

Center for Invasive Plant Management
Semi-Annual Steering Committee Meeting (Conference Call)
April 25, 2008
10:15 am – 12:00 pm (MDT)
Montana State University – Bozeman

Friday, April 25, 2008

Meeting Attendance:

Steering Committee Members: John Simons (moderator), Tim Koopmann, Mandy Tu, Dave White, Dean Peterson, Jennifer Vollmer, Eric Lane, Tim Prather, Earl Creech, and Jon Wraith (ex officio).

CIPM Staff: Liz Galli-Noble, Mary McFadzen, Mara Johnson, Dianne Brokke, and Janet Clark.

Absent: Jim Olivarez, Melissa Brown and Connie Bollinger.

I. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting was convened at 10:15 a.m. All were welcomed and introductions were made by each Steering Committee member and CIPM staff:

John Simons – is with the Bureau of Land Management based in Billings, Montana. He has been the SC moderator for the past year and was asked to moderate this meeting as well, “in order to keep the group on track.” He has been the invasive species coordinator for Montana and the Dakotas for almost three years now. He joined the SC after Hank McNeal; his position was empty for about a year and a half. Before his Billings assignment, he was the Rangeland Management Specialist and weed coordinator in Dillon, Montana for 14 years.

Dave White – Montana State Director for NRCS. He manages \$60 - \$70 million a year in various conservation programs and a “goodly portion” of that goes to noxious and invasive plant control. The NRCS has done many special projects, working with a lot of the other agencies. He is new to the SC; he has known Janet Clark for several years. He appreciates the opportunity to serve and looks forward to working with everyone.

Mandy Tu – Invasive Species Ecologist with The Nature Conservancy's Global Invasive Species Team. She is the science advisor for the organization-wide team that works on invasive species worldwide. She is based out of Portland, Oregon.

Jennifer Vollmer – She lives in Laramie, Wyoming and works for BASF Corporation. Her main job is liaison to governmental agencies, which involves: making sure that when they're using pesticides, especially BASF herbicides, that they're using them correctly; helping them with their programs; answering questions; etc.

Tim Prather – is with the University of Idaho. He works in forest and terrestrial systems and to some extent in aquatic systems. His job focuses mostly on an extension appointment but also a research appointment (about 20% of his time). He also teaches a course at the University of Idaho. He would like to work on decision support tools and landscape level issues.

Tim Koopmann – is from California. He has a small family ranch operation, where he runs a couple hundred cow/calves. He is also a resource manager for a 40,000-acre watershed/rangeland for the city and county of San Francisco, which is still being grazed – remarkable in and of itself. “We've got a number of things going on in the watershed, which we manage for biodiversity, with resource water quality being our first primary goal”.

Eric Lane – works at the Colorado Department of Agriculture. He was the State Weed Coordinator in Colorado for about 10 years. He is now the Division Director for the Colorado Conservation Services Division, which includes noxious weed management, biological control, groundwater protection and the conservation districts program. He works on a variety of natural resource issues through locally led initiatives, and is still active in the weed management arena, particularly at the regional and national levels.

Dean Peterson – is a private ranch owner and operator at Judith Gap, Montana. He has participated in the Environmental Management Systems program and weed district areas.

Jon Wraith – is head of the Land Resources and Environment Sciences Department in the College of Agriculture and the Montana Agriculture Experiment Station at Montana State University. “The CIPM is housed in our department and we’re very happy to have them.... Flow chart wise, that makes me the MSU direct supervisor of Janet Clark, previously, and now Liz Galli-Noble. We’re very excited to have Liz at the Center.”

Earl Creech – (*joined the meeting a few minutes late*) is the Extension Weed Specialist for the University of Nevada. He is one of the new SC members.

Jim Olivarez (*absent*) – is the USFS Region 1 Invasive Species Coordinator based in Missoula, Montana. Region 1 covers the Dakotas, Montana and the northern part of Idaho. *Information provided by John Simons.*

Liz Galli-Noble – It’s nice to meet everyone. I’ve spoken to almost all of you privately in the month and a half that I’ve been with the CIPM. Those conversations were very helpful and I thank everyone for taking time to do talk to me. For the few people who I haven’t had a chance to talk to yet, I plan to do that in the next month or so. As I said, I’ve been here a little over a month and it’s been a trial by fire. We’ve been very busy at the Center. I’ve already done some traveling (to Reno for the CWMA conference). I’m very happy to be working alongside Janet Clark, who agreed to stay on at CIPM to tie up loose ends. She’s helped with many, many things and I want to thank her for that. My staff has been excellent and very supportive. I’m happy to be here, happy to meet the Steering Committee and I look forward to working with you in the months and years to come.

Mara Johnson – I’m the Technology Transfer Coordinator for the Center.

Mary McFadzen – I’m the Education Program Coordinator for the Center and also function as the Assistant Director for Education and Science Communication. My primary responsibilities are to communicate science to land managers by developing online learning materials.

Dianne Brokke – I’m the Grants Manager/Office Manager for the Center.

Janet Clark – I’m the former director, working at home as a “temp hourly” doing special projects for Liz. I’m on this call to provide historical context, if it’s needed. Otherwise, I’m just listening today.

Connie Bollinger (*absent*) – Connie is the Electronic Communication Program Coordinator for the CIPM. *Information provided by CIPM.*

Melissa Brown (absent) – Melissa works part time as the Science Communication Associate for the CIPM. *Information provided by CIPM.*

II. Steering Committee Member Renewals

John Simons – I assume everyone has received and taken a look at the meeting agenda. We just covered a couple of items. Our next item of business is SC member renewals. Jim Olivarez and Jennifer Vollmer both indicated that they would continue with their membership for another three-year appointment. Eric, are you interested in doing the same thing?

Eric Lane – I would be happy to continue as an SC member; however, I suggest that it might be more useful – since I’m no longer the Colorado state weed coordinator – to make that spot available to another state weed coordinator. I’m just a little sensitive to the fact that I am taking a spot that might be useful to engage another state and another state weed coordinator. As I mentioned it’s not that I’m not still very active in weed management issues. If Liz wanted to make that slot available for someone else, I’d be happy to step aside and continue to support the Center in a different capacity; to provide the opportunity to someone else to step in and continue to do some of the work that I was doing on the SC.

Liz Galli-Noble – I want to add that I spoke with Eric Lane and Janet Clark yesterday and asked them if they had specific suggestions who might be good candidates to fill Eric's slot. Both of them agreed that Slade Franklin from Wyoming would be their #1 choice; followed by Greg Haubrich of Washington; and Tim Butler of Oregon. So, I was wondering, if it's okay with the SC, if I may go ahead and pursue filling the SC vacancy with one of those candidates over the summer? May I have comments from the other SC members, please.

John Simons – From what I know of Slade, he would do very well. He's very active; they have an excellent program in Wyoming. But if he is unable to do it, Oregon and Washington would be good states to try to include in the SC. We could even look at other programs in Colorado or Utah. But, I think Slade would work fine.

Jennifer Vollmer – I work with Slade a lot and I think he'd be an excellent choice.

Tim Prather– What kind of representation do you have from Washington and Oregon right now?

Liz Galli-Noble– Mandy Tu is in Oregon; we don't have anyone from Washington; and Wyoming (Jennifer Vollmer) is also represented.

Tim Prather – I think if our 1st choice can't do it, my suggestion would be to take a look at trying to interest someone from the state of Washington.

Mandy Tu – I would agree.

Liz Galli-Noble – Other comments? *None given.*

So, what I've heard is that people are comfortable with asking Wyoming, but we could use Washington representation on the SC as well.

Decision: The CIPM director will proceed over the summer to find a replacement for Eric Lane's SC position. The SC agreed that Wyoming and Washington State Weed Coordinators were good candidates for the SC. Liz will keep the SC apprised of developments.

John Simons – What are we doing on the tribal SC position?

Liz Galli-Noble – I was told that LaDonna Carlisle had already been approved as a new SC member at your October 2007 meeting. Janet Clark has tried to get a hold of LaDonna for some time with little success. During a recent visit to Washington DC, Janet ran into LaDonna and confirmed that she is interested in serving on the SC. She just needs to get permission from her supervisor to officially participate. So, if it's acceptable to the Steering Committee, I would like to write a letter to her supervisor inviting her to join the SC. I'm hoping that she'll be able to join at the fall meeting. Any comments? Any objections?

No comments or objections were given.

Decision: Liz Galli-Noble will contact LaDonna Carlisle and her supervisor and formally invite her to join the SC. Liz will keep the SC informed of these developments.

III. October 10-11, 2007 Meeting Minutes Approval

John Simons – Are there any comments on or corrections to the minutes from the October 2007 meeting (see *Attachment A*)?

No comments or corrections were given.

Decision: There were no comments/corrections made to the October 2007 SC meeting minutes. The minutes were approved as written.

IV. Bylaws and Strategic Plan

John Simons – We ask the SC members to take a look at the *Bylaws* and the *Strategic Plan* over the summer. We then hope to have a good discussion about possible or needed changes at the fall SC meeting. One other thing, I am willing to continue to function as the SC moderator over the summer or even through next fall's meeting, if the rest of the committee is fine with that. If not, we can go ahead and have somebody else take on moderator duties. Any comments?

All agreed that this was a good idea.

Decision: John Simons will remain SC moderator through the fall 2008 SC meeting. A new moderator will be elected at that meeting and that individual will take on those duties after the fall 2008 meeting.

V. CIPM Financial Updates

Liz Galli-Noble – Dianne Brokke provided me with the most recent CIPM budget (ending March 1, 2008), which I e-mailed to all of you last week (see *Attachment B*). I'm going to quickly summarize this budget and explain what my strategy for funding will be for the next year.

FY06 Earmark – Presently, we're spending down our final FY06 earmark. I have been told that there will be no more earmarks for the CIPM. Given that, my plan is to find different funding sources, which may include federal money but not earmark. However, when we were in Reno (for the CWMA conference), I had federal agency folks approach me to say that the CIPM should not close the door on future earmarks, and that we should consider applying for future earmarks. Of course, that action would have to be palatable to Montana State University.

CIPM Budget – If you look at page 3 of the finance report, under the FY09 column, the CIPM is fully funded (that is all CIPM staff salaries/benefits, infrastructure and limited travel) through June 2009. In addition, we have a surplus in that earmark of approximately \$120,000 and an additional \$50,000 from a science research project that was not conducted (Mara Johnson and Tim Prather will explain this later in the meeting).

New Funding –

1. The CIPM is about to sign a contract for \$100,000 to coordinate the Missouri River Watershed Coalition-Saltcedar Management Project. Janet Clark and I met with Dave Burch (Montana Department of Agriculture, Noxious Weed Trust Fund) in early April and worked out the details. The contract dates will be from May 1, 2008 to May 1, 2009. The CIPM has already provided *pro bono* assistance to this group in the past, but they are now paying us for the service. (See *Attachment C* for work plan and budget).
2. Janet Clark and I also met with John Cantlon of DuPont Corporation in early April. DuPont agreed to make a small contribution to the CIPM "to continue doing the great work that we do for the western region;" nothing more. I'm not sure of the exact amount but I imagine that it will only be a few thousand dollars.

Note: The exact amount is \$4,000 (as of May 8, 2008).

So, in addition to being fully funded through June 2009, we have an additional \$120,000 + \$50,000 + \$100,000 + \$4,000.

Potential Funding – As of yesterday (April 24), Mary McFadzen, Janet Clark and I spoke to the Department of Defense about a potential project for the CIPM. It would be for an ecologically/ecosystem-based invasive species training for DoD installations located in the southwest US, put on by the CIPM (and partners). The funding source is the Legacy Program and the CIPM would submit a proposal this fall for funding to begin in January 2009. An early estimate for the project would be in the \$50,000-\$100,000 range.

Funding Strategy – My basic funding goal is to move \$250,000 this year. I've been told that there shouldn't be a problem getting an extension on the BLM earmark. My strategy is to extend the earmark for an additional year because base funding for things like administration is so hard to get. My plan is to infuse additional money through project specific funding, which will cover salaries for specific work products, but will not allow funding for program administration or

infrastructure. So that would take us through June 2010. I would welcome comments about my funding strategy or if anyone has additional ideas. Also, many thanks to Janet Clark for bringing these new funding opportunities to the Center. *The SC members commented that they were supportive of this strategy.*

John Simons - I will make sure you have the appropriate forms for requesting the earmark extension. I have visited with the person who handles that and they're looking for justification and budget information to make that happen.

VI. Project Updates

- ***CIPM-SAC Science Project – Tim Prather and Mara Johnson***

Mara Johnson explained that during the 2007 round for CIPM research grant funding, the Science Advisory Council (SAC) decided not to fund one \$30,000 project and, instead, chose to take the money and an additional \$20,000 (that was available for the research group) to do an in-house project. The SAC had planned to take the lead on addressing a current policy -- similar to what CIPM did with the Farm Bill Workshop (brought in a panel of scientists and came up with science based recommendations for the Farm Bill). A list of policy issues (requiring the infusion of science) was developed by the CIPM and then given to the Steering Committee to rate.

Because both Tim and Mara (1) were on the new CIPM director search committee, (2) there was no clear issue like the Farm Bill to focus on, and (3) given the CIPM's financial situation, the decision was made not to use the \$50,000 for an in-house project, but instead to leave it in CIPM's general fund.

Tim Prather – They were also interested in having the new director provide some input on this project. If the decision is made that there is an issue that we really need to address, we can put those funds to that project; otherwise it should stay in the Center's general budget.

Liz Galli-Noble – Is the Steering Committee comfortable with that plan?

John Simons – That sounds fine. If there's an issue that comes up and we need a portion of that money, then we certainly should take a look at it. The Farm Bill group was very successful and was a good use of the SAC and the Center.

Other SC members agreed.

Tim Prather – One issue that has come up recently is related to biofuels; that probably would have been the one that was on the forefront for the SAC. However, there have been several very good conferences held on the topic, so the issue had been addressed fairly well at least for the near term.

- ***National Network Update – Liz Galli-Noble***

Janet Clark gave me a quick update on the National Network; much of this information was provided to the SC at your October 2007 meeting. In summary, the CIPM, along with three other centers – the California Invasive Plant Council, Midwest Invasive Plant Network and Invasive Plant Atlas of New England – discussed trying to get an earmark or promote some way of funding a national network of invasive plant centers. Eventually they put together a request for a \$2 million earmark that would fund this national network. When Janet went back to DC for the 2008 National Invasive Weed Awareness Week, she and her colleagues pitched the idea to Senator Baucus', Senator Tester's and Senator Feinstein's staff. She also spoke to Michael Bowers with the USDA-CSREES. The idea was well received and she got a lot of positive feedback about it. So in early March, she was asked by Senator Tester to submit an earmark request for the national network. It's very unlikely that this earmark will be funded. It should be noted that Montana State University did not have this on their "priority list," which is somewhat of a strike against it.

There are some follow-up actions that now should be taken, which I want to share with the SC for feedback. The CIPM took the lead on this and thus, we have to make the decision: (1) to continue to lead the effort and promote the national network idea, (2) to hand it off to one of the other center partners, or (3) to hold off for now and notify the partners. Personally, I'm happy to continue to try to subtly pursue this and work with our partners. I'm comfortable that we've already taken the first step in the lead, but don't want to make three trips to DC this year in order to continue to support it. I'm comfortable being part of this process; being part of the team. If we are not successful in

this cycle, maybe we can apply again in the next year. Janet, would you like to add anything to that? Comments from the SC?

Janet Clark – I think this effort is something that could be ongoing at a low level. It's a long-term plan with a big vision and it's worth following to see how things develop.

Jon Wraith – I just want to reiterate that, as Liz mentioned, this earmark was not on MSU's list and wasn't submitted through MSU. As a general case, we are not allowed to submit independent earmarks; however, Senator Tester's staff requested of Janet that we submit the request, so after she spoke with me, we went ahead with the submission. These are very important details regarding this situation.

Tim Prather – I can appreciate that, Jon, I know exactly what you're saying. When you have a Senator ask for something, that's certainly a positive and perhaps it could be carried forward from there. If it's something that is not going to rise on MSU's priority list, you may want to have a discussion with your other partners and find out who does have an ability to get it on a high priority list, so that the program is put forward as one that's supported by the institution and the senator.

Jon Wraith – This year, as Liz mentioned, the consensus in DC is that hardly any earmarks are going to be funded. This was more an effort to get a place holder for the future, in case we do have a future opportunity.

John Simons – It's my understanding that the other three centers are getting some funding through USDA - is that correct?

Janet Clark – They're all funded in different kinds of ways. They're all on soft money – some federal, some memberships, product sales, or grants of various kinds. The USDA has been very supportive of this effort and the folks in Washington have been working closely with CIPM to help form this proposal.

Eric Lane – I would continue to pursue this avenue because I think there may be more hope that a small coalition of like-minded senators could get an earmark, than anyone of them individually. And that's probably the strength of the proposal at some level. With support and interest from the USDA, who would be willing to channel the earmark, it would seem like a lot of the pieces are in place, and I would hate to drop it. I think it would be worth the time to continue to pursue it.

Tim Prather – One additional point that I would make is, if you're going to continue the interaction with Dr. Bowers at CSREES, you also want to emphasize the production side of invasive species. That doesn't necessarily have to be crop production, but it needs to at least be pasture-range impact to forestry. Because when you submit grants to the program he administers, you have to demonstrate a production component. This is important to note going forward on this aspect of the proposal.

John Simons – Is the level of work you're doing in Washington with the USDA at the department level or at one of the agencies within the department?

Janet Clark – It's been at the department level.

John Simons - Has there been any interest from the Department of the Interior at that level?

Janet Clark - We haven't generated a lot of interest on that side at the department level. There's some work that could be done there.

- **New Journal – Liz Galli-Noble**

I would like to send all the SC and SAC members a copy of the new Weed Science Society of America journal, *Invasive Plant Science and Management*. The journal is very impressive and I want to say thank you and congratulations to Janet Clark, who was a key person in launching this publication. A summary of this effort was provided by Janet (see *Attachment D*). The WSSA is now looking for an editor for the journal. Other comments?

Mandy Tu – Could the Center potentially play a part in that editorial role, if interested in doing so? If you're interested in doing it and if they would provide some sort of constant funding to do it? Is that something that the Center would be interested in taking on?

Janet Clark – The Weed Science Society of America has been talking for a year about its publications. It also publishes Weed Science and Weed Research, so it has three peer-reviewed publications now; and they've been discussing how to coordinate them better and what are the opportunities. They've expressed some interest in the Center being involved, but it's very vague. It's something the Center could certainly follow-up on, if it wanted to.

John Simons – Could the existing staff do that or would there need to be another staff person to be that editor?

Janet Clark – The editors themselves tend to be senior scientists who work closely with the authors, but there's been some talk about a position or a coordinating opportunity – PR, marketing, the business side – for handling all three of the journals. It's very vague right now but there could be some discussions with the WSSA board of directors about what CIPM is willing to do, what it can offer, or what it has available in terms of time. And see if that's something that WSSA is interested in.

Liz Galli-Noble – I've already told Janet that I think that's a perfect example of a role that she could play, and, I think, there are probably other individuals on staff that could also provide assistance in that capacity. It's definitely something that I want to think about.

Tim Prather – I think, if you're looking at a managing editor, that's one thing. But in terms of the editor of a journal, it really does need to be a senior scientist. Because you are making final decisions on whether or not to reject or accept papers. And you have to have the expertise in that particular field to make the judgments and evaluate the judgments of the reviewers, who review the paper and then also the associate editors. I don't know what role CIPM can fill.

Liz Galli-Noble – That's correct. We were talking more about the journal management not the editor position.

Tim Prather – That would probably require leaving Allen Press, which is the group that currently fills that role, and I wonder how comfortable they would be with that. It's something that you could discuss though. I think that it would probably meet with some resistance from Allen Press.

Liz Galli-Noble – Any further comments? *None were given.*
It's a wonderful product and I think it's a true feather in the cap of the Center to be part of this new publication process. *Other SC members agreed.*

- **CWMA Conference Update – CIPM Staff**

Liz Galli-Noble – The very first National CWMA conference was positive, energized and very successful, with a diverse group of people and a wonderful group of partners. I was able to do a lot of networking and talk to a lot of people. Congratulations to the CIPM staff for spearheading the whole event. *Liz reviewed Janet Clark's CWMA conference summary report see Attachment E).*

Janet Clark – CIPM staff was terrific in supporting this effort. Something I was really proud of is that there were nine organizations co-hosting this event and they were primarily non-governmental organizations, only one federal agency. These were grassroots groups from across the country that stepped up and everyone worked together really well. It proves the National Network concept that these groups, when you bring them together, can accomplish great things.

- **Tamarisk Research Conference – Mara Johnson**

This was an item that was in my work plan for 2008 and, I believe, it came up at the last SC meeting. The initial Tamarisk Research Conference was in 2006 in Fort Collins. We wanted to establish having this conference every two years with the partners being the CIPM, Tamarisk Coalition and a university. Both the Tamarisk Coalition and CIPM were going through director changes over this winter, which limited our ability to look for a partner at a university. Tim and I did meet with the Department of Agriculture in New Mexico last October. They were interested, but there wasn't a partner available at the university. Also, with the director change and funding constraints, we didn't know if this was something we wanted to allocate dollars toward. At this point, Liz and I will be meeting with Tim Carlson at

the Nebraska Invasive Species Summit (May 5-8) to discuss putting on another conference. The Tamarisk Coalition is interested in putting this on again, but we don't have a university partner that's interested at this time. We'll discuss what opportunities there are for this; if it's something we want to continue. Originally, we thought we'd start with saltcedar and then open it up to riparian invasive plants.

John Simons - As far as the universities, perhaps the right one hasn't been approached or they just feel there's not enough time or they're too busy already.

Mara Johnson – Colorado State University was our partner for the 2006 conference and they have a young core group of faculty who are working on saltcedar. It was a unique group of scientists who were willing to take this on. So I'm not surprised we haven't found another group like them. They're the ones who did most of the logistics for it: I did the technology transfer and Tim Carlson raised the funds. I think there might be other universities that are interested. But I doubt we're going to find the same type of partner we found at CSU, as far as the caliber of scientists who are all working on saltcedar at the same university, as well as the time and energy that the professors put into this.

John Simons – I was just thinking that since there's quite a bit of saltcedar in the southwest there ought to be somebody down there who ought to be doing quite a bit of this work and would have an interest; but perhaps not.

Mara Johnson – Well, that's why we approached New Mexico State University, that's the partner that was approached.

Jennifer Vollmer – They weren't interested?

Mara Johnson – No, they weren't interested in taking it on.

Jennifer Vollmer – What about Texas with Charlie Hart?

Mara Johnson – I think what we have to decide first is whether or not the Center wants to play a role; what kind of role the Center wants to play; and how it fits in with the rest of our funding? It is very time intensive and requires a significant amount of time for website support and technology transfer. I think that's a good recommendation, Jennifer, that Texas might be an organization. Also, Tim Carlson was thinking about Reno, there are several partners – university and government there. So from that crew, we might be able to draw the number of key scientists that we would need.

Jennifer Vollmer – What about looking at the Bureau of Reclamation science crew – Fred Nipling and Ken Lair in Colorado? One thing that I learned from trying to get funding toward the Saltcedar Act is that if you pull in the scientists from the BOR you're more likely to get funding from the BOR.

Mara Johnson – I believe Ken Lair was a partner on the last conference in Colorado. What we had was more of a coordinating committee, which was the core group of Tamarisk Coalition -- Andrew Norton (professor from Colorado State University) and me. We did most of the work and then we had this larger group that included people from several different agencies and organizations, who helped to beat the bushes and draw the attraction. So, what we're looking for is this third coordinating partner. I'll put down, Jennifer, that you also suggested Texas.

Eric Lane – I guess I would just volunteer that if for some reason it's hard to get a new university, then I'll just volunteer CSU to do it again. I think the point was to have this thing be a traveling/rotating show. But if people can't get it together – can't see the value of having this hosted at their own university – I have a hard time believing CSU wouldn't be interested in hosting it yet again. They have the experience doing it and from what I've heard from a variety of folks was that it went very well. I think it's a worthwhile conference to do and if other universities are sitting on the sidelines not taking advantage of the opportunity, then I wouldn't drop the ball and say we'll go back to CSU. As you pointed out, Mara, there's a good group of folks there that are working on it and already have a lot of collaborative partners to draw into it.

Mara Johnson– Tim and I have actually talked to Andrew Norton and he's not interested in taking on that role right now. We could approach one of the other people in that crew.

Liz Galli-Noble – I just want to make a couple comments. I realize that it is a very valid and important thing for us to be doing, but I'm trying to be very cautious about not committing the CIPM to things that actually tax our budget and we have to spend money to do. Rather, I'm trying to think of things that we will be compensated for doing. I'm not saying that I dismiss these kinds of things because I think they're very important and they're well within our mission, but gone are the days where we can just give months of staff time to things that we aren't compensated for.

Mara Johnson – We were compensated for this conference.

Jon Wraith – I agree with Eric's comments, but if there's only one regional university interested, and they might not be interested in doing it again, that's informative also. I suspect many of the institutions just don't have any kind of a critical mass of people working on saltcedar. Certainly, we don't here at MSU. So, there are complications in putting together something like this in terms of trying to find a single entity that's willing to do the leg work to make it happen.

Jennifer Vollmer – I was just wondering: did the university contribute dollars to make that happen, did they gain any dollars to make that happen, or did it cost them anything out-of-pocket when they participated?

Mara Johnson – What happened was everybody had to do their work upfront and then after the conference, everyone was compensated for their time. They had to take the risk of doing the work without knowing what the compensation would be.

Jennifer Vollmer – Charlie Hart's program is very slim on dollars, so they might look at it as something that they can do that's not going to cost them anything; but, like you said, if they can get compensated for what work they do put into it, I think they'd be more open to it.

Mandy Tu – I agree with Liz's comment that things like this do fall within the mission of the Center but we do have to be careful about where we put our efforts.

Eric Lane – I'll just follow-up. I agree with that, but the reason that I pushed the Center to do this was that it was within our mission; and my experience has been that conferences typically make money, not lose money. So, in the large sphere of activities that CIPM has been involved in, at least we can caulk up the Tamarisk Conference as one that was profitable. Certainly not as profitable as getting a \$100,000 contract to deal with the Missouri River Watershed, but vastly more profitable than many of the other activities that have been engaged in; where we've been supportive of stuff and helped make things happen but there's been no financial remuneration. There's a range of profitability out there and most of the things that we've been doing have been taxing and at least this has been one activity, which has been taxing in time but been compensated for.

Liz Galli-Noble – Thank you, that's very helpful. If these are things that we can do that are well within our mission, reach a lot of people, we're doing a lot of good for many states within the west, and it doesn't tax us financially, that's exactly the kind of activity that I want to be focusing on.

- **USFWS Online Learning Modules Update – Mary McFadzen**

The online learning modules are almost completed. For those of you who are new to the SC, we entered into a partnership with the US Fish and Wildlife Service/National Wildlife Refuge System about 2½ years ago to develop online learning products for them. The project consisted of developing two products – learning modules for Refuge staff and learning modules for Refuge volunteers. We have completed the modules for the volunteers and it is up and running on the USFWS's Invasive Species website. It's available to the public as well. Anybody can go to that site and access that information. In about a month, hopefully less than a month, we'll be handing over all the files for the staff modules to the USFWS and hopefully they'll have it up and running and go live within the next two months. That product can also be accessed by anybody on line. It's going to be a great resource for natural resource managers who don't have a background in invasive plant management. It will also be a good refresher for those who do have some experience. We're really happy to complete this project and within a month that contract will be closed and we can call it done. When the staff modules do go live I'll send all of you a link to the USFWS website so you can take a look at the modules. Any questions about that project?

Jennifer Vollmer – I just have a comment about it. I work with the USFWS for training their refuge managers for invasive plant management at NCTC. Recently, they talked quite a bit about that module for the volunteers and we even added an afternoon onto the course to go through a volunteer exercise. So I think they're really going to get a lot of use out of it.

- **New Weed Models Update – Mara Johnson**

For those of you who don't know, CIPM produced four plastic and silk weed models (spotted knapweed, yellow starthistle, leafy spurge and Dalmatian toadflax) several years ago and they were very popular. The sale of the models goes into a non-federal "designated" account that the CIPM can use for non-federal match and other things.

We set about producing four new models a couple of years ago and applied to the Noxious Weed Trust Fund for a grant to match that production. Tim Seipel worked on producing the four new models – purple loosestrife, saltcedar, perennial pepperweed and garlic mustard. In January 2008, Tim was accepted to a Ph.D. program in Switzerland, so we hired Tanya Skurski to finish up the project; coordinating with a botanist in China and the Global Floral Company. They have three of the models pretty much done, but they're having a tough time with the saltcedar, even though that seems like it would be the easiest one. Our estimated time to have the prototypes completed is June 2008. Then once the prototypes are done, we can initiate production and order 2,000 of each model (this last step is how we are using the Noxious Weed Trust Fund match). Connie Bollinger will produce matching weed identification cards for the new models, using the template from the weed identification cards for the previous four models. The final products should be done by fall 2008.

- **Research Grant Summary – Mara Johnson**

I put together the 2004 Research Grant Summary (a compilation of CIPM research grant final reports per year). The summary reports lag quite a bit because the CIPM doesn't get the final reports for one to two years after the award. In the past we've produced a hardcopy or paper booklet summary report; but we don't end up passing very many of those out. So this year we decided to post the reports online. The final reports for the two largest 2005 grants are already posted. The 2005 Seed Money Grant final reports are typically short summaries and those will be posted online as well.

- **Salish-Kootenai College/ University of Montana Collaboration – Flowering Rush Project – Mara Johnson**

This is a great project. The CIPM was invited by the Salish-Kootenai College (Professor Virgil Dupuis) and the University of Montana (Professor Peter Rice) to put in for a CSREES tribal research grant, which was awarded last year for \$20,000 (to be spent over three years). It's a collaborative effort that also includes a Confederated Salish-Kootenai Tribal wetland specialist and other local partners to address flowering rush in the Flathead Lake and River system. Flowering rush is an invasive aquatic species that has definite recreational impacts; other types of impacts haven't been studied. Many people around Flathead Lake "self treat" flowering rush. In doing so (by pulling it up), they cause it to spread further because it spreads vegetatively.

This project is an interdisciplinary collaboration to do outreach, education, and research. Researching the genetics of the particular population is pretty critical in determining how to treat the population. The CIPM is also listed as a "non-working" partner (in name only) on a Noxious Weed Trust Fund grant for trials investigating pulling and herbicide treatments. In support of that project component, I presented the research at this year's Montana Weed Control Association research session – a session that I coordinated for the MWCA. I will also present this research at the Weeds Across Borders meeting the end of May, because the Flathead is part of the Columbia River system, and this is a great opportunity to create a larger network. This has been a great project because we've been creating a network of people in the northwest by tapping the energy from this group.

John Simons – So, there might be the potential when making these presentations in various places to establish additional contacts for similar types of work?

Mara Johnson – Yes, and this core group with the Salish-Kootenai College has a lot of potential for future funding because of the success they have had and the interdisciplinary nature of the organization.

John Simons – There's a number of the tribes that are relatively financially independent with some of their projects and there might be the possibility of looking toward other tribes within our region.

Mara Johnson – That’s the great thing about this grant. With tribal research grants in CSREES, the potential to be awarded is about 80 percent, as opposed to the other CSREES grants.

- **National Invasive Species Advisory Committee (ISAC) -- Liz Galli-Noble**

I will provide a background and overview, and then Janet Clark and Jennifer Vollmer (both of whom are members of the ISAC) can respond to questions or provide additional information. When I first started at the CIPM, Janet Clark came to me and explained that she was a member of the National Invasive Species Advisory Committee; and that she was only in her second year of a three-year term. She asked if I would allow her to finish out her term on the Council; and that even though she was no longer with CIPM, she was still eligible to continue on the Council. I made the decision that Janet should finish out her term. The ISAC is scheduled to meet next month from May 11-18 in Anchorage, Alaska. I have to thank Janet for thinking of the Center and our partners and continuing to play a leadership role with this group. Janet and Jennifer do you wish to add anything?

Jennifer Vollmer – I think we should reserve time on the fall SC meeting agenda to have Janet and me report on the May ISAC meeting. We will also need time for discussion because ISAC will be talking about a national center for invasive species. Janet has done the most leg work of anyone on this issue and has really given some good guidance to the ISAC subcommittee that’s working on the issue of a national center. The subcommittee will be able to present information to the whole committee at the May meeting and will then get their feedback. Our task after that will be to get additional feedback on how other people see a national center working; what would they like to see?; and how do they think they could best interact with a national center? With the diverse group that we have on this SC, it would be really good to get everyone’s input on this subject.

Janet Clark – I agree. There are some real opportunities there and it’s good for CIPM to stay in the loop of what’s going on at that level. It’s great to have Jennifer there. I’m thankful, Liz, to be allowed to stay on the ISAC and to be able to report back. I’m glad to play that role; it’s a privilege.

Decision: An update and discussion on the National Invasive Species Advisory Council activities (in particular the proposed national center for invasive species) will be added to the fall 2008 Steering Committee meeting agenda.

VII. CIPM Program Changes

- **CIPM program focus - research; communicating science to land managers – Liz Galli-Noble**

The main reason I wanted to meet personally with each member of the SC and SAC was to get feedback on: what’s unique about the Center?; what do we do well?; are we duplicating other efforts?; what needs to be changed?; and the like. I appreciate the time many of you were able to give me and I learned a lot.

After only a month on the job, I don’t have all the answers, nor do I know exactly where the CIPM is heading. But certainly one thing that I heard from the majority of the people is that CIPM should get back to our research base and communicating science to land managers. CIPM needs to identify the unique niche that we fill, which other invasive species groups do not. The reality is that, in the short term, the CIPM will be forced to do projects that provide us with funding yet still allow us to fulfill our mission. It could be difficult to find money that will be a perfect fit, however. I really hope that CIPM staff (as a team), with the help of the SC and SAC, can come to some consensus on several specific actions/tasks that we should be focusing on. At this point, getting back to a stronger research focus is one thing we all seem to agree on. Another component of the program that I want to see and several of you have stressed is to reinstate the Research Seed Grant Program. I do not have a specific strategy to fund this yet, other than to approach federal agencies (possibly even states) for very small amounts (\$25,000 - \$50,000) to fund up to 20, small, applied research investigations, annually.

- **Missouri River Watershed Coalition –Saltcedar Management Project – CIPM new program coordinators (\$100,000) - Liz Galli-Noble and Mara Johnson**

This information was presented earlier in the meeting. The Missouri River Coalition has hired the CIPM to coordinate their program. They are paying the CIPM \$100,000 for a one-year period. (See *Attachment C* for work plan and budget.)

- **Pilot Project: online self study learning modules (Mary McFadzen)**

I am developing a pilot project with Melissa Brown. This pilot project would be working with research scientists and perhaps practitioners and extension faculty. What we're finding out from people is that people like Tim Prather and Steve Dewey have scientific information that land managers want. But extension and other research-type people can't be everywhere to give their presentations. So the easy and relatively affordable way to get that information out is to take the power point presentations that they give, and develop those into a web-based production that will support learning. It's not just putting a power point up there and having someone click through the site. It's really about developing a learning product. So, we're in the process of creating a couple of these pilot projects, where we'll have them reviewed by specific users and also use evaluations on their value. These will be funded by the CIPM because we don't have any other funding sources to do online learning projects right now. This is a really valuable investment of my time.

Liz Galli-Noble – I agree that this product is money well spent. So I am taking a bit of a funding risk and asked Mary and Melissa go ahead and produce one small product – cost effective, short term – that we can use it as pilot to show people what we can do. I'm pretty confident given the feedback that we've gotten that it's going to be well received. I hope that having some kind of a product in hand will help us sell future projects.

John Simons – I think that's a really good process and also the learning module that you produced for USFWS could certainly be shown to other federal or state agencies. This might be something that you could look at for NGOs for an education product and people can pay a small fee to take it on line.

Jennifer Vollmer – Do you think that this video-type product could be used by people going to a BLM or USFWS recertification training? Using this product instead of having the speaker there?

Mary McFadzen – There are endless possibilities. You just have to have someone who's creative, knows the resources and the media, and can coordinate it to make it happen. I feel really confident in doing that; but it does cost money. Like anything else there's definitely some investment of time and money upfront.

John Simons – We've had discussions with Richard Lee on using such a thing for the BLM certification or recertification. There is concern about being able to add annual adjustments to the product because the programs are changing on a regular basis.

Mary McFadzen – Right, and there's new information coming out all the time in terms of research that could be highly beneficial. I don't think online learning is the ultimate answer in terms of training or just supporting knowledge. But it can be a great resource to complement existing onsite programs.

John Simons – The interaction we have in a classroom setting is really valuable. We just wanted to be sure that it's practical and cost effective to make potential adjustments to those presentations on an annual basis.

Mary McFadzen – If you video a class one time, it doesn't take much to go back and video the main presenter in their office in some other state when needed. Then one can simply update the product. If the resources are there, which they usually are, it can be done quite easily.

- **CIPM continue to support CWMA efforts – Liz Galli-Noble**

I hope that the CIPM can continue to support cooperative weed management area efforts. After going to Reno, I definitely saw that small amounts of money reach a lot of people on the ground. CWMA efforts function at the grass-roots level, they do a lot of fantastic work, and by supporting the CWMA's we are reaching the local landowners. I want to be able to help and continue to financially support CWMA's, but at present we don't have the money to continue our grant program. In addition, the western region, with the exception of a couple of states, is pretty far along in the process of establishing CWMA's. The Midwest and the East are just getting started and the bulk of CWMA funding in the future will likely go to those regions.

- **Met with Montana's Governor's Office; new Invasive Species Initiative – Liz Galli-Noble**

Janet Clark and I met with Hal Harper, the chief policy advisor to Montana's governor on April 4th. Montana is trying to put together a regional invasive species initiative for the western region. Hal asked if the CIPM could provide assistance to this effort in the future. This is exciting and the timing is excellent for the CIPM to get involved.

- **New CIPM Online Newsletter - Liz Galli-Noble**

I've heard from many sources that the CIPM needs to be focusing more on research and distilling and disseminating the mammoth amount of information being generated on invasive plants to land managers. In order to do that, I want to create a new online newsletter where we would be reporting on regional and maybe occasionally national new research findings, important meetings not to be missed, the successful work that CWMA groups are doing, highlighting CIPM-funded research investigations and showcasing the Center and what we do a little bit more. We could showcase our best research grant recipients and provide follow up to their investigations. I realize that we already have a very good website, but this would be more timely information (on a month-by-month basis) and would pop-up information, not something that would require a search.

- **CIPM Promotional Packet - Liz Galli-Noble**

I've asked everyone to do one-page summaries of their projects/products for a CIPM promotional packet. I plan to give this information to congressional delegations, governors' offices, our weed coordinator partners and everyone else who needs to know what the Center does and who we are.

VIII. Weed Management Survey – Earl Creech

Earl Creech – This goes back to the first bullet point under item #6 about the focus of the CIPM being on research and education. Liz and I had the opportunity to sit down in Reno to discuss future strategies and priorities for the Center. As we discussed these issues, my thoughts went toward a formal needs assessment that we're currently in the process of conducting in Nevada and Utah. It's an electronic survey that Steve Dewey and I put together that will target our two states. It's for public land managers because Nevada is about 90% public lands and Utah isn't too far behind. It's an important component of our clientele from an extension standpoint. This survey asks questions about perceptions and practices of these land managers regarding noxious and invasive weeds. The survey purposes are to document and identify the critical needs of managers, which we can use as a base for our research and education programs. It is really helpful if you're writing a grant proposal to cite survey results that state: "this really is a problem; this is where I need to spend my time." Also, these surveys can provide baseline data for tracking changes into the future; and more and more of us in academics, and really everyone who deals with weeds, are being asked to document impact. These types of surveys, if they're done every four or five years, can help you get a feel for the impact that you may be having. The thought I had was that this survey could go out region wide. It could be something that we could send out to every state in the West. Every university has research and extension people that deal with weeds and there are an awful lot of other people who I think would have interest in this information. One of the nice things about it is that it's an e-survey, so it's cheap. As I think about sending this out regionally – going for the entire western region – if it were to come from an extension weed specialist in Nevada or Utah, I don't think the people in other states would lend it much credence and it would probably end up being deleted. But if it was spearheaded by an established, well respected, regional organization such as the CIPM, we would have a much greater chance of being successful.

John Simons – Would this survey go to individuals or to agency employees?

Earl Creech – The people that we would like to target would be everybody who has a good feel for weeds and weed management on the lands that their organization manages. It's actually people who are on the ground and deal with weeds. A lot of what you find from these surveys is that it simply reaffirms or documents what you already knew. However, you'll sometimes find that there will be some revelations, maybe some things you'd never considered before that maybe a person ought to be spending some time on. For example, I sent this survey to every Ag producer in Nevada and we had over a 31% response rate, which is actually pretty incredible for a mail-out survey without follow-up. It was surprising to me that hoary cress came back as our most problematic weed. I was kind of hoping for something a little bit more sexy than that. That's what they tell me and it was actually #1 by quite a large margin. What I'd like to propose to you on the Steering Committee is, is this something that the Center could spearhead maybe send this out using the Center to hopefully get responses from folks all across the West? Then we can all use that information in our programs and in our activities for establishing priorities and documenting impact.

John Simons –About what would be the cost per state?

Earl Creech – This is an electronic survey and so it's housed on *Survey Monkey*. It's \$30 a month and I can send it out to a billion people if I wanted to. So it's dirt cheap. The cost is negligible and actually that program collects all the data, it analyzes it, and then you're ready to write it up and summarize it. It's a really slick program and really it's cheap.

Jennifer Vollmer – Would you be the one that would summarize and analyze the data, even if it was for the whole West?

Earl Creech – You bet. I'd be happy to partner with anybody else who would like to be involved in that process.

John Simons – So, if we do this regionally, we'd be able to identify either states or regions that the results come from?

Earl Creech – You bet. We could summarize it over the entire region and then we can also summarize the data for individual states.

John Simons – Would it be possible to do it for agencies? You'd have to ask the questions appropriately to be able to do that.

Earl Creech – Yes. Initially we've mostly targeted agencies because 70% of our state is BLM. We've mostly targeted the federal agencies to date, but in states where State lands make up a pretty significant number of acres, we could also expand it to those folks as well.

Jon Wraith – I thought this looks primarily like an extension tool and I'm certain it's valuable to you and potentially to other extension folks. However, a better and more appropriate approach than having the CIPM do it top down, would be to get the other state cooperative extension weed programs involved; instead of someone else doing a survey and then saying "here are the results, do something about it." Often people do not like that approach. As you said, if Nevada extension sends it to North Dakota producers, they're going to ask "why is Nevada involved?" I think the approach is valuable but different states may have specific questions that they would like on their survey; rather than using a canned program that somebody else developed. So I have some hesitation about whether the CIPM is the appropriate way to conduct this survey regionally; or whether Tim Prather should be involved if it's going to be in Idaho. And we'll soon have a new extension person at MSU. I think there should be more discussion regarding this.

Earl Creech – One of the valuable sides of having something that is canned or something that can be applied across multiply states is that you have a much more powerful source of data at the end of the day. You have a higher response rate and you just have a little bit more power in the data you acquire. In Nevada, each of our land managers is managing million of acres; so if I send this out to everybody in Nevada (who deals with weed management on public lands), I may get 30 responses. If we can send this out across the western region, we may get 250 or 300 responses, and that makes it a lot more powerful.

Tim Prather – Earl, I think Jon is right. You want to partner with somebody in the specific state. The benefit is that you'd get a more targeted mailing, because they know who to send it to in that state. I don't think anybody in extension really likes getting surprised by having something done in their state that they aren't involved in.

John Simons – I think there's a potential maybe to use it through the agencies, as a way to target the public land users. We're looking at Montana and the Dakotas, trying to get the view from public land users, as to how they view the agencies and what they feel they need from the agencies. I'm sure that we could figure out a way to have the survey sponsored by the agency, which would go out to agency people or perhaps on the public website for the agency.

Earl Creech – What we considered doing was just going through some higher-level agency personnel; that's how we've done it in Nevada and Utah. To go to the BLM person in charge of weeds in the State of Nevada and he forwards it to everybody that he feels it's applicable to. In the end, it ends up coming internally to a lot of people. On the national level, we could work with Rick Lee or Gina Ramos to get it to all the BLM people in one try.

Eric Lane – I would recommend getting it to key federal coordinators at a state or regional level because they have their own agency staff e-mail listservs, who are their 'go to' weed people. That would probably be the most direct way, and it would also be coming from somebody they already know (even though they're going to *Survey Monkey* and when they hit "enter" it goes to you). That would be less obvious.

John Simons – I definitely think we should pursue this idea.

Eric Lane – I just want to throw out some random thoughts about the purpose of the survey, but also maybe more generally for the CIPM to think about. Your comments from the survey results awhile back where some people expressed concern about a species is a very valid piece of information. However, that would be like somebody in Colorado saying "I'm really concerned about Canada thistle" because that's the species that everybody has and that everybody's impacted by. While I don't mean to belittle the value of that information, it doesn't necessarily suggest that that's where we want to actually invest more resources. In the weed management community, we continue to struggle with the reality that local managers are constantly bugged to deal with the species that people are most aware of and most concerned about, because they're probably the most wide-spread things that people are dealing with. If that's all they do, then they ignore the new invaders, and early detection and rapid response goes right out the window. From the weed science sense of things or from a larger landscape level of management, we would say well, it's great that people think hoary cress is something they all want more help with, but will it be at the expense of them then ignoring the other half dozen species that they wouldn't know how to identify if it bit them in the butt? But they should be concerned because they need to be detecting those populations at a very early stage, so we can do something about them.

There's a dichotomy about what the typical land manager will say – I need more help on this - if they're answering a survey that's not part of a broader discussion. Where you can say: "well you have a lot of hoary cress, specifically how could we help you?" "But what are you doing about yellow starthistle, which I understand is moving into the area?" "Are you concerned about that?" And the manager says, "Oh, well yes actually we are concerned about that I could use more tools on this." So, there's that weird dichotomy between what's on peoples' minds at the moment, because that's what's constantly popping up on their list of things to do. The phone call saying, "why isn't this roadside being treated for Canada thistle?" versus no one is calling to say hey, "I found the first Dalmatian toadflax plant in the county maybe we should look for more." There's a tension there between responding to what people say they need and trying to be more circumspect on the larger landscape. We're not adequately devoting resources to early detection and rapid response. How can we help them identify that as a real need that they have, but they haven't themselves recognized it?

This is what comes to mind when I think about doing a survey. It will give us information but it will give us probably one perspective and there are other perspectives that are also well informed – from the weed science community or people, who are not so much local land managers; but larger state or regional land managers, who may have a different perspective yet equally valid.

Dave White – Earl, I read your survey and I thought it was really good. I think that it could, speaking parochially, really benefit some of the things we're doing in Montana with NRCS. We have special noxious weed sign-ups through one of our programs and I think that what your survey does could really help inform the targeted species we go after and the location. So, this is maybe not the time to do it, but Earl, would you mind if I call you after this meeting and maybe you could help me flesh out a more of a targeted survey that we might use here in Montana.

Liz Galli-Noble – Thank you everyone. I'm sorry to cut off this good discussion, but we're almost out of time. Earl, thank you for bringing this before the Steering Committee and if people have further comments or questions, please get a hold of Earl.

IX. SC Members Feedback/Guidance: Steering Committee Member Updates

John Simons – Does anyone have any comments to provide to Liz and the CIPM staff?

Eric Lane – There's a difference between responding to what some people identify as needs and then leading. The Center research experience has been a good example of how to do it; where we really have focused on synthesizing our current understanding of particular management tools – whether it's fire, grazing, mapping or the like – and putting it out there in a format so that practitioners can adopt what the current science is; instead of plowing the road that's been plowed before. That takes a certain level of circumspection to think about. What's a need out there that hasn't been articulated yet, and providing some leadership in that arena? The flip side to it is we also have to make sure, and it sounds like you're keenly aware of this, that given where we are financially we have to be profitable. There's an interesting balance there between leading and doing things that maybe people aren't clamoring for, but clearly are a need and also finding the mechanism to make those things self-supporting. I just wanted to put it out there for you to chew on a little bit more.

John Simons – I think that so far things have looked very positive. That the CIPM is continuing at a very rapid pace and it's still accomplishing a lot of things. So, I think we look forward to some good times ahead.

Tim Prather – I think, that after we've had a few more months here with respect to looking at potential funding sources and so forth, it might be good at the next meeting to talk about where the Center sits in terms of what area it's going to serve in the future. I don't know if we will have enough experience at that point to know (going forward) how big of an area the CIPM would serve. Or perhaps at least start that discussion and revisit it again over the next year, so that we'd have a good sense for where the Center is going to be going in the future.

John Simons – This past week we've put a lot of plugs in for the CIPM as far as a source of information for people down in Arizona.

X. Scheduling the Fall 2008 SC Meeting

John Simons – If there are no more comments, we're about out of time. Let's schedule the fall SC meeting.

Tim Prather – An October time frame would be good.

John Simons – Last year it was October 10 and 11, which is fine.

Dean Peterson – The time we had last year was okay.

Mandy Tu – I cannot do the week of October 6th and also not the week of October 13th (that's the Natural Areas Conference).

Jennifer Vollmer – What about the 1st week in October -- September 29 to October 5th? The NAWMA meeting is in Billings from September 15 - 18. I have an NCTC training again the week of September 15th, so that doesn't work, and certification the week before that in the afternoons.

John Simons – The week of September 29 – October 5 has been suggested. Does that look pretty open for folks? Do you like Wednesday/Thursday or Thursday/Friday?

Mandy Tu – If it could be earlier in the week that would be better for me.

John Simons – Okay, so do you want it on Tuesday/Wednesday, September 30th and October 1st in Bozeman?

All agreed that that would work.

Liz Galli-Noble – Do we want to do a two-day meeting (all day both days) or two days with one full day and one half day?

John Simons – Have we had enough time the way we've done it in the past – a day and a half. Has that been sufficient for folks?

All agreed.

John Simons – Okay, let's proceed with that.

Decision: The fall 2008 CIPM Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 30 (9:00 am to 5:00 pm) and Wednesday, October 1 (9:00 am to noon), 2008 in Bozeman.

XI. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

John Simons – Any other comments, questions or concerns? *(No response.)*
We are adjourned.

Meeting minutes submitted by Dianne Brokke and edited by Liz Galli-Noble.

**Attachment A. Center for Invasive Plant Management
Semi-Annual Steering Committee Meeting
October 10-11, 2007
Montana State University – Bozeman**

Wednesday, October 10, 2007

Attending: John Simons, Stephen Enloe, Jim Olivarez, Tim Prather, Tim Koopmann, Dean Peterson, Jon Wraith (*ex officio*); CIPM staff: Janet Clark, Mary McFadzen, Mara Johnson, Connie Bollinger, Dianne Brokke.

Participating by phone: Mandy Tu, Eric Lane, Jennifer Vollmer

Absent: Evert Byington

The meeting was convened at 8:30 a.m. All were welcomed and introductions were made. The minutes from the April 2007 meeting were approved as submitted. Janet presented an overview for the meeting.

Budget

Janet reviewed the budget sheets and the FY08/FY09 financial commitments, commented on the CWMA grants program being discontinued and the fact that some states have started grant programs, and then reviewed options that have been considered and pursued to replace long-term earmark funding. Committee discussed the following long-term funding options, focusing on the most promising ones:

- ARS funding option not as possible now.
- Recommended exploring partnership option with USGS. Highlight CIPM past involvement with USGS (grants program maybe). Janet will speak with Tom Stohlgren.
- Committee discussed CIPM bare bones operating budget and how partnership ideas could be pitched to potential partners (particularly federal agencies). Mary will make an online education presentation at the USFS meeting in Arizona this December.
- Janet expanded on the work she's done in past months to create a national network of centers and the meeting she had with the other centers (Cal-IPC, IPANE, Midwest Invasive Plant Network). They are stressing how this network would benefit federal agencies in Washington, DC. Steering Committee members felt this national network of centers sounded most promising and encouraged aggressively pursuing this option.
- Committee discussed funding potential from CIPM product sales and requested information on all product sales figures, cost of production & profit to determine distribution, potential impact, saturation of market or possible change in information.

Follow-up on Spring (April 2007) Meeting Recommendations

The committee discussed CIPM/CSU collaborations (Science Advisory Committee, Tamarisk Research Conference, Russian Olive Summit in Nebraska), meeting with Tom Stohlgren again regarding partnering with USGS, using NIFC Joint Fire Sciences Program as a potential model for CIPM in the future, Governors' Association as a funding source (long shot), and state models where governors pool money for multi-state projects. Jim Olivarez will explore multi-state funding of the USFS Coop Forestry Program as a possible model. The committee discussed Wildlife Forever/CIPM NFWF grant partnership, state & private forestry group grants, and NRCS, Doris Duke, etc., grants and why it would be a stretch for CIPM to apply for them.

Mara Johnson presented an assessment (requested at the Spring SC meeting) of partnering with Steve Dewey or independently conducting mapping workshops similar to Steve Dewey's. She met with and then attended Steve Dewey's workshop in June 2007. Mara also reviewed the monitoring consortium notes provided by Janet of Monica Pokorny's previous efforts to start mapping workshops. The committee discussed some of the numerous GPS systems being used by different organizations, which makes it difficult to settle on one GPS system in a workshop; problems involved trying to unify standards of inventory & survey among agencies; the effectiveness of teaching basic survey techniques independent of technology, and how the focus for measuring

success has changed from acres treated to what and how a management plan works. It was pointed out that the general mapping section of CIPM's Inventory & Survey publication is very helpful to people starting a mapping project and that this approach might be helpful to Forest Service personnel. The conclusion was that CIPM did not have the funds or staff to begin conducting mapping workshops, that Steve Dewey's workshops were not completely in line with the Center's mission and that the Center did not want to change its focus to be a mapping center. For these reasons the committee concluded that the Center should not elect to pursue conducting mapping workshops but would continue to provide mini-workshops and outreach on the Inventory & Survey book.

BLM Task Order/Strategic Plan

Janet reviewed the BLM task order and the four objectives of CIPM's strategic plan. The CIPM staff reported the following regarding various projects under these objectives.

- Mara commented on the Tamarisk Conference and their possible involvement in the 2008 research conference, CIPM funded grant synthesis paper, new invasive plant science & management journal article, flowering rush project, and provided an update on the new weed models which should be ready by spring 2008.
- Connie elaborated on website changes, reported that she is more involved in editing and creating new web pages (i.e., Kim Goodwin's project, Tamarisk Conference) in addition to keeping the site updated, and receives lots of emails from people all over the U.S. w/comments or questions. Janet mentioned that the USDA National Ag Library webmaster had commented on CIPM's excellent website.
- Mary reported that she and Melissa are still working on the FWS project staff modules, but the volunteer modules are complete and on the FWS website and can be accessed by non-FWS individuals also. They plan to modify these modules for the CIPM website in order to efficiently and effectively distribute this information to the largest # of people but funding will be needed for the modifications.
- Janet commented on the history of CWMA's and CWMA Conference funding - \$12,000 from BLM & \$20,000 from the Federal Highway Administration.

CIPM Director Search

Jon Wraith passed out a draft of the CIPM Director Search vacancy announcement, commented that Mara Johnson, John Simons, Mandy Tu, and Tim Prather have agreed to be on the search committee so far (still looking for a person on campus to chair the search committee) - Dianne Brokke will be search committee secretary, and requested feedback from the Steering Committee regarding salary and degree qualifications.

The Committee discussed salaries of other non-profit directors, possibilities for salary increases at MSU (20% added comp above and beyond job description), fund raising as part of the new director's job description (clear but not primary duty), competitive nature of non-profit fundraising, variety of funding that might be available to CIPM because of its regional status, degree requirements, importance of environmental background, posting position on TNC, etc websites, search committee responsibilities, hiring authority (Jon Wraith) responsibilities, and what the plan would be if Janet left before a new director is hired.

It was agreed that the director position salary should be advertised at \$60,000 (can go 10% over stated salary) and that a masters degree (MS or MA) would be required. Announcement can be sent around in about 2 weeks.

Identifying Opportunities

The Steering Committee discussed-

- need for educational materials on a broad landscape/watershed level developed by CIPM and funded by several organizations, customized weed mgmt pkgs, promote implementation of best practices at all levels, assist weed management associations,
- strengthening and taking CIPM train-the-trainer to another level, training for broader staff that crosses agency boundaries, affect of weeds on all other programs in an agency and importance of basic knowledge of

weeds training for non-weed professionals on the ground, managers, and bosses so they understand how weeds affect resources and resources affect weeds, how and who prioritizes invasives, etc., and distributing that information to agency field people to help them during the planning process,

- encouraging land managers to prioritize problems and invest resources in those priorities, provide motivation for practicing the most efficient methods, identifying what success looks like,
- importance of having straightforward, easy-to-follow education & awareness decision-making programs/tools to explain how to implement control practices that don't favor invasive species while still looking out for water quality and quantity issues in some watersheds, impacts of vegetation changes, where to find information relating to water quality and invasions and multiple species watershed mgmt, need for water and weeds publications like the fire and weeds brochures, difficulty putting together detailed control pamphlets by weed because of many, many variables,
- helping WWCC and other groups translate information to action, lobbying, and the need for weed people to have more knowledge of terminology and processes involved when working with non-weed individuals/groups (e.g., reclamation groups),
- Environmental Mgmt Systems, ISO1401, Integrating Weed Mgmt Ag Production and Land Use developed by Gene Surber of MSU (Dean will give Janet a copy of template), 95 Range Water Quality Mgmt Plan, Range Water Quality Short Course and MSU Undaunted Stewardship program, the complexity of these assessment tools, who benefits from them, time and money involved to use them and how they can help to evaluate and determine environment and long range plans,
- partnerships/training opportunities with large NGOs who aren't paying attention to weeds, lack of support for stewardship, how disturbance sets the stage for invasives, CIPM working to merge/consolidate some weed programs between different regional and national weed groups,
- grant opportunities for production ag vs natural resources, importance of CIPM seed grants as a tool for getting research started, CIPM involvement in facilitating extension collaborations across states, CIPM's educational niche in EDRR across states and at different levels (possibility of developing materials), California's state weed model, IPANE's EDRR program and how it works, and multi-author decision making tool on weeds or some system to incorporate extensive knowledge in a clear, easy to use tool.

The following is a list of opportunities suggested by the Steering Committee and subsequent comments (in blue) when this list was discussed later.

- Help chemical industry integrate their knowledge into overall management plans – training courses, modules, etc. ([integrated management with other methods beyond CIPM scope](#))
- Wyoming Weed Management Association – conference planning assistance, moral support, encouragement
- “Proselytize” weed management motivate people to support it – in support of state Depts of Agriculture...help people see the big picture, provide success stories, give kudos
- Help extension weed specialists collaborate and do things they couldn't do on their own ([university collaborations](#))
- Facilitate “train the trainer” forums ([too much time, money & people to be practical for CIPM – online training one aspect to be pursued](#))
- Provide education and awareness everywhere – field days, workshops, funding. Landowners/public aren't getting info ([labor-intensive for CIPM](#))
- Simple biocontrol guidance (see Idaho manual) ([quite a bit on this already](#))
- Training for non-weed managers, line officers, professionals, administrators – customizable introductory weed training packages for federal agencies
- Research on water (quality, quantity) and weeds – synthesis if anything exists ([two CIPM-funded hydrology projects on this](#))
- Multiple species management on a watershed scale – need guidance and tools ([huge!](#))
- Integrate weed management with production and land use – a holistic approach
- Environmental Management Systems (EMS) – see '95 Range Water Quality Management Plan, also VRIC (UC-Davis) Planning for Watershed Quality and Production ([Connie will research this](#))

- NGO training and partnership opportunities – large NGOS don't pay attention to weeds ([opportunities here](#))
- Help WWCC translate info to action – follow-up on ideas, programs, help partners collaborate and develop a product
- EDRR education – at all levels ([topic of choice](#))
- Facilitate collaboration among states
- Advocate more research dollars for natural areas
- Reinstate CIPM seed money research grants

Thursday, October 11, 2007

Farm Bill Workshop – Mara organized a workshop for researchers in spring 2007 to determine recommendations for the Conservation Title of the new Farm Bill. Proceedings were distributed widely and posted on the CIPM website. Janet presented results to Senate Ag Committee staffers in Washington, DC, in May 2007.

Science Advisory Council Project

Mara, as the contact person for the upcoming CIPM research workshop, passed out a questionnaire for the Steering Committee to complete regarding the kind of workshop topic to sponsor & desired outcomes (products) to affect policy. The workshop topic will be selected prior to next spring's SAC meeting and a small group of experts will be identified to meet, discuss the topic, and develop a product. The Committee discussed the importance of keeping the workshop unbiased science, the fact that CIPM is seen as a neutral organization, and possibly looking for partners to help fund projects like this.

Other Business

- The Steering Committee terms for Jim Oliveraz and Jennifer Vollmer will be up in April 2008 and at that time they may elect to serve on the CIPM Steering Committee for another three-year term.
- It was decided that for the April 2008 meeting a different federal agency representative would be asked to attend the meeting in place of the ARS representative.
- Stephen Enloe will resign from the Steering Committee since he has accepted a position in Alabama. Earl Creech, new Extension weed specialist at the University of Nevada, was suggested as a good candidate to replace Stephen as the university representative on the Steering Committee. Janet will contact him.
- Spring meeting set for April 24 (1:00-5:00 p.m.) – April 25 (8:00 a.m.–3:00 p.m.), 2008. Discussion topics – baseline funding, CIPM-SAC update on science project, new journal, CWMA conference update, Tamarisk Research Conference, self-study module demo, new weed models, research grant summary (2005 grants).

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Dianne Brokke

Attachment B. Center for Invasive Plant Management

Overall Income/Expense Summary

February 6, 2008

*University Fiscal Year July 1-June 30

	FY01-FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Total	Overall Totals
Income - Fiscal Year Awarded*						
Earmark BLM AA 1, Task Orders 1-4	2,693,700.00				2,693,700.00	4,924,700.00
Earmark BLM AA 2, Task Orders 1-3	1,333,000.00	886,000.00		12,000.00	2,231,000.00	
USDA-Coordinate Biological Control Book Publishing	15,000.00				15,000.00	
NCSU-On-line Invasive Plant Mangement	12,000.00				12,000.00	
Nat'l Park Service-Weed Pocket Guide	2,500.00				2,500.00	
USDA-Publishing Invasive Plant Prevention Guide	4,667.85				4,667.85	
USDA-ARS-Biocontrol Risk-Benefit Project	100,000.00	(19,360.14)			80,639.86	
USDA-APHIS-Invasive Species Mgmt Workshop	0.00				0.00	
Western IPM Center-Producing Invasive Plt Res Guide	5,712.00				5,712.00	
NPS-Conduct Gardiner Basin Native Vegetation...	7,500.00				7,500.00	
CSREES-Restoration Case Study Information	48,150.00				48,150.00	
NRCS-Nox Weeds Training for Field Ofc Personnel	7,500.00	(956.09)			6,543.91	
USFWS-Web-based Training Modules for NWR System		168,000.00			168,000.00	
MNWT-Weed Models/ID Cards (4 new species)			20,000.00		20,000.00	
SALKOO College-Spatial Modeling Invasive Flowering Rush				18,720.00	18,720.00	389,433.62
Total Income	4,229,729.85	1,033,683.77	20,000.00	30,720.00		5,314,133.62

Expenditures - MSU Fiscal Years*

Earmark BLM AA1, AA2

Administration

Salaries FY01	583,052.79	181,962.09	204,776.25	102,484.52	1,072,275.65
Benefits FY01	192,897.42	61,741.23	76,309.54	39,435.66	370,383.85
Recruiting FY01	3,120.00	2,445.48		711.57	6,277.05
Office FY01	79,903.85	35,556.90	13,893.67	2,858.33	132,212.75
CIPM Logo/Letterhead FY01	6,651.61				6,651.61
Steering Committee FY01	35,612.36	6,046.02	3,186.71	2,902.73	47,747.82
Advisors FY04	13,188.26	7,495.59	2,117.26		22,801.11

Communications

BC Book FY01	4,721.89				4,721.89
Fire Flyer/Posters FY01	7,458.23	7.46	8.15	3.94	7,477.78
CWMA Grants FY02	239,084.18	88,140.23	59,417.99	34,156.29	420,798.69
CWMA Nat'l Conference FY08				1,134.08	1,134.08
GYCC Pocket Guide FY01	243.69		3.81		247.50
Image gallery FY03	8,525.79				8,525.79
Presentations/Meetings FY01	91,904.77	31,496.69	32,225.91	10,346.87	165,974.24
Publications		26,872.71	1,749.28	(64.96)	28,557.03
Workshops/Seminars FY05	8,663.61	2,345.35	14,932.09		25,941.05

Weed Prevention FY04	193,856.81	56,477.82	626.18		250,960.81
Restoration Workshop FY02	30,149.33				30,149.33
	FY01-FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	Total
Web Site FY01	34,829.49	344.36	108.00	88.00	35,369.85
Weed Resource Catalog FY01	16,912.65	3,065.90			19,978.55

Overall Totals

Education

Fire Radio Spot FY01	1,151.22				1,151.22
Education Grants FY01	49,389.01	22,818.75	9,073.00		81,280.76
K-12 Curriculum FY03	3,644.90				3,644.90
On-Line Education FY02	32,684.82	14,602.45	8,743.60		56,030.87
Pocket Guide FY02	13,569.18	(1,582.62)			11,986.56
Spurge Roll-out FY02	4,721.82	(1,200.00)	71.66		3,593.48
Weed Models FY02	14,174.02	(3,034.96)	2,127.71	1,423.03	14,689.80
Weed Model ID Cards FY04	2,436.27	(434.99)	64.00		2,065.28
Weed Resource Box FY01	2,309.86				2,309.86
Invasive Plant Resource Guide FY04	11,720.04	(13.49)	5.87		11,712.42

Research

ARS BC Risk Assessment Conference FY01	853.97				853.97
Research Grants FY02	456,594.30	62,528.00	140,266.52	53,407.66	712,796.48
Innovations Workshop FY03	1,728.23				1,728.23
Monitoring Consortium FY03	3,286.14				3,286.14
Restoration Case Studies FY03	19,125.12	7,059.85			26,184.97
Restoration Database FY04	47,675.40	12,359.47			60,034.87
Restoration Publications FY04	4,005.60				4,005.60
WSSA Symposium FY01	3,896.17				3,896.17

IDCs

	220,280.50	54,308.08	56,970.56	24,888.72	356,447.86
--	------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------

Total Expenditures Earmark BLM AA1, AA2	2,444,023.30	671,408.37	626,677.76	273,776.44	4,015,885.87
--	---------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	---------------------

USDA-Coordinate Biological Control Book Publishing	15,000.00				15,000.00
NCSU-On-line Invasive Plant Mangement	12,000.00				12,000.00
Nat'l Park Service-Weed Pocket Guide	2,500.00				2,500.00
USDA-Publishing Invasive Plant Prevention Guide	4,667.85				4,667.85
USDA-ARS-Biocontrol Risk-Benefit Project	80,639.86				80,639.86
Western IPM Center-Producing Invasive Plt Res Guide	4,688.03	1,023.97			5,712.00
NPS-Conduct Gardiner Basin Native Vegetation...	7,370.71	129.29			7,500.00
CSREES-Restoration Case Study Information	17,270.65	30,872.11	7.24		48,150.00
NRCS-Nox Weeds Training for Field Ofc Personnel	3,002.53	3,541.38			6,543.91
USFWS-Web-based Training Moduels for NWR System		3,506.43	98,240.12	49,565.53	151,312.08
MNWT-Weed Models/ID Cards (4 new species)					0.00
SALKOO College-Spatial Modeling Invasive Flowering Rush				5,985.16	5,985.16
Total Expenditures Other Grants	147,139.63	39,073.18	98,247.36	55,550.69	340,010.86

Earmark Remaining Balance
Other Grants Remaining Balance

908,814.13
49,422.76

Earmark Projected Expenses Thru 6/30/2009	FY08	FY09			Total
Salaries	107,319.24	240,433.93			347,753.17
Benefits	41,413.41	97,840.74			139,254.15
Grants/Awards	53,851.20				53,851.20
Communications/Publications	4,000.00	1,000.00			5,000.00
Director Search	5,000.00				5,000.00
Education-FWS Modules	10,000.00				10,000.00
Farm Bill	6,857.00				6,857.00
Weed Models	7,144.00				7,144.00
Workshops/Conferences*	70,909.00				70,909.00
Russian Olive Saltcedar Summit	1,000.00				1,000.00
Meetings (travel)	20,380.21	20,000.00			40,380.21
Steering Committee Meeting	3,000.00				3,000.00
General Office Operations**	8,694.00	7,000.00			15,694.00
Total Direct Costs	339,568.06	366,274.67			705,842.73
IDCs (Indirect Costs)	33,956.81	36,627.47			70,584.27
Total Direct/Indirect Costs					776,427.00
Direct/Indirect Cost Balance					132,387.13
Discretionary Earmark Balance					120,351.93

*CWMA=\$20909/Research=\$50,000

**General ops FY08 = phone-1000 / supplies-7487 / rent-207



Attachment C.

Technical Work Plan

Missouri River Watershed Coalition – Saltcedar Management Project and Center for Invasive Plant Management

Project Title: Missouri River Watershed Coalition (MRWC) – Project Coordination

Project Duration: May 1, 2008 – May 1, 2009

PIs: Elizabeth Galli-Noble, Janet Clark and Mara Johnson

Institute: Center for Invasive Plant Management at Montana State University

Purpose: Recognizing the critical need for protecting the water resources of the Missouri headwaters, the state weed coordinators from Montana, Nebraska, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming and other interested parties formed the Missouri River Watershed Coalition to strategize invasive species management and water resources in this region. The Coalition coordinates its efforts with the state Departments of Agriculture, Native American sovereign nations, weed districts, county weed boards, and other county, state, federal agencies and private landowners concerned with the spread of saltcedar (tamarisk) and other invasive plants throughout watersheds that cross jurisdictional boundaries. The Coalition has met semi-annually for three years, written a management plan, and is working on developing a constitution and bylaws. The success of the Coalition, continued growth, and desire to further increase collaboration has highlighted the need for formal coordination of the Coalition.

The Center for Invasive Plant Management (CIPM) proposes to provide formal coordination for the Missouri River Watershed Coalition. CIPM successfully served as the initial project coordinator during the development of the Coalition. Building the coordination of the MRWC and formalizing the documentation and structure of the group will provide an ideal model for other states to use for regional coordination of invasive species.

Objectives: CIPM project coordination will focus on (1) organizing and facilitating intergroup activities, events and communication, (2) coordinating communication and disseminating information to parties outside of the group, and (3) providing evaluation of Coalition progress.

Methods: CIPM aims to increase the coordination of activities between the members of the six Missouri headwaters states – Montana, Nebraska, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming – through both general coordination of the group and facilitating specific key projects and products. Specific key projects and products for the first year have been identified from the Action Plan outlined in the MRWC Management Plan (see *Attachment A*, pages 18-19). The members of the Coalition believe that achieving these broadly defined actions will (1) protect the water resources of the Missouri headwaters from saltcedar and (2) achieve the overall goals of stopping the spread of saltcedar and containing or eradicating current infestations.

Organize and Facilitate Intergroup Coordination and Communication

- 1) The MRWC has identified Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) as a priority management tool that would be most valuable if coordinated on a regional scale. CIPM will assist with the coordination of initiating a six-state EDRR system.
- 2) CIPM will facilitate and organize semi-annual meetings and record and distribute minutes. At each joint meeting the states and the different entities in the group will give status reports. As each state reports its activities, other members can evaluate and compare them to their own situations. This will provide one of the opportunities for the different entities to decide on collaborative efforts. The MRWC will act as a clearinghouse where projects can be discussed, analyzed, and coordinated between the states and various entities; and the CIPM will facilitate that discussion, document those actions and disseminate information to MRWC members as well as the interested public.
- 3) CIPM will maintain the MRWC listserv. Between semi-annual meetings, the MRWC communicates via the Headwaters Tamarisk listserv, which has been maintained by CIPM. CIPM will continue to maintain and update the listserv and send key information to the Coalition via the listserv as needed.
- 4) CIPM will continue to host and maintain the MRWC website. CIPM will oversee the posting of data for education and mapping to the site as well as maintain the links, graphics and MRWC program information on the site.
- 5) CIPM will monitor and communicate potential funding opportunities to the Coalition.
- 6) CIPM will assist with the coordination of mapping efforts. The MRWC continues to work on creating six-state maps of saltcedar distribution for publications. Future mapping efforts will include inventories and surveys.

Coordinate Communication to Parties Outside of the Group

- 1) CIPM will share information with other groups through the website and/or by traveling and presenting at meetings, workshops and conferences.
- 2) CIPM will invite agencies and other interested parties to MRWC meetings and sponsored events.
- 3) CIPM will review national legislation and communicate opportunities to the MRWC via the listserv and semi-annual meetings.
- 4) CIPM will assist with the development of public relations materials – one-page summaries, brochures, posters, press releases, etc. – that showcase MRWC projects and activities for a target audience of peers, policymakers, potential funders and landowners.

Evaluation

The success of the MRWC will be evaluated annually at a joint meeting and CIPM will collate and distribute the results. The MRWC will review the Action Plan each year and assess the status of each of the items in the plan. The key measures of success will be:

- Buy-in by additional agencies, groups, and individuals not currently involved with saltcedar control;
- Commitment of the six states to continue the group;
- Increased awareness of the saltcedar problem;
- Increased funding from internal and external sources;
- Increased research on all aspects of Saltcedar; and
- Increased coordination of management efforts.

2008 - 2009 Milestones

May 2008:

- Montana Department of Agriculture and CIPM will finalize the MRWC/CIPM 2008-2009 Coordination Work Plan.
- MRWC will discuss and approve the MRWC/CIPM 2008-2009 Coordination Work Plan on May 6, 2008.
- CIPM will coordinate, develop the agenda, and facilitate the 2008 MRWC Spring Meeting in Gering, Nebraska in conjunction with Invasive Species Control Summit.
- CIPM will participate as a MRWC mapping group member and attend meetings with MT NRIS in Helena to discuss interactive mapping and other products.

June – September 2008:

CIPM will:

- Assist with the coordination and development of a new six-state salt-cedar infestation map for website and public relations materials.
- Organize and assist in the implementation of a Public Relations Plan for MRWC – which will involve the development of a brochure, one-page MRWC handout, new poster for Rocky Mountain Weed Summit, two saltcedar project write ups, and the distribution of these materials to the media, legislators and the interested public.
- Set up a system for documentation of MRWC activities (for example, agendas, minutes, contacts, projects, publications, etc.).
- Work with Dave Burch on building six-state EDRR system starting with sending a sample communication flowchart to other state weed coordinators.
- Attend pertinent regional meetings in support of the MRWC.
- Assist with the planning, coordination and developing the agenda for the Fall 2008 MRWC meeting.

October 2008 – April 30, 2009:

CIPM will:

- Coordinate and facilitate the Fall 2008 MRWC Meeting.
- Maintain listserv headwaters_tamarisk@listserv.montana.edu
- Maintain the MRWC website http://www.weedcenter.org/Missouri_wtrshd/miss_watershed.htm

- Organize and assist with the implementation of a Public Relations Plan for MRWC – which will involve the development of a brochure, one-page MRWC handout, new poster for Rocky Mountain Weed Summit, two saltcedar project write ups, and the distribution of these materials to the media, legislators and the interested public.
- Maintain a system for documentation of MRWC activities (for example, agendas, minutes, contacts, projects, publications, etc.).
- Attend pertinent regional meetings in support of the MRWC.

Budget:

MRWC Project Coordination Budget

May 1, 2008 to May 1, 2009

Budget Category	Amount	Totals
CIPM Personnel		
Salaries (7 part-time CIPM personnel: director, assistant director, facilitator, website manager, technical writer/ graphics designer, grants manager)	\$49,175	\$67,716
Benefits	\$18,541	
Travel	\$15,300	\$15,300
Rent (meeting room)	\$1,484	\$1,484
Contracted Services	\$10,000	\$10,000
Supplies	\$3,000	\$3,000
Communications	\$2,500	\$2,500
Total	\$100,000	\$100,000

Attachment A

Missouri River Watershed Coalition Management Plan

**Attachment D. NEW JOURNAL PROJECT - Weed Science Society of America
Income to CIPM: \$22,500 (April – December 2007)**

In March 2007 the Weed Science Society of America (WSSA) contracted with Janet Clark, CIPM Director, to coordinate the development of a new peer-reviewed journal, *Invasive Plant Science and Management* (IPSM). IPSM was envisioned to appeal to scientists and land managers by focusing on fundamental and applied research on invasive plant biology, ecology, management, and restoration of invaded non-crop areas, as well as on educational, sociopolitical, and technological aspects of invasive plant management.

The first issue of IPSM was officially unveiled at the WSSA annual meeting in February 2008. CIPM was recognized for its contribution to the successful launch of the new journal.

This project supported CIPM's Strategic Plan *Objective 1: Facilitate collaboration and communication among scientists, land managers, and policymakers.*

The contract between WSSA and CIPM concluded March 31, 2008, with all obligations fulfilled. J.Clark continues to help coordinate IPSM marketing (1-2 hrs/mo) on a *pro bono* basis, but there is no obligation on the part of CIPM for continued involvement.

Services performed by J. Clark – April through June 2007 (see Invoice #1)

- Coordinated project with WSSA Director of Publications, Allen Press, Ad Hoc Journal committee, and WSSA president.
- Conducted conference calls regarding project development.
- Finalized contract between WSSA and Montana State University/CIPM for project management.
- Assisted WSSA in identifying and hiring an editor for the new journal.
- Helped identify associate editors.
- Created and distributed journal announcement.
- Created and distributed Call for Papers.
- Consulted on journal cover and interior design.
- Negotiated publishing contract details with Allen Press.
- Consulted with private publishing consultant (Raym Crow, ChainBridge Group) on financial and other contractual issues.
- Completed operations plan for WSSA summer Board meeting.
- Developed marketing plan.
- Developed subscription pricing structure
- Drafted a three-year financial plan in consultation with Allen Press and Chain Bridge Group.

Services performed by J. Clark – July through September 2007 (see Invoice #2)

- Consulted with private publishing consultant (Raym Crow, ChainBridge Group) on financial and other contractual issues.
- Consulted with Allen Press (Karen Ridgway) on financial and other contractual issues.
- Synthesized info from ChainBridge and Allen Press

- Completed and submitted Operations Plan and recommendations to WSSA Board of Directors
- Continued work on a publishing contract with Allen Press
- Finalized journal cover and interior design
- Issued Call for Papers for Issue 2
- Revised and updated announcement on WSSA website
- Approved inclusion of IPSM in BioOne
- Coordinated meeting/PR schedule with IPSM editor

Services performed by J. Clark – October through December 2007 (*see Invoice #3*)

- Assisted WSSA and Allen Press in finalizing a publishing contract.
- Consulted with Allen Press (Karen Ridgway) on financial and other contractual issues.
- Updated IPSM marketing plan, in consultation with K. Ridgway and J. DiTomaso.
- Monitored production of IPSM to meet deadlines.
- Researched marketing materials, displays, promotional items.
- Consulted with Allen Press on ordering IPSM tabletop display and promotional materials.
- Discussed with Allen Press arrangements for journal roll-out at WSSA meeting.
- Compiled IPSM Committee project report.

Final report presented by J. Clark to WSSA Board of Directors in February 2008.

Attachment E.

People-Powered Projects

National Cooperative Weed Management Area Conference
April 2008

“People-Powered Projects: The National Cooperative Weed Management Area (CWMA) Conference” was held April 15-17, 2008, at the Grand Sierra Resort in Reno, NV. The conference focused on CWMA funding and logistics, working with volunteers, EDRR, awareness and outreach, approaches to mapping, and state and national initiatives, and concluded with an all-day field trip to restoration sites in the Reno area.

The first-ever national CWMA conference featured 33 speakers and attracted 113 attendees from 37 states (*see map*). Attendees represented local, state, and federal agencies (51%), non-profit organizations (23%), universities and other educational institutions (12%), business interests (2%), and Others (12%).

The event was organized by the Center for Invasive Plant Management and co-hosted by eight other entities. It is worth noting that seven of the nine co-hosts were non-governmental, grassroots organizations from across the United States. This unusually broad partnership of peers included:

- Alaska Committee for Noxious and Invasive Plant Management (CNIPM)
- California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC)
- Invasive Plant Atlas of New England (IPANE)
- Mid-Atlantic Exotic Pest Plant Council (MA-EPPC)
- Midwest Invasive Plant Network (MIPN)
- National Park Service
- Nevada Department of Agriculture
- Southeast Exotic Pest Plant Council (SE-EPPC)

Generous financial support was provided by government agencies and non-profit organizations:

- Federal Highway Administration
- Bureau of Land Management
- Western Weed Coordinating Committee
- Center for Invasive Plant Management

Conference outputs will include:

- National CWMA listserv
- Website featuring presentations (with audio) from the conference
- Follow-up CWMA conference in 1-2 years (tentative), hosted by an organization in the eastern United States

Conference organizers envision the eventual outcomes to be:

- Increased number of CWMA nationally.
- Improved approaches to CWMA organization and management.
- More support (financial, informational, political, moral) for CWMA.
- Increased communication among CWMA to share ideas and expertise.
- Increased collaboration among regional grassroots organizations.

People-Powered Projects

National Cooperative Weed Management Area Conference

Grand Sierra Resort • Reno, Nevada • April 2008

Agenda

Monday, April 14 – Reno Ballroom		
5:00 – 10:00 p.m.	Registration & Attendee Display Set-up	
Tuesday, April 15 – Reno Ballroom		
7:00 a.m.	Registration (adjacent to the Reno Ballroom)	Dianne Brokke, Center for Invasive Plant Management
8:00 a.m.	Welcome	Janet Clark and Liz Galli-Noble, Center for Invasive Plant Management, MT
8:15 a.m.	Opening address	Tony Lesperance, Director, Nevada Department of Agriculture
8:30 a.m.	Addressing the Big Questions Moderator: Rita Beard	Rita Beard, National Park Service, CO CWMAs: A community-based environmental movement Steve Schoenig, CA Dept Fish & Game CWMAs: The Good, the Bad, and the AWESOME Kate Howe, Midwest Invasive Plant Network, IN Adapting the Western CWMA Concept for Effective Invasive Plant Partnerships in the East Rosalind Rowe, The Nature Conservancy, FL Think Locally, Act Neighborly: Managing Invasive Species Across Boundaries in Florida
9:45 a.m. BREAK		
10:15 a.m. Our CWMAs – 1-minute presentations AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DE, DC, FL		
10:30 a.m.	CWMA Funding Moderator: Brian Bowen	Doug Holy, Natural Resources Conservation Service Potential Funding Sources for CWMAs Panel: Cynthia Taylor, Chicopee Woods CWMA, GA Dara Olson / Northwoods CWMA, WI Mark Porter / Wallowa Resources' Wallowa Canyonlands Partnership, OR
11:45 a.m. Our CWMAs – 1-minute presentations GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, ME, MD		

12:00 p.m. LUNCH on your own		
1:30 p.m.	Working with Volunteers Moderator: Cynthia Boettner	Clark Tate , Tamarisk Coalition, CO Creating & Sustaining the McInnis Canyons Volunteer Program Cynthia Boettner , U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, MA U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Volunteers: Snapshots of Programs at the National Level, New England, and the Connecticut River Watershed Damon Waitt , Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center, TX Invaders of Texas: Citizen Scientists Combat Invasive Species
2:45 p.m. Our CWMAAs - 1-minute presentations MA, MI, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NH, NJ		
3:00 p.m. BREAK		
3:30 p.m. Our CWMAAs - 1-minute presentations NM, NY, NC, ND, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD		
3:45 p.m.	CWMA Organization & Logistics Moderator: Kate Howe	PANELISTS Chris Evans , Illinois Tom Perkins , New Mexico Terri Hogan , Tennessee Jeffrey Pettingill , Idaho
5:00 p.m.	Topper Moderator: Jamie Nielsen	Dialogue on questions of the day
6:00 p.m. RECEPTION - Display Area		
Wednesday, April 16 - Reno Ballroom		
7:00 a.m.	Registration	Dianne Brokke , CIPM
8:00 a.m.	Welcome back, announcements	Janet Clark and friends
8:20 a.m.	Mapping and Inventory Moderator: Mara Johnson	Mara Johnson , CIPM, MT Fundamentals of Inventory and Survey Methods Mandy Tu , The Nature Conservancy, OR Application tools for invasive weed mapping, inventory, data aggregation and sharing, EDRR and on-the-ground decision-making: WIMS (TNC's Weeds Information Management System) and iMapInvasives Chris Evans , on behalf of Bugwood, GA Mapping and Detecting Invasive Species on a Regional Scale Using the EDDMapS Model Alycia Crall , Univ WI-Madison and NIISS, IL Integrating Invasive Species Data: Solutions for Data Collection, Management, and Dissemination
9:50 a.m. Our CWMAAs - 1-minute presentations TN, TX, UT, VT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY		
10:00 a.m. BREAK		

10:30 a.m.	Early Detection Rapid Response Moderator: Gino Graziano	Gino Graziano , Alaska SWCDs Citizen Monitoring for Invasive Plants: A Component of an Early Detection and Rapid Response Program for Alaska Bonnie Rasmussen , Oregon Dept of Agriculture Invasive Spartina: EDRR in Oregon Tony Pernas , National Park Service, FL Florida Upland Invasive Plant Program, a Cooperative Success Story (G. Jubinsky/FDEP) Doug Johnson , Cal-IPC, CA Predicting weed spread to aid early detection
12:00 p.m. LUNCH on your own		
1:30 p.m.	Awareness & Outreach Moderator: Jamie Nielsen	Connie Bollinger , Center for Invasive Plant Management, MT User-Friendly Websites Ellen Jacquart , The Nature Conservancy, IN TNC: Education and Outreach with the Nursery and Greenhouse Industry Sue Donaldson , Univ of NV Cooperative Extension Evaluating Your Program: How Do You Know If It Worked? Lori Zaumseil , CANWIN, AK Invasive Plants Awareness with Legislators and Policy Makers
3:00 p.m. BREAK		
3:30 p.m.	Laws & Policy Moderator: Doug Johnson	Peter Rice , Univ. of Montana Model State Weed Law Jamie Nielsen, Gino Graziano, Lori Zaumseil New Weed Legislation in Alaska Lee VanWychen , Weed Science Society of America, Washington, DC National Issues of Importance to CWMA's Doug Johnson , Cal-IPC, CA Role of WMAs in State and Federal Policy
5:00 p.m.	National "Who's Who" Roundtable Regional and national organizations you should know Moderator: Rita Beard	FICMNEW USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service USDI Bureau of Land Management USDI National Park Service US Forest Service National Invasive Species Council North American Weed Management Association National Assoc. of Exotic Pest Plant Councils Weed Science Society of America Western Weed Coordinating Committee
6:30 p.m. BANQUET - Tahoe Room Bob Parsons - Greater Yellowstone CWMA - The Granddaddy of Them All Recognition and Awards		
Thursday, April 17 - Load buses outside hotel		
8:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.	FIELD TRIP Morning - Swan Lake Afternoon - McCarran Ranch	Dawn Rafferty , NV Department of Agriculture and colleagues

“People-Powered Projects” National CWMA Conference Participants April 15-17, 2008 ★ Reno, NV

