

Center for Invasive Species Management
Steering Committee Conference Call
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, August 13, 2013
10:00 – 11:00 am (MST)

DRAFT 8-19-2013

Meetings by Emily Rindos; reviewed by Liz Galli-Noble.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Steering Committee Members

Dave Burch
Virgil Dupuis (*joined a few minutes late*)
Mike Ielmini
Gina Ramos
Eileen Ryce
Tracy Sterling

CISM Staff

Liz Galli-Noble
Kim Goodwin
Emily Rindos
Kitty Weiss

Absent
Scott Bockness

Absent

Lars Anderson, Larry Beneker, Andrew Canham, Amy Ferriter, Sheilah Kennedy, Roger Sheley

1. Introductions and Meeting Overview

Liz Galli-Noble did a roll call of the meeting participants (stated above) and briefly went over the purpose for the meeting.

2. Approve Minutes from July 18, 2013, Steering Committee Meeting

Tabled. No quorum so this will be addressed at the next meeting.

3. Elect a Chair for the Steering Committee

Liz reminded the group that Tracy Sterling suggested at the last Steering Committee meeting that we should elect a chair, which will be helpful in the absence of the Director.

Mike Ielmini: We have to have a quorum to do an election.

Liz Galli-Noble: You are correct.

For the record: does anybody on the call today wish to be the chair? Are any of you willing to be the chair?

Dave Burch: I nominate Roger Sheley.

ACTION ITEM: Liz was asked to approach Roger in the next week or so to see if he would be willing to serve as the CISM Steering Committee chair. If he is willing to do it, the Committee can conduct a formal vote at the next meeting when we (*hopefully*) have a quorum.

4. Transition/Sunset Plan for CISM; New Models for CISM

Handouts referenced: (1) CISM Financial Statement and CIG Project Budget Revision/One-year Extension; (2) Summary of Suggestions from Steering Committee Members and Others; (3) Draft Transition Plan

Financial update (**Handout 1:** CISM Financial Statement)

Liz reported that we are waiting to hear back from three major funding sources:

- a. Department of Defense (webinar series; \$36,000)

- b. DuPont (follow-up webinar series; \$50,000–60,000) supposed to make a decision by August 15
 - c. BLM via Gina Ramos (base funds/project assistance; half of \$15,000, less 17.5% IDCs, so about \$7,500). The other half of the \$15,000 is earmarked for the Weeds Across Borders 2014 conference; however, if that conference is cancelled, the funds will go to CISM.
- Current funding levels are enough to keep CISM staff (not including the Director) funded through October 2014.

In preparation for this meeting, Liz typed up some notes ([Handout 2: Summary of Suggestions](#)) on the comments heard during the last meeting and when talking to people independently.

Discussion of CISM’s relationship with MSU, Liz’s Transition Plan ([Handout 3. Draft Transition Plan](#)), and ideas for new models/approaches for CISM:

Mike Ielmini: The activities you’ve outlined for the next cycle are outlined well and the Transition Plan is well laid out. From October 1 of this year through next year, Emily and Kitty are covering those projects and Scott is continuing with his project. If a new project comes in, or if there’s an additional request with funding attached to it to conduct some work, is there a plan for who would handle or manage that project? Or is CISM maxed out on with current staffing?

Liz Galli-Noble: No, we’re not 100% maxed out. There is a little bit of flexibility to take on additional tasks, but those ideas are going to have to be presented to the staff—just as they would be presented to me—to determine whether or not they have time to complete the project. For example: oftentimes, Emily can quickly do something like a new brochure and Kitty can build a new website fairly quickly, depending on how complicated it is. If we were asked to host a webinar or webinar series, it would depend on the amount of planning and preparation required. Also, Kim has some free time so she could be pulled into a few projects to help Emily and Kitty.

Mike Ielmini: I was just wondering because you didn’t describe the capacity for additional work in the Transition Plan. You listed the projects staff is going to work on in the next year but the plan doesn’t say whether it’s going to take two people to do those projects, or if one person could do them and the other can do something else, or if there’s room for additional projects. That’s important because it determines your ability to accomplish the work; if someone brings you a project and the money to do it, does that mean you need to hire someone? Or would you shift someone so that project could get done? It sounds like you’ve got flexibility and the ability to do additional projects.

Liz Galli-Noble: If you presented the staff with an opportunity that they didn’t have time to complete, they could pull in partners from other centers to help. For example: CISM staff are busy with two big webinars from January to March, but if there was another project, they could pull in partners to help. I wanted the plan to show you that if CISM received no additional funding—and that’s what I’m facing right now—we’ve got enough money to carry the staff through October 2014. And if we get all the contracts that I’m planning to sign in the next month, I predict that there’s enough money to take staff through December 31, 2014. Also, keep in mind that some of the actions CISM staff are obligated to do can be done later, like November 2014 rather than finishing it in August. I just wanted to clearly show that we’re fully covered, with flexibility, for now.

Mike Ielmini: You mentioned earlier this additional \$15,000. Is that factored in here and what is that money for?

Liz Galli-Noble: It is not factored in. It is supposed to go into our base funding account. It’s for the wide variety of things that we’ve done since the beginning, using the CESU Agreement, which is basic regional invasive plant management support for multiple stakeholders.

Mike Ielmini: So it’s not a project, it’s just paying salaries or something like that?

Liz Galli-Noble: It’s base. We use it for staff, for communications, for all functions of the Center.

Gina Ramos: I may come up with a project; Liz and I haven't talked about what we're going to do with it yet.

Mike Ielmini: Would it be possible to use that \$15,000 to keep Liz on past her original end date? Or will it be put towards Emily, Kitty, or Scott? I'm just wondering. Do you have a plan for that Tracy?

Tracy Sterling: I met with CISM staff last week and we discussed that. The Center is in my department so I will default into being the staff's direct supervisor, unless we appoint an interim director (though we haven't really explored that). That's one of the ideas Liz has on her list. In terms of the \$15,000, I think it would be appropriate and allowable if Liz were to extend her stay as Director, if she wants to do that, given that the money was targeted toward base.

Liz Galli-Noble: We are supposed to get half of that money, which is \$7,500 less 17.5% IDCs; that leaves about \$6,400. That doesn't even cover one month of my pay and benefits. Gina is moving \$15,000; half of it is for the Center and she's hoping to use the other half to support a conference that is being planned right now. But it's not 100% that that conference will happen in 2014.

Gina Ramos: The other half of the \$15,000 is for the Weeds Across Borders conference.

Tracy Sterling: So [Liz] would need a larger pool of money in order to remain as Director.

Eileen Ryce: My concern for the Center is not necessarily about how to get the Center through the next year, but about the sustainability of it. From what I've seen and heard, I'm not sure if the Center staying affiliated with MSU will help it be sustainable into the future. It seems like there have been issues with getting political support. It's surprising to me that with as much political attention invasive species have been getting in Montana, the Center really hasn't been able to make much stride. I'm not sure if that's due to lack of ability to lobby or lack of ability to get the Center more recognized on a political front; but my concern is just seeing the Center become more sustainable. I think it definitely has a role to play in the national arena and it concerns me that, if it keeps going the way it is, it's going to be out of business by the end of next year. I don't know if trying to team up with another organization or following a model like the Invasive Species Advisory Committee would help, but it does seem like something drastic would have to happen to keep the Center sustainable past next year. Alternatively, maybe we just agree that the Center is going to live out its life and finish the projects that are budgeted and then move on to other things.

Gina Ramos: Now that MSU has asked for a sunset plan, have they said that they just want the Center out of MSU?

Tracy Sterling: No, MSU has not said that. The Center was started with our state senator for regional emphasis, and so it's always been on the cusp of state versus regional. The state has shown its support through housing the Center, thousands of dollars in rental contributions, and helping with payroll, accounting, and those sorts of things. I think that because it's a regional center it is difficult to create multiple units supporting the Center. That just hasn't evolved. One of the components was that it did not become part of a faculty position because Roger hired a director, and that became the model. If it had been part of a faculty member's position, then that might have created a bit more sustainability. Getting to Gina's question about whether or not MSU wants the Center, MSU values greatly everything the Center has done, as evidenced by supporting it and housing it for many years. The department also values the Center greatly for the attention it brings it.

The Center's being on the fence between state and regional has muddied the water. Because there is no infusion of dollars since the earmark days, it's difficult for MSU to pick that up because of the Center's regional focus. And I don't think it is MSU's responsibility to pick it up entirely, we've picked up a lot in terms of managing the personnel, accounts, space, etc. If we had an infusion of dollars, that would be wonderful. I'm not familiar with Eileen's idea, but other ideas have been pursued over the years to try and get sustainable funding, and MSU had to take a stand: if there is no sustainable funding, MSU can't fund it as it has a regional emphasis.

Mike Ielmini: Tracy, does MSU have other examples of programs or centers that are functioning and conducting business and providing support and/or research outside the bounds of the state of Montana?

Tracy Sterling: We have the Water Center, but that's federal dollars that come to each state and that center is located in Bozeman even though it's a statewide program. It relies on federal dollars. It interacts with a lot of other states because it focuses on water issues.

Mike Ielmini: If MSU sees value in working outside the bounds of the state of Montana on invasive species, would MSU be interested in housing and continuing this great support that it has done so well? Is MSU going to continue that support even without a director, after Liz leaves, in the future?

Tracy Sterling: Because it's in my department, I would have to be part of that decision, and I'd also have to propose it to the dean. I don't think that's a very sustainable model without a director. I've been thinking about how to move forward and have accepted the responsibility of supervising the staff of the Center, but I don't think that's a really good model. I was hoping the Steering Committee would elect a chair, who could rally regional support to make the Center permanent. But at this point, we've gone through a year of that and it's not looking good.

Mike Ielmini: That leads us to the question that I've been asking Liz: what the Steering Committee is and what added value it offers? Are we a steering committee? Are we some sort of decision making body? Are we reviewers/approvers or a board of directors? Most of the time, when you have this organizational structure, you put people in these positions to play those types of roles. What I'm starting to hear, more often than not, is that you are not really interested in the Steering Committee's decision making or approvals or credibility as much as the Steering Committee's role as fundraisers. Is that still the case?

Tracy Sterling: I guess I disagree.

Mike Ielmini: What role will the Steering Committee play in how the Center operates, where it's housed, how it's funded, who the director is, how that person functions, and what types of projects they work on? Is that the kind of thing you're thinking of in the future? This has been brought up for years, even before Liz started, and it's important to note that because, again, many years ago, the need for sustainability was recognized and the advice and counsel of this board/Committee, which I served on, has been largely ignored up to today, where we're looking at the end of the Center. That's been directly communicated to the university and both directors of the Center. So I'm wondering what the future holds for this body that we have on the phone. Are we here to offer advice that doesn't get taken, or direction that isn't communicated properly somehow, or are we going to play a different role in the future? Because if we're just fundraisers, if we're just supposed to go out there and rattle the cup, everybody knows that federal funding is zero. There's not going to be any money from the feds. That's one of the reasons the earmark went away, and that's not going to change. If we're just raising funds, then that's really not the role of a board or steering committee, it's something else—development.

Tracy Sterling: Any comments from the Steering Committee? I'm an *ad hoc* member.

Eileen Ryce: I think it's a valid point and it gets back to the question of, is our role just to get the Center through next year or are we looking at options for sustainability? If it's the latter, then we're starting to exhaust the avenues for the small pots of soft money needed to become sustainable. It's going to have to be something more than that. If we are just going to become a fundraising body...

Tracy Sterling: I don't think that was the goal of anything that I said.

Eileen Ryce: I think that we need to discuss whether we're serious about making it sustainable and if that's the case, then I don't think we have any other options other than to make significant changes. I haven't seen much in the way of a plan that's going to get us past next year. I'm not sure if there are any options out there that will help the Center become sustainable.

Tracy Sterling: Liz fought valiantly for lots of those options, with the help of the state Department of Agriculture, federal partners, and so on. I've also asked her to engage with our development officer to try to find fundraising avenues over the last three years.

Well, if there are no other comments on that topic, it seems to me we don't quite have enough of the Steering Committee with us to move to the next level. I think Liz's notes would be a good start, but I'm not quite sure what to do without the majority of the Steering Committee here.

Mike Ielmini: If you're going to have a discussion, then you want as many people as you can get, but if you're not making decisions and you want to move things forward, there's always going to be times when people can't make the meetings. That's not unusual. Is there anything else we should discuss today?

Virgil Dupuis announced that he had joined late, bringing the number of Steering Committee members present to six.

Gina Ramos: Has there been any thought of merging with another center?

Liz Galli-Noble: We work really closely with some other centers, the Invasive Plant Atlas of New England, which has more or less shut down, and the Midwest Invasive Plant Network, which is really struggling. We work with Cal-IPC a little bit and we work closely with the Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health at the University of Georgia. I haven't talked to anybody about merging, and I don't know if it's even possible. If people want to explore that, it's fine with me.

Mike Ielmini: Are we obligated to continue basing the Center out of MSU? If MSU is saying that they don't see sustainability in the future, has no budget for base, no chance of functioning without a director, are they saying it's over in one year?

Tracy Sterling: That's how I see it, Mike.

Mike Ielmini: I just wanted to be clear about this so we're not making assumptions. So in one year, there's an opportunity for CISM to move and/or be dissolved. Is that correct?

Tracy Sterling: That is correct. Or find a solution to flourish.

Mike Ielmini: Well, a solution may include moving. It will have to move because MSU won't fund it, unless someone gives MSU money. Is that correct?

Tracy Sterling: Yes, that is correct.

Mike Ielmini: So we have to move if we want the Center to continue, with or without a director.

Gina Ramos: Is this an operation that can be moved if needed?

Mike Ielmini: It's an entirely virtual operation; we have housing for the staff, the administrative support that MSU has been providing...otherwise, you can write grant proposals and do projects from your desktop. You don't need bricks and mortar to do that kind of work. So, it could be coordinated to work anywhere.

Dave Burch: I agree with what's being said and regardless, if we had base funding for [CISM], it could be housed anywhere. And anybody would probably take it on if you had the funding to do it. MSU is not really in tune to do it because there isn't going to be any funding there for anyone or for a director or staff or whatever. So, we as a group need to decide what our real role is—are we going to be fundraisers and try to get baseline funding for this so we can house this program somewhere, whether it's in MT or another place? If we as a group are exhausting our potential for trying to find that funding, then I don't see any choice but to let this go at the end of this year, as in the plan. The Montana Department of Agriculture has put a lot of money into this program but we can't continue to do that. If other states were joining in, which we've talked to them about and can't get them to do, then I really don't see the light at the end of the tunnel, where we're going to be able to sustain this program. From this Board's perspective, when Roger started the Center, bringing in a million dollars a year was pretty easy. Unfortunately, that's no longer the case. Unless there is some magic pot of funding out there that we're not seeing, then I don't see how we're going to sustain that program. That's what is really going to drive this committee and what we do in this next few months. If we decide as a group that we've exhausted all of our avenues, and we're just going to run it out, then I think that changes the role of this committee quite a bit. I'll leave it at that, but it's not the best looking picture in the world because I don't know where we'd get baseline funding.

We just went through this with Montana's noxious weed education program. Until you get baseline funding, you can't be very effective because you're always looking for money. I don't have answers for where we find that money. If it's not a high priority for the feds or states or universities or whoever, then we're not going to be able to find the money we need, even though, like Eileen said, invasive species have been at the forefront over the last couple of years. Why isn't there other funding coming in for invasive species, and especially to the Center, which has proven itself not only in the terrestrial world but also the invasives world and proven that it can coordinate efforts in this region? I just took a survey from the Western Governors Association and that's what they think needs to happen, to have coordinated efforts within this region to be able to fight invasive species. So, somewhere or another we're missing each other and it's not going to end well for the Center I'm afraid.

Mike Ielmini: Dave, why do you think that, of all the western states who have taken such great advantage of the Center's work, centralized as well as it is and tied so closely to groups like WWCC, NAISMA, NAISN, etc., why don't they see added value to the Center after all these years and why aren't they willing to fund it?

Dave Burch: I don't know. We point blank asked the same question, in regards to the Missouri River Watershed Coalition, last year at the Western Weed Coordinating Committee meeting. We asked if the states would donate or put up \$5,000 or \$10,000 and nobody was willing to do that, other than Wyoming and Montana. The WWCC barely gets along anyway, and all they do is have one meeting per year. It gets support, but there's no executive director or staff for it. It's all volunteer based and whatever money we bring in is enough to run the meeting and that's about it. We have put in \$350,000 of state (MDA) money and Forest Service money to help run the MRWC—and we can't even get support from the states who benefit from the MRWC ten times more than what they'd have to put into it. If I give \$10,000 and every other state does the same, that's all we really need. What the CIG project brought in is triple what we've spent, so to me it was a win-win situation. That's what the Center was supposed to do. I guess it's just because funding is tight and getting tighter. I'm still not ready to roll over and die though because there's a lot of value in the Center and what it can do. I think Liz and her crew have shown that. I don't know where the rest of the Steering Committee is sitting. I've talked to FICMNEW and I understand you [the feds] have problems as well but somewhere out there we've got to be able to tighten the priorities and find some funding to get this thing going again, or to keep it going with a new director, whether or not it's at MSU or even in Montana. MSU has, over the past few years, donated quite a bit of money and they also given up some IDCs.

Mike Ielmini: I don't see too many options because whether the Steering Committee's ideas or advice matter anymore or not is immaterial. The only option we have is to watch the clock until the year's out and then fold up the tent or spend some time between now and October 2014 getting the Center realigned with another university or

organization. That would be worth the investment because I'm hearing you have the flexibility with the time of the staff and you have base funding coming into the Center from BLM, which could help. So I would invest in finding a new place to camp and maybe starting all over from scratch, instead of hoping that funding will fall from heaven, because that's not going to happen. I don't doubt that MSU has been very helpful, and all these other facets of administration must be accounted for. Also note that the agencies have, on their own and through other organizations, funded operations and projects and continue to do that. For example, the Missouri River Watershed Coalition, which Dave mentioned. We've put a lot of money into that and it would hardly exist without a lot of federal funding and state support. I would suggest the Steering Committee act like a steering committee and steer, instead of just riding along until the bus goes over the cliff.

Would it be worth it to develop a budget operations structure in addition to this "transition" plan for sunseting CISM? Transitioning isn't the correct word because it implies new leadership coming in, and adjusting to that leadership. The term "sunset" tells me it's a death knell for a year of operations and then it's over. So I suggest developing a plan with an accompanying financial package and moving the Center out of MSU.

We don't have to decide today because we don't have a quorum. We are beating a horse and at this stage it's dying, so let's think about it really hard.

Tracy Sterling: Having a chair would help our meetings.

Dave Burch: Let's send the minutes of this meeting out to the other Steering Committee members and get a consensus from them. I still want to see the Center go the way it should be going. What I'm hearing now and what I've heard in the past, though, is that we're not going to be able to sustain it. Let's be realistic about it and end it, like the plan that's already in place, which will run it until October/November of next year, and if we have to pick up the pieces and try again at some other point in time, somebody can lead that charge and we can jump on the bandwagon and do it again. I agree with Mike. I think we need to follow Liz's plan and be done with it.

Mike Ielmini: That's a good idea, Dave. But we've also got to look at future functionality and what the Center's really going to end up serving. What is its role in this day and age? When it first started, the situation on the ground was very different. There wasn't much coordination or a bunch of organizations, there weren't any outreach and education projects, and so things are different than they were when the Center was started. And perhaps what the Center is doing, or has been doing, as good as it is, may need to adapt and change in the future. For example, UGA [CISEH]. They've adapted and changed and continue to modify—they're based in Georgia and work worldwide. They're constantly building new partnerships outside of their state. They would be a great partner for CISM, if not a co-managed operation.

Dave Burch: I'd have to agree with you, Mike. I think the evolution of weed management and invasive species management has changed. That's what the Montana Weed Control Association went through too. When that group really got going, none of the agencies had a weed program or coordinated education activities, so [the MWCA] did that for them. Now, all the agencies have education people or programs. It's just an evolutionary thing that's happened. The MWCA went from a little group to a non-profit group with 800-900 members and is now running well. But I think that's the same way with the Center; maybe it's run its course with what it traditionally does and needs to find new and innovative things to do. I know CISM has done a lot with the group Mike just mentioned (CISEH) and a lot of people have talked about what this Center has done. Maybe we just are at that point where we need to rethink and restructure.

Mike Ielmini: I think that's where the Steering Committee could play a role. If the Steering Committee advises to rethink and restructure and adapt and change, but MSU isn't willing to change because of the Center's regional approach, then we can't help them. One of the ways it could change is to expand its regional scope to a national scope to gain more partners. An example is discussions with the Steering Committee to change the name from the Center for

Invasive Plant Management to CISM. This was done for two reasons: to expand its national scope to gain more partners and reach out to new stakeholders and provide more services that would, in turn, provide more opportunities for funding. Obviously that's soft money most of the time, but you can only do so much for the weed community in Montana because eventually you're going to run out of customers. The Center needs to look for a better customer base, and needs to figure out how to sell itself, show people what value it adds. Liz has been extremely successful with that.

Liz Galli-Noble: Should we wrap this up and talk about scheduling another meeting? Or do people want to continue this discussion? We will send the minutes of this meeting out to the rest of the Steering Committee shortly.

Mike Ielmini: When is your end date, Liz?

Liz Galli-Noble: September 30.

You have almost 14 months of full funding for the Center before the doors will close.

I'm very thankful that the people on the phone today are willing to have a discussion about this. Closing the doors of the Center is an option, but I think there are other options as well, now that more people are really thinking about it and talking about it. The shockwaves are starting to move through our partners. I'm already having people ask me, if money came through tomorrow, would you stay?

I've been telling people for two years that this was coming and nobody did anything about it. I felt that I needed to step back for something to happen. Maybe we are going to close our doors, but we have an entire year to have this dialogue. The situation we have here with MSU, as far as infrastructure and admin and technical support, is excellent: we have great office space and a strong team working right now at the Center. There is good and bad in all of this.

Mike Ielmini: This is good that you have lined things out so well to keep things going for the next year. I disagree that we have opportunities for more dialogue here. You will be gone, there won't be a director. We still have not articulated what role the Steering Committee will play and whether we have any kind of decision making authority or if we're just a sounding board. If we haven't been listened to, as we've seen for years, and all we have left is communication with MSU between now and 2014, what's going to change? They already made their point. We agree and we've suggested moving.

There's no accountability for what we say. I don't see it being that useful. I don't see a return on that. We're busting our chops and we have been for years. Essentially, it stems from this attitude that the taxpayers of America are going to pay for what MSU is not willing to do. And so the people in Connecticut, Florida, and Kansas are supposed to pay tax money to the federal government to agencies like ours to fund base operations for something that isn't even serving them, or isn't willing to serve them. That's the issue we have to wrestle with. What added value does this offer to the rest of the country that justifies us spending taxpayer money on the issue? If it's regionally driven and serves mostly the local people in those states, and clearly those governors are not willing to fund it, what message does that send to the people of Connecticut or California? The answer is, not on our watch. They're not going to do it. It's just reality. So is there another option? The options we've suggested have not been tried, or they've been belittled. The opportunities we've given haven't been followed up on. So I guess the answer is that it's over in one year. And if anybody is interested in restarting the Center with a sustainable model or earmarks, then we'll be successful. It's tough out there right now.

So are we going to have a dialogue between now and the end of September about the Steering Committee's role? Looking at the information Liz has sent out to us, reminding of the Steering Committee's role and charter and that sort of thing, it wasn't as clear as it could have been from a decision-maker standpoint; although it does note relationships with MSU, the oversight and responsibilities, and it notes things about communication. But it's unclear about long-term decisions or programmatic and financial issues. We might vote on what we think should happen, but it hasn't been put into play in the past.

Liz Galli-Noble: So Mike, to summarize what you just said, you feel it would be crucial during the next call—which will be before I leave—to make one of the key focuses be the role of the Steering Committee. Is that correct?

Mike Ielmini: I think that should be one of them. Think about the logic of what's happening here. You have a director leaving, you have one year's worth of soft money for projects and to keep staff employed to do those projects, and you have a Steering Committee that is in sort of a gray zone in terms of its responsibility, being asked how to help figure out a solution to what's going to happen in one year. Between MSU and its leadership and support, and the Steering Committee's role, that's the only place you can make decisions on where this is going. If the Steering Committee suggests we keep it at MSU and we offer some recommendations to MSU on what they should do to change the way things are operating and what role they should play in helping sustain the Center into the future, how much of that does MSU need to follow? Obviously you don't want to offer someone advice if they just can't do it for some reason or they aren't willing to do it. But we are advisors; we aren't managing CISM. So what are we doing here? What are we helping with? Are we just providing advice and somehow it looks like there just aren't any solutions? Or if we say, hey MSU, nice working with you, we are recommending the staff of the Center take the project work they're doing, and the money that was given to them by the customers, and leave and go finish their work somewhere else. Is that feasible? They wouldn't have any incurred costs at MSU at that point. That's something that might happen. What would be the response from MSU to that?

Tracy Sterling: Well, for grants that are already in place, MSU probably wouldn't allow them to move.

Mike Ielmini: So if the staff decides to leave, what would MSU's approach be to completing the work that they've been paid to do?

Tracy Sterling: We would have to hire someone to do that. We'd need to bring the staff opinions into this as well. But if there were any recommendations or solutions from the Steering Committee for the institution, we would be grateful and review them and do the best we can given the conditions.

Mike Ielmini: If the University of Idaho or University of Florida decided they would be more than willing to house CISM, and hire that staff on to work with them, would MSU be interested in transferring those projects and the funding that was provided by those agencies over to the new university to continue?

Tracy Sterling: I would have to talk with someone higher up to know what their response would be. But the funds have been awarded to MSU, so it's in MSU's hands at this point. I suspect MSU's answer would be that such a move wouldn't make sense, as the projects are going to be done in a year anyway.

Mike Ielmini: A year is a long way away and there is a lot of work to be done. And there's \$15,000 coming in to do more work. So I'm assuming there's plenty of work and I'm wondering, if the Steering Committee says they found a solution and the solution is that they're going to pull up the stakes and find a partner willing to house the Center in a new location, we don't want to miss a beat and we don't want the Center to lose credibility, we just want to quickly move and resume business as usual, how hard would it be for MSU to cut the cord?

Tracy Sterling: I think if it were packaged in that sentiment, I think we could work through it. But I don't know the rules. It seems like a reasonable and smart move to me.

Mike Ielmini: We're just looking for options here. I just want to know that, if MSU won't fund the Center, it's willing to let it move somewhere else.

Tracy Sterling: If that was something the Steering Committee wanted to move forward, we could certainly explore it further.

Mike Ielmini: I think we should explore that and know what the situation would be and how hard it would be because if we're going to spend the time and energy to go find a new landing zone and find the political powers to make that happen...we should know if it's not going to work, so we won't waste our time.

Tracy Sterling: We've made good progress today, thank you for creating an arena for discussion.

5. Schedule next Steering Committee Meeting

Liz was asked to send out a Doodle poll to schedule another Steering Committee meeting in early to mid-September, and to contact Roger Sheley about becoming the Steering Committee chair.

CISM Financial Summary 2000-2013

August 1, 2013

Blue text indicates funding available for CISM staff

MSU Index #	Award Year	Funding Source Grant Title or Project Title	Amount Awarded	Amount Spent (to date)	Amount Remaining	Notes	*IDC rate
Current Funding							
4W2801	9/2009-9/2014	CESU Agreement, BLM: Old FY 2006 remaining \$400,000 2/2013 = \$10,000	400,000 10,000	400,000 0	0 8,201		17.5%
4W3766	9/2011-9/2013	#4. Missouri River Watershed Coalition – MT NWTF +USFS S&P • Wild Dakota TV videos, Part II = \$6,500 • Sportsman’s Guide printing = \$3,000	30,382 6,500 3,118	24,206 3,000 3,118	6,176 3,500 0		0%
4W4265	11/2012-9/2014	#6. Missouri River Watershed Coalition – MT NWTF +USFS S&P	10,000	48	9,952		0%
4W4382	3/2013 – 12/2013	#7. Missouri River Watershed Coalition - Wyoming + USFS S&P *Paying CISEH \$4,500 to maintain EDDMapS West program	5,000	*5,000	0		10%
Obligated ??	8/2013-8/2014	#8. Missouri River Watershed Coalition – MT NWTF +USFS S&P	10,000		?		0%
423188 Restricted Acct	4/2012	Missouri River Watershed Coalition efforts: EDDMapS West Android App, Sportsman’s Guide printing, etc.	15,000 2,250	10,868 2,083	4,132* 167	*CISEH needs to invoice for Android dev.	4%
4W3339	10/2010 - 9/2013 9/2014	NRCS – Conservation Innovation Grant (MRWC) • Personnel (salaries + benefits) • Travel • Supplies • Communications • Contracted Services • Equipment Rental • Other Expenses • Equipment Purchase • IDCs Total - CIG Project	261,725 54,500 15,000 30,000 492,688 0 0 30,000 116,087 1,000,000	240,015+ 19,118 7,238 400 217,846+ 1,000+ 214+ 0 67,763 553,586	21,710 35,382 7,762 29,600 274,842 0 0 30,000 48,324 ~430,000	See attached revised CIG budget request for project Year 4 Staff funding = \$140,000	15%
4W4462	6/2013-6/2014	NWTF Grant – <i>Mapping Noxious Weeds in Montana</i> Publication	10,000	196	9,804		
Obligated	7/2013	DoD 2014 Webinar – waiting for contract	36,170		?		
Potential 433234	9/2013	DuPont 2014 Webinar Series	\$50,000		?		
Obligated 4W2801	8/2013	BLM (CISM support and WAB 2014)	\$15,000		?		
433234 Design Acct	NA	CISM Services (sales/services/weed models) + CISM Products • DuPont Webinar Series (Nov 2012-April 2013; \$25,000)	NA 25,000	NA 25,000	28,428 0		0-4%
437470	NA	CISM Indirect Cost Account (\$28,000 FY2012 coming)	NA	NA	36,058		NA
Current Funding Total					\$509,418		

Previous Funding							
427089		Congressional Appropriation – Cooperative Agreement w/ BLM:					
	4/2000-9/2009	FY 2000 \$500,000	450,000	450,000	0		10%
		FY 2001 \$500,000	450,000	450,000	0		
		FY 2002 \$1 million	900,000	900,000	0		
		FY 2003 \$1 million	893,700	893,700	0		
		FY 2004 \$1 million	889,000	889,000	0		
4W0094	9/2009	FY 2005 \$500,000	444,000	444,000	0		10% +
4W2801		FY 2006 \$1 million + \$12,000 + \$10,000	908,000	See above	See above		17.5%
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	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	
4W2035	3/2008	DOT - Federal Highway Admin People powered projects: National CWMA conference	25,000	25,000	0		
March 2008 - New CISM Director							
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	0%
4W2443	12/2008	Western IPM Center Invasive Plants in Natural Areas: Connecting Regional Centers Across the U.S.	10,000	10,000	0	Completed 10/09	20%
433234	6/2008	DuPont Corporation (donation)	4,000	4,000	0		5%
NA	4/2009	MSU Extension; Montguide Revisions	1,800	1,800	0		0%
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 10,000	0 0	Contract end 2/7/10: \$2,500 returned	0%
4W2453	12/2008-5/2010	Western IPM Center Invasive Plant Inventory and Survey Methods for Land Managers: A Web Seminar Series	36,950	36,950	0	Completed 5/10	20%
4W2525	12/2008-6/2010	DoD Legacy Program Strategic Management of Invasive Species Workshop	114,216	114,216	0	Completed 6/10	17.5%
4W2542	3/2009-6/2010	MT Dept of Agriculture, NWTF Assessing plant community and soil characteristics after saltcedar invasion and treatment	25,500	25,500	0	Completed 6/10	0%
4W1720	6/2007-9/2010	Salish Kootenai College Spatial Modeling of Invasive Flowering Rush in the Columbia River Headwaters	18,720	18,720	0	Completed 9/10	25%
4W2978	1/2010-12/2010	USFWS 2010 Weeds Across Borders Conference	46,933	46,933	0	Completed 12/2010	17.5%
4W2185	5/2008-9/2010	Montana Dept of Agriculture, MT NWTF + USFS S&P #1. Missouri River Watershed Coalition	100,000	86,876 13,124	0 0		0%
4W2809	9/2009-9/2012	Montana Dept of Agriculture, MT NWTF + USFS S&P #2. Missouri River Watershed Coalition	100,000	76,332 16,368 7,300	0	Extension to 9/2012	0%
4W2782	9/2009-8/2012	CSREES (NIFA) Microbial Biocontrol Symposium	10,000	10,000	0	closed 8/2012	0%
4W3802	9/2011-9/2012	WY Department of Ag + USFS S&P #5. Missouri River Watershed Coalition	11,000	11,000	0		10%
4W3918	1/2012-12/2012	NAISN Workshop Coordination + NAISN Website	20,425 + 6,000	26,425	0		0%
4W3703	8/2011-12/2012	DoD Legacy Program Strategic Management of Invasive Species Workshop	103,000	103,000	0		17.5%

4W3374	10/2010 - 9/2013	#3. Missouri River Watershed Coalition – MT NWTF +USFS S&P <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Coordination • Wild Dakota Television Show • Hunter Education Booklet • CISEH MRWC-EDDMapS Expansion Project 	130,000 79,690 7,500 12,810 30,000	79,690 7,500 12,810 30,000	0 0 0 0		0%
4W4287	11/2012-7/2013	Fort Belknap Indian Community + MT NWTF Develop Noxious Weed Mgt Plan	5,000	5,000	0		0%
4W4316	1/2013-6/2013	Algoma University NAISN Website Development	6,000 + 10,000	16,000	0		0%

Possible Funding for CIPM – Pending Grant Applications

2013

- \$5,000-\$8,000 – NIFA; MSU Extension Coordination Grant (Barry Jacobsen) (?)
*CISM assistance with smartphone app and outreach products
- \$20,000 for CISM - Camp Monaco Prize Grant, EDRR program for the GYCC (decision: Sept 2013)

Rejected CIPM Grant Funding:

2012

- \$71,130 – APHIS 10201 Farm Bill suggestion; Invasive Plant Models and ID and Control Cards (rejected, 3/2013)
- \$25,000 – APHIS 10201 Farm Bill suggestion: Outreach, National Ed Program; lead CISEH (rejected 3/2012)
- \$191,982 – MSU Strategic Investment Proposal for Institutional Priorities, (rejected: Feb 27, 2013)
- \$11,000 – SD Weed & Pest Council – MRWC Outreach Support (rejected: Feb 2013)
- \$7,162,000: \$1,240,000 for CISM – Lead: UNL (Private Foundation); **Proposed** Invasive Species Biofuels Project (rejected: Feb 12 2013)
- \$200,000 for MRWC – 2013 Western S&PF Competitive Resource Allocation Multi-state Grant (rejected: Dec 2012)
MT DNRC, saltcedar/Russian olive, biomass project focus
- \$150,000 for MRWC – 2013 Western S&PF Competitive Resource Allocation Multi-state Grant (rejected: Dec 2012); CO Dept Forestry; general MRWC support funding
- \$72,950 – NFWF America’s Great Outdoors/Land Stewardship Program: Capacity Building for MRWC (Proposal rejected Sept 20, 2012)
- \$32,765 - Wyoming Weed and Pest Council: Wyoming Weed and Pest Council Website Redesign, Contracted Services proposal (rejected: May 2012)
- \$30,000 – NFWF PTI Grant: Protecting Wildlife Habitat: Sportsman’s Guide to Invasive Species (Preproposal rejected 6/2012)
- \$15,000 – NFWF PTI Grant: Expansion of the Wild Dakota Invasive Species Video Series (Preproposal rejected 6/2012)
- ~\$180,000 – APHIS Farm Bill 10201 Suggestion: Tribal Grant with CSKT and Blackfeet Tribe (rejected, 5/2012)
- \$86,350 – APHIS Farm Bill 10201 Suggestion: Plant Pest Outreach & Ed in the MRWC states (rejected, 5/2012)
- \$55,000 – NFWF PTI Grant: Plastic Weed Model and ID Card Production (Proposal rejected: 3/2012) + \$15,000 CIPM cash match + \$6,000 committed by GYCC to fund a 5th species model.
- \$33,542 – NWTF/USFS S&P: INVADERS/MRWC EDDMapS Database Merger Project (Draft Proposal submitted: 11/23/2011)
- \$87,461 – NWTF/USFS S&P: Columbia River Watershed Coalition-Project Coordination (Draft Proposal submitted: 11/23/2011)
- \$35,472-\$45,472 – NWTF/USFS S&P: EDRR and MRWC-EDDMapS Train-the-Trainer Workshop (Draft Proposal submitted: 11/27/2011)
- \$300,000 for CIPM - NSF Informal Science Education Grant; leads: U Conn and U Georgia; 3-year, \$3 million project; CIPM western partner in Years 3, 4, 5; (Proposal rejected: 6/2012)
- \$17,400 – USFWS National Wildlife Refuge System (Regional Grant): Expansion of the Wild Dakota Invasive Species Video Series (Pre-proposal rejected 9/20/11)
- \$73,000 – USFWS National Wildlife Refuge System (Regional Grant): Expansion of WIYW Program to MRW (Preproposal rejected 9/20/11)
- \$32,300 – USFWS: Translation of the USFWS National Wildlife Refuge System *Managing Invasive Plants* website into Spanish (never heard back)
- \$10,000 – MT FWP funding, Fort Belknap Indian Community; help write trail weed mgt plan (rejected: project changed 7/2012)

2011

- \$44.6 Million (5-year project) – USDA-NIFA, Agriculture & Food Research Initiative (Sustainable Energy) proposal: MSU/Johns Hopkins University; *Smokeless Pyrolysis of Woody Biomass in the NW for Biofuel Production and Biochar Carbon Sequestration*
CIPM – Extension Team +\$620,000 for CIPM staff (submitted 9/10, rejected: 2/2011)
- \$47,000 - Montana Noxious Weed Trust Fund – 3rd Round of Plastic Weed Models and Identification Cards (submitted 10/10, rejected: 3/4/2011)
- \$125,000 – USFWS: *Great Northern LCC: Integrating Invasive Species Data for the Great Northern LCC: Solutions for data collection and management proposal*; USGS, University of Colorado, UGA (CISEH), CIPM (rejected, May 26, 2011) *CIPM~\$20,000; host 2 workshops in Bozeman
- \$54,000 – APHIS Farm Bill 10201 Suggestion: Plastic Weed Models and ID Cards (rejected, June 2011)
- \$385,000 – APHIS Farm Bill 10201 Suggestion: MRWC Outreach and Awareness Program (rejected, June 2011)

- \$176,842 – EPA: Preproposal: Expanding the Montana Invasive Plant Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) Program: An Ounce of Prevention is Worth a Pound of Active Ingredient (rejected, July 10, 2011) *CIPM - \$10,000
- \$25,000 – NFWF PTI Grant: Expansion of Invasive Species Educational Booklet (Preproposal rejected 8-8-2011)
- \$15,000 – NFWF PTI Grant: Expansion of the Wild Dakota Invasive Species Video Series (Preproposal rejected 8-8-2011)
- \$75,000 – NFWF PTI Grant: Expansion of WIYW Program to MRW (Preproposal rejected 8-8-2011)
- \$50,000 – MT NWTF: Base funding for Campaign Program (Liz submitted draft workplan July 31, 2011, rejected 11/22/2011)

CISM Program Costs – Projected CISM annual program costs (October 1, 2013)

1. CISM Staff Salaries

Rindos (1.0 FTE), Weiss (0.75 FTE), Bockness (1.0 FTE)

Monthly Total **Annual Total**
\$10,350 **\$124,200**

2. CISM Staff Benefits

(Rindos, Weiss, Bockness)

Monthly Total **Annual Total**
\$4,250 **\$51,000**

Total Staff Salaries & Benefits = \$175,200/year

3. Communications (phones, long distance calls, faxes, stamps, etc.)

Monthly Total **Annual Total**
\$100 **\$1,200**

4. Travel (travel not covered by specific projects)

Monthly Total **Annual Total**
\$250 **\$3,000**

5. Rent (CISM storage unit)

Monthly Total **Annual Total**
\$50 **\$600**

6. Office Supplies/Materials & Equipment (computers, printers, paper, office supplies, print cartridges, etc.)

Monthly Total **Annual Total**
\$200-\$250 **\$2,500**

7. Repair & Maintenance (equipment repair & maintenance)

Monthly Total **Annual Total**
\$75 **\$900**

8. Other (subscriptions, publication purchases, dues, etc.)

Annual Total
~\$500-\$1,000

Total CISM operational expenses and program annual costs: ~\$184,400

CISM Program Costs – Projected CISM annual program costs, including CISM Director (October 1, 2013)

<u>1. CISM Staff Salaries</u> Director (1.0 FTE), Rindos (1.0 FTE), Weiss (0.75 FTE), Bockness (1.0 FTE)	Monthly Total \$15,650	Annual Total \$187,800
<u>2. CISM Staff Benefits</u> (Director, Rindos, Weiss, Bockness)	Monthly Total \$6,040	Annual Total \$72,480
Total Staff Salaries & Benefits = <u>\$260,280/year</u>		
<u>3. Communications</u> (phones, long distance calls, faxes, stamps, etc.)	Monthly Total \$100	Annual Total \$1,200
<u>4. Travel</u> (travel not covered by specific projects)	Monthly Total \$250	Annual Total \$3,000
<u>5. Rent</u> (CISM storage unit)	Monthly Total \$50	Annual Total \$600
<u>6. Office Supplies/Materials & Equipment</u> (computers, printers, paper, office supplies, print cartridges, etc.)	Monthly Total \$200-\$250	Annual Total \$2,500
<u>7. Repair & Maintenance</u> (equipment repair & maintenance)	Monthly Total \$75	Annual Total \$900
<u>8. Other</u> (subscriptions, publication purchases, dues, etc.)	Annual Total ~\$500-\$1,000	

Total CISM operational expenses and program annual costs: ~\$268,480

NOTES

Preparation for August 13, 2013 Steering Committee meeting

August 7, 2013

Suggestions from July 18, 2013 Steering Committee meeting:

1. Need a new approach for sustainability
2. Delve into a discussion with MSU and the Center; see if we can't get this current situation to work a little better
3. Develop an interim plan addressing CISM management, the need for interim or acting director, and the need for structure in order to raise money
4. Multiple university or multiple state consortium outlined through an MOU
5. Need for involvement and support from within the university
6. MSU supports the Center and its goals; but it cannot take on providing funding for CISM
7. MSU has given CISM one-time-only funding and has asked for a sunset plan for CISM
8. Flesh out an outline of steps that we need to take to implement a new plan for CISM; this could be pitched to the Dean or someone else at MSU to garner their support
9. Could the Center operate virtually and not need to be housed on a campus?
10. Caution: a multiple-university model was tried from the beginning for the Center; it did not work, which is why the Congressional earmark route was chosen
11. Tapping the Western Governors Association

Other possible new models for CISM:

1. Enter into cooperative agreements with state and federal agencies to provide funding for CISM—this is how the Montana Noxious Weed Education Campaign and other regional centers are partially funded
2. Approach entities such as national foundations to become one of their adjunct offices and take on administration/management of one or more of their national grant programs
3. Take on more than just a western regional focus; expand Center geographical focus and activities to match the needs of a wide array of invasive species partners/clients
4. Approach the Congressional Invasive Species Caucus
5. Garner support from governors' offices and state legislators

PLEASE BRING ADDITIONAL IDEAS AND EXAMPLES OF NEW MODELS TO THIS MEETING.

Center for Invasive Species Management
Preliminary Draft
Transition Plan: July 1, 2013 - October 1, 2014

Submitted by: Elizabeth Galli-Noble, CISM Director

Draft Date: August 2013

All recent edits to this document are highlighted in yellow.

PURPOSE

Dean Jeff Jacobsen sent the following email to Liz Galli-Noble and Tracy Sterling on March 27, 2013.

Email from Dean Jeff Jacobsen
Received: March 27, 2013

Liz and Tracy,

*The President, Provost and I met regarding your SIP and other documents that were provided to the President asking for money. I will be transferring as a one-time funding action: \$20,000 from the College of Agriculture academic account into the LRES academic account and \$15,000 from the Dean F&A account to your F&A account. The \$20,000 **MUST** be spent well in advance of the end of the MSU fiscal year. This is a total of \$35,000 from the Dean and Director to help as bridge support. My suggestion is to make some corrections soon (on the \$20,000) to ensure availability of these funds. The F&A monies will be transferred into Index 437470 and can be carried over as with other F&A funds.*

Given the tenuous nature of the funding stream for a number of years to CISM, I request that these funds support the following to the best extent possible: 1) finalize the sustainability effort which should also include a clear sunset strategy with calendar milestones, 2) prioritize core functions within the framework of these funds and current contracts, and 3) complete Montana-specific projects with this funding. To reiterate, this is bridge support and is a one-time-only contribution.

I hope that this assists CISM in your good work. Good luck.

jeff

Jeff Jacobsen

Dean and Director

College of Agriculture

Montana Agricultural Experiment Station

In fulfillment of Dean Jacobsen's request, Elizabeth Galli-Noble developed a preliminary draft of a transition plan for the Center. This is not a "sunset" plan, as Dr. Jacobsen specified in his email. It is instead a detailed plan of actions that the Center will take from now through October 1, 2014, specifically addressing all of CISM's current project commitments and contractually-obligated funding for core CISM staff. CISM projected actions beyond 2014 cannot be made given that state and federal grant environments are in flux and continue to shift. But it is highly likely that the same funding sources shown in this plan will continue to support CISM well into the future. Elizabeth Galli-Noble will submit a final CISM transition plan prior to her departure in late September 2013. This plan is also cited as an attachment in the CISM director's letter of resignation (dated: July 9, 2013).

BACKGROUND

CISM's Financial History 2000-2013

- 2000-2008: CISM generated \$5.5 million in Congressional earmark (95%) and other federal grant funding.
- 2009-2013: CISM generated ~\$2 million in soft-money grant funding.
- CISM program funding (2000-2013) generated more than \$685,000 in Indirect Costs.
 - Zero to 9% of the total IDCs generated were returned to CISM, annually; and 91 to 100% were retained by the MSU Vice President for Research, the College of Agriculture, and/or the LRES Department.
 - There were two exceptions to this pattern, however:
 1. Dr. Tracy Sterling returned a higher percentage of CISM's IDCs (retained by LRES), totaling \$38,554 from FY10, FY11, and FY12. Those amounts were: FY10: \$6,495; FY11: \$3,866; and FY12: \$3,193 + \$25,000 = \$38,554.
 2. After meeting with MSU President Cruzado, Dean Jacobsen agreed to give CISM \$35,000 in one-time-only funding, \$20,000 of which had to be spent prior to June 1, 2013. \$15,000 of these monies was returned CISM IDCs from the College of Agriculture, and \$20,000 was COA monies. CISM was notified of this action on March 27, 2013.
- 2011 and 2012
 - CISM continued working on 7 grant-funded projects
 - CISM was awarded 7 new grants totaling ~\$245,000
 - CISM submitted 32 new grant applications with various partners that were not funded (totaling ~\$10 million).
- 2012-2013: The first time in 12 years that CISM experienced failure to secure adequate funding to cover all Center operations. The Center is still fully funded through October 1, 2014 and all program obligations are still achievable, if the CISM Director's salary and benefits are eliminated.

CISM ACTIVITIES

July 1 – September 30, 2013

- CISM staff will continue to support all Center infrastructure, networks, and partnerships: websites, listservs, CISM Store, and select advisory duties.
- CISM staff will continue to work on several ongoing projects: Conservation Innovation Grant project, Missouri River Watershed Coalition Program Coordination, *Mapping Noxious Weeds in Montana* Publication, and EDDMapS West trainings.
- CISM will finalize several new project contracts in July and August.
- Elizabeth Galli-Noble will close out all completed project contracts and subcontracts.
- Elizabeth Galli-Noble will inform all project partners of the CISM program transition.
- Elizabeth Galli-Noble will write and submit several grant progress and final reports.
- Paperwork to extend the Conservation Innovation Grant project for one additional year and budget adjustments will be made by September 25, 2013. Scott Bockness will remain Co-PI and Dr. Tracy Sterling will take on Co-PI duties for Elizabeth Galli-Noble.
- Director Galli-Noble will terminate her position on September 30, 2013.

October 1, 2013 – October 1, 2014

- Emily Rindos and Kitty Weiss will work on the following projects:
 - Support Center infrastructure, networks, and partnerships
 - Missouri River Watershed Coalition Program Coordination
 - Conservation Innovation Grant project
 - *Mapping Noxious Weeds in Montana* Publication
 - EDDMapS West and PNEDN System Merger Project
 - DoD 2014 Webinar Series
 - DuPont 2014 Webinar Series

- Scott Bockness will continue to work full time on the Conservation Innovation Grant project as its Project Leader and Co-PI. Dr. Tracy Sterling will take over for Elizabeth Galli-Noble as the Co-PI on this grant during its fourth and final year. The project will terminate on September 25, 2014.

- *If funding permits, a portion of Kim Goodwin’s salary and benefits will also be covered (estimated: two to five months at 0.5 FTE).

The table below outlines CISM project funding sources that will be tapped during the 15-month time period: July 1, 2013 to October 1, 2014.

CISM Staff

Emily Rindos – 1.0 FTE, CISM Assistant Director

Emilyn (Kitty) Weiss – 0.75 FTE, CISM E-Communications Coordinator

Scott Bockness – 1.0 FTE, Conservation Innovation Grant Project Leader/Co-PI

*Kim Goodwin – 0.5 FTE, Montana Weed Prevention Program/CISM Research Associate

CISM Funding Sources for CISM Staff Activities: August 1, 2013 – October 1, 2014

CISM Account	Amount Available for CISM Operations (As of: 8/1/2013)	Use of Funding
<i>Secured Funding Sources</i>		
433234 – CISM Designated Account	\$28,400	Rindos – 5-25% 15 months Weiss – 5-25% 15 months Phones, storage unit
437470 – Galli-Noble IDC Account	\$36,000	Rindos – 5-25% 15 months Weiss – 5-25% 15 months Phones, misc operations
4W2801 – BLM, CESU Agreement	\$8,200	Rindos – 5% 15 months Weiss - 5% 15 months
4W3339 – Conservation Innovation Grant Project (NRCS)	~\$150,000	Bockness – 100% 15 months Rindos – 15-40% 15 months Weiss – 15-40% 15 months
4W3766 – Missouri River Watershed Coalition	\$6,000	Rindos – 5% 15 months Weiss - 5% 15 months
4W4265 - Missouri River Watershed Coalition	\$9,950	Rindos – 5% 15 months Weiss - 5% 15 months

4W4462 – <i>Mapping Noxious Weeds in Montana</i> Publication	\$9,500	Rindos – 15% 12 months Weiss - 5% 12 months
Subtotal	\$247,650	
<i>Obligated Funding; On-going Contract Negotiations</i>		
4W???? – EDDMapS West/PNEDN merger	\$12,500	Rindos – 20% 6 months Weiss - 20% 6 months
4W???? – 2014 DoD Webinar	\$36,170	Rindos – 10-70% 10 months Weiss – 10-70% 10 months
433234 - 2014 DuPont Webinar Series	\$50,000	Rindos – 20-70% 10 months Weiss – 20-70% 10 months
4W???? - Missouri River Watershed Coalition	\$10,000	
Grand Total	\$356,320	
<i>Potential Funding Sources</i>		
MSU Extension Project (B. Jacobsen)	\$5,000	
Camp Monaco Prize Grant	\$20,000	
PTI Grant	?	

Additional Expenses (July 1 – September 30, 2013):

- Galli-Noble salary and benefits = ~\$21,250
- Galli-Noble Sick Leave and Annual Leave payout, *estimated* \$5,000.