 1. Recommended State Actions

The list was prepared by Scott, reviewed twice by the Executive Committee (EC) and then sent to the membership for review and response. Draft 5 was sent to the EC and a few minor changes were added. The members on the call approved it. However, there was not a quorum of committee members so Tina agreed to send the final draft to the rest of the committee for an e-mail vote. When approved, the document will be sent to the members and put on the web site and can be used by states to determine which actions they can take based on staff and funding.

### 2. Update on Annual Meeting

The Annual Meeting Planning committee has chosen the Sea Lodge at La Jolla Shores for the meeting. Paul Olin is working with the hotel on creating a contract. The Western Governors Association still has \$10,000 from the WRP that was forwarded to them after 9/11 when our 2001 conference had to be postponed, Tina will find out if the WGA can pay the hotel invoice directly using those funds. Tina was asked to forward the first draft agenda to the EC as an FYI.

### 3. Update on State Management Plan Funding

At the last call, the EC decided to split the \$18,000 that was budgeted to fund state ANS management plans among the three states who sent in proposals; Idaho, North Dakota and Utah. Following the call, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission agreed to fund the Idaho ANS plan. Since there are two states that currently have requested funds, the EC decided to award each state \$9,000. Since the \$18,000 is also funds that the WGA is holding for state ANS projects, Tina will find out if the states was work directly with the WGA to receive the funds. The states may use the funds to work with Mike Fraidenburg, the consultant who has facilitated ANS management planning meetings in California and Arizona, hire a different consultant or use the funds in-house to write their plans. [Note: WGA agreed that they will distribute funds to Utah and North Dakota after receiving a work plan, budget and contact person from each.]

### 4. Update on Proposals for FY2003 Funding

The EC reviewed the revised proposal from Lynn Schlueter on Best Management Practices to Prevent ANS Importation by Fishing Tournament Anglers. EC members are very supportive of the project but felt there needed to additional information on budget, time-line and deliverables. Tina will send Lynn the budget spreadsheet that Mark developed. Al said this project would definitely be of use to the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

### 5. Funding Available

There will be \$30,000 in FY2003 funds for WRP projects for next year. Tina and Jim will develop a one-page fact sheet about expenditures so far for FY2003 and money available next year=s projects.

## **6. Committee Reminder Regarding FY2004 Work Plan**

Tina reminded committee co-chairs that according to the new committee schedule, draft FY2004 work plans are due to the EC by the end of May. However, since funding information has been unavailable until now, that date will be pushed up until June 10, before the next EC conference call. Tina will send out the committee work plan time-line document to the committee co-chairs who weren't on the call.

## **7. Committee Structure Changes**

This was a topic brought up on the last call and discussion continued. We might get better participation if we just have one work plan committee since there is some overlap of members for coastal and inland. The EC asked Tina to come up with some options for how the committees could be re-structured which would need to be voted on by the WRP members. The members will also need to vote on the development of an ad hoc committee on screening process (follow-up from workshop held in January, 2002). There was some discussion about whether we should have committees based on topic areas, such as education, prevention or management. Basically, we need to have enough committees to get the work done but not have committees that are ineffective.

## **8. By-laws Changes**

The EC needs more time to review the changes suggested by Mark. Tina will ask the EC to make suggestions by June 5 and get the revised version to them to discuss before the conference call on June 12. Mark suggested that we add a few sentences on the coordination function of the WRP, what is expected of WRP members, and what is expected of the chair or any member who represents the WRP at meetings.

## **9. WRP Support for Change in Noxious Weed Status of Caluerpa**

EPA representative, Joan Cabreza, had asked whether the WRP would support a petition to APHIS to classify the entire species of *Caluerpa taxifolia* (not just the Mediterranean clone) or the entire *Caluerpa* genus as a noxious weed. There was considerable discussion about this topic. This is not a simple issue, as there are many species of *Caluerpa*, some of which are highly used in the aquarium trade, some which resemble each other closely and some which don't. Scott suggested that this issue clearly points out the need for an overall federal screening process linked to individual states. The EC agreed that when the Screening Process Committee is formed, they can create an issue paper on what is needed on a federal and state level.

## **10. ANSTF Meeting in New Orleans**

Tina will be doing two presentations at the ANSTF meeting in New Orleans, May 13-14, one on a WRP update and one on the Model Rapid Response Plan. She submitted the powerpoint presentation on the WRP update to the EC earlier this week and asked for additions or changes. John Chapman e-mailed a couple of suggestions. Mark will send Tina the Oregon *Spartina* Rapid Response Plan that she can share with the Task Force.

## **11. NAISA**

Scott has recently attended the NAISA conference calls sponsored by the NEMW Institute. He reported that NAISA is in great need of support from constituents because there have been many congressional committee hearings where much education needs to be done. There is some opposition from property rights supporters who are concerned this is Abig government@ telling private property owners what they can and can't do. Scott agreed to send out a memo summarizing his report and asking for members to get their agencies or organizations behind the bill.