

HAWAII INVASIVE SPECIES COUNCIL
PLANT QUARANTINE CONFERENCE ROOM
HAWAII DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AUGUST 18, 2005
9:30 AM – 11:30 AM

DRAFT MINUTES

Members Present

Mr. Peter Young, Co-Chairperson, Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR)
Ms. Sandra Lee Kunimoto, Co-Chairperson, Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Mr. Sam Callejo for Interim Present David McClain, University of Hawaii (UH)
Mr. Larry Lau for Dr. Chiyomi Fukino, Department of Health (DOH)
Mr. Chris Dacus for Rodney Haraga, Department of Transportation (DOT)

Invited Participants Present

Mr. Garrett Kashimoto for Mark Recktenwald, Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs
Brigadier General Gary Ishikawa for Major General Robert Lee, Department of Defense
Mr. Rob Parsons for Alan Arakawa, County of Maui
Earl Campbell, Department of Interior (DOI), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Mike Pitzler, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)

Others Present:

Linda Chow, Deputy Attorney General, Attorney General's Office
Kim Langley, Coordinating Group on Alien Pest Species (CGAPS)
Christy Martin, CGAPS
Mindy Wilkinson, DLNR
Mark Defley, DLNR
Paul Conry, DLNR
Lyle Wong, DOA
Dan Vice, USDA/Wildlife Services (WS), Guam
Reginald M. Hasegawa, United Agricultural Products
Maile Sakamoto, DOH
Jeff Burgett, USFWS
Mark Fox, The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
Leslie Iseke, DOA
Dennis Nagatani, DOA
John McHugh, Hawaii Farm Bureau
Jason Knable, Senate
Tyler Jones, Hawaii Agriculture Research Center
Suzanne Case, TNC
Sara Pelleteri, DLNR
Carol Russell, USDA

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chairperson Peter Young called the meeting to order at 9:45 AM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 21, 2004

There was no discussion on the September 21, 2004 minutes.

MOTION: Mr. Callejo made a motion to accept the minutes of the meeting of September 21, 2004. Mr. Lau seconded motion.

Vote taken. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Callejo requested the posting of the minutes on the web site prior to the meeting. Mr. Young requested that it be noted that it is only a draft and has not been approved yet.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY WORKING GROUP

Ms. Mindy Wilkinson of DLNR introduced a proposal to the council to create a sixth working group that would oversee and guide the Research and Technology Program. Of the four programs areas of the HISC budget, Prevention, Response and Control, Research and Technology and Outreach, the Research and Technology Program is the only one not tied to a working group. Mindy went on to explain that this working group will encourage broader participation and have oversight by an agency that has greater depth and experience in administering granting programs. This would be very beneficial to the program as well as increasing the transparency of the process of creating requests for proposals and reviewing those proposals.

There were no additional testimonies or questions.

MOTION: Mr. Callejo moved to approve and Mr. Lau seconded. Council members approved and the motion was carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A DRAFT LETTER CONCERNING THE STATUS OF BROWN TREESNAKE INTERDICTION ON GUAM

Mr. Young noted that there is a suggestion to withdraw the item on the drafting of a letter concerning the status of the brown treesnake interdiction on Guam. He added that it means that we will be dealing with the Department of Defense and others on Guam to address this problem.

There was no discussion.

MOTION: Council members approved and the motion was carried unanimously.

STATUS OF BROWN TREESNAKE INTERDICTION ON GUAM

Mr. Earl Campbell, Department of Interior, USFWS and Mr. Dan Vice, Guam Director, USDA, Wildlife Services presented a PowerPoint presentation on the status of brown treesnake interdiction on Guam.

Mr. Earl Campbell wanted to share with the council two important issues. 1) Results of an independent panel who met with a number of people to discuss the brown treesnake issue. The findings were reported in Washington, D.C. in March at a meeting that was called by the Office of the Secretary of Interior. They said that the dedication and accomplishment of numerous divisions and organizations have been impressive. 2) Certain portions of the programs are struggling or limited because of the short term planning and funding. The panel overall felt that there was progress on new technologies and strategies but it needs to go further. Another point stressed was that policy decisions need to be made at the appropriate administrative level. In this case they made the observation that some of the decisions were made at a ground level, particularly in the federal government, and that they needed to be made up at a higher level.

The foremost key issue that the panel identified was that there is a need to resolve issues of cooperation and support from the military. We were told that we needed to establish stronger leadership at the most senior levels of all participating agencies, primarily at the federal end. We also need better-defined program leadership and agency policies on invasive species. We also need to continue to expand interagency cooperation and private industry involvement.

Mr. Campbell also presented an overview of current interdiction issues. Significant expansion of Air Force and naval facilities on Guam that is underway. It is estimated that up to \$10 billion is being put into this project. This means there will be a commensurate increase in military and commercial flights and ships moving staff, equipment, household goods, and other types of cargo. We need to have our brown treesnake interdiction control and research based on the volume of goods destined to high-risk sites like Hawaii.

Mr. Vice addressed the council to give a summary of the overall situation on Guam. In the past couple of years our budget has been strained to deliver 100% effective quarantine. Our staffing has been reduced under the previous two fiscal years. This current year we have received some additional funds and have been able to increase our containment activities to try to get back to where we consider it 100% containment. The inspection capabilities are still less than 100%. It takes time to hire, train and develop potential handlers.

Given the fact that we are still not capable of providing 100% inspection, we have internally prioritized the inspections. As a consequence we are missing quite a lot of stuff. Between September 2004 and July 31, 2005 roughly 100 military aircraft departed without inspection. This was due to staffing issues and lack of notification of flights. There were also 302 commercial aircrafts that departed without inspection. Most commercial aircrafts were quick turn around and considered low-risk.

Mr. Campbell explained the longer-term issues that need to be addressed. 1) It is clear that we need to elevate the issue to the appropriate agency levels. 2) We also need to secure long-term

funding and logistical support to ensure program stability. 3) Funding for brown treesnake interdiction, control and research on Guam must be commensurate with the volume of goods destined to high-risk sites. Mr. Campbell announced that Matson would be opening a direct line from Guam to Hawaii, which is a significant issue. 4) We also need to enhance cooperation, coordination and accountability, through regulatory measures, if necessary.

Ms. Kunimoto questioned Mr. Campbell on when Matson will be starting this new service. Mr. Campbell was not positive on the exact date.

Mr. Young announced that this is a non-action item and asked for public comments. There were none.

STATUS OF WEST NILE VIRUS PLANNING

Mr. Larry Lau presented a brief review on West Nile virus efforts. In January 2004 a conference was held and their consensus was that we would try to prevent the arrival and establishment of West Nile virus. We will try to find it quickly while it is still localized and respond rapidly and effectively to eradicate it. This strategy will protect both the public and wildlife. However, no one else has tried this method so there are no guarantees and we are developing it as we go. There have been a lot of improvements and we have learned a tremendous amount. We also have a very strong team within the DOH and other agencies. This is a good example of agencies working together, which is what is needed. We have also have had success in informing the public and getting the public to respond.

PREVENTION

The main focus is to try to suppress the mosquitoes around potential entry points. We use a two-mile zone around selected airports and harbors. Our operation goals are to keep mosquitoes down to five or fewer per track per night. The areas are also surveyed to find their breeding sites. We have talked to people to get them to reduce the standing water. We are actually looking at more sprayers and pesticide but in terms of the budget we are really looking for more tracking and surveillance capability and to upgrade our computer information system to enable us to share our information.

Mosquito transportation is being examined but there is no control strategy yet. We're looking at: mainland inspection, aircraft, container and ship disinsection. Migratory bird risk is being researched but it is still an on-going research project.

As for surveillance, mosquito trapping is being done at the ports; we have live bird exposure testing at airports; our labs operation have improved; we have also improved our computer system. Research is being done on how our local species of birds react to the West Nile virus. In approximately one year, we have tested the following: 3,000 mosquitoes, 725 dead birds, and 1,225 live birds. For humans and horses, we have a system working through the appropriate agencies.

One of the issues that have arisen is the dead bird surveillance, which the experts have said is one of the most important surveillance tools. We need more birds, and we need the public to help us. Back in September 2004, we got a lot of publicity and received a lot of responses from the public.

Our surveillance target is to increase the number of tests by double or triple the amount and reduce the turn-around time. In order to achieve our goals, we will need more help and money.

The last part of the strategy is response. We need more pesticides, equipment and public acceptance. The University of Hawaii has prepared media responses that have been distributed at various times. We don't have any aerial capacity to spray yet.

Although airplanes are controversial, there are a lot of areas that trucks are unable to reach. The planes would be doing what is referred to as Ultra Low Volume, which amounts to about a teaspoon or two per acre. HC&S responded to help reduce standing water in their fields and irrigation system, and they have helicopter capability, but it still leaves a lot of area. So, for an effective response we need aircraft capability.

As for our challenges ahead, our co-ordination among and within agencies has been good but it's a constant effort. Public information is really important, i.e. dead bird reports; pickup, mosquito prevention, getting standing water reduced and educating people on the reason to spray. There are serious environmental issues from the staff as well as the DOA on the safe use of pesticides. In summary, our budget will be utilized to help us get more and faster tests, more dead birds, getting the word out to the public, and more prevention. We'd like to do more suppression. We are not trying to increase the number of ports of entry. This budget will go to the surveillance and prevention. Stage one will be heavy ground response and stage two will include the aerial response. That includes prepositioning a plane. The budget request for DOH's West Nile virus is more than the HISC Prevention Working Group approved. We request approval of the working group amount for \$455,000 with permission to DOH to reallocate, as it needs. Since that working group gave us that approval we have had major developments and the federal Centers for Disease Control came back and gave us more money. However, we don't have definite guidance on what we can spend it for.

Mr. Young announced that this is a non-action item and asked for public comments. There were none.

WORKING GROUP UPDATES:

Mr. Lyle Wong reported that in 2005 the Prevention Working Group recommended approval of four funding projects. 1) \$650,000 to DOA Quarantine Branch to expand inspection programs at ports of entry, 2) \$90,000 to USDA Wildlife Services for a study on Guam to look at the inspection program of sea containers, 3) \$75,000 to DLNR Division of Aquatic Resources to conduct projects to increase communication between other agencies and the shipping industry to minimize aquatic invasive species, 4) \$175,000 DOH Division of Vector Control to improve surveillance and rapid response capabilities to address the threat of West Nile virus. Two of the four projects, DOA Quarantine Branch and DOH threat control of the West Nile virus are still

on-going. The other two, DAR's aquatic invasive species and the USDA wildlife study have been completed.

The DOA has been increasing efforts at ports of entry to identify and assess the risk of pathways or entries of pests to the state.

For the FY06 budget, the Prevention Working group met twice to review and decide on project recommendations: 1) \$755,000 to DOA, ports of entry inspection programs to identify and assess the risk of pathways and entries to the state (\$300,000 for data base management and \$455,000 for pest risk assessment, both airport and maritime); 2) \$455,135 to DOH, Vector Control, West Nile virus initiatives; 3) \$186,000 to USDA, Wildlife Services, Guam brown tree snake inspection and 4) \$120,400 to DLNR (\$75,200 for Ant Prevention Coordinator and \$45,000 for Weed Risk Assessment Technician).

ESTABLISHED PESTS

Ms. Mindy Wilkinson, DLNR, reported on the overview of the Established Pest Working Group. The Response & Control section of the budget, which the working group oversees, is allocated to "on the ground" and "in the water" field crews that carry out early detection and rapid response to pests. The goal for the Response & Control funding is to build up response capabilities to conduct invasive species detection and control on the ground. This effort was cooperatively developed through the working group. A number of concerns on the part of some agricultural groups were brought to light due to past directions of the invasive species committees being sponsored by groups such as DLNR and The Nature Conservancy. It was felt that we needed to broaden our scope and consider more agricultural pests as well

Last year an Aquatic Invasive Species Response team was funded and organized under the DLNR, Division of Aquatic Resources. This team would go out and survey for aquatic invasive species organism and attempt to develop control efforts. The remainder of the funding was divided among the counties. When the remainder of the budget was released last year, a larger portion that was originally budgeted went to Response & Control because it was felt that the island Invasive Species Councils could more effectively utilize that funding rather than the more involved process of development of new programs. It is easier for them to hire crews and immediately address known threats such as coqui frogs and miconia.

Big Island: The county of Hawaii has the state's largest population of coqui frogs and miconia. Coqui frogs are widespread through the island and more than 110,000 acres infested with miconia. The coqui frog problem is handled differently in the County of Hawaii. It is not eradication. There are no reasonable mechanisms to achieve the goal given the current resources and technology.

On Maui County: They addressed the need to get people out looking for the things that aren't so widely established yet, but we can make a biological difference by going after them with sprayers and machetes. In the short term, they want to make sure that these infestations do not become widespread. The initial funds match a commitment that Maui County has made in

addition to the Board of Water Supply. They hired a temporary crew to address the coqui frog and miconia.

On Oahu: This went to hire a temporary crew of five during the summer months. We are happy to report that the population of coqui frogs on Oahu has gone from tens of thousands to as of last week, three.

On Kauai: The Kauai Invasive Specific Committee has doubled its operation over the last year and is addressing the sole population of coqui frogs in addition to doing miconia surveys. Kauai has the best chance to completely eradicate these two top priorities on their island.

The Aquatic Invasive Species Management Team is working to control the population of snowflake coral at Port Allen, Kauai and may provide an opportunity to protect the entire Northwest Hawaiian Islands from this organism.

Ms. Wilkinson went on to explain that there will be funding to continue the Weed Risk Assessment in order to move forward on a science-based offensive that will reduce the importation of potentially invasive plants in the future.

On behalf of the Working Group on Established Pests, one of the key goals will be to review how effective we're being at detecting and making progress. This will be one of our key topics to be discussed on the future.

Mr. Callejo thanked Ms. Wilkinson for her summary and asked if she could provide a breakdown on the actual expenditures for FY05 for each of the counties: labor, equipment, material as well as what was matching funds by the other agencies?

Ms. Wilkinson will provide the requested information.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. Mark Defley, HISC Implementation Manager, reported on the Research and Technology Program. The Research and Technology Program branches out and puts out request for proposals to the community at large to help find solutions for invasive species in Hawaii. Seventy-three proposals were received and seventy-one were reviewed. Two were not review because they exceeded the page limit. Seventeen projects were awarded, which amounts to twenty-four percent of the seventy-one reviewed. The total amount awarded was \$599,788 and the match was estimated at over one million dollars.

Eight contracts went to universities, all but one to UH. Four went to private entities, four to the federal government, and one to the state. The majority of the strategies fall into the response and control area.

The projects address ten terrestrial threats, five aquatic threats, four commerce, four agriculture and three public health.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

Ms. Maile Sakamoto, who is new to HISC, reported on the Public Outreach Working Group. Ms. Sakamoto started by saying that it's a huge challenge. Public Outreach is trying to reach other groups.

Ms. Christy Martin reported that with the funds from FY05 they were able to hire staff and we have been able to increase our presence on each island. We've done more than 10 talks and events since March and we've been able to reach a lot of people all the way from senior citizens down to little children. These are the people that we would normally miss during traditional outreach. We were able to get additional media attention, which helps in getting our message out to more than 200,000 people. We have been able to get local, national and international media attention. We have been able to provide immediate assistance for island-specific needs. For example, for the snake sighting in Lihue, our specialist was able to create a flyer and get them posted through the island. A lot of the steps she took would not have been achieved if it were not for our outreach specialist. Our Oahu staff sent out 330 letters directly to nurseries because coqui frogs were identified as an issue and in order to eradicate we need to detect. As for long-term state-wide issues, we need to change some of our outdated outreach materials. The mini-grant funding has allowed some of our groups doing outreach to go one step further.

Mr. Callejo asked if there has been any discussion with the Department of Education as far as outreach is concerned.

Ms. Sakamoto explained that it has been difficult to work with the Department of Education. Invitations have been extended and several appointments were made to meet with their lead environmental educator with no success. Now that we have a staff on-board, we will pursue their participation to our HISC meetings.

The new website, new statewide pest hotline and database will be online, and all grants projects will be completed by the end of 2005.

Ms. Sakamoto explained that their goals are to 1) increase outreach efforts and opportunities statewide; 2) develop more interagency cooperation; and 3) develop new partnerships.

As for their budget, Ms. Sakamoto asked the council for some flexibility with the budget to have the ability to work within the working group--to be able to go beyond the boundaries to these different groups to share some of the access to those funds.

Mr. Defley reported on the Public Outreach Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2005. Out of twenty-three proposals received, thirteen grants were awarded – five went to individuals and three to agencies. The grants amounted to \$109,710 and matched by \$238,156.

Kim Langley (CGAPS) stated that looking at the budget that Maile put up and the overall amount and the grants, it appears that with four people working with public outreach that the amount of money per grants would be almost nothing this year.

Ms. Martin explained it's the other way around. The money on the outreach budget can pay three staff and leave \$7,000 left over for everything else and \$80,000 for mini-grants.

Mr. Defley explained that the level of the grant program for this year hasn't been determined because the working hasn't proposed specific projects yet.

Mr. Callejo explained that it looked like a budgetary mismatch.

Mr. Defley stated that the proposed budget will be reviewed later by Ms. Wilkinson.

Mr. Defley reported the DBEDT representative was not able to make the meeting so he will be doing the report on the Resources Working Group which met four times since July 16, 2004. Information gather included the fact that the GCAPS Additional Needs Matrix projected personnel and funding needs by species and by activity for all state and non-state invasive species activities. The annual requirements projected were 515 new FTE's at \$35.5 million and \$17.1 million in project funds for a total of \$52.6 million. These numbers are probably conservative.

The working group has three main recommendations: 1) Institute a stable, dedicated funding mechanism tied directly to the level of material arriving in Hawaii; 2) Create a state invasive species rapid response fund, similar to that for responding to wild fires; and 3) Cross-train department employees on awareness of invasive species.

The Interagency Working Group has not met this year so there is no report.

Ms. Kunimoto addressed Ms. Sakamoto and agreed that working closer with the outreach groups and working groups is a very good starting point. She went on to explain that she had a discussion with Director Rod Haraga about using the airport as a venue for invasive species awareness and education. Ms. Kunimoto suggested that they work with Lyle and the deputy with airports at the DOT to discuss what spaces would be available and what would be appropriate to exhibit.

Mr. Young announced that the group updates are non-action items but welcomed any public comments.

Ms. Wilkinson reported on the budget for FY 05 and 06. HISC is committed to receiving a one-to-one match. The overall goals for this year funds will be used to backfill gaps in existing programs. The idea of these funds is to develop new and effective programs and fill in areas that were not being addressed and work towards the adoption of programs that were hard to develop to improve the overall level of Hawaii's response to invasive species. The budget does not match to what was originally proposed in the Hawaii Invasive Species Council plan. The original proposal allotted 35% to Prevention, 30% each to Response & Control and Research & Technology and 5% to Outreach. The biggest change to the budget was the decrease of allocation to Research & Technology.

Prevention has 38% of the total budget, which is a 5% increase of the original budget: \$755,000 to the DOA; \$455,000 to the DOH – specifically for the West Nile virus work; \$186,000 to the USDA Wildlife Services cargo certification on Guam; \$120,000 to the DLNR for two specific projects: one to coordinate ant prevention and one for weed risk assessment.

Mr. Callejo noticed that the handouts from Lyle Wong include a request from Larry to the working group that has a DOH request of \$318,000. Why is there a difference from the proposal of \$455,000?

Mr. Lau explained that there were discussions at the working group and they came to a compromise on some programs, so the budget request was increased.

Ms. Wilkinson continued with the budget:

Response & Control: This amount totals 39% of the total funding. DLNR's Aquatic Invasive Team will get an additional \$300,000 to continue supporting their five-person dive team as well as travel and supplies. The remaining \$1.26 million will be divided among the counties.

Research & Technology: This amount totals 17% of the total funding. This has two main components. The first is to continue to support the HISC function and the remaining will be going to grants.

Public Outreach: This amount is 6% of the total HISC funding. This will be used to cover staff salaries through the fiscal year and provide administrative support. The remainder will be provided to the outreach working groups and the grant program.

Mr. Ron Parson wanted clarification on how some of the reduction in the budget was reached.

Ms. Wilkinson explained that from a historical perspective the \$3 million that was provided at the beginning of FY05 (July 2004) was divided according to the same formula and went to four counties. When the final 25% of the budget was released in January 2005 there was some recognition that \$1 million need to be expended as efficiently as possible. So an additional \$500,000 was made available to the Response & Control project, which was divided five ways for five projects and they were asked to carry out an immediate project or immediate support function. That was the difference. You're getting the original distribution with \$100,000 added to it. One of the goals for this year was to put greater emphasis on prevention. Prevention and Response & Control would each receive approximately 40% of the budget, which is working out to be 38% for Prevention and 39% to Response & Control. With this shifted allocation, the overall percentage going to Response & Control this year as compared to last year is decreased by 8%. This reduction was shared among the county groups.

Mr. Parson asked if the ISC managers on the various island know about the reduced amount of funds.

Ms. Wilkinson responded that they were all given a tentative budget as of last week.

There was no discussion.

MOTION: Mr. Callejo moved to approve and Mr. Lau seconded the motion. Council members approved and the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Lau wanted to thank all of the staff members for their hard and diligent work. The Department of Health staff has dedicated at least \$1 million of their time plus an additional \$800,000 of staff time for the mosquito control for the West Nile virus. This is being done at the expense of other programs. Mr. Lau went on to stress that we need to look for ways to be more efficient.

Ms. Christy Martin, from the Outreach Working Group suggested that the leaders or chairs of the working groups all meet together before to work out all of the concerns before the budget is finalized.

Mr. Parson shared some comments from the Maui County. The interagency model that the HISC demonstrates is commendable. One area that could use a little more outreach would be to our representatives in Washington, D.C. There doesn't appear to be a seat at the table or that we are directly communicating with them. This is an opportunity to support Rep. Case's HR 3468. He went on to say that the group has decided that more measures and funding for prevention are the key to long-term success and suggested that the HISC, the governor, the mayors and county councils draft supporting comments to HR 3468.

Also, Maui County in FY06 budgeted a small amount to address the coqui frogs and fire weed. The increase, which was approved by the county, was \$100,000 to include a rapid response capability. A month and a half into the fiscal year it seems that the entire amount may be expended to try to deal with the ramifications of *Erythrina* gall wasp. Maui has some of the best examples of remnant dry land forest on the south slope of Haleakala. The mayor and the county council have made people on Maui feel that the effort is justified. It was mentioned earlier that a rapid response fund might be a wise idea for this council to consider.

Finally, would like the HISC to consider discussions of seed banks. We need to stockpile seeds to replant native species because strong possibilities of wiliwili being severely impacted by this wasp. He would like to see the HISC support for agencies to collect the seeds.

There was no discussion.

MOTION: Council members approved the FY06 budget proposal as presented and the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Young announced that the next meeting is scheduled for December 1, 2005 with detail to follow.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:27 am by Co-Chairperson Peter Young.

State of Hawaii
HAWAII INVASIVE SPECIES COUNCIL
Honolulu, Hawaii

January 19, 2006

Chairpersons and Members
Hawaii Invasive Species Council
State of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Council Members:

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE
HAWAII INVASIVE SPECIES PREVENTION ACT, H.R. 3468.

This council submittal approves a resolution in support of the Hawaii Invasive Species Prevention Act, H.R. 3468, sponsored by Congressman Ed Case (Attachment A).

BACKGROUND:

Congressman Ed Case introduced a bill to require the same or greater level of federal inspection of all visitor and cargo shipments arriving in Hawaii from domestic and foreign locations as now exists for outgoing traffic. He said the measure was the only way to overcome “a true crisis” caused by rapidly accelerating introduction of invasive species and diseases that are devastating Hawaii's flora and fauna and costing the state millions of dollars in agricultural losses, export costs, and other expenses.

“My bill, the Hawaii Invasive Species Prevention Act, may be condensed into this simple statement: what is good for the U.S. mainland should be good for Hawaii,” said Case, a member of the House Agriculture Committee. “Current federal inspections protect the U.S. mainland from insect pests in Hawaii. But Hawaii, which has the greatest number of endemic endangered species of any state in the nation, doesn’t enjoy similar protection.”

Case states that the bill is needed particularly because the state, as the transportation crossroads of the Pacific, has been hamstrung by existing federal laws that preempt state efforts to control the movement of goods and requirements that states consider regulatory burdens imposed on commerce.

In response to those obstacles, Case’s bill:

- states that it is U.S. policy to fund and support efforts to control and prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species into Hawaii and no federal agency may take action to counter that policy;

- directs the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Interior to implement a comprehensive system in Hawaii of post-arrival protocols for all persons, baggage, cargo, containers, packing materials, and other items traveling or being shipped to Hawaii from domestic or foreign locations.

Case said a similarly comprehensive system is already in place in New Zealand, which is comparable to Hawaii because of its remoteness and high and exposed endemic species. New Zealand “white lists” permissible import species but bans everything else, and conducts inspections of arrivals. But ironically, Hawaii, which has a much more acute overall problem than either the U.S. mainland or New Zealand, has found it very difficult to fashion and implement a similar prevention regime under current law.

The bill supports the following statements from the Hawaii Invasive Species Council’s *Interim State of Hawaii Strategic Plan for Invasive Species Prevention, Control, Research and Public Outreach*:

- Increase inspection and other prevention capabilities to prevent high-risk invasive species and diseases . . . from entry into the state . . .
- An integrated action and funding plan that incorporates contributions from . . . federal . . . sources is needed to provide focus and fiscal resources for the ongoing invasive species prevention and control programs.
- Coordinate efforts with federal agencies to maximize resources and reduce or eliminate system gaps and leaks . . .
- Request APHIS [USDA] to screen domestic traffic into Hawaii for living plant material (similar to the screening that takes place between Hawaii and the mainland now).

RECOMMENDATION:

That the council resolve to support the Hawaii Invasive Species Prevention Act, H.R. 3468, sponsored by Congressman Ed Case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK DEFLEY
Plan Implementation Manager
Hawaii Invasive Species Council

Attachment A