

MAUI INVASIVE SPECIES COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
2007 PRIORITIZATION WORKSHOP
August 10, 2007

ATTENDANCE: Randy Bartlett, Bob Hobdy, Kim Starr, Forest Starr, Kuhea Paracuelles, Rachel Hodara, Jeremy Gooding, Steve Anderson, Stuart Funke-d'Egnuff, Lloyd Loope, Jason Hanley, Karl Buermeyer, Philip Thomas, Fern Duvall, Sam Aruch, Sky Harrison, Glenn Shishido, Teya Penniman, Joylynn Paman, Brooke Mahnken, Mike Ade, Sam Akoi III, Elisse Deleissegues, Elizabeth Anderson

- Randy Bartlett (MPC/Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:20am. Introductions were made around the room.
- Minutes from the June 8, 2007 meeting were approved. They will be posted on the website.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- Steve: Tavita from the National Park in American Samoa has started an invasive species team modeled after MISC. He asked me to present this gift to MISC to put up in the yurt to thank us for our help.
- Teya: we have two visitors joining us today from the USFWS – Jason Hanley and Karl Buermeyer.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION / PERSPECTIVES

Funding & Staffing

- Teya: in general, we are doing very well. I give credit to each of you for the vision to make things happen years ago. We are continuing to receive strong funding support and the diversity of work we are doing continues to increase. We are very fortunate with the staff we have. MISC currently has 29 staff members including Molokai and three temporary coqui workers. We have not added any additional administrative staff as we have grown. We are pulling together as a team really well. Randy: thanks to Teya for her strong leadership.
- Elizabeth: our FY07 expenditures totaled \$1.6 million. Teya: we expect to receive \$1 million from Maui County this coming year. We are also faring well at the state level. We are expecting \$370,000 from the HISC this year as well as \$200,000 for coqui and \$142,000 from the Forest Service. The Forest Service funding is down a little from last year. We should also receive ~\$100,000 in State pass-through funds. There is also a chance we may get something from FWS in FY08, but we don't know for sure. We did not receive any FWS funding in FY07.
- Teya: we just received word that our NRCS Federal proposal for bulldozing the core was not funded, but we will be receiving \$75,000 from NRCS for miconia aerial control. A big thank you goes out to Stuart for helping us pull the NRCS proposals together. We will apply for the bulldozing project again in future years. Hana Ranch provided a letter of support. NRCS is an agricultural funding source.
- Kuhea: we are still hoping to hear about funding for miconia and coqui (\$750,000) out of Mazie Hirono's office. We should hear soon. We submitted five projects for funding: two conservation proposals, one on invasive species, and one for watersheds. Stuart: the earmarks for this year have not yet been approved or disapproved.
- Steve: in 2016 the National Park Service will be 100 years old. There is a Centennial Challenge initiative that we are working on. Teya went to a related listening session a while back in Kona and Kuhea had a letter drafted through the Mayor's office. The proposals require a 1:1 non-federal match. We have put in for \$500,000 with half for MISC targets and the remainder to be used inside the park. The proposal also includes environmental education with funding for the Hoike curriculum. The proposal made it through regional review and has been well received in Washington. The funding is for Federal FY08 and we included a 2009 component as well. We have a very strong match. Teya: kudos to Steve for the time and effort he has put into this. Jeremy: there will be \$150,000 going into aviation for miconia next year.

Maui Nui

- Teya: today we will focus on Maui. We focus on the other islands in Maui Nui at another meeting. MISC supports Molokai, Lanai, and Kahoolawe. Paul would like us to do invasive species work on Kahoolawe. Currently we have been focusing on planting during our Kahoolawe trips.

OVERALL EMPHASIS: PLANTS VS. VERTEBRATES

- Teya: roughly 70% of MISC's time is spent on plant related activities and 30% on vertebrates. Today we will focus on plants. Our last meeting focused on vertebrates. We have specific funding earmarked for coqui frogs and BBTV and that determines the amount of effort to some degree.
- Forest: what about invertebrates and plant pathogens? Teya: we respond on a case-by-case basis. We have previously said that if there is a major outbreak we are available to respond on an ad hoc basis. We contacted HDOA regarding nettle caterpillar and told them we are available to assist. Mach trained some of our staff on identification and then the crew went out and helped with surveys. It looks like the caterpillars have been in Haiku for at least a year. Stuart: are we talking about an emergency like the gall wasp? Should we start the process of applying for emergency funds? Teya: I understood from Lyle that they have 1000's of pheromone traps. The distribution needs to be better known before a decision to act can be made. Kim: since it impacts human health, you would think there would be support. Kuhea: my brother lives on the Big Island and has tons of nettle caterpillars on his property. It is a real health concern. Teya: I will continue to emphasize that we are available to help and from there we will see if it is appropriate to go for funding.
- Lloyd: we need to be more proactive regarding the little fire ant. Teya: at this level of discussion, is there input on how MISC should be spending its resources? We have been deciding on an ad hoc basis. Maybe for the little fire ant MISC should be moving forward. Lloyd: we don't want to intrude on HDOA territory, but we need to do more than just cooperate. We need an education program. Early detection by the public is the best thing we could do. Teya: it is an early detection target.
- Lloyd: I would like clarification on BBTV. Teya: we receive earmarked funding from the County each year otherwise we would not deal with it. BBTV is being found in more and more places. It is difficult to control something spread by a flying insect. We are working with the BBTV Steering Committee to set priorities. We also are working with the Agriculture Farm in Kula, which has a big infestation. We don't want to throw in the towel, but it is spreading significantly.
- Philip: I sent around copies of some ideas just before the meeting. Whatever MISC decides to do regarding how to choose targets, the system needs to be transparent and consistent. People need to understand how the decision was made and should be able to independently come up with the same answers. There must be a list of criteria (e.g. the species must be eradicable, it must cause harm to one of the listed sectors, etc.). Miconia should be specifically excluded from the ranking since it has its own justification. BBTV should also be excluded since it is specifically funded. We need to make the criteria very clear. If the criteria bring you to a small pool, then you may not need to prioritize. If the pool is small enough, those are your targets. If there are too many and you pare some off, then you need to have a justification for why you cut them.
- Teya: I sent out a draft matrix. I don't intend to blindly go through it but rather to use it as a jumping off point for discussion. In the past, we have talked about having a more rigorous framework. Our past criteria have included level of threat (agricultural economy, quality of life, native habitats, etc.), feasibility of control, and cost of control. We have ranked these items loosely in the past. Philip's point is good. We want to be able to defend what we are doing. OISC has used this model, which is based on a matrix system that exists in New Zealand. One of our biggest problems is that miconia will always come out with a low rating in this model. Kim: there may be too much weight on some categories. Teya: there are two paradigms: weed-led and site-led. This is the framework for a weed-led strategy. Our focus on protecting high value conservation areas makes some of our decisions more site-led. If you follow a site-led approach, the most important factors are biodiversity and urgency of action.

- Kim: I would like to see more of an assessment of each species and where you are with each. Teya: there is also the question of how we evaluate existing targets vs. how we add new targets. The processes may be different. Philip: what does control mean? It should be clear when we are not eradicating. These species are the black hole of funding. Stuart: can you assign a threat value? If we don't eradicate X, it has this impact on the island. The impact of not doing something should be considered. Steve: ecosystem displacing or modifying is a fundamental principle. It is on the matrix, but it is weighted low. Stuart: if the threat is great enough, you go out and find more funding. We shouldn't use money as a basis for saying we want to limit our participation.
- Steve: we keep tossing miconia out as the exception, but pampas grass is another example. Forest: there is the buffer strategy and that may really be the priority. Lloyd: the big problem is that eradication is not forever. If there is no prevention, eradication is impossible. I don't think eradication should be sacred. Like Stuart said, the impact/threat is what we need to look at. Randy: I agree with Philip that we need to be transparent about our process. I don't believe eradication is our sole criteria. We can't give up on our containments. Jeremy: with pampas, I don't think we can say we know yet whether it is eradicable. Forest: we have not delimited the population for pampas yet. Randy: from a weed-led vs. site-led perspective, our site is the island. Philip: if you use the New Zealand site-led approach, you go into an area and get rid of all the weeds in the area and you create a buffer. It will be ongoing. Teya: we aren't working in high value natural areas. Our partners work inside and we are creating the buffers. Elisse: in New Zealand they have laws in place to keep stuff from coming in. Forest: yes, they have good prevention. Elisse: here there is a lot of travel between islands. Forest: if something is only known from one island, it should be a high priority. Teya: New Zealand takes on projects that will take 20-30 yrs. They don't shy away.
- Stuart: we should take a look at the original mission statement of MISC. We may do things because they are part of our mission. If something fits the mission, you should take a look at it. You may be able to achieve transparency through your mission statement. Lloyd: looking back at the notes from last year, we decided to keep working on everything. We did scale back on arundo at one point. Randy: maybe a decision tree would be better. Kim: all the models are good at showing what is bad and what is benign. Forest: threat and eradicability are different. What are we trying to get at?
- Teya: if we look at the % of time out of plant time only, our "other" targets (e.g. eradicables, etc.) take up only 1% of our time. We should keep doing these other targets. Lloyd: those are the best examples of species that are eradicable. They may need more than 1% of your effort to actually do it. If we are starting over, we need to re-look at those species as well. Teya: that system was based on known distribution and threat level. Lloyd: we also considered the impact a species has had in other areas of the world. We don't always have all the information we need available. Kim: that system was good for choosing new targets, but not for assessing our current targets. Teya: the question of whether we should add new targets is another discussion.
- Stuart: are numbers really the best method for deciding? I am not sure that is realistic. Is there a narrative way of looking at the question? Teya: a narrative is not repeatable. Lloyd: why does it have to be repeatable? Philip: if independent people look at that the same set of criteria, would they come to the same conclusion? Teya: we owe it to our funders to use a system that is transparent and repeatable. Lloyd: rationality is important. Stuart: what if you gave all the great minds a list and let them each rank based on what they think is important. Sky: for legacy species you may not want to use the matrix. Professional judgment may be the way to go there. You should have a ranking system for eradicables and early detection species.

TARGET SPECIES EVALUATION

MICONIA

- Jeremy: there were two significant finds this year outside what was expected. There was a single fruiting tree found between Huelo and Haiku at 1,400 ft. It was unexpected and there was nothing around it. The second find was a seeding population in Wailua nearly adjacent to Kipahulu and less than one mile from the park boundary. We have been doing aerial work in that area for four years and somehow we missed it. We won't ever let it seed again. The population is under intensive management now. We have returned three times via aircraft to make sure. All aerial management units were covered in the 12-14 month period before April. We would like to add a layer or two of higher elevation units. The ground crew will be doing more intensive work near Nahiku. It looks like a lot of new plants, which is somewhat misleading because we haven't been working there. These are areas we haven't really worked on in the past because of complex landownership. The Nahiku end of the Hana core has been split into ground units and the rest of the Hana core receives aerial coverage, but not comprehensive coverage.
- Lloyd: what percent of MISC's budget would it be necessary to use on miconia to not lose it on the ground? Teya: we are still keeping mature numbers down for both ground and aerial. We are successfully containing miconia. With the helicopter contract hiccup last year, we did aerial in a more compressed period of time than we wanted to. Jeremy: the outliers are under intensive management. Lloyd: so we should continue to do better over the next years. Jeremy: this is the first year we started doing more core area work. Lloyd: I think the most cost effective thing we can do is to really do a good job with miconia. Forest: are there any biocontrol agents moving forward? Lloyd: biocontrol may be a solution in the long run. If we had counted on it 16 years ago, we would be on our way to Tahiti now. There hasn't been any monitoring done on the biocontrol that was released here, but in Tahiti they saw ~1/3 leaf coverage reduction.
- Teya: there are a couple of measures we need to come up with. One is the total footprint we need to cover on the ground given 4-5 years to maturity (e.g. we need to cover X acres per year). We need to bring that figure forward and evaluate how we are doing. Many of the acres we cover by air we also need to cover on the ground. Detection from air is not complete. Elisse: there are definitely places where it would be good to compare aerial and ground operations. The problem is the terrain and the logistics of getting there. There are some areas that are just not possible. Jeremy: Brooke and Elisse are redefining the ground units based on access, terrain, etc. Kuhea: the footprint may change when the Superferry starts. Teya: I hope that there will be a risk assessment done after the Superferry has been in operation for awhile. Lloyd: it is good for us that Oahu is doing a good job with miconia.
- Sky: do we have a sense of the cost on remote sensing for miconia on East Maui. Jeremy: Greg did a test here and we couldn't reliably detect miconia. We need to spend more time looking for a miconia signature. Steve: it is not just a signature we need to look for. He is also getting growth rate and if you look at that across a landscape, you know the fast growing stuff is not native. I was impressed that the state was footing a lot of the bill for Greg's work. I don't know if DLNR was specifying where they went.
- Considerable discussion on how the rating system works for miconia followed. It was decided that if a species rates out as not eradicable, it will bump from the current matrix to a process similar to what is used for site-led control where urgency, threat to biodiversity, cost, etc. will be rated. After there is a decision that a species is not eradicable, there will be a split off the flow chart. Jeremy: what is the cost if we don't control miconia? In that light, the miconia control program is not expensive vs. a landslide somewhere.
- Fern: this is an assessment of what MISC is doing in a reactive model. We need to be proactive as well. We know some things are not working. There have been no new listings of noxious weeds, there is inadequate prevention, etc. Why can't we take 10% of our budget and use it through the County to get a lobbyist to push things through HDOA, develop white and black lists, etc.? That is the most urgent need for MISC. Kuhea: I agree it needs to be done. Maybe the new Maui Conservation Alliance can work on that. At what point do we hold the State accountable? The County has taken on a lot of responsibility. We need to push the State into doing what they should be doing.

Rating Results - Miconia

Significant threat?	Yes
No = No action	
Effective control method available?	Yes
No = watch, research	
Relatively widespread?	Yes
Yes = conduct control in high-value areas only	
Present on conservation land only?	No/Yes
No = Have you gained cooperation of other landowners?	
Yes & Yes = potential target for species-led approach	

Biological Success Score (0-3)

Seed set	3
Persistence of seed bank	3
Vegetative reproduction	1
Establishment & growth rate	3
Effectiveness of dispersal	3
Maturation rate	2
	15

“Effect on System” Score (0-3)

Species effects on composition and structure of native community	3
Species suppresses native regeneration	3
Species persistence over time	3
	9

Weediness Score = Biological success + (2 x Effect on System) 33

Weediness Group A = 29-36, Group B = 26-28, A

Group C = 21-25, Group D = 20 or less

PAMPAS GRASS

- Teya: Lissa is our point person for pampas grass. She put together a presentation for a recent operational review and is working to refine our strategy. Fern: everywhere that miconia isn't, pampas could be. Teya: we are planning to cover more gulches. We are sweeping the gulches with one person on the bottom and people on both sides. We've included the NPS aerial surveys in Nu'u in our data. They looked for pampas while looking for other things. Lissa: we recently did a trip to Hanaula. This is our third year on the ground in that area. The first year we found 40+ plants. This year there were only ~10. We are getting them before they flower. We are trying to include West Maui staff on our aerial surveys, but it is logistically challenging. We have done several drops on East Maui in Honomanu. During our most recent camping trip, we did helicopter bumps first thing in the morning. The crew was dropped up about a mile and then hiked down. We did three transects that way and it greatly increased our coverage area. We killed 30 plants in Kauaula during recent aerial operations. We will need to go back during September to finish up. We are finding far fewer plants in residential areas.
- Teya: we definitely have not turned the corner yet on pampas grass. There is no clear trend. We are finding more plants because we are doing more work. Forest: the seed lifespan on this is less than other species. Mike: it may only be two seasons. Lissa: we have changed our aerial strategy to be more systematic by creating management units so we don't just get bumped around by the clouds. We are identifying hotspots within the units. We have covered 8,000 acres so far this year. Steve: with resources you have, are you able to do all you need to? Lissa: we could do more. We would like to do surveys east of Koolau Gap. There are some plants in flower now and we are still finding spent seed heads from last year on plants that haven't flowered yet this year. Mike: plants on West Maui were flowering before July 1 this year. Lissa: "hands across the crater" is scheduled for Sept. 17-21. We hope to start a little higher this year (~8,000') and work down to crater road. Forest: are you still doing yards? Lissa: yes and we still have recalcitrant landowners. Forest: have you contacted the Department for assistance? Teya: we need to let Neil Reimer know again. Forest: it would be nice to have a time sequence on the maps so you can show which sites are pau and which are active.

ACTION ITEM:

- *Follow-up on pampas grass recalcitrants.*

Rating Results – Pampas Grass

Significant threat?	Yes
No = No action	
Effective control method available?	Yes
No = watch, research	
Relatively widespread?	Yes
Yes = conduct control in high-value areas only	
Present on conservation land only?	No/No
No = Have you gained cooperation of other landowners?	
Yes & Yes = potential target for species-led approach	

Biological Success Score (0-3)

Seed set	3
Persistence of seed bank	2
Vegetative reproduction	1
Establishment & growth rate	3
Effectiveness of dispersal	3
Maturation rate	2
	14

“Effect on System” Score (0-3)

Species effects on composition and structure of native community	3
Species suppresses native regeneration	3
Species persistence over time	3
	9

Weediness Score = Biological success + (2 x Effect on System) 32

Weediness Group A = 29-36, Group B = 26-28, A

Group C = 21-25, Group D = 20 or less

IVY GOURD

- Fern: it was brought to my attention that there is ivy gourd on the point where the wedge-tailed shearwaters are nesting on West Maui. We need to go in and control the plants after the birds leave. We need coordination between control work and the birds. Teya: we don't want to let it fruit, but we also don't want to collapse the burrows. Randy: please send the points and a map to Sam.
- Teya: our coverage is good and we visit almost all of our sites every year. We are continuing to find more. We spend a significant amount of time on ivy gourd (13% of our Piiholo crew plant time). Mike: our progress is good with flowering plants. We continue to find new sites - the more we search the more we find. There is a new site in Wailuku. The amount of moisture is a significant variable. We found a number of new sites when we were looking for the gall wasp and we often find plants when we are surveying for BBTV. In the past we didn't do a good job of capturing the negative polygons. We are working on that. Ivy gourd requires a lot of revisits. The Huelo plant probably came via a Big Island cow. So far the site is all female with no male plants. The fact that ivy gourd is dioecious is a plus for us. We planted some fruit at a Kihei nursery to do a germination trial. To date it has not germinated.
- Teya: we are doing control work on Lanai. Mike: the work is easy on Lanai because we can do all foliar spray. We are not trying to deal with residential areas and ornamentals. Sky: it seems like ivy gourd is a good early detection target and a good candidate for aggressive public outreach. The public could really be helpful. Steve: we may have a real opportunity with the new FWS program. Jason may be able to help us get more resources for ivy gourd. Kim: if we don't do more, are we doing enough? Mike: we need to do more survey work. We aren't losing it, but we don't have the resources to do more with everything else we are doing.

ACTION ITEM:

- Send ivy gourd points from petrel area to Sam Aruch.
- Control ivy gourd in petrel area after nesting is pau.

Rating Results – Ivy Gourd

Significant threat?	Yes
No = No action	
Effective control method available?	Yes
No = watch, research	
Relatively widespread?	Yes
Yes = conduct control in high-value areas only	
Present on conservation land only?	No
No = Have you gained cooperation of other landowners?	
Yes & Yes = potential target for species-led approach	

Biological Success Score (0-3)

Seed set	3
Persistence of seed bank	3
Vegetative reproduction	3
Establishment & growth rate	3
Effectiveness of dispersal	3
Maturation rate	3
	18

“Effect on System” Score (0-3)

Species effects on composition and structure of native community	3
Species suppresses native regeneration	3
Species persistence over time	3
	9

Weediness Score = Biological success + (2 x Effect on System) 36

Weediness Group A = 29-36, Group B = 26-28, A

Group C = 21-25, Group D = 20 or less

FOUNTAIN GRASS

- Teya: 6.4% of the Piiholo crew’s plant time is spent on fountain grass.

Rating Results – Fountain Grass

Significant threat?	Yes
No = No action	
Effective control method available?	Yes
No = watch, research	
Relatively widespread?	
Yes = conduct control in high-value areas only	
Present on conservation land only?	
No = Have you gained cooperation of other landowners?	
Yes & Yes = potential target for species-led approach	

Biological Success Score (0-3)

Seed set	3
Persistence of seed bank	2
Vegetative reproduction	1
Establishment & growth rate	3
Effectiveness of dispersal	3
Maturation rate	3
	15

“Effect on System” Score (0-3)	
Species effects on composition and structure of native community	3
Species suppresses native regeneration	3
Species persistence over time	3
	9
Weediness Score = Biological success + (2 x Effect on System)	33
Weediness Group A = 29-36, Group B = 26-28,	A
Group C = 21-25, Group D = 20 or less	

ARUNDO

- The committee worked through the matrix for arundo, but there was little discussion.

Rating Results - Arundo

Significant threat?	Yes
No = No action	
Effective control method available?	No
No = watch, research	
Relatively widespread?	
Yes = conduct control in high-value areas only	
Present on conservation land only?	
No = Have you gained cooperation of other landowners?	
Yes & Yes = potential target for species-led approach	

Biological Success Score (0-3)	
Seed set	0
Persistence of seed bank	0
Vegetative reproduction	3
Establishment & growth rate	3
Effectiveness of dispersal	2
Maturation rate	3
	11

“Effect on System” Score (0-3)	
Species effects on composition and structure of native community	3
Species suppresses native regeneration	3
Species persistence over time	3
	9
Weediness Score = Biological success + (2 x Effect on System)	29
Weediness Group A = 29-36, Group B = 26-28,	A
Group C = 21-25, Group D = 20 or less	

PITTIOSPORUM UNDULATUM

- Teya: we will need to guess on a lot of the scoring information. It is a noxious weed. We don't have a lot of information. Our concern is based on the fact that it is a bad problem elsewhere.
- Mike: we need to survey for *Pittosporum undulatum* before we decide on what action to take. We know of 3-4 naturalized populations in Kula around houses and one hedge in Makawao. Teya: are we planning to actively control *Pittosporum* or has it gone too far? Steve: on the lands we know about, how receptive are the landowners? A lot of it is in backyards. Forest: I can provide a map of known locations. Randy: you need to visit the sites, give people information, and see what kind of reaction you get.

Rating Results – *Pittosporum undulatum*

Significant threat?

No = No action

Effective control method available?

No = watch, research

Relatively widespread?

Yes = conduct control in high-value areas only

Present on conservation land only?

No = Have you gained cooperation of other landowners?

Yes & Yes = potential target for species-led approach

Biological Success Score (0-3)

Seed set	3
Persistence of seed bank	2
Vegetative reproduction	0
Establishment & growth rate	3
Effectiveness of dispersal	3
Maturation rate	2
	13

“Effect on System” Score (0-3)

Species effects on composition and structure of native community	3
Species suppresses native regeneration	3
Species persistence over time	3
	9

Weediness Score = Biological success + (2 x Effect on System) 31

Weediness Group A = 29-36, Group B = 26-28, Group C = 21-25, Group D = 20 or less A

ERADICABLE & OTHER SPECIES

- Lloyd: we need more experience at eradication. We should try in the next year to eradicate all the species that are on our eradicable species target list. Teya: one of the issues is that most of our current staff have never seen these species because we have controlled them. We aren't getting good negative data. Randy: outreach is very important on these species. Forest: we don't want to complicate our outreach with too many obscure targets. You can only ask for so much from the public. Fern: *Pittosporum undulatum* is one where we would get a benefit from having more people aware of it.
- Teya: should we allocate our resources in a different way in terms of effort? Should we add species? What is our process for adding new species? Lloyd: in the beginning, we had a defined process for selecting the eradicable species. Forest: *Erica lusitanica* is one that it would be good to have the crew be on the lookout for while they are doing pampas sweeps. It looks a lot like pukiawe and is called Spanish heath. Scott Meidell may have already controlled the known site. Steve: for the pampas sweeps it would be nice to have a live sample so staff can get an eye for it.

ACTION ITEM:

- Have staff be on the lookout for *Erica lusitanica*.

CONCLUSIONS/ IMPLICATIONS

- Lloyd: it was interesting to go through this exercise. The numbers for the species we are doing are not much different. We wouldn't be justified in picking a target that is innocuous. We will only work on things that have been shown to be bad elsewhere. Philip: I would argue that this doesn't fully address why we are picking these species. Lloyd: they are plants we thought we could do something about. Fern: going way back, they were all thought to be incipient. They were all presumed to be eradicable at the time they were selected. Sam: if the ball is rolling do we want to stop it? Lloyd: we know now that there are species we aren't going to eradicate. If we are working on them already, we don't want to drop them. Fern: if something was considered more than incipient we didn't do it initially. Forest: MISC is shifting from an eradication focus to a buffer management strategy and that may be OK.

- Teya: I haven't heard anyone say that we should shift our resources from what we are doing. Given more resources for miconia, we would increase our effort. We could stand to increase our effort on pampas grass and we could do more ivy gourd survey and public relations work. Randy: stay the course. Philip: I second Lloyd's suggestion regarding eradications. We will always have repeat incursions. We can't do anything about that, but we should get them out of the way. Teya: we have talked about our priorities if additional funding comes through and we've gotten the message that we should make sure our eradicables are eradicated. Steve: we need to maintain some flexibility in the eradicable species. At any meeting if someone has a target they think should be added, we need to discuss. Randy: if you have something that needs to be added, don't wait until the annual priority setting meeting. That 1% should be bumped up.
- Teya: I don't want to ignore the little fire ant issue that Lloyd brought up. We should discuss further at a future meeting. Lloyd: we need to do everything we can in terms of reporting on our successes. Steve: we need to keep in mind that we are dealing with soft money.
- Kuhea: we should we meet again to discuss the lobbyist idea. Fall is the time to start working on that sort of thing. We may not need another person. Maybe someone at MISC could work with Justin.
- Fern: we've offered to assist with nettle caterpillar and received no response. Teya: in some cases we can just go and take action, but we don't have the pheromone traps. Sky: if it is an early detection target, then we need to be able to do something now that it has been detected

ACTION ITEMS:

- *Schedule a meeting to discuss lobbyist idea.*
- *Discuss MISC role with little fire ant at a future MISC meeting.*

NEXT MEETING: October 12, 2007