

Hawaii Invasive Species Council Resources Working Group Strategic Planning

October 15, 2014, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Hawaii State Capitol Room 309

Facilitator: Emily Montgomery (HISC)

Working Group Chair: Leo Asuncion (DBEDT)

Participants: Josh Atwood (HISC/DLNR), Sonia Gorgula (DAR), Brian Nielsen (DAR), Justine Niipali (DBEDT), Julia Parish (OISC), Christy Martin (CGAPS), David Rodriguez (DOT), Senator Ruderman, Representative Onishi, Albert (Representative Sylvia Luke's Office) Maigee Chang (Senator Ruderman's Office), Rob Hauff (DLNR), Michael Green (Senator Ruderman's Office)

Via WebEx: Teya Penniman (MISC), Jesse Souki (DLNR), Chuck Chimera (WRA)

General Priorities Discussion & Ranking:

Top Ranking Priorities from January Strategic Planning Workshop + Priorities from Ch. 194:

HISC Priority Ranking Score = to or > 5	
Dedicated and sustainable funding source(s) for prevention, control, outreach, and research Dot Exercise Ranking (DER): 10	
Engage Hawaii Tourism Authority to be more part of the process (marketing, funding, etc.) DER: 6	
Have tourists pay into systems that funds work ADDED to one above	
Establish Aquatic Invasive Species Team capacity on each island DER: 2	
More sophisticated cost/benefit analysis of control DER: 9	
Identify and prioritize each lead agency's organizational and resource shortfalls with respect to invasive species DER: 10	Ch. 194
Identify all state, federal, and other moneys expended for the purposes of the invasive species problem in the State DER: 0	Ch. 194
Identify all federal and private funds available to the State to fight invasive species and advise and assist state departments to acquire these funds DER: 2	Ch. 194
Advise the governor and legislature on budgetary and other issues regarding invasive species DER: 0	Ch. 194
Provide annual reports on budgetary and other related issues to the legislature twenty days prior to each regular session DER: 0	Ch. 194
Include and coordinate with the counties in the fight against invasive species to increase resources and funding and to address county-sponsored activities that involve invasive species DER: 6	Ch. 194

Discussion:

- Combine HTA and tourist systems items into one item
- Clarification on relationship between HTA and HISC: HTA is an attached agency to DBEDT, a HISC member agency
- Clarification on cargo fee: fee per tonnage on imports (interstate, not intrastate), revenues go to HDOA for inspection and other operational costs
- Change "teams" to "capacity." could mean that there is central capacity that has the ability to move to other islands as needed

Priority 1: Identify and prioritize each lead agency's organizational and resource shortfalls with respect to invasive species

- a. What is the Ideal Result?
 - Difficult for agencies to identify gaps/things to fix. HISC is mechanism to make that happen. Document and prioritize shortfalls
 - Agencies recognize that they're not on their own- solutions can be collaborative
 - Missions for individual agencies reflect needs and are support (may require expansion of mission)
 - Providing a structure for resource sharing (through identification of opportunities)
 - Synthesizing this information into a meaningful plan for action (legislative or otherwise)
 - Have a complete picture including why other groups are necessary and need support
 - Provide a clear understanding of roles/responsibilities/kuleana and how all fit together
 - Information is included in annual legislative report – meaningful synthesis that results in action
- b. Identify HISC Strategies (Implementation steps for HISC: i.e. policy, funding, and/or management/action)
 - HISC staff works directly with agencies to identify organizational/resource shortfalls
 - Staff at each agency identified as "HISC liaison" and perhaps part time funded by HISC to ensure agency representation and implementation at a staff level (or vice versa: HISC has staff that work with each agency, this may not work as well – limited ability to more fully integrate with agency)
 - Peer or external review of HISC and invasive species programs (i.e. HISC agencies review one another or an external reviewer is used to get feedback, similar to the 2006 report by Paula Warren, or maybe office of the Auditor?)
 - Identify roles/responsibilities/priorities agencies have to be able to see shortfalls
 - Consider other groups that used to be more engaged
 - Information is synthesized in HISC legislative report and a legislative bill package
- c. What capacity does HISC need to do this?
 - Staff within agencies vs. staff within HISC support: Having a staff member within each agency that works part time on HISC issues would provide better input on agency operations and needs
 - Better connection to county staff (e.g. Rob Parsons, agency – boots on the ground)
 - Ability to contract external reviewer or conduct peer review
- d. Identify Evaluation Measures
 - Legislative report is produced with a synthesis of this information
 - New LRB study on filling the gaps
 - Tracking number of filled or assigned positions (or vacancies) related to invasive species (FTE), could also review reorganizations to fill gaps
 - Number of positions lost or gained
 - Survey (quantitative or qualitative) to assess how we're doing, target to agency staff (at management level?)
 - Survey decision makers on increased understanding of needs, gaps, issues, etc.

Priority 2: Dedicated and sustained funding source(s) and mechanisms for prevention, control, outreach, and research

- a. What is the Ideal Result?
 - Acknowledgement that this is work in perpetuity
 - Effectively managed invasive species
 - Emergency funding in place with capacity and mechanism for emergency response
 - Sustainability for both recurring funding (e.g., core agency programs) and competitive funding that provides flexibility (e.g. HISC). Needs to be a mix

- Optimized management strategies and plans
- Capacity to address impacts of projects strategically included from the outset (i.e. development of a new road- invasive species transport is included as a risk of development and mitigated somehow)
- b. Identify HISC Strategies (Implementation steps for HISC: i.e. policy, funding, and/or management/action)
 - All sources funding are identified and sustainability assessed
 - Public private partnerships are utilized
 - Educating private funding organizations (i.e. Atherton, Castle) within Hawaii Community Foundation (we need to educate them on our needs, but also understand what they want to fund and find opportunities for our work to be relevant to it)
 - Outreach to VIPs- large property owners, potential donors
 - Engage specific industries that are part of the solution
 - Create a comprehensive snapshot of different funds available and how they address core functions of invasive species management
- c. What capacity does HISC need to do this?
 - Marketer to make contacts with industries/funders
 - Updated economic analyses on impacts and costs
- d. Identify Evaluation Measures
 - Measuring funding level needs vs. funding levels met (including matched or leveraged funds)
 - Species introductions or expansions are reduced
 - % of state budget going towards invasives (or natural resource management)
 - Diversity of portfolio (i.e. # of agencies receiving funds and from where)
 - Qualitative measures: staff moral (can indicate support)

Priority 3: More sophisticated cost/benefit analysis of control

- a. What is the Ideal Result?
 - Measures of progress are established toward an objective or goal
 - Understanding what the worst invasive species species are, where they are, and true impacts
 - Funds are provided for economic analyses
 - Accurate picture of risk for species not present
 - Analysis of adequate inspection at each port (facilities and people)
 - Economically support management actions (avoid supporting more costly actions to mitigate other less costly issues)
 - Cost described in context of individual/community or industry cost
 - Measure public support v lack of support
 - Understanding of opportunity costs when shifting between species
- b. Identify HISC Strategies (Implementation steps for HISC: i.e. policy, funding, and/or management/action)
 - Define what the high priority economic questions are (can provide more direction during funding process) – i.e. Evaluation of new technologies for costs savings (e.g., UAVs or aerial imagery vs helicopters)
 - Develop template for data collection on costs/benefits- should be defining categories of costs, benefits and metrics so that we can synthesize data across studies (i.e. do we want to know about impacts to groundwater recharge in gallons, medical costs, should benefits include valuation of preserved species, habitats, etc.). Enable more standardization in the future
 - Work with economist to determine what is needed in a model
 - Identify all groups working on invasives species

- Information is used for both program justification and adaptive management
 - Facilitate/support more information sharing capacity, i.e. workshops for information sharing, like weed control technique workshops offered by Mary Ikagawa.
 - HISC is a clearinghouse for economic analyses and information
- c. What capacity does HISC need to do this?
- Contract or hire for data collection/management across groups
 - Economists
 - Pest risk specialists/assessors (what capacity exists within agencies already?)
 - Capacity to take info and coordinate it
- d. Identify Evaluation Measures
- Priority list of questions produced
 - Usable numbers are produced
 - Users are getting the info and they can/are use(ing) it
 - Number of studies hosted on HISC website
 - Outreach materials produced with easily digestible data
 - Track decision-making based on evaluation on costs/benefits
 - Milestones developed, ability to show price points adjusting as management occurs
 - Track how used to impact decision making

Identify & prioritize each lead agency's organizational & resource shortfalls with respect to invasive species

$$1+9=10$$

Identify all state, federal, and other moneys expended for the purpose of the invasive species problem in the state

Identify all federal & private funds available to the state to fight invasive species and advise and assist state departments to acquire these funds

Advise the governor & legislature on budgetary & other related issues regarding invasive species

Provide annual reports on budgetary & other related issues to the legislature 20 days prior to ea reg. session

Include and coordinate with the counties in the fight against invasive species to increase resources & funding & to address county sponsored activities

$$1+5=6$$

Dedicated & sustainable funding source(s) for prevention, control, outreach, & Research

$$2+8=10$$

Engage HTA to be more part of the process (marketing, funding)

$$2+4=6$$

Have tourists pay into systems that fund work

Establish AIS ^{capacity} teams on each island

$$2$$

More sophisticated cost/benefit analysis of control

$$9$$

Dedicated & Sustain. fund. source(s) for IS

& mechanisms

2. effectively managing IS

☐ emerg fund in place, capacity & mech for emerg response

☐ acknow. that this work is in perpetuity

☐ optimized mgmt strategies

- plans etc.

☐ both a comp process for funds, but also having a recurring ^{known} sources (agency core function)

☐ capacity to address impacts of projects

B. ^{ID} - all sources of funding are identified & sustain. assessed
- assuring ca

pub/priv

☐ public/private

old private funders w/in on needs (Zaner)

H^{on}C Foundation is, & d

☐ leveraging what funders are focused on to meet our needs

OUTREACH-MARKETING & GOING AFTER SMOZZING KEY IDWD

B. ☐ engage specific industries that are part of the solution

☐ create a comp^{reh} snapshot of the diff funds avail & link to avenues to fund IS work.

C. ☐ marketer/ to make content professional

☐ having to eval in place

☐ tracking % of State bud. going to IS/ ^{capacity to (+ leverage match, fed funds etc)}

D. ☐ funding level need vs. met

☐ reaching goals around reducing introduct. or exp.

☐ diversity of portfolio, # of agencies entities,

☐ qual. moral ^{receiving funds}

11) : Prioritize each lead agency's org. & resource shortfalls w/ Respect to Invasive Species

- a. • difficult for agencies to ID gaps/needs/ things to fix — HISC is mechanism to make that happen w/ cohesion, together, no micro document, prioritize
- Agency not on their own, can be collab. addressed.
 - help support mission (expansion) & ID opportunities, how this work fits in
 - providing a structure for resource sharing (ID opportunities)
 - gives a good pic of why other groups are priorities (
 - Clear understanding of the role of ea. agency & how ev. fits in
 - REPORT w/ this info - meaning seen that results in action

- B. ☐ staff working directly w/ agencies
- ☒ staff in the agency w/ with HISC or vis/versa
- ☐ peer review team (external) ^{next the} CHALLENGE of agencies reviewing themselves
- ☐ ID the roles & respons. ^{of each} AGENCY — have to understand the roles to see the shortfalls
- ^{* consider other groups that used to be more engaged etc.} look spec. at IS (maybe agency is doing somewhat but has IS —)
- ☐ (eg. report & package
-
- C. → liaison w/ dept makes connection stronger, dept more invested buy-in
- (inclusive of counties?) level boots on the ground
- ability to contact ex. rev.

d. — the leg rep. is produce of

- ☐ an LRB completed
- ☐ track # of filled positions or # of vac ^(or assigned) } based on gaps ID'd
- ☐ Survey w/ in agency on how we are doing } qual feedback
- ☐ Survey of increased understanding
- ☐ Positions lost / gain

COST/Ben. analysis of control & prevention

- ☐ est milestones, measures of progress ^{FRAME work for prioritization i.e. opp costs emerg respo tasks away trans ongo} towards mtg an obj.
- ☐ putting funding to project for a study
- ☐ understanding what the worst are, where they are: true impacts
- ☐ acc. projection of timelines
- ☐ acc. pic of risk for species not present
- ☐ economically support mgmt actions (i.e. avoid using wrong action to avoid...)
- ☐ analysis of adequate inspection at each port. (consider facilities)
- ☐ COST described in context of ind. ^{vs} gen pub
- ☐ measure public support v. lack of support

- ## B.
- ☐ Coordinating body to define the highest priority questions
 - scopes:
 - ☐ template for data collection [model]
 - ↳ help define what costs, units, ...
 - ↳ standardization into the future
 - ☐ work with economist to
 - determining what is need in a model
 - ☐ HISC is a clearinghouse for info
 - ☐ ID all groups working on IS
 - ☐ increase ^{HISC} support capacity w/ weed spec. → sharing info to other collectors
 - ☐ contract or hire for data collection & management across groups
 - ☐ Economists
 - ☐ pest risk specialists/assessments
 - ↑ what capac. within agency already
 - ☐ capacity to take info & coordinate it based on actual eco efficiency

D. ☐ producing the priority list of Qs

- ☐ useful eval used
- ☐ users: are they getting the info & can they use it.
- ☐ # of analysis produced
- ☐ Outreach materials ^{having} using easily shareable data (#s)
- ☐ track decision-making based & eval on using cost/ben
- ☐ milestone developed, ability to show Price Points adjusting as mgmt occurs
- ☐ track how used to impact decision-making

plus

delta

/m

- facilitation +1 ||

- Obj. & Os clearly defined

- On time

- Pretty good consensus

- Great part & dis.

- Structure +1

- really focused & +1 manageable

- participation

• phone. +1 || better ||

• not every represented + ||||
(opp. for discussion) 1

• temp

• more review of past process

• bigger dots or stars

• following changes.
w/Pres Dynamics