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MRWC Business Meeting

I. Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview
Andrew Canham, MRWC President, opened the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda (Attachment 1).
Kitty Weiss, CIPM, then gave instructions to the web-linked participants on how to use Adobe Connect meeting process.

II. Approval of MRWC Spring Meeting Minutes
Meeting participants were given a few minutes to review the draft April 27, 2011 MRWC meeting minutes. Mitch Coffin moved to approve the meeting minutes as written. Ron Moehring seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved (Attachment 2).

III. MRWC Budget Update
Liz Galli-Noble presented the MRWC program budget to the group and briefly went over funding and expenditures by source, grant applications submitted and rejected, pending grant funding, and potential future grants (Attachment 3).
IV. Announcements
Several announcements were made:

- Andrew Canham welcomed Karie Decker to her first MRWC meeting as Coalition Vice President.
- It was announced that Andrew Canham was elected to his second two-year term as MRWC President by the MRWC Executive Committee in August 2011.
- Ron Moehring presented the Coalition membership with the North American Weed Management Association Outstanding Achievement Award, which had been awarded to group during the NAMWA annual conference in September 2011. The award reads:

  Since its inception in 2005 The MRWC has completed a Missouri River Saltcedar map, an online Saltcedar control and restoration database, and launched an Early Detection and Distribution Mapping System (EDDMapS) for 11 western states. Their outreach and education group has developed a MRWC hunter education booklet addressing invasive plants, partnered with the Wild Dakota television show to raise awareness of invasive species among sportsmen, and facilitates the transfer of successful state-based awareness and education programs to other states. For these accomplishments we would like to present the Missouri River Watershed Coalition the Outstanding Achievement Award.

V. Outreach and Awareness Workgroup Update
MRWC Outreach and Awareness Workgroup members – Kristi Paul (chair), Ron Moehring, Emily Rindos, Karie Decker, and Kelly Sharp – provided an update and summary on their activities over the past six months (see Attachment 4).

VI. 2010-2011 MRWC Program Evaluation and Summary of Accomplishments
As part of the formal MRWC evaluation process, Andrew Canham and Liz Galli-Noble provided a program evaluation and summary of accomplishments to the Coalition membership (see Attachment 5). MRWC program is evaluated every two years according to “key measures of success” set forth in the MRWC Saltcedar Management Plan (2007).

Key Measures of Success covered include:

- Buy-in by additional agencies, groups, and individuals not currently involved with the Coalition and/or invasive plant control
- Increased awareness of the invasive plant problem
- Commitment of the six states to continue the group
- Increased funding from internal and external sources
- Increased research on all aspects of invasive plants
- Increased coordination of management efforts

Andrew Canham then asked if anyone else wanted to provide additional comments:

Montana – Dave Burch
This has far exceeded my expectations. Before we had CIPM involved in this group, we couldn’t get very far. We needed some vehicle to coordinate this. When Liz Galli-Noble took the CIPM Director position, she was the first person I called to help the MRWC with program coordination. The USFS State and Private Forestry program is very excited about our progress. We not only took the program across county borders but across state borders. The USFS looked at it like a pilot program and supported us. And they still see this as a pilot project for the region. They are very happy with the EDDMapS project and supported the expansion of that program. Montana funding helped to launch the program, but we’ve gotten quite a return on our investment. It’s win-win for everybody.

Nebraska – Mitch Coffin
I concur with Dave. In Nebraska, we were struggling with county programs doing their own thing and not looking outside of their borders. This program has really expanded the types of projects we’re doing. It’s a great vehicle to allow us to get together, work across state borders, interact on a regular basis, and really get somewhere. Thanks to CIPM and to everyone who participates; we have come a long way.

Saskatchewan, Canada - Arlene Unvoas
I am from the Swift Current Creek Watershed Stewards group in Saskatchewan. When invasives first hit our radar in 2006-08, we didn’t know where to go to get information about the problem. We found your website and it was very
helpful and up to date. It was one of the only sources we found. We recently found saltcedar and are very concerned. We also find CIPM’s plastic weed models to be very helpful educational tools.

Wyoming - Mary McKinney
We love the weed models and use them extensively. The GYCC would like to see new weed models developed and we would encourage others to support

Colorado – Steve Ryder (typed comment)
From Colorado - We're a small part of the watershed, and of course are fully occupied with our own in-state workload. BUT, we're happy to contribute as best we can. We'll continue working with the EDRR committee (with Patty York) and the awareness and outreach committee. We'll probably work best with specific, limited tasks that we can take on, as well as keeping up with the broader vision and direction. We think Liz is doing a great job - as are those of you who have jumped into the coordination roles. Thanks very much!

15-Minute BREAK

EDRR/Invasive Species Data Management Mini Workshop
Part I. Where We Are Now
Facilitated by Andrew Canham and Liz Galli-Noble

VII. State EDRR Presentations

Colorado
Presenter: Patty York

- Patty York started in this position three months ago; she’s the EDRR specialist who replaced Crystal Andrews. It’s a full time position dedicated to EDRR.
- Colorado’s Noxious Weed Act is a little more stringent than the federal law; CO has a State Weed Advisory committee who decides who or what species are going to be listed, what species are going to be on the A, B, and C lists. A hierarchical list for management.
- Patty is in charge of Category A-listed species, which are not yet present or widespread throughout the state. She and Steve Ryder (Noxious Weed Program) coordinate with all the counties in CO to make sure they have the resources they need to enforce management.
- They get lump sum funding from the USFS State and Private Forestry program, which pays for Patty’s position and a seasonal. They also have a Noxious Weed Fund, which comes out of the Agriculture Commission each year. Left over money from the State and Private Forestry grant and the Fund is regranted out to counties, municipalities, county conservation districts, and to anyone who applies to us saying they have List A or B species (and they require matching funds). CO grants out about $300,000/year throughout the state.
- CO recently developed an EDRR brochure about one month ago. A “weed spotter” form is included in the brochure and when completed, it is sent to Patty, who verifies it. We are thinking about leaving them at trail heads.
- CO also has the CO Weed Management Association, which is not directly linked to the CO Department of Agriculture, but we work closely with them. They sponsor a “Pulling for CO” event, which coordinates volunteer efforts around the state to come together to pull weeds on one Saturday in July; CDA provides grant funding for this as well. CWMA also produces weed booklets, which lists all the species in their hierarchies; and they also make noxious weed calendars, which CDA distributes each year.
- Biggest thing the CDA is doing currently is developing a “Watch List,” not quite List A species, but species that aren’t yet present or they are here but we don’t know their extent. The reporting system is done by county weed managers themselves.
- The other big thing that the CDA is creating is our own online reporting system. It’s similar to EDDMapS but it is very specific to having reports conducted by the county weed managers. All List A and about 5 list B species distribution are updated each year. Phase 1 allows weed managers to report at the USGS quarter quad level. Phase 2 is in development, which will include GIS, points polygon, and poly lines that can be reported.
Kristi Paul – How many weeds are listed in Colorado?

Patty York - CO’s watch list has 19 species. See Attachment 6 for full list.

Heidi Sedivy - Is the EDRR brochure available online?

Patty York - No. We hope to put it online soon, or I can scan it and get posted on the MRWC website.

**Nebraska**

Presenter: Karie Decker

See NE’s EDRR Program powerpoint presentation and Adobe Connect recording.

- Nebraska is really in the early phases of our EDRR program.
- EDRR activities in NE is led by the NE Invasive Species Council for 5 years now, which is working very well.
  - Limited part of coordinator duties
  - They are working on work plan currently
- There is no specific funding for the program; we just contribute our time when possible to accomplish EDRR efforts
- NISP = federal aid grant is their funding source
- Data collection utilizes centralized reporting and collects info on ALL species (plants, aquatics, insects, etc.); it is still relatively new. Data sources: the public and agencies. Works well for aquatics and insects; not as well used for plants
- The first sighting of Zebra mussels by a 13-year-old Boy Scout this past year. He as recycling cans and found a mussel. He reported it and the lake was drained to kill any remaining mussels.
- Our state is extremely varied from east to west.
- Data collection and management: we have noxious and watch weed lists. And EDDMapS has had limited use so far.
- EDRR in NE: NE has a prioritized list of invasives (based on current distribution, risk assessment, and similar factors):
  - Category 1: future invasive species
  - Category 2: priority invasive species, those that they have a feasible chance of eradicating
  - Category 3: established invasive species
  - Category 4: noxious weeds; also have a similar list for aquatics.

This whole process has worked very well.

- Early Detection Network is lacking and we are trying to developing one. We do have state agencies using these lists, but we need to have other groups helping as well.
- Survey and Detection: we do have some done by the NDA and the Weed Control Association, but we need to work on this more. Reporting procedures: rapid assessment and validation goes through the NE Invasive Species Project, which works really well. Rapid response plans are not currently in place for those priority species.

Mitch Coffin - The Category lists don't have regulatory sense behind them. We often get questions from a landowner about developing their native prairie lands. We need a list of species that should not be planted by citizens, such as smooth brome; it may be fine in some settings but not in others. We need to be proactive now. We used to be reactive in the past; we waited until there was a problem and then decided what we were going to do about the invasions. The key is to have a list of ranking based on the analysis and assessment of risk. People now understand that we can do something about noxious weeds with the help of EDRR.

Mitch Coffin - We wanted to develop a watch list and to build our awareness program. Landowners are getting involved and helping with reporting.

Karie Decker – There is a lot of support for these lists.
Mitch Coffin – When you put something on the watch list and let people know what to look for, you may be surprised by the response. That happened when we put salt cedar on our watch list. People knew what to look for and started reporting it. We didn’t think we had much but now know that we have several thousand acres of it in dry lake beds.

Montana
Presenter: Dave Burch

- Montana has had the INVADERS Database at University of Montana since the late 1980s, so we had a system to report EDRR sightings and infestations; but it has been costly and hard to maintain. It has cost the Noxious Weed Trust Fund from $100,000 to $150,000 for that system. It is also hard to confirm which sightings are correct and which are not in the system. That information goes out to everybody – it’s a huge issue because that data isn’t confirmed before it is sent out.
- The counties in MT have authority for noxious weed control. The Department of Ag establishes the state weed list but the counties can also add weeds to their own weed list. This can create confusion.
- MT has had a Weed Listing Committee since the late 1980s. The committee meets every two years. Committee members have the credentials to list species. Often times, species that are listed on county lists are petitioned to be added to the state weed list; and if they meet the criteria for listing they are considered by the Core Committee. That committee makes the final recommendations, which go to rule making if approved by MDA Director.
- MT has a Weed Management Plan and more recently an Aquatic Management Plan for dealing with the noxious species. Dealing with aquatic species is new for many of our county managers, many of whom are just part time positions. We need to evolve as things change.
- To make this a success, EDDMapS needs to get reports coming in on a regular basis; we would need to get counties involved from the get go. We need to establish a good protocol.
- We have been doing this for a long time now. We have struggled with mapping in Montana. We’ve tried several different approaches to EDRR and mapping and we are hoping that this new system is better than where we are right now.

North Dakota
Presenter: Rachel Seifert-Spilde

- Aquatic species are handled by state Game and Fish in ND. The NDA does not do much with aquatics besides coordinating with them. There is not much funding associated with this just yet.
- ND does have a state aquatic plan. They are doing inventory and monitoring of those species.
- For terrestrial weeds, the NDA and ND Weed Control Association are leaders of the EDRR program.
- There is no specific funding for “non-noxious” weeds in ND. ND is using USFS State and Private Forestry funds to do work with hounds tongue and yellow toadflax.
- Data Collection and Management: We work with our 53 county weed boards and 7 city weed boards to use GPS data logger units. They collect the data, upload that data to the State, and we process that information and upload it to our website using “Weed Mapper.” People can look at that data and see where the infestations are. The program is working well.
- ND has two statewide listservs which are also used for reporting; we also have a phone contact system.
- ND does not have a Watch List per se. ND has a state weed list with 11 listed species, plus counties can add species to their own lists.
- ND is utilizing EDDMapS more now. Look forward to getting that on line.

South Dakota
Presenter: Ron Moehring

- South Dakota has a split system with aquatics and weeds like North Dakota. Aquatics are handled by Game, Fish and Parks Department; although they did work up an aquatic invasives plan which the Department of
Agriculture was part of. We also have a split within the SDDA, which has made things difficult when dealing with things like the emerald ash borer. We have also had many personality issues and not a lot of them are willing to work together.

- SDDA terrestrial weeds EDRR system works with APHIS PPQ system. Ron has tried to work with a diverse EDRR Committee (with no funds) to generate a watch list. Russian mallow was never expected, so it was not on the list. But as soon as we found it, we immediately took control and monitoring action.
- Funding: SDDA has no funding for EDRR. Ron or weed technicians do it when they have time. The Game, Fish and Parks Department has an aquatic invasive species coordinator, so they have some funding for EDRR there.
- Counties have their own lists and then they can make it to the state list from there.
- There needs to be a better reporting system. There needs to be one committee like Nebraska.
- Ron could use a full-time EDRR person, but there is no budget for that currently
- SD has been using EDDMapS some, but Ron wants to get more people to use it.
- Weeds have to be framed in how they affect agriculture to get people involved.

**Wyoming:**

Presenter: Slade Franklin

- Wyoming has a state EDRR committee made up of Weed and Pest employees; they discuss species of concern and put out a booklet of those species. That list has no regulatory authority assigned to it (it is just for awareness purposes).
- One of WY’s concerns is that they started talking about how to help out the EDRR thing within their state’s laws, and the tiered list system, but WY’s program is so defined by the counties that tiered lists for the state restricts the counties from doing EDRR. So, this past session, they added a law. Their process enables the director to declare an emergency declaration and can get the media behind it to increase attention. The change is a little more proactive than reactive.
- Funding: WY does have strong funding on the county level and also some funding on the state level that can be used for EDRR. WY has a pesticide registration fee which has an emphasis on emergency actions with noxious weeds. Interestingly, WY has had a pesticide registration grant since 1973; so EDRR has been included in concept in WY law for decades. We also have a pretty strong quarantine law that we can use.
- EDDMapS: Slade is excited about this new system. It’s a good concept and it’s got the potential to expand and be all-inclusive and include all taxa. Early concerns include the validation aspects of it. We do not need to validate common weeds. County validation may be a better way to go.
- WY has had a few EDRR species show up this year (dyer’s woad and rush skeletonweed); our mechanism for communication worked well. We have an EDRR mapping system that will hopefully work with EDDMapS in the future.
- Aquatics: In WY aquatic invasive species are dealt with by the Game and Fish Department. They have the expertise and manpower to handle the identification. The Dept of Agriculture has the ability to go in for the rapid response portion; and we can cooperate if needed.

**VIII. EDDMapS Presentation**

Presenter: Chuck Bargeron, Technical Director and Public Service Assistant, Center of Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health, University of Georgia

Chuck Bargeron gave an update on the MRWC EDDMapS project as well as an overview of the EDDMapS program, regionally and nationwide (see EDDMapS powerpoint presentation and Adobe Connect presentation).

**IX. South Dakota’s Russian Mallow Effort**

Presenter: Ron Moehring, SD State Weed Coordinator

Ron Moehring presented on the EDRR reporting of Russian Mallow in SD (see powerpoint presentation and Adobe Connect recording). Shortly after the MRWC launched EDDMapS in 2010, Russian mallow was found in Hutchinson County, SD (the first sighting in North America) and it was reported via EDDMapS. It comes from the
Armenia/Russia area; Russian thistle is also from the same area. Ron validated the report with the help of SD State University. It was found in July, it was sent as a herbarium sample for identification, but it was difficult to identify. After several attempts, it was eventually identified. At the time it was found, the plants were over eight feet tall. Ron got a grant from the SDA to go out and survey and treat it. Anthony Koop from APHIS did a risk assessment on it. When it was first found, Roundup treatments were conducted but they were not all unsuccessful. Thirty new sites, with one to two plants per site were also located, all within six square sections. The risk assessment indicated that it’s not going to be a problem and some locals say the plant has been there for 20 to 30 years. However, 2010 was a particularly wet year, which may have made growing conditions particularly good for the plant. SD will continue to monitor the area. This is an EDRR success story using the MRWC EDDMapS.

X. More Eyes, Less Weeds: Park County, WY EDRR Strike Team
Presenter: Mary McKinney, Assistant Supervisor, Park County Weed and Pest Control District (WY)

Mary McKinney presented on the Park County’s strike team effort as an example of tapping volunteers to help with EDRR on public lands (see powerpoint presentation and Adobe Connect recording).

Mary stressed the following points as key aspects of tapping volunteers for EDRR activities:

- How do we encourage people to help report weeds? How do we get people interested? This is not instantly attention grabbing.
- We need to see the importance of our public lands that we have access to. Getting information out to the people will spark interest.
- Working with agencies like the Forest Service, BLM and also outdoorsmen will lead to protection of public lands. Recruiting family and friends to do invasive plant surveying is always a start.
- Volunteer EDRR teams should love to be outdoors, have the will to look for weeds and then report them, and be willing to do the surveys.
- Our goal is to protect the land.
- We made a handbook about early detection and other general information to help people preserve the land. There is also a guide as to what else, besides reporting, people can do to help with invasive species. There are many responsibilities for volunteers. We also teach volunteers skills in safety and field trainings. We provide them with the proper tools to survey.
- There is an end of the season meeting to talk about what worked and what didn’t.
- There are track logs to keep track of mapping of weeds.
- We have done recruiting and may be looking for a coordinator. We need to start expanding the program into aquatic invasive species.
- Wyoming doesn’t prioritize species, but we can prioritize areas (hence the EDRR booklet’s inclusion of common species such as leafy spurge).

Nebraska comment - Our problem is that less than 3% of Nebraska is public land. So the challenge lies in getting people to report and restore private lands. This means you have to encourage private landowners to get involved.

XI. EDRR Trainings for Montana INVADERS Database System
Presenters: Jane Mangold and Hilary Parkinson, Montana State University-Extension

Jane Mangold presented on her EDRR training program, which provides general information on EDRR, teaches plant identification and trains individuals to use the INVADERS Database System. She made the following points:

- This program is a good example of a system for training. The objective of our program is to motivate a group of volunteers who are willing to survey the land and report and share information on weeds they see. We have received two years of funding from the Noxious Weed Trust Fund, and recently from the Western Regional IPM Center to do these trainings.
  - The format for our training has been a half-day workshop. We have been tapping into the local coordinators and Extension agents. We have also had one Weed Watch Day to raise awareness, which
was fairly successful. For the first year or so, we targeted local agencies; but lately, we have expanded to focusing on volunteers and anyone who is interested in noxious weeds.

- The first part of the workshops, we introduce EDRR. The majority of the workshop is about plant identification and skills to identify weeds. The last part covers the database and how to enter information into the database and receive alerts.
- Many federal and state agencies along with interested citizens have been represented at the workshops across Montana.
- The focus has been on 1A and 1B Priority Weeds based on region.
- It is very important to focus on outreach to local and extension agencies in order to more efficiently motivate the right people.

Hilary Parkinson then went over the workshop workbook. She explained that the workbook goes over everything that is covered in the workshops. The last part of the booklet is made up of publications, which provide detailed information on most of the weeds listed in Montana. The workbooks are available online at: http://www.msuextension.org/invasiveplantsMangold/extensionsub.html or http://www.msuextension.org/invasiveplantsMangold/documents/Workshop/EDRR%20workbook.pdf.

Mary McKinney - The Weed Watch Day was a great way to spread awareness.

1-Hour LUNCH BREAK

EDRR/Invasive Species Data Management Mini Workshop (continued)

Part II. Where We Want to Go

Facilitators: Ron Moehring and Andrew Canham (see Attachments 7, 8, 9, and 10)

XII. Reflections and Advice for the MRWC EDRR Program

Presenter: Randy Westbrooks, US Geological Survey, North Carolina (linked by phone and Adobe Connect)

Randy Westbrooks was asked to listen to the EDRR presentations given during the morning session, and to provide feedback to the MRWC about: what we are doing right, where we can improve, and ideas of things that we might try to strengthen our EDRR effort region wide.

Randy conveyed the following information to the MRWC membership:
- This is what we need to implement in order to continue advancing EDRR.
- There needs to be a primary contact for each state to go to with questions or information. Each state needs to have an Invasive Species Council to work on invasive species issues.
- Each state also needs to have a committee with local, county, state, and federal people and also incorporate botanists and scientists. There also needs to be associations.
- Each state needs an EDRR coordinator and trainer (like Jane Mangold), who can go out and network with people and do trainings. Start with regulated weeds and then focus on non-regulated plants. Publicize contacts in order for people to know exactly where to report information. Hold events to get people involved.
- Implement a reporting system like EDDMapS, so we know which weeds to control. Start with noxious weed lists. Also implement watch lists and limit them to weeds we know we can eradicate.
- Put examples of eradicated weeds on the website to encourage fighting weeds.
- Encourage everyone from ranchers to hikers to become involved in weed prevention and EDDMapS.
- Assign someone to be in charge of aquatic weed prevention.
- Calendars are a great way to get information out.
- Funding is key.
- The value of EDRR will be shown through projects.
- We need invasive species management to become like every other maintenance for our land.
- Verifying plants before starting a project is important.
- Sending reports from smart phones in conjunction with EDRR will be revolutionary in reporting weeds.
• Success starts with training. Make sure people are trained on plants that will actually be seen and, therefore, reported.
Slade Franklin - Some federal agencies have higher priorities than noxious weeds. Which federal agencies should we contact to get the appropriate response?

Randy Westbrooks - Start with FICMNEW in Washington. Explain that we need help from federal agencies. Also engage the USFS, DOD, and BLM.

XIII. Working Session: Next Steps for the MRWC EDRR Program
Ron Moehring called peoples’ attention to the EDH handouts provided:
• Handout/Attachment 7 is Recommendations for Developing New Capacity for EDRR at the State and Regional Levels, which was developed by Randy Westbrooks and his colleagues.
• Handout/Attachment 8 is a revision of Randy’s document specifically addressing the MRWC situation.
• Handout/Attachment 9 is an EDRR Planning Form, which was originally created by Randy Westbrooks (and presented at the 2011 NAWMA meeting) and then revised by Ron Moehring to help guide the process of developing MRWC state EDRR plans. Also mentioned by Andrew Canham and Ron is the SD Department of Agriculture’s Commercial Applicator Pesticide Handling and Discharge Response Plan, which they gave as a good, potential model for writing a state EDRR plan. It gives guidelines for the development of a plan with many of the same elements as an EDRR plan (see link: http://sdda.sd.gov/Ag_Services/forms/Com_PHDRP.pdf for details).
• Handout/Attachment 10 is an EDRR survey conducted by the MRWC EDRR Workgroup in December 2009.

Ron Moehring - Do we want a regional EDRR plan? We would all have to work together to get that done. Each state could have their own committee.

Randy Westbrooks - Regional/national/US and Canadian systems would have to be built on state systems. Every state must have a self-sustaining system. Without state plans there could be no regional plan. There is no need for a trainer in every state. Maybe a regional trainer would work better.

Ron Moehring - Build up the state plans to the regional level?

Randy Westbrooks - Have one regional plan to base the state plans off of.

Chuck Bargeron: One thing that might help would be a marketing plan across the region to allow an easy way for people to get involved (for example, ivegotone.com)

Karie Decker - It might be difficult to create a regional marketing plan.

Ron Moehring: The MRWC can still be a place to make reports no matter what state we are in. If we are traveling we still know where to report. One regional contact would make things straightforward and simple.

Andrew Canham - We have to start with the state plans then link the state plans together.

Comment - Each situation will have a different contact, but having a list of a few contacts for each state will be helpful for reporting.

Ron Moehring - Where do we want to take EDRR? We need to compile a program to build up state plans. Do we want to take the state plans we have now and start building a regional plan?

Randy Westbrooks - We need to have a plan to find and eliminate weeds. We also need a long-term goal and have partners that can develop a regional plan and build networks. Park County (WY) has a great example of a county
plan. There has to be one person from each county to go out and work with other programs to build up the national system. “All weeds are local.” Work with everyone from the county to the state level.

Andrew Canham - It’s time we start working regionally on EDRR.

Patty York - Volunteer efforts could be really important to not only the state effort but a regional effort. Statewide effort based on small groups from around the state. North Dakota is ready to take the next step, just waiting for approval.

Ron Moehring – We would ask the states look over and fill out the EDRR Form (Attachment 9) and review the SDA Commercial Applicator Pesticide Handling and Discharge Response Plan, and the MRWC will compile your information and discuss it at the 2012 MRWC spring meeting.

Liz Galli-Noble – We should also ask the EDRR and Outreach & Awareness Work groups to look over the handout and come up with ideas for addressing EDRR plans and trainings. We should go ahead and start doing EDRR trainings in the MRW this coming year; we can write grants to fund that immediately.

Ron Moehring – We should target the younger generation with our EDRR messages.

Patty York - Get it into the classroom, create apps, and target hikers.

Liz Galli-Noble then polled each of the Executive Committee members about their state’s use of a new MRWC-EDDMapS application:

- Wyoming - It would be a good idea.
- South Dakota - We would use an app. The younger people are the ones that will be using it and the ones we need to target.
- Nebraska - Everything is on the internet. It would get the younger generation involved.
- Montana – Yes.
- North Dakota – Yes.
- Colorado - That is a great idea. Getting into the classroom and getting information to hikers through the app would be a great idea.

Emily Rindos - It is really important to get to the average person and give them a way to identify plants. More people have their phones on them while hiking now anyway. We should develop an app for each individual state.

Ron Moehring - Do we make one app for the region or make individual apps for each state? Modifications can be made of the regional app in order to be specific to each individual state.

The consensus was to move forward with a MRWC-EDDMapS app. Specifics regarding how the individual states use the app or one of their own can be worked out by the EDRR Workgroup and the Executive Committee.

15-Minute BREAK

CIG Project Presentation and Woody Biomass Demonstration

XIV. Opening Remarks and Project Update
Presenter: Scott Bockness, CIPM, CIG Project Leader

Scott Bockness presented an overview and updates for the CIG Project. He presented regional examples of the challenges and benefits to addressing the invasive plant impacts in riparian areas. The objective of the project is to implement conservation practices and monitor the practices to evaluate the efficacy and ecological changes; use current bioenergy technologies to utilize invasive plant material to benefit the environment; and to then utilize CIPM and MRWC infrastructure to share information to regional stakeholders. He presented updated timeline of the project (see powerpoint presentation and Adobe Connect recording).
Topics he addressed include:
- How to remove Russian olive and saltcedar, and prevent regrowth
- Vegetative inventory and environmental assessment before any changes to the landscape are made
- Looking into converting invasive plant biomass into green, renewable energy forms
- Saltcedar treatments
- Wood fuel possibilities

Scott Bockness - We will continue to look into bioenergy alternatives such as: commercial and residential gasification, biomass pellet systems for landowners. We need to continue to conduct more bioenergy feasibility testing to establish regional consistency of bioenergy viability for energy applications.

XV. NRCS Montana: Russian Olive and Saltcedar EQIP Special Initiative
Presenter: Joel Fidel, NRCS Resource Conservationist

Joel Fidel presented for NRCS in Montana on the Russian Olive and Saltcedar EQIP Special Initiative. He explained that for the past seven to eight years, NRCS has been working to:
- Eliminate noxious weeds (Russian olive) in the Yellowstone River area.
- Help landowners control Russian olive and saltcedar

He touched on the objectives of the Initiative and how funding has been invested in different areas:
- Spraying roots of Russian olive - the need and effect of re-treatments
- Alternative control methods - goats, camels, biocontrol (insects)
- Bio-fuel
- Future budgets
(see powerpoint presentation and Adobe Connect recording).

XVI. CIG Site Selection and Monitoring Project Update
Presenter: Jack Alexander, Owner, Synergy Resource Solutions, Inc.

Jack Alexander presented on the CIG Site Selection and Monitoring Project (see powerpoint presentation and Adobe Connect recording). He touched on the following topics during his presentation:
- Impacts of treatments of Russian olive and saltcedar on the growing season, environment
- Using protocols to find reasons why sites are better or worse
- Keeping record of findings for future reference
- Protocols looking at what is the impact of the woody debris that is left behind?

XVII. Green Energy Development Plans in Montana
Presenter: Larry Wilbert, Executive Vice President for Operations for the Montana Division of ecoTECH Energy Group, Inc.

Larry Wilbert gave an oral presentation on green energy development in Montana. He commented on the following during his talk:
- Biomass energy is one of the most expensive powers in the United States
- His company is interested in Russian olive and saltcedar for an energy source
- It takes money to get projects off the ground. If we take it to the federal government, we would have a great advantage in our region, due to the volume of viable material.
- Very high tech – high efficiency use of biomass for power generation
- Would not put out enough emissions to require permitting by the State of Montana.

XVIII. Woody Biomass Processing Presentation (Pelletization)
Presenters: Scott Bockness and Ken Stewart, MidDakota Vegetation Management, LLP.

Scott Bockness presented on woody biomass processing. He covered the following:
- The only current small pellet mill manufacturers are out of China, they have many processing problems
Pelletization is like making a cake, good quality materials are critical components
We need an accurate inventory of the amount of Russian olive and saltcedar in Montana and in the region
Wood pellet production requires integrating multiple machines to convert the materials; farmers and landowners could easily be trained to use these types of systems.

Scott Bockness - We are trying to establish a beneficial use of the invasive plant material as a resource to make this effort more than the control of noxious weeds. If we can make these resources readily available for landowners, we could really start controlling these invasive species. The technology is all there. All we need to do is show the public that this is a good energy source. To find the invested value of biomass energy, we need to make an economic analysis and create quantifiable data. There is already a need to expand the agricultural market. Once we get the word out about this alternative energy, demand will increase significantly.
(See powerpoint presentation and Adobe Connect recording.)

_______________________________
Note: Just before the group went outside for the woody biomass demonstration, Dave Burch made an announcement that the Eurasian watermilfoil tour at Fort Peck Reservoir (scheduled for the next day) had to be cancelled due to predictions for extremely high winds.
**Winds measured >35 miles per hour on October 12 and small water craft were not able to launch.
_______________________________

XIX. Woody Biomass Processing Demonstration (Pelletization)

The indoor portion of the meeting adjourned at ~4:00 pm and the meeting moved outside.

Scott Bockness and Ken Stewart demonstrated a small-scale wood pellet mill that he purchased from Pellet Pros, Inc. (an Iowa-based company). Scott Bockness informed the group about the material handling requirements needed to convert the Russian olive and saltcedar biomass from the mechanical removal stage to a usable bioenergy form. He passed around samples of plant materials that he had already prepared for pellet processing (chipped and milled to the proper particle size). Ken Stewart then gave a brief explanation on the operation of the pellet mill machine and allowed the audience to look over the internal components. Multiple samples of both Russian olive and saltcedar plant materials were processed through the pellet mill machine and converted to wood pellets by Ken Stewart and shown to the group. The group discussed the processing challenges and viability of use by a variety of potential product users. Economic potential for local or area commercial biomass (pellet) operations seemed to be a possible opportunity that could be explored.

The outdoor portion of the meeting adjourned at ~5:30 pm.
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### AGENDA

**TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11 / FORT KEOGH, MILES CITY, MONTANA**

*Most of Day 1 will be web-linked via Adobe Connect*

#### Morning Session: MRWC Business Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:00 am | **Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Overview**  
Andrew Canham, MRWC President / Karie Decker, MRWC Vice President |
|        | Adobe Connect Web-link Instructions  
Kitty Weiss, CIPM |
| 8:10    | **Approve Minutes from MRWC Spring Meeting**  
Andrew Canham |
| 8:20    | **MRWC Financial Business**  
**MRWC Budget Update**  
Liz Galli-Noble, CIPM / MRWC Executive Committee |
| 8:30    | **Announcements**  
Welcome to Vice President Karie Decker  
Andrew Canham  
Second Term for President Andrew Canham  
Karie Decker  
MRWC Award Announcement  
Ron Moehring |
| 8:35    | **MRWC Workgroup Updates**  
**Outreach and Awareness Workgroup**  
Kristi Paul / Ron Moehring / Emily Rindos / Kelly Sharp |
| 9:00    | **2010–2011 MRWC Program Evaluation and Summary of Accomplishments**  
MRWC Executive Committee |
| 9:15    | **Break** |

#### EDRR/Invasive Species Data Management Mini Workshop

**Part I. Where We Are Now**

Facilitators: Andrew Canham / Liz Galli-Noble

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:30 | **State EDRR Presentations**  
MRWC EDRR Workgroup Members / MRWC Executive Committee |
| 10:15 | **EDDMapS Presentation**  
Chuck Bargeron, Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health  
**South Dakota’s Russian Mallow EDRR Effort**  
Ron Moehring, South Dakota State Weed Coordinator |
| 11:00 | **More Eyes Less Weeds: The Park County, Wyoming Volunteer EDRR Strike Team**  
Bob Parsons / Mary McKinney, Park County Weed and Pest District |
| 11:20 | **EDRR Trainings for Montana INVADERS Database System**  
Jane Mangold / Hilary Parkinson, Montana State University Extension |
| 11:40 | **Update: EDRR Database Merger (EDDMapS, GISIN, INVADERS)**  
Chuck Bargeron / Jane Mangold / Hilary Parkinson / Liz Galli-Noble |
| 12:00 | **Lunch** |
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11 / FORT KEOGH, MILES CITY, MONTANA

**Afternoon Session: EDRR/Invasive Species Data Management Mini Workshop (continued)**

**Part II. Where We Want to Go**
Facilitators: Ron Moehring / Andrew Canham

1:00 pm  **Reflections and Advice for the MRWC EDRR Program**  
Randy Westbrooks, US Geological Survey *(via web-link)*

1:15  **Q & A Session**

1:40  **Working Session: Next Steps for the MRWC EDRR Program**

2:00  **Break**

**CIG Project Presentation and Woody Biomass Demonstration**

2:15  **Opening Remarks and Project Update**  
Scott Bockness, CIG Project Leader

2:30  **NRCS Montana: Russian Olive and Saltcedar EQIP Special Initiative**  
Joel Fidal, NRCS Resource Conservationist

2:50  **CIG Site Selection and Monitoring Project Update**  
Jack Alexander / Amy Ganguli, Synergy Resource Solutions, Inc.

3:15  **Green Energy Development Plans in Montana**  
Larry Wilbert, Executive Vice President for Operations, Montana Division, ecoTECH Energy Group, Inc.

3:30  **Woody Biomass Processing Presentation (Pelletization and Gasification)**  
Scott Bockness / Ken Miller, MidDakota Vegetation Management, LLP

4:00  **Meeting moves outside (end of web-linked meeting)**

4:15  **Woody Biomass Processing Demonstration (Pelletization)**  
Scott Bockness / Ken Miller

**CIG Field Site Visit at Fort Keogh**  
Scott Bockness

5:30  **Adjourn**

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12 / FORT PECK RESERVOIR, MONTANA

**Eurasian Watermilfoil Tour**

7:45 am  **Meet in front of the Guesthouse Inn in Miles City**

8:00  Depart Miles City

11:00  **Lunch at the Fort Peck Hotel**

12:00 pm  **Eurasian Watermilfoil Tour**  
Dave Burch, Montana Department of Agriculture / Patricia Gilbert, US Army Corps of Engineers / Rick Stellflug, Valley County Weed Coordinator

3:00  Depart Fort Peck Reservoir

6:00  **Arrive in Miles City and depart for home**
Video Conference and Web-linked Meeting  

**Attendance:** Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming were represented at this meeting.

**Meeting facilitators:** Andrew Canham and Liz Galli-Noble  
**Meeting note takers:** Cori Huttinga and Emily Rindos, CIPM  
**Minutes edited by:** Liz Galli-Noble

**36 meeting participants:**
- *Andrew Canham, MRWC Pres (SD)*  
- Nadeen Baldridge, MSU (MT)  
- Chuck Bargeron, CISEH (GA)  
- *Scott Bockness, MRWC VP (MT)*  
- Steve Brill (WY)  
- *Dave Burch, MTDA*  
- Jaimy Cass (WY)  
- *Mitch Coffin, NEDA*  
- Karie Decker (NE)  
- Kevin Delaney  
- *Slade Franklin, WDA*  
- Robert Friedrich, MSU (MT)  
- *Liz Galli-Noble, CIPM (MT)*  
- John Gaskin (MT)  
- Scott Guffey  
- Cori Huttinga, CIPM (MT)  
- Wayne Isaacson  
- Nathan Jagim (NE)  
- Jerry (last name unknown)  
- Gordon Kirsch (SD)  
- Paul Lepisto, IWLO (SD)  
- Mary Mayer (MT)  
- *Ron Moehring, SDDA*  
- *Bob Parsons-proxy (WY)*  
- *Kristi Paul-proxy (NE)*  
- Karan Rawlins, CISEH (GA)  
- Rich Riding (UT)  
- Emily Rindos, CIPM (MT)  
- Rachel Seifert Spilde (ND)  
- Nina Steinmetz  
- Tom Sterkel  
- Greg Sundstrom (CO)  
- Janet Valle (UT)  
- Kathy Weiss, CIPM (MT)  
- Greg Womeldorf (SD)  
- Mark Zweifler  

* = MRWC Executive Committee members

**I. Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Overview**

Andrew Canham, MRWC President, opened the meeting and provided an overview of the meeting agenda (see Attachment 1). After Andrew initiated the meeting, Kitty Weiss (CIPM E-communications Coordinator) provided technical instructions on how the video conferencing and web link portion of the meeting would work and what participants should do if they had technical difficulties. The participants at three of the four hubs (MT, SD and WY) introduced themselves and the number of participants linking to the meeting via Adobe Connect was announced.

**III. Approval of the September 27, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

Meeting participants were given a few minutes to review the draft September 27, 2010 meeting minutes. Slade Franklin moved to approve the meeting minutes as written. Ron Moehring seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved (see Attachment 2).

**IV. MRWC Financial Business**

Liz Galli-Noble presented the MRWC program budget to the group and briefly went over funding and expenditure details (see Table 1 below). She stated that overall the MRWC is doing well. She also reported that the NRCS CIG contract was officially signed on September 24, 2010, the project began in October 2010, and Scott Bockness began employment with CIPM on December 1, 2010.
Table 1. April 27, 2011 Meeting Financial Update
Amounts of March 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Grant #</th>
<th>Funded Activities/Subcontracts</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Spent</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5/2008 – 2/2010 MT NWTF & USFS #MDA-2009-702 #4W2185 $100,000 | MRWC Program Coordination CIPM personnel, travel, communications, shipping, supplies, etc.  
  - Outreach Program ($1,000)  
  - Projects  
  - *Database Project (~$1,000) | 86,786 | 86,786 | 0 | 1-year extension granted to project |
| 9/2009 – 9/30/2011 MT NWTF & USFS #MDA-2010-703 #4W2809 $100,000 | MRWC Program Coordination CIPM personnel, travel, communications, shipping, supplies, etc.  
  - Outreach Program ($9,000)  
  - Projects  
  - *Database Project (~$4,000) | 59,007 | 62,203 | (3196) | |
| JHS, Inc. – Saltcedar Mapping Project | 13,124 | 13,124 | 0 | Project completed 4/30/2009 |
| 9/2010 – 9/2012 MT NWTF & USFS #MDA-2011-701 #4W3374 $130,000 | MRWC Program Coordination CIPM personnel, travel, communications, shipping, supplies, etc.  
  - Outreach Program  
  - Projects  
  - *Database Project | 92,500 | 35,555 | 56,945 | |
| EDDMapS Project Expansion to Western States | 30,000 | 0 | 30,000 | Project began 12/2010 |
| CISEH – EDRR Project (EDDMapS) 12/2009 - 12/2010 | 16,368 | 16,368 | 0 | |
| JHS, Inc. – Yellowstone River Mapping Project 10/2009 - 8/30/2011 | 24,625 | 0 | 24,625 | Project delayed in 2009 and 2010 |
| 10/2010 – 9/2013 NRCS CIG #4W3339 $1,000,000 | MRWC Conservation Innovation Grant (CIG) Projects  
  - Treatment & Monitoring Project  
  - Biomass/Bioenergy Project  
  - Project Coordination/Tech Transfer/Outreach  
  - Synergy Resources – Subaward, Year 1 | 917,000 | 34,493 | 882,507 | Project began 10/2010; Bockness hired 12/2010 |
| Wild Dakota TV/Vern’s Video | 7,500 | 2,500 | 5,000 | Project began 11/2010 |
| Total | $1,329,910 | $251,029 | $1,078,881 | NA |

**Anticipated Additional Funding:** Montana NWTF funding ($50,000) is obligated for the MRWC for FY2012-2013 program coordination and projects. Wyoming state funding ($11,000) for the MRWC is expected in June 2011 for program coordination and projects.

**Potential Grant Funding:** Applied June 2010 - APHIS Farm Bill 10201 FY2011 funding ($385,000) for MRWC Outreach Program; no word yet.
V. MRWC Constitution and Bylaws

Andrew Canham and Liz Galli-Noble opened the discussion, explaining that over the previous four months, the Executive Committee had reviewed the MRWC Constitution and Bylaws, proposing five relatively minor changes (see Attachment 3 for proposed changes). Liz Galli-Noble read through each of proposed changes prior to discussion.

Proposed Change - Discussion began with the fifth proposed change, which was to add “electronic vote” to the first sentence of the MRWC Bylaws, Article II.

Andrew Canham: When the bylaws were originally written, the Executive Committee had not foreseen the travel restrictions for members due to financial considerations.

The MRWC states were polled and Ron Moehring, Rachel Seifert Spilde, Steve Ryder, Dave Burch, and Slade Franklin all agreed that this change should be made.

Proposed Change - The next discussion focused on the proposed change to the MRWC Constitution, Article IV regarding MRWC Officers and the length and number of terms they can serve for the organization.

Slade Franklin: Is there much difference between four years and six years?

Liz Galli-Noble: The language originally specified a one-year term with the possibility of a total of four terms to be served. The idea was, if the person was well-suited to the position it would allow that person to serve more than two terms.

Slade Franklin: Would we extend the number of terms to three, if they are two-year terms?

Liz Galli-Noble: That could be a possibility, if the members approve that. Or it could be two, two-year terms.

Bob Parsons: Has there been any prior discussion about alternating the years for re-election of President and Vice President? So both positions don’t open in the same year.

Liz Galli-Noble: The way it is set up now, the Vice President is elected at the spring meeting while the President is elected at the fall meeting. However, it could be changed to alternate years, if needed.

Scott Guffey (electronic comment): Should it read, “but not to exceed two (or three) term’s instead of years”?

Dave Burch: There should be no problem with six years as that is how the State of Montana currently operates its advisory council. We would welcome it, if someone is willing to stay on for six years and they’re doing a good job.

Rachel Seifert Spilde, Steve Ryder, and Mitch Coffin agreed with Dave Burch.

Slade Franklin: Wyoming agrees with six years, but what would happen if someone steps into a partial presidency of less than one year?

Ron Moehring: The Constitution should read: “terms” instead of “years.” Those elected could serve three full terms, regardless of the number of years.

Everyone agreed to change the language to read, “not to exceed three full terms”.

Proposed Change - The next discussion was in regards to Article III, Section I of the Constitution.

Liz Galli-Noble: “Vice President” was missing from the last sentence regarding who serves on the MRWC Executive Committee.

Everyone agreed that that was an acceptable change and there was no further discussion.

Proposed Change - The next discussion was a proposed change to Article I, Section II of the Constitution regarding Coalition membership.
Liz Galli-Noble: Do we want to broaden the language to include other groups and individuals? There are several groups in states and Canadian provinces outside the traditional six Coalition states that have interest in the Missouri River Watershed. Obviously, through EDDMapS we’ve already extended membership to states outside the Missouri River Watershed.

Andrew Canham: Could we offer an “associate” membership to those outside the MRW area? We don’t want to exclude others.

Dave Burch: Associate membership is a good way to go. The Canadian provinces have asked about participating. It’s good if they’re interested in what we’re doing. The Milk River in Canada is part of the Missouri River Basin. We get extra advice, extra perspectives on how things should be going and how it’s going to help out the rest of the country.

Slade Franklin: I support it and think that associate membership is a good idea.

Ron Moehring: Associate member could indicate that they reside outside the six states.

Several other wordsmithing suggestions were made. The idea of associate membership was eventually dropped.

Liz Galli-Noble: Let me try to summarize what we just heard from the audience; the new language will read as follows, “Representatives from each of the following groups – all the Tribes, Federal and other State Agencies, and any private coalition or individual located in or concerned with the Missouri River Watershed.”

Everyone was comfortable with this and no other comments were made.

Liz Galli-Noble then announced that CIPM would now conduct a vote/poll to approve the proposed changes to the Constitution and Bylaws. She gave directions for the vote/poll. She explained that in order for the vote to be valid, three quarters of the MRWC members present had to vote to approve the action. There also had to be a quorum of the MRWC states represented at the meeting (four of the six), which they had.

Liz Galli-Noble read through each of the five changes and Andrew Canham called for a vote. The results were tallied as follows:
- South Dakota: Yes (3), No (0)
- Wyoming: Yes (4)
- CIPM: Yes (4)
- Via Adobe Connect: Yes (18), No (0)

**Decision:** With 92% of the meeting participants voting, the vote was a unanimous “yes,” to approve the changes to the MRWC Constitution and Bylaws (see Attachment 4).

**VI. Election of MRWC Vice President**

Andrew Canham: Scott Bockness is unable to continue to serve as Vice President given his new employment with CIPM as the MRWC CIG Project Leader. At the last Executive Committee meeting there was discussion that this may be a conflict of interest, having Scott continue to serve in the VP capacity. Consequently, we asked for nominations for VP candidates and we will now conduct an election.

Liz Galli-Noble: There were three nominations: Karie Decker from Nebraska; Daniel Dew from North Dakota; and Bob Parsons from Wyoming. Please take a few minutes to review the bios for each of candidates (Attachment 5), after which, we will call for a vote.

Liz Galli-Noble called for the vote. CIPM staff tallied the votes, and Liz Galli-Noble announced the results:
- Karie Decker: 9 votes
- Bob Parsons: 8 votes
- Daniel Dew: 2 votes
Liz Galli-Noble: Congratulations to Karie Decker. She is the new Vice President of the MRWC. She’s not connected to us via telephone due to technical issues, but Mitch Coffin has been updating her via email throughout the meeting.

Andrew Canham: Welcome Karie and thank you to all who put their names in. Karie will officially take on the VP duties on May 1, and we will send her information and add her to the appropriate listservs in the next few days.

VII. Funding Discussion

Overview
Andrew Canham: I would like to say a few words to the Coalition regarding our accomplishments and future funding needs:

- Our goals are: (1) reduce saltcedar and other invasives in the MRW; (2) increase coordination regionally; (3) maximize funding for control in riparian areas; and (4) team landowners, schools and universities. Our greatest resource is people and the sharing of ideas. We currently have 115 active members. We’ve had many presentations over the past couple of years. We offered EDDMapS trainings in Great Falls and South Dakota, and have upcoming trainings in Nebraska and Wyoming. We plan to build and expand education and awareness to K-12 students.
- The Outreach and Awareness Workgroup has done an excellent job with the website, a new brochure, the traveling display, hunter education booklets, etc.
- Saltcedar Mapping Project: the resulting map has been used in the brochure, display, and at meetings in DC. It shows people that saltcedar is going to affect them because it’s close to them and not just relevant to “weed” people.
- EDRR: Since 1999, we’ve been hearing about it. Implementing it on a state level has been a problem due to finances, resources, people, etc. It would be most effective if it was implemented on a regional level as it would greatly reduce the cost.
- EDDMapS: This has been an excellent project for the MRWC. It was discussed at a meeting two years ago and it was considerably less expensive than the other two programs that were considered. The entire program cost was $16,368. Currently EDDMapS has 365 county contacts in the six states.
- With that, I would like to call on a few of the states to say a few words.

Dave Burch: From the beginning, we knew it was going to become a pretty wide ranging, dynamic group. Through the cooperative forestry assistance program and the NWTF, Montana has contributed around $380,000. I will have to reduce the amount of funds given to the group due to the state budget. This year’s grant will be $50,000 and next year will hopefully be $50,000. I believe this is money well spent. The $380,000 we’ve put in has basically gotten us $1,000,000 through the CIG and that’s a pretty good investment.

Slade Franklin: There has to be some baseline funding with the group. We see great potential with the group. We’ve been riding on the coattails of the funds contributed by Montana. Wyoming can allocate $11,000 through state and private forestry grants in the very near future.

Ron Moehring: South Dakota doesn’t have state and private forestry money. All funding is going to the counties and I don’t want to ask them to give up that money. The Weed and Pest Committee has drafted a grant proposal with the National Wild Turkey Foundation for reprinting the hunter education booklets. South Dakota lost a lot of funding this year, including Extension services. Grants are the one thing we’ve got that we might be able to tap for MRWC funding.

Greg Sundstrom: Colorado partnered with Wyoming on riparian area projects. He suggested contacting Mark Hughes in Wyoming and Dennis Adams in Nebraska for multi-state state forestry grants.

Rachel Seifert-Spilde: North Dakota does not have the ability to help fund the MRWC. All the money we give to our counties comes from the ND Legislature. There’s a slight possibility of using state and private forestry funds in the future. We are not at all interested in paying membership dues, although there might be a benefit to dues in the future.
Mitch Coffin: I agree with Slade that we’ve ridden on Montana’s money for quite a while. Getting the Nebraska State Administration to help fund the Coalition is unlikely. I can see the benefits of membership dues, but it’s hard to get the officials to see that. I will look into state and private forestry money.

Membership Dues
Liz Galli-Noble: The Executive Committee had a lengthy discussion about membership dues more than two years ago. It was decided (by consensus) that the states did not want to impose dues for membership. Maybe they don’t need to be required. Instead, maybe we could solicit dues from people, organizations, states who are able to provide funding; even on a small scale it would be helpful. I’m not sure about NGOs and other people who work with our Coalition, perhaps that’s a resource we could tap.

Slade Franklin: Liz, when you went over the budget, it seemed funding was okay. What’s your prediction for the future?

Liz Galli-Noble: We need about $65,000 per year, minimum, to pay for the very basic services the Center provides the MRWC. It’s such a good deal because CIPM has established infrastructure and solid staff, which the MRWC taps for your program and projects. Typically, we carry over the remaining funding from the $100,000 to the next year, or we spend it on specific projects (establishing the MRWC EDDMapS, printing the Hunter Education Booklets, and conducting the Aerial Mapping project, for example). We’re doing quite well. Even with the reduced amount of $50,000, we should be okay for the next year or so. In the future, we will need to write grants targeted at project-specific goals. How we come up with that $65,000 without USFS/NWTF funding?; I am not sure. Could we go leaner?; maybe. But it would depend on how much the Coalition needs to travel, how many meetings we conduct per year, and the like.

Slade Franklin: Let’s try to hold off on membership dues for a bit longer.

Scott Bockness: In light of the conditions of state budgets, to go back to the state operations issue and trying to come up with creative ways to fund the program... we all, within our own states, need to dance around the justification of what we’re using budget dollars for...go back to the EDDMapS system. Are there any potential state funding sources dedicated to EDRR that could be redirected to EDDMapS? We’re providing directly to the states. Could we redirect some of those funds back to the Center/MRWC?

Andrew Canham: As President, I feel like we need to be looking ahead. We don’t want to be at the end of our funding and find out we’re in a crisis.

VIII. Washington DC Visits (March 14-17, 2011)

Andrew Canham began the discussion. At the meetings he, Liz and Scott attended in Washington DC from March 14 to 17, Andrew gave a history of the MRWC and reminded those they met with that Andrew had been in DC a few years ago and that the Congressmen and Senators were very supportive. He discussed MRWC goals and accomplishments, and where the Coalition has been and how far it has come. He said the group presentations were very well received—notably by Senator Thune (SD).

Liz Galli-Noble added a few more details regarding the Washington DC visit. Liz setup meetings with Congressmen/women from MT and NE: Senators Baucus, Nelson, and Tester and Representative Rehberg; and Andrew set up meetings for SD (see Attachment 6). They were not able to formally meet with any of the Congressmen/women, but did meet with their staff. The staffers were not able to provide much future funding direction, due to the fact that the Federal budget still had not been passed, but they were very positive about the MRWC and the states working together and pooling resources. Federal agencies have made it clear that they can’t possibly fund all of the individual states’ needs, and they are looking to fund regional efforts that help multiple states with the same needs. They encouraged the MRWC to continue to produce outreach products and conduct projects that are relevant to all six states. Andy, Scott and Liz briefly spoke to Senator Thune (SD) and met with his senior policy adviser, who was extremely helpful. Liz brought with her and distributed packets containing: MRWC products, briefing papers, project summaries, budgets, media products, and the like. During her part of the presentation Liz stressed that in 2008 the Coalition needed coordination, and when CIPM took that on, it all came together. CIPM was created to do exactly the kinds of things being done by the MRWC; it’s really a match made in heaven. The MRWC representatives (including Dave Burch) also
met with our funding partners: NRCS and the USFS-State and Private Forestry Program, while in DC. Those meetings also went very well and continued funding for the MRWC looks promising.

Scott Bockness: The DC trip was a great opportunity to show regional efforts and gain exposure for CIPM’s and MRWC’s needs. The Coalition has leaped forward under the leadership of CIPM. We gave them a message that says this directive the federal government is trying to push is exactly what the Coalition is doing. He thanked them for their prior funding.

Slade Franklin: Were these meetings only for the MRWC or also for the HHC?

Andrew Canham: We were not part of HHC activities; the states had their own representatives there for HHC.

Liz Galli-Noble: We made sure we didn’t cross the line between HHC and MRWC. We were in DC representing the MRWC and did not participate in any of the HHC lobbying activities. Although, all of the MRWC states do, independently, support HHC. And we were respectful of that as well.

Andrew Canham: The only combined meetings were with Rob Mangold (USFS) and NRCS; during those meetings, we only spoke about the MRWC. The MRWC hasn’t formally endorsed HHC.

Perhaps this is good time for Dave Burch and other states, who are involved in the HHC, to give us a little summary of their DC activities.

Dave Burch: I provided an update for HHC (see Attachment 7). Fifteen states were represented at the HHC advocacy week. We met with 100 Congressmen and they were impressed with the accomplishments of HHC, especially with the difficulty of coordinating so many states. HHC is trying to make the federal government look at their budgets and perhaps redirect funding where it will be used more efficiently. We’d like the funding to go where the workers are and use the money more effectively. The Western and National Governor’s Associations are on board as are the National Agriculture Directors.

The three main ideas HHC is currently working toward are:
1. Federal agencies provide a state pass through fund assessed at 25 cents on each state’s federally managed acre.
2. To stop the conduit for invasive species spread, the FHA should authorize a line item at $150 per state center line mile of highway.
3. Over five years, Federal land management agencies will increase their on-the-ground control obligation by five-fold and decrease current infested acres by 25%.

IX. MRWC Projects Updates

MRWC EDDMapS and Expansion to Other Western States
Liz Galli-Noble presented a summary of the EDDMapS project and its expansion (see Attachment 8, which also summarizes the subsequent two projects discussed during this meeting).

When CIPM was asked to start coordinating for the MRWC in 2008, the first thing we were told to do by the Executive Committee was to establish an effective and fairly inexpensive way to implement a regional EDRR system. In general, the states communicated effectively within their own state, but didn’t communicate very well across borders and with other states. We looked at four potential EDRR programs, and EDDMapS was selected by the MRWC due to the system’s ease of use and low cost for implementation. It took one year and a little less than $17,000 for the system to get up and running. Chuck Bargeron of Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health (CISEH, Bugwood) produced a great product. The EDDMapS was presented to the MRWC at our September 27, 2010 fall meeting and was officially launched the next day.

The USFS was so impressed with the product that they contributed an additional $30,000 in late 2010 to expand the MRWC EDDMapS to additional western states. Liz and Dave Moorhead (CISEH) did an EDDMapS presentation at the WWCC meeting in December 2010; people liked what they saw and contacted the MRWC to join. Just in the last couple of months, five new states: Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Utah and Washington have been added to the system. Bugwood/Chuck made this very easy for us; they are great partners for the MRWC.

Chuck Bargeron: This project has been a great example of how things should work (getting buy-in from states, working with state contacts), which Chuck has been showing to others. The Alberta Invasive Plants Council is interested in expanding this kind of model into their region. He’s open to suggestions and currently working on a mobile version of EDDMapS that will run on the IPhone and Androids, and possibly the newer Blackberry platforms, which will allow
mobile reporting (it’s going to be a Mobile App, not a Regular App). We got a report from Utah today that one of their county weed coordinators reported an invasive plant. Verification has not been done as of yet.

Liz Galli-Noble: If there’s anything we can do in terms of grant writing or letters of support, to move along the creation of the App, please let me know.

Chuck Bargeron: In terms of an actual App, that will take longer (about a year). A Mobile App will be quicker.

Bob Parsons: Is it possible to integrate other invasive taxa, like bugs for example?

Chuck Bargeron: We tend to stay away from regulated pests. APHIS and the states would have to commit to the project and more concerns come into play. The program is designed to handle all invasives. It could be integrated through education in each state.

Liz Galli-Noble: The MRWC EDRR Workgroup was disbanded after we hired CISEH to develop the EDDMapS, but Andrew Canham has recently asked that they reconvene. So perhaps they can address this.

Conservation Innovation Grant
Scott Bockness: The CIG funding was approved last fall. Early efforts have been: giving presentations, getting exposure for the project, and making people aware of the project and what its components are. It was a natural fit for the MRWC. So the context of the project was developing new tools and better documentation and to better evaluate management strategies for saltcedar and Russian olive. Synergy of Belgrade, MT will begin the week of May 23rd to do the preliminary site inventory and baseline for the project. There are about 5 locations in MT, 2 or 3 in WY, 4 to 6 in SD, maybe one in NE to be considered for monitoring. Once we complete the site list, we’ll start with site assessments and develop timelines. In the first year of the project, we’ll spend half of the $163,000 that was earmarked for the monitoring portion of the project. The rest of the money will be spent in Years 2 and 3. At the conclusion of this project, we will be able to provide some good guidance on control strategies, good informational direction on restoration practices, among other things. The people from Yankee Pellet Mill will have a prototype of the portable pelletization machine completed in a couple of weeks. They’ve been testing different dryer systems to make the system mobile. The technical specifications will be posted on the MRWC website when they are available.

Yellowstone Corridor Aerial Imagery Project
Scott Bockness: We did a demonstration flight last fall, but weren’t comfortable that the quality of data from that flight was all we hoped it would be. We’re going to run another test flight over a segment of the Yellowstone River in June or July. The contract expires in September of this year and we’ll have to make a quick decision about how best to proceed after the test flight.

Greg Sundstrom: Currently the State of Kansas is using aerial imaging on riparian sites. Russian olive and saltcedar are viable for biomass and the river systems are a sustainable resource.

X. MRWC Workgroup Updates (see Attachment 9)

MRWC Outreach and Awareness Workgroup
Andrew Canham: Kristi Paul is the new Chair of the Outreach and Awareness Workgroup. We thank her for volunteering to lead this effort.

Liz Galli-Noble: Emily Rindos, CIPM Outreach and Science Communications Associate, will take over coordination of this group. There is still no word on APHIS FY11 10201 funding for the outreach program expansion. We would welcome additional people to join this workgroup!

Ron Moehring: The Wild Dakota TV-MRWC collaboration is progressing nicely. Ron Moehring, Kelly Sharp, and Andrew Canham were recently interviewed for a video segment. The first episode will be aired at 7:30 am Sunday (May 1st) in select areas in South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, and Minnesota.
Emily Rindos: Should the MRWC have a Facebook page? It’s a great way to raise awareness of the group and increase traffic to the website. We could link to things like the Wild Dakota TV show, project updates, new products and publications, surveys, photos, and so on. CIPM could maintain the page and it wouldn’t take much time at all.

Karie Decker (via Adobe Connect): “I agree with the Facebook idea – social media is currently the number one way to increase website traffic.”

MRWC EDRR Workgroup
Liz Galli-Noble: I wanted to quickly share the results of the MRWC EDRR Workgroup survey that was conducted late last year (see Attachment 10). Crystal Andrews, EDRR Workgroup Chair and EDRR Specialist for the CO Department of Agriculture, developed the survey with input from the Workgroup members. The Workgroup will convene in the next couple of months to further analyze the results of the survey and focus on state-based EDRR systems. Crystal Andrews recently accepted a new position, so she will no longer be involved with this Workgroup. She will be missed.

**XI. Ideas for Future MRWC Projects**

Andrew Canham opened the discussion asking if any members had ideas for new projects that the MRWC could pursue this year.

Ron Moehring: Custer County, SD has asked about a treat and re-vegetate at-the-same-time program.
Dave Burch recalled that Roger Sheley at Montana State University did a program on that and suggested contacting Kim Goodwin.

Someone asked whether or not there was information on the viability of pulling hoary cress before the grass comes in.

Scott Bockness: There is an information gap regarding regional inventory of invasive plant infestations. We need to incorporate treatment and monitoring into these inventories. We need to be able to answer the question: why are infestations expanding in certain areas and not in others?

Andrew Canham: This is exactly why we need the aerial mapping project. We need the ability to quickly map for inventory and it seems aerial mapping would achieve this.

Slade Franklin: Emphasis should be on control and education. People ask why are we doing this? Ag producers and the Fish and Game Service can tell them why we treat weeds – benefits to wildlife, water savings, water quality, better Ag production. We need to better explain this to the public. It could be put on the website – to answer why weed prevention and inventory is so important in riparian areas. Research, inventory, documentation; we don’t have the whys addressed for invasive species management; we need to better educate the public.

Steve Brill said some landowners are interested in using invasive plant biomass for erosion control and other uses. CIG could help produce BMPs for these actions.

Greg Sundstrom and Scott Bockness suggested better tapping the services provided by Plant Material Centers.

South Dakota would like to see projects focusing on phragmites.

**XII. Schedule Fall 2011 MRWC Meeting**

Andrew Canham: Are there any suggestions on when and where the Fall 2011 MRWC meeting could take place? We typically hold our meeting in conjunction with the NAWMA meeting. But this fall that meeting will be held in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada on September 19-22, and we wanted to know how many of the MRWC members plan to attend that meeting. It could also take place at a similar time at another meeting that most MRWC members would be attending. Would the WWCC meeting in Las Vegas be a good fit? The timeframe we are looking for is September through late November or very early December, 2011.

Slade Franklin: If you go with the WWCC meeting, you need to coordinate with the hotel soon.
Dave Burch: Would the other states be interested in coming to Montana to tour the Eurasian watermilfoil efforts at Fort Peck Reservoir? Fall would be an excellent time to see how Montana is dealing with this. Maybe we could combine the MRWC fall meeting with this tour.

Mitch Coffin: It would be an excellent opportunity to see on-the-ground projects.

Scott Bockness: Miles City has a great site and I could showcase the CIG project at the same time. I’ll check with Yankee Pellet Mill to see if their prototype portable pelletizer will be ready by then. We could invite the public and state legislators.

Slade Franklin: Or should we stick to the video conferencing format? Wyoming will provide a room and host the fall meeting if this is the best way to get people to participate.

Mitch Coffin: We want to meet in person, if possible.

Decision: There may be an opportunity to combine the Fall 2011 MRWC meeting with (1) other meetings (NAWMA or WWCC), or (2) with a tour of Eurasian watermilfoil management at Fort Peck Reservoir in MT and a CIG biomass utilization demonstration. Liz Galli-Noble was asked to poll the MRWC membership to find out who is planning to attend certain meetings and how many members would attend these specific events. This meeting could also be the same as the Spring 2011 meeting (video conferencing and web-linked).

XIII. Meeting Adjourned
The meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.
All participants were invited to stay for the MRWC EDDMapS training that followed.

**MRWC EDDMapS TRAINING**
Training conducted by Karan Rawlins - Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health with assistance from CIPM

**Questions for Karan Rawlins and CISEH**
1. MRWC EDDMapS homepage – the “My EDDMapS” tab isn’t available, but I think it used to be. Is there a way to include this so that people don’t have to click the “EDDMapS Home” tab first? Could we add the “Tools and Training” tab also?

2. Can we provide a direct link (using the MRWC logo) to the MRWC website from the MRWC-EDDMapS homepage? The link currently is easy to overlook. Maybe put the MRWC logo next to CIPM’s? That box looks empty anyway.

3. My Alerts: By state, county, or species. Question: If you set up an alert for a specific species, does it alert you any time that species is reported anywhere? Or can it be narrowed down to the MRWC states?

4. Can you take a look at the EDDMapS instruction sheet I made and let me know if you have any suggestions for how I can improve it?

5. Ideas for the app: a mobile app won’t be as useful; many of the places where I would encounter a species I want to report don’t have cell phone reception (which wouldn’t allow me to use the app). However, I think I can set the camera on my phone to record the GPS coordinates of where the photo was taken. This way, I could use the app (or my computer) to submit a report when I returned home or got back to an area with cell phone reception. Maybe we could include this information in the instructions once the mobile app is ready to go.
## MRWC Program Budget

### October 11, 2011 Meeting Financial Update

**Amounts as of October 1, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Grant #</th>
<th>Funded Activities/Subcontracts</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Spent</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5/2008 – 2/2010 MT NWTF & USFS #MDA-2009-702 #4W2185 $100,000 | MRWC Program Coordination CIPM personnel, travel, communications, shipping, supplies, etc.  
- Outreach Program ($1,000)  
- Projects  
*Database Project (~$1,000)  
JHS, Inc. – Saltcedar Mapping Project | 86,786 | 86,786 | 0 | 1-year extension granted to project |
| 9/2009 – 9/30/2012 MT NWTF & USFS #MDA-2010-703 #4W2809 $100,000 | MRWC Program Coordination CIPM personnel, travel, communications, shipping, supplies, etc.  
- Outreach Program ($9,000-Hoopes)  
- Projects  
*Database Project (~$3,000)  
*Lab testing ($2,666)  
JHS, Inc. – Yellowstone River Aerial Mapping Project 10/2009 - 9/30/2011 | 59,007 | 61,106 | (2,099) | 1-year extension granted to project  
Actual remaining: $17,325 - $2,099 = $15,226 |
| 9/2010 – 9/2012 MT NWTF & USFS #MDA-2011-701 #4W3374 $130,000 | MRWC Program Coordination CIPM personnel, travel, communications, shipping, supplies, etc.  
- Outreach Program (Hunter Ed Booklet $12,810)  
- Projects  
*Database Project | 92,500 | 67,457 | 25,043 | |
| 10/2010 – 9/2013 NRCS CIG #4W3339 $1,000,000 | MRWC Conservation Innovation Grant (CIG) Project  
- Project Coordination/Tech Transfer/Outreach  
- Travel/communications/shipping/supplies, etc.  
Synergy Resources Solutions, Inc. – Subcontract: Monitoring Project  
Biomass Sample Testing Project  
Pelletization Demo Project; portable pellet mill development  
Treatment Project  
Equipment Purchase | 469,500 | 464,645 | 37,855 | 165,855 | Contract signed; work started 7/2011  
Feasibility/herbicide residue testing  
Purchased Pellet Pro services 10/2011  
No progress to date  
Purchased Pellet Pro equipment 10/2011 |

*Project began 1/2011*  
*Project began 10/1/2010*  
*Bockness hired 12/1/2010*  
*2011 flooding delayed project*  
*Project delayed in 2009 & 2010*  
*Project terminated 9/30/2011*  
*Project completed 4/30/2009*  
*Project completed 12/2010*  
*Project began 10/1/2010*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Personnel, Travel, Communications, Shipping, Supplies, etc.</th>
<th>Outreach Program</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Total Personnel, Travel, Communications, Shipping, Supplies, etc.</th>
<th>Outreach Program</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2011 – 10/31/2013</td>
<td>MRWC Program Coordination CIPM personnel, travel, communications, shipping, supplies, etc.</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Project began 9/2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2011 – 9/2012</td>
<td>WY Dept Ag &amp; USFS #? #4W? $11,000</td>
<td>MRWC Program Coordination CIPM personnel, travel, communications, shipping, supplies, etc.</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Contract signed 10/6/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $1,380,910 $365,920 $1,014,990

Pending CIPM Grant Funding:
- $55,000 – NFWF PTI Grant: Plastic Weed Model and ID Card Production (Preproposal submitted: 7-15-2011; full proposal submitted 10-7-2011, pending)

Recently Rejected CIPM Grant Funding:
- $385,000 – APHIS Farm Bill 10201 Suggestion: MRWC Outreach and Awareness Program (rejected, June 2011)
- $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)
MRWC Outreach and Awareness Workgroup Update
October 11, 2011

I. WORKGROUP OVERVIEW

Prevention is the most efficient and economical invasive plant management strategy. Key components of prevention are increasing public education and awareness. The six MRWC states value prevention and education programs, and launched the Outreach and Awareness Workgroup, as well as a public relations campaign across the region in fall 2009.

Led by the MRWC Outreach and Awareness Workgroup and CIPM, successful state-based awareness and education programs (adult and K-12) are being expanded to other states within the watershed. Key individuals from all six states help coordinate this effort. Current Outreach and Awareness Workgroup members include:

- Kristi Paul (NE), Chair
- Emily Rindos (CIPM, MT), Coordinator
- Steve Ryder (CO)
- Liz Galli-Noble (CIPM, MT)
- Dave Burch (MT)
- Karie Decker (NE)
- Ron Moehring (SD)
- Andrew Canham (SD)
- Kelly Sharp (SD)
- Julie Kraft (WY)
- Jamie Cass (WY)

We are currently looking for additional members. If you are interested in joining the Outreach and Awareness Workgroup, please contact Emily Rindos (emily.rindos@montana.edu).

II. PROJECT UPDATES

The MRWC Outreach and Awareness Workgroup meets on a regular basis and accomplished the following during this reporting period:

**MRWC-Wild Dakota Invasive Species Video Series**

In late 2010, the MRWC partnered with South Dakota-based Wild Dakota Productions to develop a series of eight short videos to raise awareness among sportsmen of invasive species and their impacts. Wild Dakota is a regional television show that targets hunters and anglers in and around South Dakota. Wild Dakota has been on the air since 2003 and currently reaches over 500,000 people weekly with its Sunday morning TV show plus thousands more via YouTube and Facebook. The videos offer information on identification, prevention, reporting infestations, and the things sportsmen can do to help in the battle against invasive species. Episodes include: Invasive Species Overview, No Hitchhikers, Fight Five, Early Detection and Rapid Response, Angler Awareness, Waterfowl Awareness, Upland Game Invasives, and Big Game.

All eight videos have aired and the response has been fantastic and the Montana Weed Control Association plans to adopt the “Fight Five” idea. Each video has received between 70–215 views on Facebook alone, and the comments show that there really is a need for this type of outreach—people are listening and want to learn more. The videos can be viewed on the MRWC website (www.weedcenter.org/mrwc/outreach) and MRWC Facebook page (link from the MRWC home page).

*Total Cost: $7,500 plus $2,000 from the South Dakota Association of County Weed and Pest Boards*

**Protecting Wildlife Habitat: Sportsman’s Guide to Invasive Species**

Originally developed by the Wyoming Weed and Pest Council in 2009, the goal of this booklet was to convey information about noxious weeds to hunter education course participants. Because these state-based courses have little time to devote to the subject of weeds, it was decided that an inexpensive booklet (included in course packets) was a great way to reach this target audience.

In September 2009, the MRWC collaborated with Wyoming Weed and Pest to finish the booklet and prepare it for printing. The resulting product provides an overview on invasive species issues and the threats they pose to wildlife habitat, as well as information on how to identify sixteen terrestrial weed species. CIPM staff helped with the layout and design of the booklet and 62,000 copies were printed. Each state received between 5,000 and 10,000 copies to distribute via their respective hunter education programs. The response to this product has been extremely
positive and there have been numerous requests for additional copies.

Workgroup members have been actively pursuing funding sources (writing grants and approaching organizations such as the National Wild Turkey Federation) to develop and distribute a second edition.

Total Cost: $13,000 plus $3,000 from APHIS–WY (about $0.30 per copy)

MRWC Banner
CIPM developed an MRWC banner to be used at fairs, sporting events, meetings and conferences, and so on. Seven banners were ordered, one for each state and one for Wild Dakota.

Total Cost: $450

III. Funding Update:

Grants Applied For:

Pulling Together Initiative

Project Title: Regional Expansion of the What’s In Your World? Education Program
Description: Conduct a train-the-trainer workshop and distribute materials to expand the What’s In Your World? program classroom activities and resources to integrate weed science into 2nd–7th grade curriculums in the six Coalition states. Status: Rejected.

Project Title: Expansion of Invasive Species Education Booklets for Hunters
Description: Expand the existing Sportsman’s Guide to Noxious Weeds booklet to inform hunters of the threats posed by invasive species to wildlife and federal lands, to be used in conjunction with state hunter education courses. Status: Rejected.

Project Title: Wild Dakota TV Invasive Species Awareness Video Series
Description: Develop a series of videos to inform sportsmen of the threats posed by invasive species to fish and wildlife habitat on federal lands in the Missouri River Watershed, and what they can do to help. Status: Rejected.

Project Title: Production of Plastic Weed Models and Identification Cards
Description: CIPM will develop, produce, and distribute approximately 12,000 botanically accurate plastic weed models and approximately 20,000 weed identification cards of four new weed invaders in the western US. Status: Invited to submit full proposal.

US Fish and Wildlife Service National Wildlife Refuge System

Project Title: Expansion of the What’s In Your World? Youth Naturalist-Weed Scientist Program in the Missouri River Watershed
Description: Conduct a workshop to train state-based teachers and USFWS–NWRS staff teams to use the What’s In Your World? curriculum and initiate and implement teacher trainings and/or service-learning projects in the six Coalition states. Status: Pending, but unlikely.

Project Title: MRWC and Wild Dakota Invasive Species Video Series Featuring US Fish and Wildlife Service National Wildlife Refuges
Description: Develop a series of four engaging, informational video segments to inform sportsmen of the threats posed by invasive species to wildlife refuges and what they can do to help. Video segments will feature NWRS managers and staff in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska. Status: Pending, but unlikely.

The Outreach and Awareness Workgroup is always on the lookout for sources to fund our projects. If you come across a funding opportunity, such as a grant program, that you think might be a good fit for us, please forward it to Emily Rindos (emily.rindos@montana.edu).
IV. Potential Future Projects

Over the next several months, the Workgroup plans to do the following:

**Second edition: Sportsman’s Guide to Invasive Species**

A second edition of the Sportsman’s Guide to Invasive Species will expand on the current publication to include: more information on the Coalition; an overview of EDRR; aquatic invasive species impacts and aquatic EDRR species; more detailed species descriptions; list of resources for more information on noxious weeds; messages from the Wild Dakota videos; and more. It will also emphasize the importance and ease of reporting using EDDMapS.

As with the first edition, several thousand copies will be printed and distributed to state hunter education programs for 2012.

*Funding:* The Workgroup will continue to pursue funding from grant programs as well as NGOs such as the National Wild Turkey Federation to develop and print several thousand more copies.

**EDRR Posters**

This poster series will focus on EDRR species and emphasize the use of EDDMapS to report sightings.

*Funding:* Kristi can make copies of the posters for free, so the cost for this project will be minimal.

**2013 Calendar for Sportsmen**

The Workgroup will develop a 12-month calendar that incorporates invasive species awareness messages for hunters and anglers as well as information on how to identify EDRR species and how to report sightings. Each month will correspond to relevant hunting seasons and seasonal outdoor activities, such as upland bird hunting in September, big game hunting in November and so on.

*Funding:* Emily will create a prototype, which Workgroup members will use to solicit sponsorship from sporting goods stores, outdoor goods manufacturers such as Winchester and Remington. In exchange for their support, we will include their logos and possibly even small advertisements in the calendar.
October 1, 2011

Missouri River Watershed Coalition
Program Evaluation and Summary of Accomplishments
2010-2011

The Missouri River Watershed Coalition program is evaluated every two years according to “key measures of success” set forth in the MRWC Saltcedar Management Plan (2007). This two-year evaluation, covering 2010 and 2011, addresses those measures of success and summarizes the Coalition’s many accomplishments.

2010-2011, KEY MEASURES OF SUCCESS

1. Buy-in by additional agencies, groups, and individuals not currently involved with the Coalition and/or invasive plant control
2. Increased awareness of the invasive plant problem

Coalition Membership
The Coalition’s membership has grown steadily over the past two years. At present, the MRWC has more than 100 active members, including: federal, state, and local agencies, tribes, businesses, universities, conservation organizations, and private landowners. We now have members from within the Missouri River Watershed, as well as from northwestern Canadian provinces and neighboring states outside of the watershed basin. Coalition members were invited to present at many meetings and conferences in 2010 and 2011. The Coalition also expanded the MRWC EDDMapS program to five additional western states (ID, NV, OR, UT and WA) in April 2011. Through these regional outreach efforts, many organizations and individuals outside of our traditional Coalition stakeholder group have expressed interest in what the Coalition is doing and are actively tapping our programs and educational products.

MRWC Listserv and Website
Hosted by CIPM, the MRWC listserv (headwaters_tamarisk@listserv.montana.edu) is well used and has become a key communication tool for many of our members and partners throughout the region. Between semi-annual meetings, the MRWC communicates via this listserv with one to 10 postings going out each week. The Coalition also has a comprehensive website www.weedcenter.org/mrwc, which is hosted and managed by CIPM. Due to the expansion of the MRWC program in 2010, a full redesign, restructure, and expansion of the MRWC website was required. This was accomplished by CIPM staff over a several-month period – from July to December 2010. CIPM oversees the posting of information for education, awareness, mapping, EDRR activities, management and the like to the site, as well as maintaining the links, graphics and general MRWC program information on the site.

CIPM Coordination
The success of the Coalition and enhancement of its programs is a reflection of a successful three-year, coordination and partnership with the CIPM. The growth of the MRWC in status, membership and organization, and the Coalition’s ability to take on grant writing and complex project management only reinforces the very real need for sustained, formal coordination for the organization.
MRWC Workgroups
In 2010 and 2011, the MRWC has activated and tapped the resources of two workgroups – EDRR and Outreach and Awareness – which have helped to add extra energy and focus to particularly important, difficult, and time-consuming issues.

MRWC EDRR Workgroup - The EDRR Workgroup was active in 2008 and 2009, focusing on the selection and implementation of an EDRR system for the MRW. Once the MRWC EDDMapS project was under contract, the Workgroup ceased to meet. At the direction of the MRWC President, the Workgroup was reactivated during the September 27, 2010 MRWC meeting in Pueblo. They were asked to help: promote, guide, and implement user trainings for the new MRWC EDDMapS; formulate a strategy for state-based EDRR systems; and guide the expansion of the EDDMapS to other western states in 2011. The EDRR Workgroup met in November 2010 and began the implementation of the following actions: election of the EDRR Workgroup Chair; approval of the MRWC EDDMapS expansion workplan and budget; setting up MRWC EDDMapS training sessions; developing an informational packet for the MRWC EDDMapS; resumed planning for state-based EDRR systems; preliminary discussion about linking the EDDMapS and the INVADERS databases; and the development and conducting of an EDRR Survey in December 2010 to determine what is presently being done to address EDRR by the six MRWC states. Members of this Workgroup and the Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health (CISEH) gave MRWC EDDMapS presentations and/or conducted trainings on December 1 and 9, 2010; and January 13, February 17, April 27, and August 24, 2011.

MRWC Outreach and Awareness Workgroup - Prevention is the most efficient and economical invasive plant management strategy. Key components of prevention are increasing public education and awareness. The MRWC states value prevention and education programs, and through the Coalition launched an outreach and awareness program, as well as a public relations campaign across the region in 2009-2010. Led by the 10- to 14-member MRWC Outreach and Awareness Workgroup, successful state-based awareness and education programs (adult and K-12) have been expanded to other states within the watershed. The Workgroup meets on a regular basis and accomplished the following during 2010 and 2011:

a. Produced, printed, and distributed an update of the MRWC brochure in 2010;
b. Began implementation of outreach product development as suggested by MRWC members in a 2009 poll;
c. Took the MRWC educational, traveling display to several meetings in SD, NE, and MT;
d. Were interviewed by KTVM Channel 6 in Bozeman, MT to talk about the MRWC CIG projects;
e. Developed, printed, and distributed a MRWC hunter education booklet (based on a WY publication) focusing on invasive plants in the MRW region. 62,000 booklets were distributed to the six MRWC states in December 2010, and a second printing is planned for winter 2011. This project was funded by the MRWC and APHIS. The booklet can be downloaded using this link to the MRWC website: http://www.weedcenter.org/mrwc/docs/Minutes/hunters-safety.pdf#zoom=100.
f. Partnered with the Wild Dakota TV show to raise sportsmen awareness of invasive species and the problems they cause; foster the identification, prevention, reporting of invasive species; and inform sportsmen about what can do to help in the war on invasive species. Wild Dakota wrote, produced and have aired 7 of 8 video segments concerning invasives and how they affect sportsmen. Wild Dakota will combine all of the segments and produce an educational DVD in late 2011, which will be copied and disturbed as a standalone educational piece. Key personal from the MRWC along with state organizations dealing with invasives have provided assistance with topics and formatting of the segments to ensure accuracy and consistency with state and local programs. A priority has been placed on introducing the viewers to the concept of an early detection rapid response plan and the active role that sportsmen can play in invasive plant prevention and control.
g. CIPM developed a one-page summary of the CIG projects (see link: http://www.weedcenter.org/mrwc/docs/CIG%20Briefing%20FINAL%20Feb2011.pdf).
h. CIPM and key members of the Executive Committee conducted outreach presentations to agencies, tribes, organizations and other interested parties during 2010 and 2011, informing them of MRWC activities, inviting them to join the MRWC, to use MRWC products and listserv, and to attend meetings. Formal presentations conducted include: (1) a presentation at the Missouri River Natural Resources Conference, March 17-19, 2010 in Nebraska City, NE; (2) participation in the Missouri River Association of States and Tribes (MoRAST) meeting in the summer 2010 in SD; (3) a presentation to the MT Noxious Weed Management Advisory Council on June 15, 2010 in Helena, MT; (4) a presentation at the 2010 NAWMA meeting in Pueblo, CO; (5) a presentation to the Western Weed Coordinating Committee on December 1, 2010 in Las Vegas, NV; (6) a presentation to the MT Governor’s Weed Advisory Committee on December 9, 2010 in Helena, MT; (7) an application to join the Missouri River Recovery Implementation Committee (MRRIC) in 2010; (8) a presentation at the Missouri River Natural Resources Conference, March 9-11, 2011 in Nebraska City, NE; (9) a presentation to the Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee’s Weed Subcommittee on May 3, 2011 in Powell, WY; and (10) several interviews with MT’s news media showcasing the MRWC EDDMapS program in 2011.

i. The MRWC President and CIPM staff traveled to Washington DC from March 14-17, 2011 and met with seven Congressional representatives from MT, SD, and NE. They also joined MT for two additional meetings with MRWC program funders: NRCS and USFS State and Private Forestry program. During all of these meetings, the MRWC’s program and projects, outreach products, partnerships and collaborations, and EDRR system were showcased. The CIPM staff developed and distributed informational packets at all of these meetings, which included: MRWC program and project briefings, media materials, outreach tools, training materials, and publications. Inquires about potential funding for the MRWC were also made by the team. A portion of the CIPM Director’s presentation on March 16 to FICMNEW focused on CIPM’s strong partnership and collaboration with the MRWC.

3. Commitment of the six states to continue the group

The six MRWC states are fully committed to continuing their participation in the Coalition. That commitment has been demonstrated in many ways, including:

a. Weekly to monthly participation by the six state weed coordinators as members of the MRWC Executive Committee.

b. Each of the six states has committed staff time and expertise as members of the MRWC Workgroups and as advisors to CIPM.

c. Coalition semi-annual meetings have been well attended, and have always achieved a quorum of the six states in attendance.

d. The MRWC states have played differing roles in support of several multi-state projects undertaken by the Coalition and CIPM: grant writers, technical advisors, field support, spokes persons for the MRWC, liaisons to state and federal agencies, and funders.

e. In a June 2011 letter of official notice to the Coalition Executive Committee, North Dakota’s Agriculture Commissioner stated that he understood “the importance of a regional effort in the proper management of Invasive Plant Species,” and reaffirmed that “the North Dakota Department of Agriculture wished to remain a member of the Missouri River Watershed Coalition.”

4. Increased funding from internal and external sources

All six states have contributed grant funding and/or in-kind services to the MRWC over the past two years. To date, more than $381,000 in cash funding and thousands of hours of in-kind services have been contributed to the Coalition by the states. Those contributions have also helped to leverage more than $1 million in grant funding for the Coalition in 2010 and 2011. In an effort to fund MRWC program coordination and special
projects, CIPM staff and members of the MRWC Executive Committee and Workgroups have written and submitted 11 grant applications during this two-year period.

5. Increased research on all aspects of invasive plants  
6. Increased coordination of management efforts

Conservation Innovation Grant
The Coalition received a $1 million, 3-year Conservation Innovation Grant in September 2010, which has three main objectives: (1) to establish and monitor herbicide treatment and control sites, infested with saltcedar and Russian olive, for short- and long-term ecological changes, riparian system function, environmental protection, and natural resource enhancement; (2) to investigate and demonstrate the use of innovative bioenergy technologies that promote the utilization of invasive plant biomass as a fuel source; and (3) to utilize the MRWC’s established management and communications infrastructure and network to coordinate this project, and to transfer project findings, products and technologies to a broad range of regional stakeholders, including the private sector and NRCS. On behalf of the MRWC, the CIPM Director hired a CIG project leader in December 2010. Throughout 2011, CIPM staff and members of the MRWC Executive Committee have begun implementation of portions of the project and will conduct the first invasive plant biomass utilization demonstration at the MRWC fall meeting. There has been tremendous interest in the CIG project by many groups in the Watershed, as well as industry representatives throughout the U.S.

MRWC EDDMapS
The MWRC identified EDRR as a priority management tool that would be most valuable if coordinated on a regional scale. The MRWC contracted with the CISEH in late 2009 to create and host a custom EDDMapS program for invasive species reporting and mapping in the Watershed. The system was officially launched on September 28, 2010 (http://www.eddmaps.org/mrwc/) and is actively being used to report new sightings of select invasive plant species, to generate distribution maps of these species based on data that is entered, and to notify appropriate personnel when a new sighting has been reported. Press releases were written and widely distributed by CIPM announcing the launching of this new system in October 2010 and April 2011. MRWC EDDMapS trainings were conducted by CISEH and CIPM on January 13, February 17, April 27, and August 24, 2011 in MT, SD, and ID. CIPM has been developing a MRWC EDDMapS instruction booklet for system users. The MRWC secured additional funding from the USFS in 2010 to expand the MRWC EDDMapS to other western states. CIPM and the MRWC EDRR Workgroup approved a workplan in November 2010 and a new contract with CISEH to start the project was finalized in early January 2011. CIPM and CISEH gave a presentation on this project during the Western Weed Coordinating Committee meeting on December 1, 2010 in Las Vegas, NV. At that time four states asked to join the MRWC EDDMapS expansion: WA, OR, UT, and NV. Idaho joined in March 2011. By the end of March, these five states were active on the MRWC EDDMapS.

Yellowstone River Corridor Imagery Project
In October 2009, the MRWC contracted to conduct the Yellowstone River Corridor Imagery Project. The purpose of the project was to demonstrate the usefulness of aerial imagery to quickly and accurately locate infestations of saltcedar and Russian olive along the shores of the Yellowstone, Bighorn, and Tongue rivers. The objective of the project was to enable county weed control personnel to use the new imagery at a low cost and with minimal training. Unusual weather/vegetation conditions in fall 2009 made it impossible to conduct the imagery flights; spring 2010 conditions were also not favorable. Consequently, a “ground-truthing” flight was conducted in October 2010 to “test” the imagery for accuracy. That test failed due to camera setting problems. A second test flight was conducted in August 2011. MRWC and CIPM project managers rejected the August test fight deliverable and the project was terminated on September 30, 2011. Unspent funding from this project will be infused back into the MRWC program.
# Colorado Noxious Weeds (including Watch List)

## List A Species (23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Management plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African rue</td>
<td>(Peganum harmala)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelthorn</td>
<td>(Alhagi pseudalhagi)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common crucina</td>
<td>(Crupina vulgaris)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress spurge</td>
<td>(Euphorbia cyparissias)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer's woad</td>
<td>(Isatis tinctoria)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elongated mustard</td>
<td>(Brassica elongata)</td>
<td>Proposed addition 2011</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant reed</td>
<td>(Arundo donax)</td>
<td>Proposed addition 2011</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant salvinia</td>
<td>(Salvinia molesta)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrilla</td>
<td>(Hydrilla verticillata)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese knotweed</td>
<td>(Polygonum cuspidatum)</td>
<td>Proposed addition 2011</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giant knotweed</td>
<td>(Polygonum sachalinense)</td>
<td>Proposed addition 2011</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemian knotweed</td>
<td>(Polygonum × bohemicum)</td>
<td>Proposed addition 2011</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow knapweed</td>
<td>(Centaurea pratensis)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean sage</td>
<td>(Salvia aethiopis)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medusahead</td>
<td>(Taeniatherum caput-medusae)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle spurge</td>
<td>(Euphorbia myrsinites)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange hawkweed</td>
<td>(Hieracium aurantiacum)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple loosestrife</td>
<td>(Lythrum salicaria)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush skeletonweed</td>
<td>(Chondrilla juncea)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sereica lespedeza</td>
<td>(Lespedeza cuneata)</td>
<td>proposed move to List C, 2011</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squarrose knapweed</td>
<td>(Centaurea virgata)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tansy ragwort</td>
<td>(Senecio jacobae)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow starthistle</td>
<td>(Centaurea solstitialis)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## List B Species (37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Management plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absinth wormwood</td>
<td>(Artemisia absinthium)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black henbane</td>
<td>(Hyoscyamus niger)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouncingbet</td>
<td>(Saponaria officinalis)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull thistle</td>
<td>(Cirsium vulgare)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada thistle</td>
<td>(Cirsium arvense)</td>
<td>proposed 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese clematis</td>
<td>(Clematis orientalis)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common tansy</td>
<td>(Tanacetum vulgare)</td>
<td>proposed 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common teasel</td>
<td>(Dipsacus fullonum)</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn chamomile</td>
<td>(Anthemis arvensis)</td>
<td>proposed 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutleaf teasel</td>
<td>(Dipsacus laciniatus)</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmatian toadflax, broad-leaved</td>
<td>(Linaria dalmatica)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmatian toadflax, narrow-leaved</td>
<td>(Linaria genistifolia)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dame's rocket</td>
<td>(Hesperis matronalis)</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse knapweed</td>
<td>(Centaurea diffusa)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasian watermilfoil</td>
<td>(Myriophyllum spicatum)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoary cress</td>
<td>(Cardaria draba)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houndstongue</td>
<td>(Cynoglossum officinale)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointed goatgrass</td>
<td>(Aegilops cylindrica)</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leafy spurge</td>
<td>(Euphorbia esula)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayweed chamomile</td>
<td>(Anthemis cotula)</td>
<td>proposed 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moth mullein</td>
<td>(Verbacum blattaria)</td>
<td>proposed 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musk thistle</td>
<td>(Carduus nutans)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxeye daisy</td>
<td>(Chrysanthemum leucanthemum)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perennial pepperweed</td>
<td>(Lepidium latifolium)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumeless thistle</td>
<td>(Carduus acanthoides)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quackgrass</td>
<td>(Elytrigia repens)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian knapweed</td>
<td>(Acreption repens)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian-olive</td>
<td>(Elaeagnus angustifolia)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt cedar</td>
<td>(Tamarix chinensis, T. parviflora, and T. ramosissima)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scentless chamomile</td>
<td>(Matricaria perforata)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch thistle</td>
<td>(Onopordum tauricum)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted knapweed</td>
<td>(Centaurea maculosa)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurred anoda</td>
<td>(Anoda cristata)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur cinquefoil</td>
<td>(Potentilla recta)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice mallow</td>
<td>(Hibiscus trionum)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild caraway</td>
<td>(Carum carvi)</td>
<td>proposed 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow nutsedge</td>
<td>(Cyperus esculentus)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow toadflax</td>
<td>(Linaria vulgaris)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List C Species (15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulbous bluegrass</td>
<td>(Poa bulbosa)</td>
<td>Proposed addition 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicory</td>
<td>(Cichorium intybus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common burdock</td>
<td>(Arctium minus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common mullein</td>
<td>(Verbascum thapsus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common St. Johnswort</td>
<td>(Hypericum perforatum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downy brome</td>
<td>(Bromus tectorum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field bindweed</td>
<td>(Convolvulus arvensis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halogeton</td>
<td>(Halogeton glomeratus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnsorgass</td>
<td>(Sorghum halepense)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perennial sowthistle</td>
<td>(Sonchus arvensis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison hemlock</td>
<td>(Conium maculatum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puncturevine</td>
<td>(Tribulus terrestris)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redstem flaree</td>
<td>(Erodium cicutarium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvetleaf</td>
<td>(Abutilon theophrasti)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild proso millet</td>
<td>(Panicum milaceum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Watch List Species (20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian mustard</td>
<td>(Brassica tournefortii)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby's breath</td>
<td>(Gypsophila paniculata)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst burr, Spiney cocklebur</td>
<td>(Xanthium spinosum)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common bugloss</td>
<td>(Anchusa officinalis)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common reed</td>
<td>(Phragmites australis)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering rush</td>
<td>(Butomus umbellatus)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairy willow-herb</td>
<td>(Epilobium hirsutum)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himalayan blackberry</td>
<td>(Rubes armeniacus)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese blood grass/cogongrass</td>
<td>(Imperata cylindrical)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow hawkweed</td>
<td>(Hieracium Caespitosum)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pampas grass</td>
<td>(Cortaderia jubata)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch broom</td>
<td>(Cytisus scoparius)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sericea lespedeza</td>
<td>(Lespedeza cuneata)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainsonpea</td>
<td>(Sphaerophysa salsula)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian beancaper</td>
<td>(Zygophyllum fabago)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water hyacinth</td>
<td>(Eichhornia crassipes)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water lettuce</td>
<td>(Pistia stratiotes)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White bryony</td>
<td>(Bryonia alba)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolly distaff thistle</td>
<td>(Carthamus lanatus)</td>
<td>Proposed creation 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U.S. National Early Detection and Rapid Response System for Invasive Plants
Recommendations for Developing New Capacity for EDRR at the State and Regional Levels

Randy G. Westbrooks, Leslie J. Mehrhoff, and John D. Madsen

September 24, 2010

Development of the U.S. National Early Detection and Rapid Response System for Invasive Plants depends on the development of state and local capacity for preventing the establishment and spread of new invasive plants. Steps in developing EDRR capacity at the state/provincial and local levels include:

I. Interagency Coordination - Establish a State/Provincial EDRR Coordinating Committee
   A. Develop a Committee Work Plan (template available upon request)
   B. Identify Committee Members; Develop an EDRR Target List
   C. Develop a Clear Communications Structure with Protocols for Reporting, ID and Vouchering, Data Archival, Rapid Assessments, and Rapid Response Initiatives

II. Early Detection Network - Develop a State Early Detection and Reporting Network (EDRN)
   A. Agency Field Personnel (Department of Natural Resource Biologists, Nature Conservancy Land Stewards, County Extension Agents, County Weed Supervisors, County Ag Fieldmen, etc.)
   B. EDRN Volunteers (Native Plant Society Members, Friends Groups, Civics Club Members, Master Gardeners, Fishermen, Scouts, etc.)

III. Survey and Detection - Survey, and Monitor Important Natural and Managed Resources that are at risk.
    A. Conduct Weekend Bio-Blitzes for New Weeds at Selected Parks, Forests, Refuges, etc.
    B. Monitor High Hazard Sites Where New Invasive Species May Become First Established (e.g., Maritime Ports of Entry, International Airports, Bonded Warehouses, Free Trade Zones, Inland Intermodal Shipping Terminals)

IV. Reporting - Report Suspected New Invasive Plants to one of the Regional Invasive Plant Atlases (IPANE, IPAMS, EDDMaps, INVADERS, etc.).
    A. Archival of Field Data Records Submitted by the EDRN
    B. ‘Real-time Distribution Information on EDRR Target Species – Beneficial for:
       1. Creating Distribution Maps of EDRR Target Species
       2. Ecological Niche Modeling Research
       3. Planning Invasive Plant Control Programs

V. Rapid Assessment - Conduct Rapid Assessments of Confirmed New Species that are not already Regulated within a State (regulated species generally don’t require a new assessment).
   A. Identify an appropriate lead agency to address a particular new invasive plant problem – OR –
   B. Recommend the establishment of an invasive plant task force to address a new invasive plant problem that cannot be address by a single agency.

VI. Rapid Response – Develop a Rapid Response Plan to Address Specific Problems.
   A. Assist the designated lead agency in addressing a new invasive plant problem –
   B. OR – establish an invasive plant task force to address the problem – as appropriate. The Carolinas Beach Vitex is a good example of a successful interagency partnership.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Randy G. Westbrooks, USGS BRD
233 Border Belt Drive, Whiteville, NC 28472
Phone: 910-648-6762 E-mail: rwwestbrooks@usgs.gov

UCONN, 75 N. Eagleville Road, Storrs, CT 06269-3043
Phone: 860-486-5708 E-Mail: ljmehrhoff@uconn.edu

John Madsen, Invasive Plant Atlas of the MidSouth, Mississippi State University
2 Research Blvd., Starkville, MS 39759
Phone: 662-325-2428, E-mail: jmadsen@grs.msstate.edu
Missouri River Watershed Coalition
Regional Early Detection and Rapid Response System for Invasive Plants (Species?)
DRAFT – 9-28-2011; Moehring, Galli-Noble, Canham

Development of a MRWC regional EDRR System for Invasive Plants depends on the development of state and local capacity for preventing the establishment and spread of new invasive plants. Steps in developing EDRR capacity at the regional, state and local levels include:

I. Interagency Coordination – Establish a State EDRR Coordinating Committee
   A. Identify Committee Members and establish Committee (done: CO, MT, SD, WY ?)
   B. Develop a Committee Work Plan (done: CO, MT, SD, WY ?)
   C. Develop an EDRR Target List (done: CO, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)
   D. Develop a clear communications structure with protocols for reporting, ID and vouchering, data archival, rapid assessments, and rapid response initiatives (MRWC EDDMapS does most of this; can it be expanded to do more?)

II. Early Detection Network – Develop a State Early Detection and Reporting Network (EDRN)
   A. Agency Field Personnel [state and federal natural resource and wildlife managers, county weed supervisors, city weed supervisors, NGOs (TNC, TWS, RMEF, etc.), county Extension agents, university Extension personnel and researchers, etc.]
   B. Volunteers [watershed groups, CWMAs, civic organizations, Master Gardeners, sportsmen and sportsmen’s organizations, recreationalists, youth groups (4-H, Scouts, etc.), Native Plant Society, conservation districts, NGOs, etc.]

III. Survey and Detection – Survey and Monitor Important Natural and Managed Resources that are at risk.
   A. Monitor High Hazard Sites Where New Invasive Species May Become First Established (for example, highways, roads, trails, waterways, tourist areas)

IV. Reporting – Report Suspected New Invasive Plants to EDDMapS or INVADERS databases
   A. Archival of Field Data Records Submitted to EDDMapS
   B. ‘Real-time’ Distribution Information on EDRR Target Species – Forwarded to western state weed coordinators by EDDMapS

V. Rapid Assessment – Conduct Rapid Assessments of Confirmed New Species that are not already Regulated within a State (regulated species generally don’t require a new assessment).
   A. Identify an appropriate lead agency to address a particular new invasive plant problem

VI. Rapid Response – Develop a Rapid Response Plan to Address Specific Problems.
   A. Assist the designated lead agency in addressing a new invasive plant problem –
   B. OR – establish an invasive plant task force to address the problem – as appropriate. Yellow starthistle, dyer’s woad, and Russian mallow are good examples of a successful interagency partnerships.

Source: This EDRR concept was taken from the U.S. National Early Detection and Rapid Response System for Invasive Plants-Recommendations for Developing New Capacity for EDRR at the State and Regional Levels written by Randy G. Westbrooks, Leslie J. Mehrhoff, and John D Madsen; September 24, 2010.
### 1. EDRR Coordinating Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Co-chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Specialist</td>
<td>EDDmaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Atlas</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eddmaps.org/mrwc/">http://www.eddmaps.org/mrwc/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal/State Biologist Rapid Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Weed Scientists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Weed Scientists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Land Liaisons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Weed Regulatory</td>
<td>Al Tasker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Weed Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRR Outreach Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. State/Regional EDRR Target Species List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDRR Weeds Not yet found in the State/region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDRR Weeds Found but limited Distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. EDRR Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USDA APHIS PPQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Forest Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA NRCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey</td>
<td>Randy Westbrooks <a href="mailto:rwestbrooks@usgs.gov">rwestbrooks@usgs.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept. Of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Wildlife and Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Rapid Assessment Guidelines

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Identify, Biology, Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Current World Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Invasiveness History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Regulatory History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Stake Holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Containments Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Eradication Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Control Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Potential for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Short Term Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Long term Impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Rapid Response Initiatives Eradication of Target Species

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) survey was developed by Crystal Andrews, MRWC EDRR Workgroup Chair, and other members of the Workgroup in November 2010. The purpose of the survey was to gain a better understanding of the resources being devoted to supporting Noxious Weed EDRR programs in the Missouri River watershed.

The Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health set up the Survey Monkey account for the Workgroup and a wide array of MRWC partners were asked to fill out the survey in December 2010.

25 individuals responded to the Survey Monkey questionnaire. Attached is a summary of survey results. To view detailed survey results link to: (password: mrvcedrr)

http://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=JmFCxdl74Tb2K4Eq_2bn5_2fUWTepnRN_2bGJJAA_2bGi0tnIBc8_3d

Results from this survey will be used by the MRWC EDRR Workgroup to help launch state-based EDRR programs within the MRW region, and for funding applications to bring more needed resources to EDRR efforts in the region.
1. Thank you for filling out the EDRR survey, the results may be used in funding applications to bring additional resources to EDRR efforts throughout the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 25

skipped question 1
### 2. Does your state have an EDRR program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 17
skipped question 9

### 3. Does your state have dedicated staff to an EDRR program or to EDRR activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 17
skipped question 9
4. If you answered yes to number 3, how many dedicated staff do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 5
skipped question 21

5. If you have dedicated staff for an EDRR program, what percentage of their time is designated to EDRR duties (on average)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>33.3% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>33.3% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>33.3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100.0% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 5
skipped question 21
### 6. Does your state have financial resources dedicated to the EDRR program or to EDRR activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 17
- Skipped question: 9

### 7. What source(s) of revenue fund the program or activities (by percent)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General funds</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant(s)</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated or special tax or fund</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specify source)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 6
- Skipped question: 20
8. What is the source of authority for the EDRR program in your state?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Authority</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By statute</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatically without statute</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If you have an EDRR program in place, within what department is the program housed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All do</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Do county weed supervisors have EDRR programs in place in their individual counties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Availability</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All do</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some do</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None do</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question: 12
skipped question: 14

answered question: 16
skipped question: 10
11. If you have an EDRR program but limited resources, would you expand the EDRR program with additional funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If you do not have an EDRR program in place, would you support having an EDRR program in your state if funds were made available?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Are new invasive plant species mapped in your state?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. If you answered yes to question number 13, how are new invasive plant species mapped (check all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line system</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand drawn on Existing maps</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 16  
skipped question 10

15. Any suggestions, comments or ideas are welcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 7  
skipped question 19