

Center for Invasive Plant Management
Steering Committee Meeting – Conference Call
October 6, 2009
10:00 am - 12:00 pm MST

*Meeting Facilitators: John Simons (SC Chair) & Liz Galli-Noble (CIPM Director); Note taker: Emily Rindos
Minutes produced by Emily Rindos and edited by Liz Galli-Noble*

Tuesday, October 6, 2009

Meeting Attendance:

Steering Committee Members: John Simons, Mike Ielmini, and Tracy Sterling

Later in the meeting: Slade Franklin, Dean Peterson, and LaDonna Carlisle.

CIPM Staff: Liz Galli-Noble, Mary McFadzen, Erik Lehnhoff, Dianne Brokke, Melissa Brown, Janet Clark, and Emily Rindos

Absent: Tim Koopmann, Jennifer Vollmer (*flight was changed at the last minute*), and Tim Prather (*had a scheduling conflict*)

The meeting began at 10:05 am. John Simons gave a brief overview of the meeting agenda.

1. Meeting Minutes Approval

John Simons asked if corrections were needed for the May 26, 2009 meeting minutes. No corrections were required, but because there was not a quorum of SC members present, John requested that the minutes be emailed to the committee members for final approval (*Attachment A*).

2. Brief CIPM Program and Financial Updates

CIPM Financial Summary 2000-2009

Liz Galli-Noble briefly went over the CIPM Financial Summary 2000-2009 (*Attachment B*).

Liz also reported that she approached the MSU Foundation to inquire about CIPM soliciting program donations directly from the CIPM website. The Foundation agreed to the arrangement. She explained that the Foundation provides all the services needed for this donation process (sets up the webpage, processes the credit card paperwork, and tracks the finances) and they only charge a 5% fee from each donation for the service; the rest goes directly to CIPM. Liz got approval from Tracy Sterling and Jeff Jacobsen, Dean of the College of Agriculture, to set up the system. She hopes to have it up and running in November.

Mike Ielmini: This is a good option.

Liz Galli-Noble then reported on CIPM program activities (*Attachment C*) and recent grant applications. Of the four grant applications that CIPM (or a project partner) submitted this fall, none were funded:

1. EDDMapS (Early Detection and Distribution Mapping System) Project (NATFIS, Pulling Together Initiative) \$61,500

2. Connecting the Dots: Building a National Invasive Plant Network (DoD Legacy Program) \$239,700
3. Improving Stakeholder Understanding of the Department of Defense's Role in North American Conservation (DoD Legacy Program) \$73,555
4. Strategic Management of Invasive Species Workshops (DoD Legacy Program) \$107,394

But the DoD encouraged CIPM to resubmit #4 -- a follow-up invasive species workshop proposal -- in FY11. They wanted to wait to see how the October workshop goes before committing to another round of funding.

Erik Lenhoff: I put in a DoD SERDP application [Multi-scale invasive plant inventory, monitoring and prediction protocols for TER-S management support (DOD SERDP) \$564,000] but haven't heard anything yet. A decision should come very soon.

(Note: 10/20/09 – the research project was not funded.)

Liz Galli-Noble added:

- The IPM³ program is moving forward and they have formally asked CIPM to assist them with the invasive plant portion of the learning model.
- CIPM was one of a few groups who submitted a proposal to take over the Noxious Weeds Short-Course. The WSWS Board was unable to make a decision about who should take over coordination of the new course and postponed their decision until next year. The course will not be taught in 2010.
- There are also many opportunities for the Center to move funding through our coordination of the MRWC program.

Mike Ielmini: Is it difficult to track down new grant applications and/or programs to apply for?

Liz Galli-Noble: There are some grant programs that seem to be an ideal fit for CIPM and we have already had success applying to them. CIPM moved very little money via grants in the past, so this is a new process for the Center.

Janet Clark: If the Center is looking outside of government sources for funding, which is a good idea, there are private foundations CIPM could look into. They are different and difficult, though, and it usually depends on who you know and can take years of talking to even be considered. This takes a lot of staff time and energy. In addition, because of the current status of the economy, foundations don't have the money they used to. If CIPM wants to be considered for more funding, we need to repackage what we do.

Liz Galli-Noble: I had planned to approach the Doris Duke Foundation via a letter of intent. But if it looks promising CIPM must get approval from MSU to formally apply for foundation funding. In general, foundations have cut way back on their giving in the past year or two.

Erik Lehnhoff: On the research front, many other groups are tying in education and outreach components, potentially a good match for CIPM. I agree that it is more difficult to access funding now with less money available.

Mike Ielmini: Have you reached out to EPA for educational funding and offered to help?

Erik Lehnhoff: No, I haven't.

Mary McFadzen: There are a lot of climate change efforts going on with EPA.

Mike Ielmini: There are a myriad of different things funded by EPA, but in order to go about accessing those funds, you should know who to talk to beforehand (direct requests probably won't work well).

John Simons: Maybe we should pair weeds and climate.

Mike Ielmini: With EPA, there has been a huge push toward restoration. This could potentially be helpful for CIPM in terms of the invasive species and education components restoration entails.

Slade Franklin: In Nebraska, the funding used for the North Platte River project came from an EPA water quality grant.

3. Expand CIPM Program to Address Broader Invasive Taxa?

Liz sent out the following bullets prior to the meeting to prompt discussion:

- *Expand to address what? ANS, Riparian systems invasives, Forest pests (plant and insect), other?*
- *Is this where the Nation is going? Is this where future funding lies?*
- *CIPM change to Center for Invasive Species Management? – pros and cons*
- *Should new SC members be chosen to reflect broader taxa?*

John Simons introduced the topic and asked for comments.

Slade Franklin: Would the Center have to make staff or other changes in order to shift in this direction?

Liz Galli-Noble: I would like to hire an aquatic invasive specialist. It seems like a natural progression for us to move into water issues, considering the work we're already engaged in, for example with the MRWC, and the fact that water is such a key vector for the spread of many invasive species.

Mike Ielmini: The education aspect is big—if CIPM adds ANS, does it move ahead with education and outreach, because a lot already exists.

Liz Galli-Noble: The Center could easily branch out because much of what we would be doing to address ANS issues is directly linked to what we're *already* doing.

Slade Franklin: Have you gotten any feedback in terms of moving into ANS?

Liz Galli-Noble: Yes. Though we're not a go-to expert in the area, people are still asking the Center for help with aquatic invasive issues.

Mike Ielmini: This is the right direction for CIPM to be moving in. The issue of invasive species isn't two separate issues-- aquatic and terrestrial -- it's a broad, tightly linked issue that is looking at the whole

scope of the problem. Water is a common denominator, but it isn't the only factor. Though it may be a hot-button item in the West, it was the same way in the East and Pacific Northwest years ago. It will be beneficial in the future if the Center branches out from plants because that is where all the money will be. This would be a smart move to make and the Center doesn't risk getting left behind. This is the right path and we should support it.

Slade Franklin: I'm not opposed to expanding the program, but I'm not sure how Liz will make it work within the current program. Changing the Center's name and including all taxa is a good plan, though.

Mike Ielmini: Expanding the program would greatly increase partnership opportunities and wouldn't require much of a difference in how we do weed stuff. The solid elements are the same.

Liz Galli-Noble: I used to be the director of the Whirling Disease Initiative and that group would be a very easy partner for us to link to, as would the ANS Western Regional Panel. I like the model of Bugwood, which addresses weeds, insects and forestry as base components of their program. The Center has many links to biocontrol information sources, but could look at it a different light. Or perhaps we could expand a bit more into upland forest invasive species issues for example. Are these the type of people I should be asking to join the Steering Committee?

Janet Clark: All three major projects I'm currently working on have expanded into all species; CWMAs are becoming CISMAs, National Invasive Species Awareness Week has expanded, as have State species councils in the West. I think it would be great if the Center could become the regional hub.

Mike Ielmini: Even the BLM is now a member of the ANS Task Force.

John Simons: In a few months, Liz could create an outline for CIPM to become a real clearinghouse for expanded information. If we could disseminate that information and become a really important source for it, we could get a large chunk of that market share.

Tracy Sterling: Mike made an articulate argument for diversifying. It could greatly expand opportunities for funding and utilize the vast scientific expertise on campus. But I agree with Slade about not moving too fast. You need a core mission and to take it one step at a time.

Slade Franklin: While it is a good idea, there is an important question of what kind of impact an expansion would have on the Center. I don't want it to be a stress on you.

Mike Ielmini: An expansion would need to be a source of money, and because education and awareness components for all these other areas are needed, CIPM could benefit.

John Simons: It is important to see if funding for that position is there.

Slade Franklin: Why would the Center need someone extra to be an expert in that realm? Couldn't a weed educator, one who is good with sharing information, partnering, etc. do the job? Or would a person with a PhD be necessary?

Liz Galli-Noble: Take Mary, for example. Her academic and professional background is in wildlife, not plants. If I did hire additional staff, I might aim for something the Center is lacking, such as forestry, insects, aquatic invasive species. We have weeds well covered already.

Mike Ielmini: The Center doesn't necessarily need more expertise, so we shouldn't go there when we're in need of more people to write grants, etc.

Slade Franklin: Is the plan is to get into aquatic invasive research?

Liz Galli-Noble: Let me clarify here: When I put this on the agenda, I was simply trying to make sure support for expansion of our program even existed with the Steering Committee. I have not made a plan because I was not comfortable doing so without your support for the basic idea.

Mike Ielmini: Maybe the next step is to write an outline of what we need?

Slade Franklin: Perhaps Liz could survey the aquatics people she knows for advice and poll them, etc.

LaDonna Carlisle: After looking at websites on aquatic invasives, I noticed that different places (FL, CA, and MN) are addressing different weeds; most of this stuff is regional. Broadening a little would take away from what the Center already has.

Dean Peterson: Going into aquatics is a good idea but I don't want the Center to spread itself too thin or spend too much time looking for funding for new areas.

John Simons: It seems that expanding taxa is generally agreed on. The next step is to draft a plan.

4. New Strategy for Steering Committee

Liz sent out the following bullets prior to the meeting to prompt discussion:

- *Membership Reappointments: John Simons, chair, 2nd term*
- *Membership – More than one member under each category? Change Steering Committee Bylaws to permit this?*
- *Membership Vacancies – DoD, USACE, Tribal (2nd individual?), NGO (TNC, RMEF); broader taxa – USFWS, TU, APHIS, etc.*

Liz Galli-Noble: If we broaden the CIPM program, should we ask people with different backgrounds to join the Steering Committee?

John Simons: Earl Creech had to resign due to a new university job. Liz mentioned APHIS, RMEF, TU, TNC, DoD, etc. Do other members have ideas on the makeup of the Steering Committee?

Mike Ielmini: If we want to diversify, we need to think outside the box, yet we also need ties to the big groups and the NGO side, like the TNC and "hook and bullet" groups.

Slade Franklin: APHIS, because of biocontrol.

Mike Ielmini: Would it be weird to invite a sort-of colleague center like Bugwood to join us? Someone mentioned Bugwood is great model earlier.

Liz Galli-Noble: It's a good idea. The Center already works with and has built a strong relationship with Bugwood.

Janet Clark: It's a good idea. Cal-IPC could serve as the Committee's NGO because they are people dealing with the same problems, roadblocks, etc and also need to find new sources of funding.

LaDonna Carlisle: Although I don't have a problem with it and I'm fine with bringing another tribal member on board, it should be noted that incorporating another tribal member could result in trouble as they all have their own agenda. Going through the BLM would be a good idea.

Liz Galli-Noble: The reason this subject was originally put on the agenda is because Mandy Tu made the statement at a previous meeting that the "Conservation Group" member category perhaps required more than just one person to represent them. That then led to a discussion that we may want to change our Bylaws to allow for more than one person to be appointed to a particular category. John Simons requested that this be a discussion item for this meeting. The Committee needs to decide if it is willing to make changes to the Bylaws to allow for that, or not.

John Simons: Three spots need to be filled before getting into whether or not to change the bylaws. There are openings for a Federal Agency, Conservation Group, and University Representative.

LaDonna Carlisle: What about inviting someone from the US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Mike Ielmini: APHIS isn't just bugs and biocontrol, but invertebrates too.

Slade Franklin: APHIS has a broad reach and so it is more important to consider the person.

Liz Galli-Noble: Should people be recruited by national/state/regional status?

Slade Franklin: No, that doesn't matter as much as how much they would be willing to participate.

Liz Galli-Noble: I was thinking about Hannibal Bolton with the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mike Ielmini: Wouldn't it be better to go for someone under Hannibal, instead? Hannibal won't have time for this. How about Susan Mangin or Jenny Ericson?

Other suggestions: Gary Smith (APHIS-PPQ), Al Cofrancesco (Corps), Kurt Getsinger (Corps)

Liz Galli-Noble: I also know someone on the ANS TF Western Regional Panel, but I'm afraid of being too Montana-centric. What about DoD or the Corps of Engineers?

Mike Ielmini: The Corps is the way to go for aquatic invasives people.

Liz Galli-Noble: As I was instructed at our last meeting, I did do research into the proposed candidates mentioned:

- TNC – Bas Hargrove (Idaho)
- Cal-IPC – Doug Johnson (CA)
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation - ? (MT)
- Trout Unlimited – (no particular person mentioned)
- Thomas Gonzalez NRCS in NM (La Donna has spoken to him about this, but no commitment was ever made)
- Western Regional Panel member of the ANS Task Force – an aquatic invasive plant person
- AZ Invasive Species Task Force member
- NPS regional office

But I put off contacting them because I wasn't sure if we wanted to take a different approach, a broader taxa approach, to the whole thing. Bass Hargrove with TNC would be an excellent candidate, as would Doug Johnson with Cal-IPC. Anita Dragan a tribal consultant to the DoD, who I met this summer, would also be a great addition.

(Dianne Brokke joined meeting.)

Mike Ielmini: What about Amy Ferriter?

Liz Galli-Noble: She would be another excellent choice under State Agency. Again that would require more than one person under a single category, which I am comfortable with. Are SC members comfortable with changing the bylaws to allow for this?

Mike Ielmini: If the bylaws need to be changed or restructured in order to allow the Center to better move in the direction it wants, we should go ahead.

John Simons: I'm worried about the Steering Committee getting too big because that would make it more difficult to get things done.

Others agreed.

Janet Clark: In order to be flexible and allow things to change, perhaps the bylaws should state that "the Committee can consist of no more than 15 people, including those from NGOs, Federal agencies, etc." This would leave it wide open to change, yet keep membership numbers limited.

Slade Franklin, John Simons and Dean Peterson all expressed agreement.

Liz Galli-Noble: I will put something together and send it to the group via email for official approval. We do not have a quorum to vote on this at this meeting. Tim Prather contacted me last week and stated that he was comfortable with changing the bylaws, for the record.

Mike Ielmini: A plan should be drafted and sent out to the others explaining today's discussion.

DECISION: The Steering Committee members agreed that a revision of the Bylaws will be written and distributed via email to Steering Committee members for an official approval vote (see Attachment D for revised Bylaws).

John Simons: One more thing under the membership item: Are there any volunteers for chairman of the SC? I've done one term and can do another, but if nobody else wants to do it, I'll continue.

No one else volunteered. Other members thanked John for chairing the group and volunteering to continue to do so.

They also thought that John had already been appointed to a second term as Chair, but according to the SC meeting minutes of September 30, 2008 the SC discussion and decision actually addressed the ability of the Chair to serve for a two-year term rather than for a one-year term. So 2009 was actually the second year of John Simons' first term.

DECISION: The Steering Committee will also be asked via email to formally vote to approve John Simons' second, two-year term as Chair, which will terminate in the fall 2011.

5. Ideas for New CIPM Projects (outreach, research, and policy) and New Funding Opportunities

Erik Lehnhoff: I'm working on getting funding from the Montana Noxious Weed Trust Fund but can't offer any specifics yet.

John Simons: As we expand taxa, we will be presented with more opportunities to pull in funding.

LaDonna Carlisle: Within the BLM, there is an effort to provide more funding for weeds and other taxa, but I'm waiting to hear more, as we are currently at the bottom of the list. Our weed budget should double next year and triple the next. Lots of tribes are trying to begin more projects but are having difficulties putting weed plans together, and so I refer them to CIPM. I'm also letting other regions know what is going on and working with many other programs.

6. Schedule Next SC Meeting

DECISION: It was decided that Liz Galli-Noble will poll the group in January 2010 to schedule the next CIPM SC meeting. That meeting will be a conference call or possibly could be held in conjunction with another invasive species meeting that is already attended by the majority of SC members. The next meeting will likely be in late March 2010.

John Simons: Liz and I will take a look at spring meetings and try to coordinate something.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm MST.

CIPM Financial Summary 2000-2009

Updated: September 2009

MSU Index #	Award Year	Funding Source Grant Title or Project Title	Amount Awarded	Amount Spent (to date)	Amount Remaining	Notes
427089	4/2000-9/2009	Congressional Appropriation – Cooperative Agreement w/ BLM: FY 2000 \$500,000 FY 2001 \$500,000 FY 2002 \$1 million FY 2003 \$1 million FY 2004 \$1 million FY 2005 \$500,000	450,000 450,000 900,000 893,700 889,000 444,000 908,000	450,000 450,000 900,000 893,700 889,000 444,000 ~675,555	0 0 0 0 0 0	
4W0094 4W2801	9/2009	FY 2006 \$1 million + (CWMA confer \$12,000) + (Natural Areas Confer \$10,000) FY2009 \$78,000 + ~\$189,555(?)	~310,445	0	~232,445 ~310,445 + 189,555(?)	Estimated 9/30/2009 New funding 10/09
Previous Funding						
426774	7/2002	USDA Coordinate biological control book publishing	15,000	15,000	0	
426377	1/2002	NCSU Online invasive plant management	12,000	12,000	0	
427519	5/2001	NPS Weed Pocket Guide	2,500	2,500	0	
426805	9/2002	USDA Publishing invasive plant prevention guide	4,668	4,668	0	
426759	8/2002	USDA-ARS Biological risk-benefit project	80,640	80,640	0	
425437	9/2003	USDA-APHIS Invasive species management workshop	30,000	0	0	Returned, Project Canceled
4W0154	8/2004	NPS Conduct Gardiner Basin native vegetation workshop	7,500	7,500	0	
4W0056	7/2004	CSREES Restoration case study information	48,150	48,150	0	
4W0311	1/2005	Western IPM Center Producing invasive plant resource guide	5,712	5,712	0	
4W0457	5/2005	NRCS Noxious weed training for field office personnel (\$7,500)	6,544	6,544	0	
4W0811	10/2005	USFWS Web-based training modules for NWR system	168,000	168,000	0	Completed 8/08

MSU Index #	Award Year	Funding Source Grant Title or Project Title	Amount Awarded	Amount Spent (to date)	Amount Remaining	Notes
Current Funding						
4W1608	5/2007	MT Dept of Agriculture, Noxious Weed Trust Fund Weed models & weed cards (2 nd series)	20,000	20,000	0	Completed 9/09
4W1720	6/2007	Salish Kootenai College Spatial modeling of flowering rush	18,720	16,038	~2,000	Project extension 7/09
4W2035	3/2008	DOT - Federal Highway Admin People powered projects: National CWMA conference	25,000	25,000	0	
4W2185 4W2809	5/2008 9/2009	Montana Dept of Agriculture, Noxious Weed Trust Fund #1. Missouri River Watershed Coalition – Project Coordination #2. Missouri River Watershed Coalition – Project Coordination	100,000 100,000	73,614 0	~26,386 100,000	
433234	9/2008 4/2009	WSSA #1. <i>Invasive Plant Science and Management</i> journal marketing #2. <i>Invasive Plant Science and Management</i> journal marketing	11,960 10,000	11,960 1,643	0 8,357	
4W2443	12/2008	Western IPM Center Invasive Plants in Natural Areas: Connecting Regional Centers Across the U.S.	10,000	9,642	358	
4W2453	12/2008	Western IPM Center Invasive Plant Inventory and Survey Methods for Land Managers: A Web Seminar Series	36,950	151	36,799	
4W2525	12/2008	DoD Legacy Program Strategic Management of Invasive Species Workshop	114,124	32,747	81,377	
433234	6/2008	DuPont Corporation (donation)	4,000	4,000	0	
4W2542	3/2009	MT Dept of Agriculture, NWTF Assessing plant community and soil characteristics after saltcedar invasion and treatment	25,500	285	25,215	
NA	4/2009	MSU Extension Montguide Revisions	1,800	1,800	0	
4W2782	9/2009	CSREES Microbial Biocontrol Symposium	10,000	0	10,000	
433234	NA	CIPM Services CIPM Products			23,969 1,815	
437470	NA	CIPM Indirect Costs			8,518	
Total					\$635,239 + ~\$189,555(?) = \$824,794	

Center for Invasive Plant Management September 2009

CIPM Staff

1. Director – Liz Galli-Noble – 1.0 FTE
2. Assistant Director for Policy – Janet Clark – 1.0 FTE
3. Assistant Director for Science Communication – Mary McFadzen – 1.0 FTE
4. Assistant Director for Research – Dr. Erik Lehnhoff – 0.8 FTE
5. Science Communication Associate – Melissa Brown – 0.5 FTE (based in Helena)
6. Office Manager/Accountant – Dianne Brokke – 0.45 FTE
7. Office Assistant – Emily Rindos – 1.0 FTE
8. Web Communications Assistant – Sindhu Karanam (Grad Student) – 0.25 FTE (done: Dec 2009)

Hope to Hire

9. E-Communications Associate – 1.0 FTE (Oct 2009)
10. Aquatic Invasive Plant Specialist – 1.0 FTE (2009-2010)
11. Office Assistant/Financial Manager – 0.5-1.0 FTE (take over for D. Brokke)

Current Projects/Funding

CESU Agreement (BLM) - (FY06 Congressional Appropriation + FY09 BLM funding) – CIPM program and basic services funding [\$232,445 (FY06 remaining) + \$78,000 (new funding Oct 1, 2009)] + ~\$189,555 (BLM) = \$500,000

National Network of IPM Centers meeting (WIPMC) (\$10,000)

January 2009 - Two-day meeting of six regional invasive plant centers to establish of a national network of organizations focusing on invasive terrestrial and aquatic plants in non-crop areas. The identified organizations (located in CA, CT, FL, GA, IN, MT) educate and serve natural resource managers through programs that have proven successful. They are all committed to an ecological, integrated approach to pest management.

Working together, these organizations can offer more comprehensive services more efficiently. In many cases, the center directors (who are deeply involved in their own regions) had not met or spoken with each other. A face-to-face meeting facilitated by CIPM provided a forum to explore ideas and come to consensus on concrete actions to build an efficient, information-sharing network and possibly collaborate on multi-regional or national projects.

Web Seminar Series - Invasive plant inventory and survey methods (WIPMC) (\$36,950)

Locating and mapping both the presence and absence of invasive plant populations provides essential information for developing effective IPM strategies. Land managers use this information in prioritizing their efforts and developing strategies for prevention, early detection-rapid response, monitoring, and control. To be successful in this daunting responsibility, land managers need efficient and cost-effective inventory and survey methods that are appropriate for large areas.

To assist land managers in their IPM efforts, will offer a series of six interactive web seminars that will disseminate inventory and survey methods to a large audience and provide an opportunity for land managers and scientists to exchange ideas. The seminar series will be based on chapters from the publication *Inventory and Survey Methods for Nonindigenous Plant Species* (L.J. Rew and M.L. Pokorny, editors, 2006, Montana State University Extension). CIPM coordinated and funded the development and printing of the publication, which presents practical inventory and survey methods that are being successfully applied over large areas, and provides guidance on selecting methods to best meet the objectives of an IPM strategy.

Salish Kootenai College – Spatial modeling of flowering rush project (CSREES Tribal Grant) (\$18,720)

CIPM working with SKC/Tribe and U of Montana; CIPM assisting with project evaluation, technology transfer/science communication, outreach.

**Potential Phase II project starting in 2010 (\$90,000+)

Plastic weed model project - (MT DoA, Noxious Weed Trust Fund) (\$20,000)

June 30: 2nd set of weed models: purple loosestrife, saltcedar, garlic mustard, perennial pepperweed

Missouri River Watershed Coalition (MT DoA, Noxious Weed Trust Fund + USFS State & Private Forestry) [(2008) \$100,000 + (2009) \$100,000]

Program coordination, grant writing, outreach and education, EDRR

Workshop: Strategic management of invasive species on SW DoD lands (DoD Legacy Program) (\$114,000)

October 2009: Five-day workshop will instruct Southwest installation personnel on invasive species ecology, prevention, detection, management, and regional partnerships. A resource notebook and DVD provided will allow content to be shared throughout the region.

Support DoD in the management of invasive species, we will offer a five-day workshop to military installation personnel in the southwestern United States. The goal of the workshop is to provide participants with knowledge and resources that will enable them to improve land stewardship by building partnerships and effectively addressing invasive species problems in their particular sites and situations. Invasive species science and management experts from academic institutions, federal and state agencies, and non-governmental organizations will outline key components of a strategic approach to preventing, detecting, and managing invasive species. The species to be considered include terrestrial plants, aquatic nuisance species, and insects. Participants also will learn about local, state, and federal invasive species initiatives and regional partnership opportunities. With the new knowledge, skills, and materials (notebook and DVD recordings of the sessions) gained at the workshop, participants will be able to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of their invasive species management, and will be positioned to educate other installation personnel and project partners.

WSSA – Marketing *Invasive Plant Science and Management* journal [(2008) \$11,960 + (2009) \$10,000]

Janet Clark marketing new journal

Research investigation: *Assessing plant community and soil characteristics after saltcedar invasion and treatment* (MT DoA, Noxious Weed Trust Fund) (\$24,500)

The CIPM, in cooperation with MSU Extension and LRES facility, received \$24,468 in grant funding from NWTF to conduct a research investigation focusing on saltcedar (*Tamarisk* spp.) invaded sites along the Yellowstone, Big Horn and Musselshell rivers and possibly Fort Peck Reservoir. In this research project, CIPM will obtain valuable information on soil characteristics (specifically salt accumulation) of saltcedar invaded sites, as well as knowledge of plant community recovery after treatment and removal of saltcedar. This research will assist in future saltcedar treatment projects by helping land managers understand and predict what vegetation will occupy the site subsequent to saltcedar treatment, and by providing soil information which will assist in future selection of species for revegetation.

MSU Extension – Montguide Revisions (\$1,800)

Melissa Brown worked with Jane Mangold to revise 3 Montguides (houndstongue, St. Johnswort, oxeye daisy) for MSU Extension.

CIPM Coordination of 2010 NISAW for WSSA (\$6,000)

CIPM (Janet Clark) has agreed to help coordinate the 2010 NISAW to be held in January 2010 in DC.

CIPM Assistance with the Microbial Biocontrol Symposium: State of the Science and Enhancing Regulatory Communication (CSREES) \$10,000

Microbial control of arthropods, weeds, and plant pathogens still remains underutilized, in part, due to knowledge gaps, challenging regulations, relatively limited funding opportunities for applied microbial biocontrol projects, perceptions of risk, and other factors. Objectives for the microbial biological control symposium are: to bring together microbial ecologists, population biologists, microbial geneticists, conservation biologists, and sociologists to showcase the “state of the science” of microbial biological control; to provide a balanced discussion on perceptions of risk; to identify strategies to improve public trust and support for microbial biological control; and to develop a position paper to help enhance communications about the state of the science and inform regulatory policy.

Pending & Potential Projects/Funding

*** Multi-scale invasive plant inventory, monitoring and prediction protocols for TER-S management support (DOD SERDP) \$564,000**

The CIPM (in cooperation with LRES facility and others) submitted a grant: *Developing multi-scale invasive plant inventory, monitoring and prediction protocols at Fort Huachuca, Arizona* to the SERDP DoD program.

Project objectives:

Improve our understanding of those non-native invasive plants that are present on DoD lands in the Southwest and potentially have a significant impact on the native ecological systems and associated TER-S.

1. Refine and implement a methodology for generating predictive maps for extant invasive plant species potentially impacting Palmer's agave (*Agave palmeri*) success on Fort Huachuca, AZ and the surrounding private, state and federal lands.
2. Develop methodology for predicting future distributions of non-native invasive plant species on Fort Huachuca, AZ and the surrounding private, state and federal lands based on climate change envelope models
3. Evaluate methodology for rapid assessment of invasive plant population change, with and without implementation of management strategies, for the period 2010-2050.

***IPM³ program - potential collaboration**

CIPM assist with: *Integrated Pest Management of Weeds and Other Vegetation* session; Bob Nowierski asking for partnership

***WSSA Noxious Weed Short Course (\$22,000, break-even funding)**

Course facilitation; delayed decision 2010

*** 2011 Strategic Management of Invasive Species Workshops (DoD Legacy Program) \$107,394**

The CIPM is a subcontractor on this project with our partner and lead Invasive Plant Control, Inc.

Two weeklong workshops for DoD personnel in the Northeastern and Northwestern U.S. will outline invasive species ecology, prevention, and management and the value of regional partnerships. Two additional two-day workshops will be held in the Southeast and Southwest to expand on specific topics presented at these locations in 2009. Resource notebooks and DVDs will allow broad dissemination of workshop content. The primary goal of the weeklong DoD Invasive Species Workshops is to provide a comprehensive overview of invasive species issues and management strategies for invasive species managers at DoD installations across the United States. The long-term goal is to lay a foundation for development of effective invasive species management programs at installations across the country. Two Legacy-funded workshops are being conducted in late 2009 in the Southeast and Southwest, and two more are proposed for the Northeast and Northwest in 2010. The goal of the intensive two-day workshops is to address specific invasive species issues identified during the weeklong workshops that are being presented in 2009.

Note: Not funded in 2009, asked to reapply next year.

*** Missouri River Watershed Coalition**

* Missouri & Yellowstone rivers comparative study (saltcedar & Russian olive control) (NRCS-CIG 2010)

* MRWC-sponsored outreach/education for NE (Nebraska Environmental Trust)

*** 2011 Congressional Appropriation (\$500,000)**

* MSU Foundation Donation Account for CIPM (5% IDCs taken)



**Center for Invasive Plant Management
BYLAWS
2008-2009**

10/6/09 – Proposed Changes to Bylaws in blue text - DRAFT

I. MISSION

The mission of the Center for Invasive Plant Management (CIPM) is to promote proactive, ecologically sound management of invasive plants in western North America by sponsoring research, conducting public education, and facilitating collaboration and communication among researchers, educators, policy makers and natural resource managers.

II. STEERING COMMITTEE

~~A. Representation—The Steering Committee shall consist of one representative of:~~

- ~~1. USDI Bureau of Land Management~~
- ~~2. USDA Forest Service~~
- ~~3. Tribes/USDI Bureau of Indian Affairs~~
- ~~4. Universities~~
- ~~5. State agencies~~
- ~~6. Conservation groups~~
- ~~7. Private landowners—Montana~~
- ~~8. Private landowners—outside Montana~~
- ~~9. Industry groups~~
- ~~10. Research interests~~
- ~~11. Other federal agency~~
- ~~12. Montana State University, Land Resources and Environmental Sciences (LRES) Department Head (*ex officio*)~~

A. Representation – Steering Committee members shall ~~be drawn from throughout~~ represent diverse geographical areas, constituencies, and approaches to ~~land~~ natural resource management from throughout western North America. ~~The Steering Committee shall have up to 15 members (from a broad spectrum of representatives including but not limited to: universities, tribes, state agencies, federal agencies, Industry, conservation organizations, and private landowners), plus the Montana State University/Land Resources and Environmental Sciences Department Head (*ex officio*)~~

B. Terms of Office – Steering Committee members shall be elected for three-year terms with the opportunity for re-election for an additional three-year term. Terms of office commence on membership start date. ~~New appointments are encouraged.~~

C. ~~Election~~ Appointment – Steering Committee members shall be ~~nominated and elected by a majority vote~~ appointed by the CIPM Director in consultation with current Steering

Committee members. The participation of agency representatives must be approved by the agencies that they represent.

D. Officers – Steering Committee members may elect among themselves a Chair to help facilitate decision-making and get quorum decisions from the Steering Committee, and to run Steering Committee meetings. The Chair may serve a two-year term with a fall election.

E. Voting – Proposals and initiatives will be recommended for approval with a positive vote of two-thirds of the Steering Committee, working toward consensus. Votes may be registered in person, by phone, by e-mail, or in writing. Votes may be conducted via e-mail/fax between meetings.

F. Expectations – Steering Committee members shall advise the CIPM Director and the LRES Department Head; ~~attend~~ **participate in** semi-annual Steering Committee meetings; advocate CIPM programs; identify new partnership opportunities; and support funding existing and new initiatives.

G. Conflict of Interest – Steering Committee members shall abstain from voting on issues or providing direction that directly affects their financial or legal standing personally or professionally.

III. MEETINGS

A. Time – One in-person meeting of the Steering Committee will be held in the fall and conference call meetings will be held as needed.

B. Notification – Steering Committee members will be notified at least 30 days in advance of meetings.

C. Quorum – A quorum shall consist of seven of the 11 voting Steering Committee members.

IV. DECISION-MAKING

A. Long-term decisions – The entire Steering Committee shall be solicited for their advice and votes on issues regarding long-term vision and planning for CIPM, as well as programmatic focus and financial support.

B. Immediate decisions – The Center Director shall have the authority to make day-to-day decisions, hire staff, and act in the best interests of CIPM when immediate action is required.

V. COMMITTEES

A. The Steering Committee may form subcommittees as needed.

B. Science Advisory Council (SAC) shall: 1) function as a regional, scientific sounding board for the CIPM – providing scientific guidance and oversight, and helping identify emerging research/management needs; 2) assist CIPM in building regional

- technology transfer, education and research consortia that strategically address invasive plant issues; 3) serve as a review panel for CIPM's research grant program, when the program is active; and 4) provide specific grant writing advice to the CIPM as requested. Five or six members shall be appointed by the CIPM Director for two-year terms.
- C. The Education Advisory Committee shall: 1) advise the CIPM Assistant Director for Outreach and Education on the informational needs of educators/land managers who work on invasive plant issues; and 2) review and advise in the development of educational materials and programs produced by CIPM. Members shall be appointed by the Director for two-year terms.

VI. CENTER DIRECTOR

A. Hiring and Dismissal – The Steering Committee, in partnership with Montana State University, shall select, interview, and hire the Center Director. The LRES Department Head shall be the hiring authority and lead the search process. The LRES Department Head shall provide direct oversight of the Director as far as university policies, office space, grants and contracts, personnel, and administration. The Steering Committee, according to MSU policies and procedures, may recommend termination of the Director to the LRES Department Head.

B. Responsibilities – The Center Director shall: conduct semi-annual Steering Committee meetings; communicate regularly with and follow the intent of the Steering Committee; facilitate collaboration among researchers, educators, and land managers to restore, maintain, and protect healthy ecosystems by managing invasive weeds; coordinate CIPM research and education activities; negotiate agreements; generate funding; manage personnel and budgets; and facilitate correspondence among all interested regional and national partners.

C. Oversight – The Center Director is responsible to his/her LRES Department Head and to the CIPM Steering Committee. Written annual reports, including financial reports, shall be provided by the Director to Steering Committee members and the LRES Department Head, as well as to Center funders.

D. Other staff – With justification provided to the CIPM Steering Committee and LRES Department Head, the Center Director may hire and terminate CIPM staff as needed.

VII. RELATIONSHIP WITH MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

A. Partnership – Montana State University will support CIPM by providing office space and facilities, janitorial services, administration (personnel, grants and contracts, fund administration), legal advice, purchasing agreements, computer network services, and other benefits and services associated with the university.

B. Funding – As established with other MSU centers and institutes, MSU upper administration may fund with broad earmarks to MSU-CIPM high-priority university programs that complement and support CIPM activities, provided that the allocation does not impinge on CIPM's historical baseline funding. Plans for and outcomes of that

funding will be reported to the Steering Committee. The MSU LRES Department Head will communicate with the Steering Committee concerning such funding.

VIII. BYLAWS

A. Changing – Bylaws may be added, amended, or deleted with a two-thirds vote of the entire Steering Committee, either in writing or in person.

B. Notification – Proposed bylaws changes shall be provided to Steering Committee members in writing at least 30 days preceding the vote.