Missouri River Watershed Coalition
MEETING MINUTES
June 16 and 17, 2009
DRAFT - 7/3/09

Location: Spearfish, South Dakota

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

Meeting facilitator: Liz Galli-Noble
Meeting note taker: Rachel Hammond

27 meeting participants:
Liz Galli-Noble, CIPM (MT)  Nathan Jagen, Meade County W&P (SD)
Ron Moehring, SD Department of Agriculture  Stacey Barta, MT Department of Agriculture
Rachel Hammond, CIPM (MT)  David Heck, SISMA (SD)
Erik Lehnhoff, CIPM (MT)  Andrew Canham, MVM & SISMA (SD)
Janet Clark, CIPM (MT)  Bruce Shambaugh, USDA/APHIS/PPQ
Greg Sundstrom, CO State Forest Service  Scott Guffey, Pennington County W&P (SD)
Paul Beaver, High Plains WMA (NE)  Kelly Sharp, MVM (SD)
Tabithia Christner, SD State University
Shauna Waughtel, SD State University
Sharon Clay, SD State University
Darwin Kurtenbach, SD Department of Agriculture  The following MRWC Executive Committee members
J. Bruce Helbig, USDA/APHIS (WY)  linked to the meeting via conference call:
Mike Stenson, SD Department of Agriculture  Dave Burch (MT)
Kristi Paul, NWCA (NE)  Mitch Coffin (NE)
Dennis Beyer, High Plains WMA (NE)  Rachel Seifert-Spilde/Blake Schaan (ND)
Ken Shackelton, Cook County W&P (WY)  Kelly Uhing (CO)

Tuesday, June 16, 2009
9:00 am

I. Welcome:
Liz Galli-Noble opened the meeting and introductions were made.

II. Approval of Minutes:
Ron Moehring moved to approve the September 18, 2008 meeting minutes as written. Kristi Paul seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved (Attachment A).

III. Announcements:
- Liz Galli-Noble reminded meeting participants to fill out and submit the MRWC in-kind match and contribution sheet – meeting attendance can be used as match. Project expenses and match will be reported in the MRWC semi-annual reports. Match demonstrates the worthiness of projects (download form from MRWC website at: http://www.weedcenter.org/Missouri_wtrshd/miss_watershed.htm).
- Liz Galli-Noble announced that there will be a second round of funding for the MRWC coming through the MT Department of Agriculture, Noxious Weed Trust Fund for 2009-2010; details were provided later in the meeting.

IV. MRWC Membership Update
Liz Galli-Noble provided the meeting participants with a handout summarizing feedback from a poll that was sent to the full MRWC membership (mostly via the MRWC listserv headwaters_tamarisk@listserv.montana.edu)
in late 2008/early 2009 (Attachment B). Presently, there are approximately 100 MRWC members (~80 on the listserv) and the poll had a more than 80% response rate. Questions asked in the poll were:

1. Do you wish to continue your MRWC membership? Yes No
2. Do you typically attend MRWC meetings? Yes No If no, why not?
3. Do you have any comments or suggestions for the MRWC Executive Committee?

The main reason for conducting the poll was to determine the actual number of active MRWC members and thus allow the group to equitably vote for officers.

V. Election of MRWC Officers (President and Vice President)

Liz Galli-Noble and Ron Moehring briefly went over the voting rules (Attachment C). Executive Committee members who linked via conference call emailed or text messaged their votes to Liz Galli-Noble and Rachel Hammond, who recorded their votes on a paper ballot.

- It was decided that two rounds of voting would conducted: the first round for President and the second round for Vice President.
- Liz Galli-Noble called for nominations and four individuals were nominated: (1) Scott Bockness - MT, (2) Patricia Gilbert - US Army Corps of Engineers, MT, (3) Greg Sundstrom - CO, and (4) Andy Canham - SD.
- After which Kristi Paul moved to close the floor to further nominations and Dave Burch seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.
- All members present filled out a paper ballot and Executive Committee members participating via conference phone called in their votes; and after the ballots were collected and tallied, Andy Canham was elected President. He accepted the position.
- A second round of voting followed with the same nominations, less Andy Canham’s name, and Patricia Gilbert was elected Vice President. Patricia was not present at the meeting, so it was suggested that if she was to decline the position, Scott Bockness (a close second in number of votes) would be asked to be Vice President. All members present agreed to this suggestion.

VI. MRWC Program Summary

Liz Galli-Noble provided the membership with a handout and brief overview of a MRWC program summary that she had presented to funding partners in February 2009 and that she had recently updated for a MRWC progress report (Attachment D). A poster and large saltcedar map were displayed as outreach tools developed for the MRWC.

VI. MRWC Program Evaluation

Janet Clark facilitated the program evaluation discussion (Attachment E).
She explained that the MRWC established an annual program evaluation process as part of the 2007 Salt Cedar Management Plan, which states that the success of the Coalition will be evaluated annually at a joint meeting. The Coalition will review the Action Plan each year and assess the status of each of the items in the plan. The key measures of success will be:

- Buy-in by additional agencies, groups, and individuals not currently involved with saltcedar control
- Commitment of the six states to continue the group
- Increased awareness of the saltcedar problem
- Increased funding from internal and external sources
- Increased research on all aspects of saltcedar
- Increased coordination of management efforts.
Janet Clark asked for feedback from the Coalition members and comments received addressing the key measures of success were recorded and summarized:

1) **Buy-in by additional agencies, groups, and individuals not currently involved with saltcedar control**
   - SD – MRWC needs to increase awareness and needs more involvement from the BIA (mapping/treatment/attention generally); SD has previously worked with the tribes to help them with mapping and treating tribal lands.
   - Nationally, saltcedar is getting more attention – positive and negative – note the recent lawsuit by the Center for Biodiversity Conservation
   - MT – The Fort Belknap Tribe contacted CIPM because of the MRWC connection
   - CO – Resource Conservation & Development Councils (RC&Ds)… Grazing Land Conservation Initiative (GLCI – NRCS grants program)
   - MORAST/MRRIC/MRNRC – very interested in partnering; another tribal contact was made at the MRNRC (Elizabeth Wakeman, Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe, SD)
   - USFWS – increasing interest in invasive species (CO)
   - SD-NRCS – looking for more information
   - NE-High Plains Weed Management Assoc formed (under RC&D) and funded – 7 county organization
   - MT – Yellowstone River Conservation District Council wants to work with MRWC – possible research project with saltcedar and Russian olive

2) **Commitment of the six states to continue the group**
   - Signed MOA addendum
   - Multi-state projects
   - Listserv & website – good responses and involvement
   - Map – contributions and commitment from all six states
   - Handouts developed about group (MRWC); suggestion: mail to CDs and other conservation groups in all 6 states

3) **Increased awareness of the saltcedar problem** – everyone agreed that there has been an increased awareness of the saltcedar problem in their states.

4) **Increased funding from internal and external sources**
   - SD – calls from hunters
   - NE – WMA projects with state and federal funding
   - CO – CO Water Conservation Board – Platte River $1M for invasives
   - NE – Legislature – one senator took on invasives as his pet project
   - SD – phragmites – more questions being received; increased funding from the state
   - CO – stimulus funding proposals
   - BLM – using stimulus funding for saltcedar & others BC research
   - Secretary Salazar – proponent of invasive species management… and others in the administration now
   - MT passed Invasive Species Act and funded it
   - SD – ANS Plan for the state was signed by the governor
   - NE – Invasive species funded by lottery – funding is continuing… some programs are 50/50 cost-share with landowners and they’re still popular

5) **Increased research on all aspects of saltcedar**
   - SD – USDA-funded project
   - CO – CSU working on Russian olive
   - MT – NWTF funded projects, more proposals on saltcedar received each year – control and rehab, MSU and UM
   - Riparian projects getting more funding
6) Increased coordination of management efforts.
   • More communication and coordination among states… about new weeds and management
   • Gone to conferences, meetings, met people… learn about new species
   • Subprojects: Sheyenne R, Platte R, Belle Fourche River
   • Inspiration – EDRR presentation in NE

VII. MRWC Financial Business
Liz Galli-Noble reported that:
   • A second round of funding for the MRWC will be secured in July 2009. This is funding from the USFS State and Private Forestry program, which passes through the MT Noxious Weed Trust Fund to the CIPM. The first round of funding for the MRWC was in May 2008 for $100,000, of which ~$45,000 remains. The second round of funding will also be for $100,000 – of which ~$25,000 will be targeted for a saltcedar mapping project in MT – and the rest will go to the MRWC and CIPM.
   • Recovery Act funding proposals were made to the US Forest Service, Bureau of Reclamation, and NRCS on behalf of the MRWC; these were large funding requests (~$1 million) to provide grant funding for monitoring, restoration and other invasive plant management projects in the Missouri River Watershed states. Not successful in the first round but may still get funding late in the FY.
   • Other potential funding sources are:
     o NRCS National CIP grant for up to $2 million, which the MRWC has been encouraged to apply for.
     o NRCS CCPI grants, which are great multiple states funding sources that can focus on water courses or riparian weeds and distribution of money to private landowners.
   • Liz Galli-Noble also reminded the MRWC membership that there are a couple of different options that might be pursued regarding establishing a designated financial account for the Coalition (Attachment F). Two options are through MSU-Bozeman and possibly through the Western Weed Coordinating Committee, which is a non-profit organization.

VIII. MRWC EDRR Project
Erik Lehnhoff has been working on the development of an early detection-rapid response (EDRR) system for the MRWC for the past 10 months. He put together several presentations for the membership to provide an overview of that process and to give CIPM’s recommendations for MRWC EDRR system implementation.

Presentation 1. EDRR System, Erik Lehnhoff, CIPM
The first presentation was by Erik Lehnhoff (see link to “EDRR Overview – Lehnhoff” for PowerPoint presentation). He gave an overview of several EDRR systems used in North America. He also provided a demonstration of the Invaders Database EDRR system (University of Montana) and discussed its capabilities and limitations. He stated that the system is based on high-quality herbarium data from 5 western states (WA, OR, ID, MT and WY) and does a good job of displaying this historical data at a county level. It also provides a nice, simple graphical tool to track changes in historical distribution over time (number of counties infested over time). It was also discussed that the Invaders Database is not a GIS system and does not have point mapping capabilities. It does, however, serve as an EDRR system by allowing qualified users to submit new sightings of invasive plants and has a mechanism to notify interested parties of the new sightings. Erik said that the cost to expand the Invaders Database system to the MRW would be ~$50,000 per state, or ~$200,000 for CO, ND, SD, and NE.

Q: What is this map going to be used for? A: The map will not be used for management; it will be mainly used to document where the weeds are and to help management at a county level.
**Presentation 2. Chuck Bargeron – Early Detection and Distribution and MAPping System, Development of an Invasive Species Early Detection Distribution Mapping System; Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health (CISEH or Bugwood), University of Georgia.** *Note: Chuck participated via telephone and his presentation was shown simultaneously.*

Chuck presented on the capabilities of CISEH’s EDDMapS system. See link to “EDDMaps – Bargeron” for Powerpoint presentation.

Q: Could WMA’s enter data and view data? A: Anyone is able to enter data on the system at present, but there would be a small fee charged if we are required to develop new or additional capabilities for a client.

Q: Can you download the GIS information from the website? A: Yes, you can download in Excel using a format from Google Earth. It is only in latitude and longitude; there are no polygons yet, but they could possibly be added for a fee.

Q: What is a ballpark figure to develop a system for the MRWC with minimal customization? A: The fee would likely be between $15,000 and $30,000 (depending on what you need from us) and then a small maintenance fee, annually.

**Presentation 3. Andy Canham, Kelly Sharp, and Dave Heck – EDRR Systems MVM; Mid Dakota Vegetation Management, Miller SD.**

Andy Canham, Dave Heck and Kelly Sharp from Mid Dakota Vegetation Management company presented their vision for the development of a mapping/EDRR system that would serve the needs of the MRWC (see link to “MVM EDRR System – Canham & Sharp” for PowerPoint presentation).

Q: What is the cost and how long would it take to develop? A: It could be funded by other people. It would take approximately one year to build.

Coalition member comments:
- We need to be focused on new information.
- We do not need to know where the old plants are; we need to focus on where the new plants are and where they are going.
- There can be automated alerts if a new weed is found within your county or state.
- WIMS goes into the national database.
- EDDMapS is very user friendly and self explanatory.
- We need to be concerned where the money is going to come from to fund this project.
- There is money already available though CIPM to help fund this effort.

Q: Who would be informed when something new is found, state level? Feds? county level? A: Everyone needs to be alerted, all states, at all levels.

**Decision:** Erik Lehnhoff will lead an ED RR Workgroup – which will include MVM personnel, Bugwood and members of the MRWC Executive Committee – to discuss these options in detail and to develop an ED RR system Plan of Action. They will report back to the Coalition membership at the September 21 MRWC meeting. The consensus is that the MRWC is very close to implementing a regional-level ED RR system.

**IX. 2009 Tamarisk Coalition Research Symposium Review**

Erik Lehnhoff attended the 2009 Tamarisk Coalition Research Symposium and presented highlights of that meeting to the membership (Attachment G).
Erik Leinhoff also addressed questions that had been posed to CIPM staff back in 2006/2007 concerning a list of questions to ask while at the research symposium (Attachment G).

X. Bio Control Presentation

Bruce Shambaugh, State Plant Health Director, USDA Animal and Plant Services (APHIS) Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) in Cheyenne, Wyoming, presented *Saltcedar Biocontrol in Wyoming using Diorhabda elongate, the Saltcedar Leaf Beetle saltcedar biological control in Wyoming using Diorhabda elongate, the saltcedar leaf beetle*. Link to “Saltcedar Biocontrol – Shambaugh” to view Powerpoint presentation.

Q: How were the beetle releases made? A: With cardboard boxes; then they were placed on sprigs of the plants at the site; it is best to do it at dusk.

Q: Is anything desirable coming back into areas? A: He has not seen the sites recently enough to know if any desirable re-growth is taking place, and they do not have a re-vegetation plan.

Q: Are you continuing environmental monitoring? A: Yes we are.

Q: What is happening to native plants in the areas where biocontrol is being used? A: Other groups are doing more research on that subject.

XI. Workgroup Meetings
Two MRWC workgroups (Educational Workgroup and EDRR Workgroup) met after the meeting concluded for the day.

Wednesday, June 17, 2009
8:00 am

XII. MRWC Potential Projects for 2009-2010
Liz Galli-Noble presented “what CIPM has heard from the Coalition members concerning potential MRWC outreach, on-the-ground and research projects,” to be implemented in the next year or two (Attachment I). She then asked for additional ideas from the audience. Highlights and ideas from this discussion follow:

*Education and Awareness Campaign*
- Liz Galli-Noble presented the new MRWC logo, which was designed by Melissa Brown (CIPM) and tentatively approved by the Executive Committee in May 2009.
  - She then asked for comments/suggestions concerning the logo.
- Only one comment was made concerning the logo: It may look better with the map colors switched around, so that the red is highlighting the watershed area and the tan shows the U.S.
  - Decision: The members liked the logo and approved its use for the MRWC. The color suggestion would be put to the Executive Committee for a final decision. Note: The Executive Committee was polled several days later and the decision was made to leave the logo as is (final version shown above).
- CIPM would like to partner with Carla Hoopes (MT Statewide Noxious Weed Awareness and Education Campaign) to coordinate the MRWC awareness campaign. CIPM plans to fund Carla in the amount of ~$10,000 over the next year for her services (Attachment H). Liz Galli-Noble asked the members for feedback and if they were comfortable with this plan?
Decision: All agreed to this plan. Working with the Educational Workgroup, Carla Hoopes, CIPM and other key education/awareness contacts from the six states will have a conference call in late July or early August to begin developing the program and to prepare to present at the September 21 MRWC meeting.

- South Dakota holds a water festival for 4th graders all over the state, so that they can learn about soil and water.
- The Forest Service does a broadcast system in schools to help educate about weeds and other issues around the states.
- The Natural Resource Conservation Service has many resources that MRWC should be tapping.

**On-the-Ground Projects**

Liz Galli-Noble asked the membership for additional ideas for on-the-ground projects; here are specific suggestions made:

1. **Ron Moehring, SD: Noxious Weed Control on the Cheyenne River in Wyoming and South Dakota; a Missouri River Watershed Coalition Pilot Project**
   
   * WY and SD cooperatively working on the Cheyenne River, starting at the headwaters and moving along the entire river, simultaneously treating as we map.

   **Project Objectives:**
   
   The primary objective of the Planning Phase of the project is to identify saltcedar (*Tamarisk* spp.) and other noxious weed occurrences along 527 miles of the Cheyenne River over an 18-month period. At least 150 people from state agencies, Tribes, counties, federal agencies and individual producers will be involved in the surveys and mapping. Saltcedar is our project target species because it’s a highly invasive plant, yet it is still at a stage where it can be controlled or even eradicated.

   During the 18-month Planning Phase period, our secondary objective is to (1) inform producers about the negative impacts of saltcedar and other noxious weeds to agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and riparian system functions and (2) encourage them to take an active role in decreasing the threats from these invasive species on their lands and within their communities.

   The objective of the Implementation Phase is to reduce saltcedar and other noxious weed infestations along the drainages of the Cheyenne River. At least 100 people will be involved in the reduction of saltcedar over a two-year period.

2. **Dennis Beyer, NE: Platte River Project**

   Russian olive control project and after treatment disposal; produce biomass/biofuel from this effort. NE, CO, SD, MT, WY (Steve Brill) are all interested in this project. There is a need to find a way to change raw biomass into something useful; it can be added to old plastic to make indestructible building blocks/materials.

3. **Nate Jagin, SD and Greg Sundstrom, CO: Restoration Projects**

   The MRWC should be leading the effort to implement and showcase invasive plant management/restoration projects and tying these projects to BMPs for the watershed. Best example to use is the Ninemile Project in NE (contact: Dennis Beyer). It was suggested that we could take all BMP’s from each state and combine them into one large publication; it would be a 2-4 year project. Sharon Clay mentioned that SD just completed developing “Best Management Practices for Corn Production in South Dakota (2009)”; these could be used as an example for other states; see the SDSU Weed Website (http://plantsci.sdstate.edu/index_files/agbiopubs.htm) for publication.

4. **Phragmites Monitoring and Genotyping**

   Partnerships with government agencies concerned with environmental management in western states will be essential in expanding phragmites research and will enable exploration of many more potential *P. australis* sites. Sharing of information among these state agencies will be critical in ‘getting the word out’ about the threat of invasive genotypes in the region. MRWC member states could partner with Dr. Adam Lambert (Eastern Connecticut State University) and Dr. Bernd Blossey (Cornell University) to locate native
(Phragmites australis) and non-native phragmites populations in the region, and provide those data to established regional and national genotype databases.

Decision: MRWC members supported the idea of having a portion of the MRWC website focus on phragmites and how problematic it is in some parts of the watershed and why other states need prevent its invasion.

5. Establish a MRWC Tamarisk Control & Restoration Projects Database

Decision: The MRWC members supported implementing this effort.

CIPM will hire a graduate student to set up a database and collect data and other information from the six state departments of agriculture (and other potential information sources: TNC, Tamarisk Coalition, etc.) for: saltcedar presence and absence, saltcedar treatment areas, methods used, restoration actions taken, costs associated with actions, monitoring of treated sites, successes, failures, etc.

*Include bio-control data and map sites of bio-control release and establishment; this will help managers to avoid treating in those areas (Bruce Shambaugh).

Research Investigations

Additional suggestions made by the Coalition membership:

- MRWC could make a map showing bio-controlled areas, so that other states are aware of those locations and can avoid interference.
- Erik states that when you treat for Saltcedar you get other noxious weeds to grow back like Canada thistle rather than native species such as cottonwood. This summer there will be research done on how saltcedar changes the soil composition.
- The MRWC should have someone (NRCS) give an ecological site description for what we could hope restoration would look like.

XIII. Presentation: Sharon Clay – South Dakota State University, Plant Science Department

Dr. Sharon Clay spoke to the group about mechanistic evaluation of water, atmospheric N deposition, and fire interactions on saltcedar seed germination, invasive species establishment, and rangeland goods and services (see link to “Sharon Clay_SDSU” for Powerpoint presentation).

XIV. Roundtable Discussion

Janet Clark – CIPM (MT) She will be attending the Tamarisk Coalition meeting January 12-13, 2009. Invasive Species Advisory Council is working on making invasive plants into biofuels, how climate change affects invasives, and the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). National Invasive Weed Awareness Week is being changed to National Invasive Species Week (NISAW) and the meeting will be held January 10-14, 2009. CIPM is working with the National Network of Invasive Plant Centers to build an infrastructure to help landowners and land managers have access to more information.

Stacey Barta – MT Dept of Ag The MRWC group will be receiving $100,000 from the Montana Noxious Weed Trust Fund. The 2010 NIWAW meeting is a huge conflict for the Montana Dept of Agriculture and Montana Weed Control Association; therefore, they will not be attending. Dave will not be able to attend the NAWMA meeting and requests that a conference call-in be made available.

Nathan Jagem – Meade County Weed and Pest (SD) South Dakota is doing inventory and treatment projects on the Belle Fourche and Cheyenne rivers. The state is also working on bio-control agents. The Belle Fourche department of agriculture partnership is mapping for saltcedar, and inventoried phragmites and saltcedar. They are starting a new project for treatment and restoration of phragmites.
Scott Guffey - Pennington County Weed and Pest (SD). They are starting a new organization called the South Dakota Invasive Species Management Association (SISMA) to help expand the voice at the local, state and federal levels. South Dakota is also in the process of hiring more people and developing a website.

Bruce Shambaugh - USDA/APHIS/PPQ (WY). There has been a lot of misleading information disseminated to the public, and he would like to focus on getting the correct information out to them – through things like Facebook, Twitter and other popular web and informational sites.

Mike Stenson – SDDA The Department of Agriculture is surveying all rivers in South Dakota. They found saltcedar in southwest Day County and will continue to survey rivers over the summer.

Bruce Helbig - USDA/APHIS (SD) Biocontrol is on hold due to the lawsuit in the southwest. He is working to find new biocontrols; and they may have been successful in finding biocontrol for yellow toadflax, garlic mustard, and hoary cress. Gypsy moths are moving west, so we need to be aware of them and be prepared. South Dakota is working with nine Indian reservations in the state.

Darwin Kurtenbach - SDDA The state is starting to work on a saltcedar survey. They are looking at other ways to use money from APHIS, and new biocontrol initiatives. The state would like to connect the dots with already existing centers and programs and would like to have another MRWC meeting attached to the weed and pest conference.

Sharon Clay - SDSU She suggested to look at the Great Lakes Commission for ways to run the MRWC group, because they have five to six years of experience.

Shauna Waughtel - SDSU Enjoyed the meeting, and felt like it is a good place to network.

Tabby Christner - SDSU Enjoyed meeting new people and the new information.

Dennis Beyer - High Plains WMA (NE) Reminder for everyone about the NAWMA meeting in Kearney, NE in September. Nebraska will have someone on board to help with mapping. He brought Ninemile Creek videos for free to whoever would like them. There is a weed watch insert in the NE newsletter about the panhandle and it is very effective to raise awareness. The state is funding the High Plains CWMA.

Paul Beaver - High Plains WMA (NE) Nebraska is continuing work in the Ninemile and it’s becoming a success story. They are removing Russian olive along the Platte River and in the summer they will begin treating those areas again.

Andy Canham – SISMA (SD) Newly-appointed MRWC president. South Dakota would like to contract work with all six states. He pointed out that other MRWC states need to pay attention to Montana’s contributions to the Coalition, and to try to give money as well. He agrees that MRWC must set goals and set dates concerning EDRR, and also needs to pursue the education and awareness campaign.

Erik Lehnhoff - CIPM (MT) Interested in helping with research and would like to work with SDSU concerning disturbance on areas/impacts of plants.

Greg Sundstrom – Colorado State Forest Service Working with several WMA’s, and working on increasing funding.

Ron Moehring – SDDA Seasonals are doing small grain insect trapping, pulling samples of phragmites, and research on invasive plants vs. natives. He is working with Bruce Shott on phragmites.

Healthy Habitats Coalition – HHC provided updates on their work through a handout (Attachment J).

XV. Schedule Fall 2009 MRWC Meeting

The fall 2009 MRWC meeting will be held in conjunction with the North American Weed Management Association meeting, which will be held September 21-24 in Kearney, NE. The NAWMA board members have given the MRWC a meeting time of Monday, September 21 from 2:00pm - 4:00 pm. This may not be enough time, so Liz Galli-Noble will see if the room can be used by the MRWC from 2:00 pm until say 6:00pm.

XVI. Meeting Adjourned The meeting was adjourned at ~11:15am on Wednesday, June 17, 2009.
Tuesday, June 16

**Time** | **Agenda Item** | **Presenters**
--- | --- | ---
9:00 – 9:15 am | Welcome & Introductions  
Approve minutes from MRWC September 18, 2008 meeting  
Announcements:  
- CIPM coordination of MRWC  
- Please track in-kind match for MRWC; fill out In-Kind Match form and send to CIPM  
- Other announcements |  

9:15 – 10:15 am | MRWC Membership Update  
Election of MRWC Officers (President & Vice President)  
*Paper ballots will be distributed, collected and decisions announced* | Liz Galli-Noble

10:15 – 11:00 am | MRWC 2008 Program Summary Report  
MRWC 2008 Program Evaluation | Liz Galli-Noble, Janet Clark

11:00 am - Noon | MRWC Financial Business  
- 2009 Funding Updates  
  *USFS State and Private Forestry program  
  *Recovery Act funding requests for MRWC  
  *Other Funding Sources  
- MRWC Financial Account Setup (WWCC or MSU)  
- Grant writing targets for 2009/2010  
- Other Financial Business | Liz Galli-Noble, Executive Committee

Noon – 1:30 pm | LUNCH – *on your own*

1:30 – 3:45 pm | MRWC EDRR Project  
- Update  
- Presentations: CIPM, Invaders Database, EDDMaps, South Dakota project  
- Discussion  
- Decision (?) | *Erik Lehnhoff  
*Chuck Bargeron  
*Kelly Sharp, Andy Canon & Dave Heck

3:45 – 4:00 pm | 15-minute BREAK

4:00 - 4:15 pm | 2009 Tamarisk Coalition Symposium review | Erik Lehnhoff

4:15 – 5:00 pm | **Presentation:** Bruce Shambaugh [USDA-Animal and Plant Health Services (APHIS)-Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) in Cheyenne, WY] saltcedar biocontrol agent (*Diorhabda elongata*) in Wyoming. | Bruce Shambaugh
### Workgroup Meetings
- **EDRR Workgroup** – new workgroup
- **Mapping Workgroup** – saltcedar map close to completion; where do we go from here? Move on to an EDRR workgroup?
- **Funding Workgroup** – continue on-going discussions.
- **Outreach/Education/Awareness Workgroup** – Projects to focus on in 2009? CIPM and Carla Hoopes will work closely with this group in next few months to launch MRWC awareness campaign. Add an educational special session to MRWC Fall meeting?

### New workgroups?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8:00 – 10:00 am | **MRWC Potential Projects for 2009-2010**<br>• Additional Project Wish List Ideas?  
• On-the-ground projects  
• Research investigations  
• Outreach/Education/Awareness Effort  
  *Public relations campaign - CIPM & Education Workgroup  
  *new MRWC logo approval  
  *Carla Hoopes (or staff) & CIPM – MRWC Education and Awareness Campaign | Liz Galli-Noble  
Group discussion |
| 10:00 – 10:45 am| **Presentation:** Sharon Clay (South Dakota State University, Plant Science Dept.); *Mechanistic evaluation of water, atmospheric N deposition, and fire interactions on saltcedar seed germination, invasive species establishment, and rangeland goods and services.* | Ron Moehring  
Sharon Clay |
| 10:45 – 11:00 am| **15-minute BREAK**                                                        |                                                 |
| 11:00 am – Noon | **Roundtable Discussion, Update, New & Upcoming Events** (2 to 5 minutes each)<br>• NIWAW (Janet reviews 2009 and plans for 2010 meeting)  
• HHC  
• News from the MRWC States  
• News from MRWC members  
• MRRNC, MoRAST, MRRIC  
• Others |                                                 |
| Noon – 1:00 pm | **Schedule Fall 2009 MRWC Meeting** - Held in conjunction with the 2009 Annual NAWMA conference, September 21-24 in Kearney, NE. *What date(s) and time(s) are best for MRWC meeting?* | Kristi Paul & Kelly Uhing |
| 1:00 pm        | **Adjourn**                                                                |                                                 |
 Missouri River Watershed Coalition  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 18, 2008  
1:00 – 5:00 pm  
DRAFT

Location: Billings, Montana
Attendance: Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, South Dakota and Wyoming were present. North Dakota was not present.
Meeting facilitator: Liz Galli-Noble
Meeting note taker: Tonda Moon

15 meeting participants:
Dave Burch, MT Department of Agriculture
Fred Raish, Yuma County (CO)
John Simons, BLM
Julie Allen, Carbon County Weed & Pest (WY)
Kelly Sharp, MVM (SD)
Kelly Uhing, CO Department of Agriculture
Kristi Paul, Sheridan County Weed District (NE)
Liz Galli-Noble, Center for Invasive Plant Mgt (MT)
Mary Mayer, USDA-ARS (MT)
Patricia Gilbert, US Army Corps of Engineers
Ron Moehring, SD Department of Agriculture
Ruth Richards, Big Horn County Weed and Pest (WY)
Scott Bockness, Yellowstone County/MWCA (MT)
Slade Franklin, WY Department of Agriculture
Tonda Moon, MT Department of Agriculture

I. Welcome:
Liz Galli-Noble opened the meeting and introductions were made.

II. Approval of Minutes:
Dave Burch made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 6, 2008 MRWC meeting and the July 25, 2008 MRWC Executive Committee meeting (Attachments A and B) as written. Ron Moehring seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

III. Announcements:
- The MRWC MOA Addendum, which added Colorado to the Coalition, has been signed. MRWC is now officially a six-state coalition (Attachment C).
- The contract between the Montana Department of Agriculture and CIPM/MSU for MRWC facilitation and coordination has been signed (May 1, 2008 – May 1, 2009).
- Liz Galli-Noble and Dave Burch reminded meeting participants to fill out and submit the MRWC in-kind match and contribution sheet – meeting attendance like NAWMA can be used as match. Project expenses and match will be reported in the MRWC annual report. Match demonstrates the worthiness of projects (download form from MRWC website at: http://www.weedcenter.org/Missouri_wtrshd/miss_watershed.htm).
- Liz Galli-Noble mentioned that the MRWC typically does a program evaluation each year. She asked permission to address the evaluation at the spring 2009 meeting, rather than discuss it at this agenda-packed meeting. All participants agreed to this request. Liz distributed an evaluation handout (Attachment D) and asked MRWC members to think about program evaluation over the winter; it will be on the spring 2009 meeting agenda.

IV. Final Review and approval of MWRC Constitution and Bylaws:
MWRC Constitution
Ron Moehring reported that slight changes and additions to the MRWC Constitution and Bylaws had been made both by the MRWC Executive Committee (July 25, 2008) and by the South Dakota
Department of Agriculture’s attorney. The group then reviewed the 8/01/08 version of the document.

The following comments and edits were made:

**Constitution, Article III.**

In the original version of the document, officer positions included a Secretary and Treasurer. The Executive Committee felt that these positions could potentially be dropped because CIPM is providing secretarial assistance to the MRWC, as well as potentially providing a financial accounting mechanism for the MRWC.

Slade Franklin asked if an MWRC secretary is needed. **All agreed that the CIPM is already providing this service.**

Liz Galli-Noble handed out a summary sheet explaining what a CIPM/MSU Designated Account would look like, if the MRWC decides to pursue one (Attachment E). She stressed that there are restrictions with this account – such as not allowing expenditures for alcohol – and that MSU will take indirect costs of 4% to 9% on all money held within the account. MSU takes 4% and the Land Resources and Environmental Science Department (which houses CIPM) is allowed to take up to an additional 5%, which they often waive. CIPM has not heard back from the department as to what percent they plan to take in this case. Also noted is that grant awards to the MRWC cannot be held in a “designated account;” a separate account would have to be established if MSU/CIPM partnered with the MRWC on a specific project grant. The six state weed coordinators will decide how the designated account money is spent. Finally, Liz mentioned that if the MRWC disbanded for some reason in the future, MSU would cut checks to all the account contributors, less 4% to 9% already taken by the University.

Dave Burch mentioned that his state department of agriculture would likely be more comfortable contributing money housed by CIPM (a regional center) rather than giving the money to a different western state entity.

Slade Franklin said he likes the designated account idea, if the indirect cost percent stays low. He also mentioned that MRWC has no money now, but this step is in preparation for contributions that will come in the future. He suggested leaving out the Secretary and Treasurer language in the Constitution.

**Decision: For now, the decision was made to leave out language about a MRWC Secretary/Treasurer in Article III and IV of the Constitution.** The MRWC Executive Committee will revisit the issue at their next meeting and make the final decision about the MSU/CIPM designated account.

The group agreed that they were comfortable with Article III as edited.

**Constitution, Article IV.**

The question was posed, “Officers are eligible for re-election for an indefinite period of time, but not to exceed …” how many years? Six? Four? Ten?

Kristi Paul asked if the Vice President would take over as President after one year’s time.
Dave Burch said that in Article IV it says “elect officers annually,” and that would be the election of both the President and Vice President.

Slade Franklin suggested not to exceed four years, and to have elections for both officers every year.
All agreed with these suggestions.

**Constitution, Article V.**
Slade Franklin asked who the MRWC “members” are? Is it all meeting attendees or member states? He asked that the quorum of voting members (Article I and V) be clarified.
Ron Moehring replied that a quorum is four of the six member states.
Dave Burch said in order to be consistent, the word “states” also be inserted into Article V, line 2, after “member.”
Ron Moehring said and “states” should also be added to the Bylaws Article VII concerning a quorum.
Dave Burch then asked how MRWC “members” are defined?
Scott Bockness suggested using the MRWC membership list. That the current sign-up sheet be used to define MRWC membership; although some of the contact information may be out of date.
The group agreed with this suggestion.

**Liz Galli-Noble was instructed to send out an electronic invitation to all MRWC members on the current sign-up list to ask if they wish to “continue their membership.”** The problem of email “bounce backs” and the potential large number mailings was raised. **It was decided that if emails bounced back, Liz would follow up with a phone call or letter.** She then mentioned that given this decision, there could be no election of MRWC officers until the group has an official membership list, perhaps at the next MRWC meeting. All agreed with this statement.

John Simons asked how voting would be handled, whether by mail or at an MRWC meeting?
Slade Franklin suggested election by written ballot or email.
Ron Moehring suggested it should be done in person at a MRWC meeting with a paper ballot. **All agreed not to use email and that elections would be by paper ballot, in person at a MRWC meeting.**

**MRWC Bylaws**
Dave Burch mentioned that the Executive Committee discussed the issue of membership dues (originally addressed in Article IV of the Bylaws) at their July meeting and decided that there should be no membership dues required for the MRWC. Instead, MRWC would ask for voluntary contributions from its membership.

There were no changes made to the Bylaws except the insertion of the word “states” in Article VII, line 1, as discussed earlier.

**Decision: Kelly Uhing moved to accept the MRWC Constitution and Bylaws as edited (Attachment F).** Scott Bockness seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
V. Workgroup Reports

1. Appropriations and Funding Workgroup
Ron Moehring gave the workgroup update (see handout, Attachment G).
List of funding sources
- Noxious weed funding?
- Saltcedar/Russian olive control act
- Farm Bill – conservation district
- West of 100th Meridian bill
- Waters for America - Kelly Uhing clarified. Challenge Basin Grants - Kelly will send a write-up.
- Wind energy? Oil? As good neighbors.

Waters for America grant
Next steps for the workgroup? Mike Sarchet will write up the grant with Kelly. The guidelines will be out soon. CIPM can help: editing/formatting, send it out to states for review, etc.

Water 2025
- Kelly needs to find out who this funding goes through; is it Bureau of Reclamation?
- John Simons: Resolution of Federal Budget probably will not happen this year; last year’s money equals to this year’s money.
- We should be thinking about MRWC projects that are a good match for the funding source.
- We need to remember that initially, we may not be highly competitive for these funding sources; so need to continue to apply year after year if necessary.
- Scott Bockness – A major objective for this group is educational outreach. NRCS? Invasives? Get states to put out money.
  We need a mechanism to get a marketing program for education and outreach.
- John Simons – ARS has funding for invasive species researchers.

2. Mapping Workgroup
Slade Franklin reported for the mapping workgroup (see Attachment H for a summary of his report).
Other comments made:
- Patricia Gilbert (USACE) – Showed the audience salt cedar presence and treatment maps generated by the Corps at Fort Peck Reservoir. Patricia works closely with Lindy Garner, USFWS. The Corps is willing to share information on this project and provide assistance to the MRWC. January/February is a good time to tap Corps for assistance. She also thinks that threatened and endangered species and cultural items would be good additions to our mapping effort. She is the T&E specialist for Fort Peck.
- Ruth Richards (Big Horn County, WY) - Is there a mapping spreadsheet that specifies what is to be added to this map? Can things like salt cedar removal and treatment be added to the map?
- Slade Franklin – Presently, information is provided as: “present,” “absent” or “not looked at” on Kelly Sharp’s map. We also need to show project work that’s been done (salt cedar treatment and removal) as a line item for each state and map that in the future. We are already doing lots of work on Platte River. We need to stress that the states are doing this
work now and are not waiting for federal dollars to pay for it. We need to stress these efforts – spearheaded by the states – when seeking funding.

**Decisions made at the Mapping Workgroup meeting:**
*Only a few changes are needed for Kelly Sharp’s mapping product. This six-state, county-level salt cedar presence and absence map will be a preliminary MRWC mapping product, which can be completed for the five prepared states within the next couple of months.*

*MRWC may want to expand this mapping effort into the future, which could address additional invasive plant species, in particular aquatic nuisance species.*

*Over the next year or so, Montana will move forward on its weed mapping effort with CIPM and a private contractor. And when complete, they will add Montana’s salt cedar data to Kelly’s map.*

*Kelly Sharp does need the states to clearly state what they want to be included in the map: layers (tributaries, roads, cities, etc.), timeframe, etc.*

*Liz Galli-Noble requested that Kelly Sharp provide her with: (1) his original data spread sheet; (2) a general description of his mapping effort (map specs: salt cedar acres per county/presence and absence); (3) what he has developed to date; (4) what he needs from the states and by when (feedback needed from states); (5) how data is to be shared/uploaded and by whom; etc. Liz Galli-Noble will assist with documenting this process and sharing this information with the full MRWC group.*

*Slade requested that Kelly Sharp provide the states with a few examples of different maps projections that the states can review and then choose from. Kelly should talk to Pat Dougherty (JHS, Inc.) about the map he presented at the MRWC spring meeting. Many people liked that product.*

**VI. MWRC EDRR**
Dr. Erik Lehnhoff gave a PowerPoint presentation and provided a handout on EDRR and the MRWC.

**Comments:**
- Scott Bockness - Ranges on habitat suitability based on *T. chinensis* vs. *T. ramosissima*. Remote sensing is not effective, and costs more as well.
- Ruth Richards - Insert “Rapid Response” in flow chart of information. Is your EDRR focus for all weeds or just saltcedar?
- Ron Moehring - Garlic mustard is a new plant that should be addressed for EDRR.
- Slade Franklin/Dave Bruch – Use EDRR for all new plants/invaders, not just salt cedar.
- Kristi Paul /Kelly Uhing - Saltcedar is established; why are we thinking of doing EDRR with it? Biocontrol is not approved for eradication in Colorado.
- CIPM could help establish the communications link for EDRR between states.
- MRWC will need a database to do EDRR on a Missouri River Basin regional level. The INVADERS database ([http://invader.dbs.umt.edu/](http://invader.dbs.umt.edu/)) is good but some information is out of date. It has a verification method for new weed postings using citation. Perhaps MRWC should be a pilot EDRR program; focus on six states and not whole West; focus could be
on all or most problematic plant species, plus all incoming ANS. Top ten list of species of concern; list goes against EDRR. It’s a start, then move on to more. Weed species of concern are not now known in Missouri River watershed. We need a tiered approach: using INVADERS-type database plus tapping a national, well-established database like USDA’s PLANTS database (http://plants.usda.gov/index.html).

- Ron Moehring - New to the area. EDRR is equivalent to “iron wood” in South Dakota. Look at what is not here.
- Ruth Richards – List is too restrictive; runs counter to EDRR mentioned above. Ease of database; what is the point if people don’t use it?
- Kelly Uhing – Providing scientific data to the layman is tough.
- Ruth Richards - Keep it small as far as people go, not plants; people need to be notified if invasive plant is found.
- Kelly Uhing – Like a reverse 911. Dr. Enloe.
- Liz Galli-Noble – CIPM would like to look into establishing a database for an MRWC EDRR pilot project. I would like this group’s permission to explore funding opportunities to pay for this. But I must be clear that I think it will cost a minimum $250,000 to build a regional EDRR database, and likely much more. Is this group comfortable with CIPM looking for grant opportunities to fund this preliminary step in an EDRR project? All agreed that CIPM should pursue this action.
- Dave Burch – Before doing anything else, Erik Lehnhoff needs to put together a form to send to all state weed coordinators asking what existing programs/systems they have. What will be needed in a database? Incorporate all of the states’ listed weeds + watch list for each state.

VII. Roundtable: Saltcedar Projects Agency

- Patricia Gilbert, USACE. Patricia provided the group with several handouts on the Missouri River Recovery Program (MRRP) -- all can be found on their website: http://www.moriverrecovery.org/mrrp/f?p=136:1:654605254852845 -- and gave an overview of the MRRP and possible partnership with the MRWC. She then gave a summary of her project: In 2007, $1.5-million, 5-year contract for task order with completion date. Target species are tamarisk and Russian olive; looking to control small individual plants, not large infestations. $203,000 spent so far; an additional $250,000 for 2009. Used for mapping. Tie in with cottonwood rehabilitation.
  - John Simons, BLM. He described work on Yellowstone River and on Hi-Line EDRR. Slade will encourage Wyoming BLM contact to communicate; same for Kelly Uhing in Colorado.
- Mary Mayer, ARS Biocontrol. Fort Peck Diorhabda “black hole”; predation. New insect-gall-forming moth will come to Sidney for research in about two weeks.
- Slade Franklin, Wyoming. Insectary became vacant; new CRMs.
- Ron Moehring, South Dakota. Mapped two more rivers. Dramatic site differences in population of biocontrol on same river (close); possible genetics of Tamarix.
- Kelly Uhing, Colorado. South Platte River watershed association is forming. Possible dollar match. Republican River. $1 million for cost-share grants; check with Bureau of Reclamation on status of seven assessments of west slope Diorhabda from Utah.
- Dave Burch, Montana. Saltcedar grants. Russian olive; 90% mortality (Scott Bockness).
**VIII. Upcoming Events**

- NIWAW - Slade Franklin wants the MRWC to communicate and participate as a six-state group. The MRWC Executive Committee will visit this topic at their next meeting.

- **Decision:** The MRWC Executive Committee will meet in early 2009 via conference call to set a formal date for the MRWC spring 2009 meeting. The group agreed that the meeting will be held in Spearfish, SD in either April or early May 2009. Members need to look for other potential meetings in SD that would be a good time for the MRWC to meet as well.

- Reminder: The Western Weed Coordinating Committee will meet December 2-4, 2008 in Las Vegas.

**IX. Meeting Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at ~5:00 pm.
Missouri River Watershed Coalition
Membership List
March 2009

headwaters_tamarisk@listserv.montana.edu hosted and maintained by the Center for Invasive Plant Management

MRWC Active Members:
Janet Clark <janet.clark@MONTANA.EDU> (NOCASE)
Kim Johnson <kijohnson@MT.GOV> (NOCASE)
Carol Bearden <cbearden@MT.GOV> (NOCASE)
Ron Moehring <ron.moehring@STATE.SD.US> (NOCASE)
Dave Burch <dburch@MT.GOV> (NOCASE)
Rick Stellflug <rstellflug@CO.VALLEY.MT.US> (NOCASE)
Scott Guffey <scottg@CO.PENNINGTON.SD.US> (NOCASE)
Cherri Weyrauch <mcweed@RESTEL.NET> (NOCASE)
Jennifer Cramer <treasureweed@RANGEWEB.NET> (NOCASE)
Slade Franklin <sfrank@STATE.WY.US> (NOCASE)
Bob Parsons <pcwp@WAR.NET> (NOCASE)
Celestine Duncan <weeds1@IXI.NET> (NOCASE)
Patricia Gilbert <patricia.l.gilbert@USACE.ARMY.MIL> (NOCASE)
John Heideman <jheideman@QWEST.NET> (NOCASE)
Larry Cain <larry.t.cain@APHIS.USDA.GOV> (NOCASE)
Kristi Paul <kossweed@GPCOM.NET> (NOCASE)
Vicki Marquis <mrccd@MISSOURIRIVERCOUNCIL.INFO> (NOCASE)
Bill Walker <william.walker@UAP.COM> (NOCASE)
Amy Mesman <amy.mesman@APHIS.USDA.GOV> (NOCASE)
Kevin Fridley <kevin.fridley@STATE.SD.US> (NOCASE)
Patrick Dougherty <jhsinc@IXI.NET> (NOCASE)
John Simmons <john.simmons@BLM.GOV> (NOCASE)
Janet Valle <jvale@FS.FED.US> (NOCASE)
D Kurtenbach <darwin.kurtenbach@STATE.SD.US> (NOCASE)
Mike Sarchet <twincities@WNCC.NET> (NOCASE)
Charles Brooks <cbrooks@TRIBASINNRD.ORG> (NOCASE)
Brandon Houck <bhnwtf@HOTMAIL.COM> (NOCASE)
Todd Nordeen <todd.nordeen@NGPC.NE.GOV> (NOCASE)
Kelly Sharp <kelly@SBTC.NET> (NOCASE)
Dennie Mann <dennie.mann@STATE.SD.US> (NOCASE)
Jack Doolittle <jwdoolittle@EXCITE.COM> (NOCASE)
Ruth Richards <bhcwp@TCTWEST.NET> (NOCASE)
Greg Sundstrom <gsund@COLOSTATE.EDU> (NOCASE)
Lindy Garner <lindy garner@FWS.GOV> (NOCASE)
Jared McJunkin <jared.nwtf@YAHOO.COM> (NOCASE)
Gary Stone <ghostrider@SCOTTSBLUFF.NET> (NOCASE)
Mike Stenson <mike.stenson@STATE.SD.US> (NOCASE)
Nathan Jagim <meadeweed@MEADECOUNTY.ORG> (NOCASE)
Lani Malmberg <ewe4icbenz@AOL.COM> (NOCASE)
Ted Tietjen <bigbyron@GPCOM.NET> (NOCASE)
Kelly Uhing <kelly.uhing@AG.STATE.CO.US> (NOCASE)
Tim Bradeen <tim.bradeen@STATE.SD.US> (NOCASE)
J TenBensel <jennifer.tenbensel@NE.NACDNET.NET> (NOCASE)
Brian Mealor <bmealor@TNC.ORG> (NOCASE)
Roger Wickstrom <bowmanweed@ND.GOV> (NOCASE)
Derrill Fick <wcweeds@SRT.COM> (NOCASE)
Dick Sackett <ccwp@RANGEWEB.NET> (NOCASE)
Cindy Larom <clarom@GP.USBR.GOV> (NOCASE)
Mitch Coffin <mitch.coffin@NEBRASKA.GOV> (NOCASE)
Andrew Canham <ajcanham@MNCOMM.COM> (NOCASE)
Liz Galli-Noble <elizabeth.gallinoble@MONTANA.EDU> (NOCASE)
John Gaskin <john.gaskin@ARS.USDA.GOV> (NOCASE)
Jennifer Rogers <panhandle.rcd@ALLOPHONE.COM> (NOCASE)
Dennis Beyer <dbeyer@ALLOPHONE.COM> (NOCASE)
High Plains Weed Mgmt <highplainsweed@ALLOPHONE.COM> (NOCASE)
Rachel Seifert-Spilde <rseifert@ND.GOV> (NOCASE)
Scott Bockness <sbockness@CO.YELLOWSTONE.MT.GOV> (NOCASE)
Dennis Longknife <dlongknife@HOTMAIL.COM> (NOCASE)
Jim Hansen <jimhansen@ND.GOV> (NOCASE)
Nicole McClain <YellowstoneRiver@LIVE.COM> (NOCASE)
Erik Lehnhoff, erik.lehnhoff@montana.edu
Rod Litzel, jcwp@qwestoffice.net
Fred Raish, ycpest@plains.net
Julie Allen, jewelyjoe@hotmail.com
Steve Brill, gocoweeds@embarqmail.com
Cheryl Pearce, cpearce@uwo.ca
Hank McNeel, hmcneel@usadig.com
Nathan Jagim <meadoweed@MEADECOUNTY.ORG
John Fanning, handcountyweedandpest@yahoo.com
Shayne Galford, Shayne.P.Galford@aphis.usda.gov
Steve Chick, steve.chick@ne.usda.gov
Heather Hundt, Heather.K.Hundt@usace.army.mil
Mike Mooney, mmooney@blm.gov
Pam Converse, brweed@co.broadwater.mt.us
Sam Little, slittle@jeffco.mt.gov
Karen Laitala, powellweed@bresnan.net
Sharon Scognamiglio, sscognamiglio@anacondadeerlodge.mt
Aaron Kneeland, a.kneeland@co.custer.mt.us
Stacey Barta, sbarta@mt.gov
Jan Kluver, jkluver@3rivers.net
Roger Stockton, roger.stockton@ne.usda.gov
Elizabeth Wakeman, fsstbfc@mchsi.com

Not sure
Darrell Deneke, Darrell.Deneke@SDSTATE.EDU (corrected email)
Lynn Deibert, ldvd@valleytel.net (corrected email)
Amy Mesman <amy.mesman@APHIS.USDA.GOV (corrected email)
Mary Mayer, mary.mayer@ars.usda.gov
Leo Vetter, lsvetter@state.nd.us
CIPM conducted a poll of MRWC members from November 2008 – January 2009
CIPM sent out e-mail requests on:
- November 25, 2008
- December 22, 2008
- December 23, 2008

Questions asked:
1. Do you wish to continue your MRWC membership? Yes No
2. Do you typically attend MRWC meetings? Yes No If no, why not?
3. Do you have any comments or suggestions for the MRWC Executive Committee?

Responses (received +80% response to the poll through 1/09)
Current member lists (sign-up sheet and listserv) = ~100 names

1. Do you wish to continue your MRWC membership? Yes 55 No 3

2. Do you typically attend MRWC meetings? Yes 29 No 20
   If no, why not?
   - I just haven't attended in the past.
   - Time commitment.
   - I will try to make as many meetings as possible.
   - Too busy doing other work. Sometimes it is too far to drive.
   - Not one of my high priorities at this time.
   - It has been getting more towards no, as our travel budget is taking some major cuts.
   - Unfortunately, they just have not fit into my schedule, but I do plan on making a meeting one of these days.
   - Cannot afford to attend.
   - Missed the last several meetings due to current work duties and other conflicts
   - No, sometimes due to scheduling.
   - No, competing interests.
   - Meetings as of late have been conflicting with other previously set up meetings I have had, as we proceed I will make the meetings that I can as long as I have no conflicts.
   - No - They just have not fit into my schedule as of yet.
   - I have attended meetings in the past and was one of the charter members of the delegation for Nebraska entering into the agreement. Unfortunately I became a member of the Nebraska governors riparian task force and have had conflicting schedules ever since. I’ve relied on Kristy Paul for information and guidance for Nebraska’s interests. Your e-mail is helpful also.
   - I have not attended any meeting since the first meeting that was in Spearfish because of other meeting that took priority. I have attended the meetings in NE, and Montana and worked with the group last year in D.C.
   - I have attended as many meetings as possible and will continue to attend.
   - When possible and there isn’t a conflict in my schedule.
   - Canadian - can’t get funding to attend.
   - No, I am relatively new in my position at the NDDA and have not received the meeting information.
Whenever I can.

3. Do you have any comments or suggestions for the MRWC Executive Committee?
- Keep it up!
- Expand/improve the level of communication between working groups and Executive Committee and CIPM coordination for task needs!!
- Yes, Steve Chick (NE State Conservationist) should become a member as he was just appointed to the Missouri River Review team representing NRCS.
- Remember the values that proper functioning riparian forests provide.
- Could optional teleconference updates be helpful in sharing project results etc. and leave member meeting more time to problem solve and explore coalition options.
- I would still like to stay in the loop however at this time I my level of commitment is unknown. Either way as a COE representative I will help as much as I can.
- I appreciate the information sharing and hope to attend or have one of our members attend future meetings.
- If this committee does phone conference calls instead of several face to face meetings it would be good to let folks know if they can listen in.
- I think we are still trying to find the best way to utilize the broad background, knowledge and priorities of the group into one focused goal.
- I very much appreciate the work of the group and your efforts to keep me informed of pertinent issues and the efforts of the group.
- The Bowman County Weed Board would like to continue their MRWC membership (bowmanweed@nd.gov). Bowman County found their first Salt cedar 6 years ago and through aggressive control measures have not LOCATED any plants since then. They at that time sprayed approximately 5,000 plants. The information from MRWC is very important to us. We will attend meetings as distance permits. We would like to thank MRWC for being there.
- McKenzie County Weed Control has been involved with the coalition in the past. A new Weed Officer will be in the office in January 2009 and will pass this information to her. Her name is Cherri Weyrauch. From: Norine Jorgenson, Secretary; MCWC; P.O. Box 930; Watford City, ND 58854
- Keep up the good work. (3)
- I think Liz does an amazing job leading meetings and moving them forward with great summaries of our assignments!
- Keep up the good work. It is vital that this coalition get moving forward.
- Not at this time, but in the future we really need to be looking at getting control measures on the ground and helping the States involved with granting and other funding ideas to get this moving.
- Although I don't generally attend the meetings, it is good to be kept in the loop on the activities of the group.
- Having the meetings during or concurrent with other meeting works great and we seem to get the greatest membership.
- From: Charles Brooks, Phelps County Weed Superintendent, NWCA Past President
Having been to Washington DC the last three years as part of NIWAW and NAWMA, I have experienced the difficulties of lobbying Congress. If there is any life in any of the bills (Russian Olive-SaltCedar bill) or if we need to sponsor a new bill I have several comments.
- We need the support of at least 22 Senators, or 11 States and the congressmen too. Our Senator informed us that if he had that kind of support he could probably get something through. Unfortunately we weren’t organized enough to get 10 Senators to work together.

- The bill or law must allow everyone to participate (any state). If you look at the bill coming out of Nevada, Nebraska isn’t included and I can’t ask my Senators to waste any of their time supporting something that won’t help us. Probably a multispecies effort is needed so more states could use the money for their own particular invasive species with allocations to each state. This would get more congressional support and everyone wants to support something that would help them too. We can’t worry about keeping the cost down (the Nevada bill) and we need to start by getting something funded even with limited funds because of sharing with other states and entities.

- The new bill must require money will be spent on control efforts and not demonstration, equipment, or administration. Let the States provide that match.

- If a bill is passed we need to be organized enough to hire a lobbyist to work on the inside to get appropriation funded. There is very little any organization can do on the outside in Washington DC.

- We need to work with several or any invasive plant group already formed. Strength in size and numbers. Washington deals in large problems.

- Thanks for the opportunity to provide input. I believe in the MRWC. We have a lot of strength in the number of states involved and our watershed approach.

- At this time I would say that everything seems to be working fine. Please let me or Kelly Uhing know what NAWMA can do for this group.

- From Tony Jacobson: I’m no longer working with the noxious weed department 3. Please send MRWC news to Heather Hundt Natural Resource Specialist who is my replacement for the Corps of Engineers. Her email is Heather.K.Hundt@usace.army.mil Even though I no longer work with invasive plant management, I've enjoyed keeping up with what's happening with MRWC. Keep up the great job.
MRWC Voting Rules
As outlined in the MRWC Constitution and Bylaws

MRWC MEMBERS:
The Missouri River Watershed membership shall be composed of the official state agriculture agencies of the following states: Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming. As well as, (1) other states within the Missouri River Watershed, upon the approval of the existing member states, and (2) a representative from each of the following groups -- all the Tribes, Federal Agencies, and any private coalition or individual located in the Missouri River Watershed states.

VOTING FOR MRWC OFFICERS:
All members shall be eligible to serve as Missouri River Watershed Coalition officers provided that all other provisions of the Constitution are complied with.

The officers of this organization shall consist of a President and Vice-President. These officers shall be elected annually or until their successors are elected and qualified. Officers are eligible for re-election for an indefinite period of time, but not to exceed four years.

The officers of this Coalition shall be elected by written ballot.

Note: At the MRWC September 18, 2008 meeting, MRWC members agreed not to use e-mail voting and that elections would be by paper ballot, in person at an MRWC meeting.

QUORUM: A quorum shall consist of a number of members representing a majority of the member states.

Voting Process for June 2009 Election of MRWC Officers (President and Vice President)

1. The election of MRWC officers is to take place during a regularly scheduled MRWC meeting. The 2009 election of officers will be conducted during the June 16, 2009 meeting.

2. CIPM will call for nominations for MRWC President and Vice President. Nominations will be recorded and the process closed when no further names are added to the list of candidates.

3. All MRWC members who are present at the meeting may vote for MRWC President and Vice President.

4. MRWC members will fill out and submit a paper ballot with their vote for MRWC officers.

5. Note: There may be Executive Committee members participating in the meeting via conference call. Those individuals will be allowed to vote via proxy by calling Liz Galli-Noble on her cell phone and providing her with their votes. Liz will then fill out a paper ballot for those committee members and submit their votes for them.

6. A quorum is needed to validate the election of officers. A majority of member states (a minimum of 4 of the 6 member states) must vote to validate the election of officers. It does not matter if one member state has many individuals participating in the meeting and another member state has only one participate. There only needs to be one participate from four of the member states to satisfy the quorum rule. If a quorum is not reached at this meeting, election of MRWC officers will be postponed until the Fall 2009 MRWC meeting.

7. CIPM will gather and tally the paper ballots. The winner for President and Vice President will then be announced and recorded in the meeting minutes.
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MRWC Overview

Ecological and Economic Need for the Missouri River Watershed Coalition
The Missouri River is the longest river in the United States. At 2,540 miles in length, it drains about one-sixth of the North American continent. From its headwaters in the northern Rocky Mountains, the Missouri River and its tributaries flow through the western states of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska. These states rely heavily upon the Missouri River headwaters system for economic and ecological stability. The rivers, streams, reservoirs, and ponds of the watershed support and provide for agriculture, livestock, recreation, tourism, wildlife habitat, irrigation, drinking water, industry, and power generation throughout these states. Invasive plant species, saltcedar (\textit{Tamarix} spp.) and Russian olive (\textit{Elaeagnus angustifolia}) in particular, threaten these many uses.

Tamarisk or saltcedar was introduced from Eurasia in the 1800s and has become established over at least one million acres of floodplains and riparian areas across the western United States (source: http://invasipedia.ucdavis.edu/doku.php/tamarix_spp?\$=tamarisk). As saltcedar replaces stands of native vegetation (cottonwood, willow and mesquite) along the rivers, it can create dense monocultures that restrict access for irrigation, wildlife, and outdoor enthusiasts. Dense saltcedar infestations can also degrade or eliminate habitat for threatened and endangered species.

Recognizing the critical need for protecting the natural resources of the Missouri River headwaters, state weed coordinators from Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming and other interested parties began the process of forming what would come to be known as the Missouri River Watershed Coalition (MRWC) in 2005. Since its inception, the Coalition has coordinated its efforts with federal, state, and local agencies, tribes, businesses, universities, conservation groups, and private landowners concerned with the spread of saltcedar and other invasive plants throughout watersheds that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

The six states involved in the MRWC spend millions of dollars annually to control noxious and invasive weeds. In 2008, South Dakota counties allocated over $5 million in county general funds to noxious weed control, and state and federal agencies spent approximately $1.75 million on weed control. Of those expenditures, 5% - 20% were targeted for riparian weed control.

In addition to direct costs of monitoring, mapping, and controlling invasive plants, there are significant costs associated with loss of recreation, tourism, agricultural production, and quality and quantity of natural resources. For example, Nebraska estimates it loses 115,000 acre-feet of water per year to saltcedar alone.
Financial resources are currently inadequate to effectively manage noxious weeds in many of the MRWC states. Increased funding to private land managers, county weed districts, federal and state agencies, and improved efficiency and organization of grassroots efforts are critical to implementing viable weed management programs in the watershed. With shrinking state budgets, geographic expansion of well-established noxious weeds due to climate change, and the potential for many new invasions (aquatic and terrestrial) on the horizon, the need to cooperate and pool limited resources on the watershed level has never been more necessary.

**Management Using a Watershed Approach** – It is widely held that addressing the riparian invasive plant issue in the United States, and in particular invasions of saltcedar, will require a multi-facetted, collaborative approach across the West that includes: using a watershed approach, starting control projects at the headwaters and working downstream, and working with partners at all levels of government and private landowners. Creating the Coalition in recent years was a major step in that direction for the Missouri River headwaters states.

From the beginning, Coalition members acknowledged the need to consolidate resources, share information and avoid duplication of effort in the Missouri River watershed. The makeup of the MRWC is a demonstration of the strength that can be built by seating local and state agencies, concerned citizens groups, tribal nations and federal regulatory agencies as collaborative managers, investigators and decision makers. Further, having many of the highly-invested parties charged with invasive plant management and regulation of river resources represented in the Coalition membership has helped to promote interstate and regional communication and will streamline projects, research and outreach efforts at the watershed level. Finally, bringing managers, academics, and policy makers to the table will also ensure that research conducted by the Coalition will have practical management application, and the results of research conducted and management activities undertaken by the Coalition will be shared with other concerned parties throughout the watershed, and beyond.

As a coalition of states, the MRWC is able to develop and deliver regional programs efficiently, aggregate state-based data and information sources, and effectively share experience and expertise at the watershed level. By taking a watershed approach to management and pooling limited state resources, the Coalition provides an ideal model for other states to use for regional coordination of invasive species.

**MRWC Goals**

**MRWC Overall Goal** – To maintain productive, biodiverse riparian ecosystems that provide quality water, habitat, recreation, and power to meet the economic and ecological needs of the Missouri River Watershed region.

**Management Goals** –
- Reduce the introduction and spread of saltcedar (*Tamarix* spp.) and other noxious plants in the Missouri River Watershed region.
- Increase regional coordination and communication, and develop regional management strategies and priorities for invasive plant species and water resources.
- Maximize funding efficiency for public education, prevention, management, and restoration projects on riparian corridors.
• Team government, businesses, universities, conservation groups, landowners, water users, and sportsmen in private-public partnerships.

Watershed Cooperation/ State & Local Leadership


Constitution and Bylaws – On September 15, 2008, Coalition members voted to approve a new Constitution and Bylaws, which formalized their purpose, structure and leadership roles (Attachment B). Through this action, they also formally established an Executive Committee, which governs the Coalition. The Executive Committee supervises the business, programs, and policies approved by the Coalition membership, and appoints members to special workgroups as deemed necessary to conduct the business of the Coalition. Authorized representatives from each state and an elected MRWC President make up the Executive Committee.

Although state departments of agriculture function in a leadership role for the MRWC, the group has encouraged and benefited from broad watershed representation from its membership including: tribal nations, weed districts, county weed boards, private citizens, non-governmental groups, and other county, state, and federal agencies.

Membership – The MRWC has steadily grown in partner cooperation and membership over its three-and-a-half-year history. At present, MRWC has approximately 100 active members. The Center for Invasive Plant Management (CIPM) maintains the MRWC listserv of approximately 80 members, sending pertinent information to the group on a weekly or monthly basis. The listserv also allows for discussion of issues and for the exchange of management and research ideas. In December 2008, CIPM conducted a survey of the MRWC membership, which showed that the vast majority of those polled remain fully engaged and supportive of the Coalition and its work. More than 80% of the members responded to the survey, representing all six states, non-governmental organizations, Industry and eight federal agencies (ARS, APHIS, BLM, BOR, NRCS, USFS, USFWS, and USACOE).

Feedback from MRWC members (Dec 2008)....

• “I appreciate the information sharing and hope to attend or have one of our members attend future meetings.” Vicki Marquis, Missouri River Conservation Districts Council, MT

• “Bowman County Weed Board would like to continue their MRWC membership. Bowman County found their first Saltcedar 6 years ago and through aggressive control measures have not LOCATED any plants since then. They at that time sprayed approximately 5,000 plants. The information from MRWC is very important to us. We will attend meetings as distance permits. We would like to thank MRWC for being there.” Roger Wickstrom, Bowman County Weed Officer, ND
• “...in the future we really need to be looking at getting control measures on the ground and helping the States involved with granting and other funding ideas to get this moving.”
William “Bill” Walker, Territory Manager, UAP Distribution (SD, ND, NE)

• “I very much appreciate the work of the group and your efforts to keep me informed of pertinent issues and the efforts of the group.” Jared W. McJunkin, Northern Great Plains Regional Biologist, National Wild Turkey Federation, SD

• “I believe in the MRWC. We have a lot of strength in the number of states involved and our watershed approach.” Charles Brooks, Phelps County Weed Superintendent, NE (Nebraska Weed Control Association, Past President)

**MRWC Saltcedar Management Plan** – The MRWC began the development of the *Missouri River Watershed Coalition Saltcedar Management Plan* in 2006, and completed the plan and began its implementation in 2007 (*Attachment C*). This plan outlines the broad strategy of the Coalition, organizes project surveys and treatment, and compiles necessary information to best use the states’ limited collective resources. The overall goal of this plan is to protect and improve agriculture, ranching/grazing, recreation, aesthetics, water systems, and wildlife habitats, by minimizing the effects of saltcedar and other noxious and invasive species within the six-state area.

**Moving Beyond Saltcedar** – The MRWC focused almost exclusively on saltcedar in its early years. In 2008, the MRWC began to broaden its program focus to include more than just saltcedar and Russian olive. Other newly-arrived invasive plants (in particular, aquatic invasive plants) are also of major concern in the watershed and therefore have been added to the Coalition’s management strategy. MRWC members also wish to establish a network to share information on all invasive plant species impacting the watershed, with a major emphasis on preventing the spread of new species into un-infested areas, and to utilize early detection of new invasions and rapid response strategies to effectively treat new outbreaks. The 2007 *Saltcedar Management Plan* will be used as a model for future plans that target other invasive species that threaten the watershed. The MRWC believes that managers need to approach all noxious weeds as a whole and not one at a time. When land managers focus on controlling any single species, the species that have been ignored may hinder the efforts of controlling the target weed species.

**2008 MRWC Activities & Accomplishments**

The Coalition has had the capability to achieve many of the goals outlined in their management plan for a few years, now. However, they were constrained by lack of funding or inadequate staffing, technology, educational tools, equipment, and ability to travel and attend meetings. Having received crucial funding through the USFS State and Forestry – Forest Health Protection Program in mid-2008, several key program coordination and technical constraints have been addressed. This funding allowed the MRWC to establish their organizational structure and an operations base in 2008, and to start the planning process for collaborative research investigations, on-the-ground projects, and outreach activities in 2009.
CIPM Program Coordination – The CIPM volunteered to serve as the initial project coordinator during the development of the Coalition (7/2005-4/2008). In May 2008, under a formalized agreement initiated by the Montana Department of Agriculture’s Noxious Weed Trust Fund, CIPM took on integration of the MRWC activities through both general program coordination and facilitating specific projects and products (Attachment D). To date, CIPM coordination has been focused in three program support areas: (1) organizing and facilitating intergroup activities, events and communication, (2) coordinating communication and disseminating information to parties outside of the group, (3) developing a mapping and early detection-rapid response (EDRR) system for invasive plant species within the MRWC states, and (4) providing evaluation of the Coalition progress. CIPM’s partnership with the Coalition is a good example of how land-grant universities like Montana State can play a pivotal role in protecting one of our nation’s most valuable water resources, the Missouri River headwaters.

The following are highlights of MRWC activities and accomplishments in 2008:

Expansion to a Six-State Coalition – An addendum to the MRWC MOA, adding the state of Colorado to the Coalition, was officially signed by all six states in July 2008 (Attachment E).

MRWC Constitution and Bylaws – After several months of discussion, on September 15, 2008, Coalition members voted to approve a new Constitution and Bylaws, which formalized their purpose, structure and leadership roles (Attachment B). Through this action, the MRWC also formally established an Executive Committee, which governs the Coalition.

MRWC Saltcedar Mapping Project – One of the initial management goals of the Coalition was to increase cooperation on mapping efforts. Over the past 1½ years, Kelly Sharp (MidDakota Vegetation Management; Miller, SD) has been assisting the Coalition with the creation of a Current Extent of the Problem map that includes major rivers\key reservoirs, state boundaries, and estimated acreage of saltcedar by county. He developed a data-entry sheet and a web-accessible downloading system, which documents: State, County, and estimated saltcedar acreage, or 0 = absent, or -1 = no data. The state of Colorado joined this project in late 2007. Getting counties to share their updated data, and thus allowing for the completion of the map, has been a slow process. In response, the Coalition asked CIPM to assist with the coordination of MRWC mapping efforts in 2008. The Mapping Workgroup met in conjunction with the Fall 2008 MRWC meeting in Billings, with two outcomes: (1) CIPM contracted with JHS, Inc. of Helena, MT to complete Montana’s saltcedar mapping effort; and (2) CIPM was to work closely with Kelly Sharp and JHS, Inc. to complete the six-state, saltcedar map for MRWC outreach purposes and publications (Attachments F and G). Future MRWC mapping efforts, slated for 2009/2010, will expand on the saltcedar mapping effort to include additional invasive plant species (in particular, additional aquatic plant species) and inventories and surveys.

EDRR – The MWRC identified EDRR as a priority management tool that would be most valuable if coordinated on a regional scale. CIPM has assisted with the coordination of initiating a six-state EDRR system since August 2008. Erik Lehnhoff has done background research on the development of a MRWC EDRR system, and presented on his progress at both the Fall 2008 MRWC meeting and during the January 6, 2009 Executive Committee meeting. Several solid partnerships with existing, regional or national EDRR/database efforts have been identified and will be presented for Coalition member discussion at the Spring 2009 MRWC meeting.
MRWC Meetings

Semi-Annual Meetings – The Coalition membership meets semi-annually – typically once in a western-most state and once in an eastern-most state within the Missouri River Watershed. In 2008, the MRWC met in May in Nebraska and again in September in Montana. The May 6th meeting was a half-day gathering in Scottsbluff, NE held in conjunction with the Invasive Species Control Summit - Russian olive, tamarisk, phragmites – A complete watershed approach to invasive plant control. Twenty-nine Coalition members were present, representing five of the six states (ND was absent) (Attachment H). The second 2008 meeting was a half-day event held on September 18 in conjunction with the North American Weed Management Association (NAWMA) annual conference in Billings, MT. Fifteen Coalition members were in attendance representing each state except ND (Attachment I). In addition, two MRWC workgroups met prior to the main Fall meeting to focus on mapping projects and upcoming funding opportunities for the Coalition (Attachments F and J). CIPM planned, facilitated and documented all of those meetings.

The MRWC scheduled their Spring 2009 meeting for March 27th in Billings, MT. Unfortunately, due to severe weather conditions, flooding and road closures throughout the region, the meeting had to be rescheduled for later in the season. The meeting will now be held on June 16th and 17th in Spearfish, SD.

Executive Committee Meetings – In addition to their semi-annual meetings, the MRWC Executive Committee also met via conference call twice this past year – July 25, 2008 and January 6, 2009. Those meetings were planned, facilitated and documented by CIPM. The main topics discussed included: MRWC semi-annual meeting planning, MRWC funding and financial business, the saltcedar mapping project, the EDRR project, NIWAW and HHC updates, and potential new watershed partnerships (Attachments K and L).

MRWC Special Workgroups – The Coalition forms special workgroups to add extra energy to particularly important, difficult or time-consuming issues. Thus far, three workgroups have actively met in 2007 and 2008: Mapping, Education, and Appropriations/Funding. The Coalition plans to use these and other new workgroups more in 2009 to guide and oversee specific projects, to seek funding (write grant proposals), and to generate awareness and education products.

MRWC Website & Listserv – The MRWC has an established and well-used member listserv of approximately 80 individuals, which is maintained and updated by CIPM. Between semi-annual meetings, the MRWC communicates via this headwaters_tamarisk listserv. The Coalition also has a well maintained website http://www.weedcenter.org/MRWC/index.html, which is hosted and managed by CIPM. CIPM oversees the posting of data for education and mapping to the site as well as maintaining the links, graphics and MRWC program information on the site. CIPM monitors and communicates new research findings, informational resources, new management practices and potential funding opportunities and reviews national legislation to the Coalition via the website and listserv.

Outreach & Education Materials – Generally orchestrated by members of the Education Workgroup, the Coalition has produced a few outreach products in the past two years: brochures, posters and press releases. In 2008, CIPM agreed to assist with the development of public relations materials – one-page summaries, brochures, posters, press releases, etc. – that showcase MRWC projects and activities for a target audience of peers, policy makers, potential funders and landowners. CIPM has also done personal outreach to agencies, tribes, organizations and other interested parties in 2008, informing them of MRWC activities and inviting them to MRWC meetings.
Evaluation – The success of the MRWC is evaluated annually at a joint meeting. Coalition members review their Management Action Plan and assess the status of each of the items in the plan. In November 2007, CIPM facilitated that discussion, and collated and distributed the 2007 MRWC Evaluation results (Attachment M). CIPM will do the same for 2008 at the Spring 2009 MRWC meeting.

Plans for the Future

The Coalition has established a solid and active membership, organizational structure, program facilitation and technical base. They are now prepared to move forward on regionally-focused projects and targeted outreach efforts. The Coalition and CIPM will either apply already-secured funding to fund for these efforts, or they will seek new funding through other sources – including writing grants and member contributions – to pay for them.

Several potential projects and activities that the MRWC is considering for 2009/2010 – funding permitting – include:

Research Projects

Missouri River Watershed Early Detection – Rapid Response System
CIPM will complete the development of a mapping and EDRR system for invasive plant species within the MRWC states. CIPM is evaluating the numerous mapping and EDRR systems that currently exist and will adopt and/or adapt one of them for use in the Missouri River watershed. The system will be interactive, allowing a diverse group of users to enter invasive species location data into a central database. Information would be automatically disseminated to interested users including county weed supervisors, state weed coordinators, CWMAs, other state agencies, private landowners and others.

Evaluating Saltcedar and Russian Olive Treatment Success: A Comparative Study on the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers
Evaluate the effectiveness of saltcedar and Russian olive control treatments and the re-establishment success of native and non-native vegetation in a select number of river channel types on a regulated (dammed) river and unregulated (undammed) river. Does a naturally occurring flood regime (flood events) provide a positive impact for the control of riparian invasive plant species, such as saltcedar and Russian olive? If the answer is yes, can invasive plant managers use flood events as a tool for controlling riparian invasive plant species? Can we quantify the economic and environmental impacts over time? What is the economic impact that these flood events have on a state’s budget for controlling and restoring infested sites? If a flood event would have to mimicked in a regulated system, what frequency and velocity would be needed to have the most positive impact?

Phragmites Monitoring and Genotyping
MRWC member states will partner with Dr. Adam Lambert (Eastern Connecticut State University) and Dr. Bernd Blossey (Cornell University) to locate native (Phragmites australis) and non-native phragmites populations in the region, and provide those data to established regional and national genotype databases. Sharing of information among these state agencies will be critical in ‘getting the word out’ about the threat of invasive genotypes in the region. A secondary project could include assisting research teams with determining the relative importance of direct plant competition and indirect effects of exotic aphids on native P. australis growth and survival.

Establish MRWC Tamarisk Control & Restoration Projects Database
CIPM will hire a student to set up a database and collect data and other information from the six states and other potential information sources (TNC, Tamarisk Coalition, etc.) for: saltcedar presence and absence, saltcedar
Saltcedar Monitoring and Research
Saltcedar restoration efforts in the Missouri River Watershed have had minimal success. Saltcedar eradication often leads to invasion by other species including Canada thistle, houndstongue, cheatgrass and others. Part of the reason for this may be that there is often little baseline data regarding the status of the invaded plant community and the chemistry of the soil. Successful restoration can’t be expected, without tremendous revegetation efforts, if native species don’t exist or are very sparse on the site, or if saltcedar has altered soil chemistry such that native plants can’t be supported. Based on this, the MRWC will consider conducting monitoring and research:

- At the Hell Creek site on Fort Peck, saltcedar was eradicated but revegetation did not occur. Monitoring data from one monitoring event subsequent to saltcedar eradication is available. The MRWC will conduct follow-up monitoring to track the trajectory of vegetation at a site where saltcedar was eradicated, but follow-up restoration efforts were not implemented. This multi-year effort will gather information to help understand vegetation succession after saltcedar removal.
- Conduct comparative soil studies of invaded and un-invaded vegetation communities to evaluate the effect of saltcedar on soil. This work could be conducted in a single field season.
- Conduct greenhouse, and then field scale, experiments to determine what vegetation is suitable for use in site restoration on saltcedar degraded sites. This research would likely take one year in the greenhouse and several years in the field.

On-the-Ground Projects
The Coalition supports using an integrated approach to managing saltcedar and other riparian invasive species that involves the use of herbicide, mechanical, and biological treatments, with the ultimate goal of protecting or restoring the water resource. Several on-the-ground projects being considered by the MRWC in 2009 are:

- **Develop and Evaluate Combination Spray-and-Seed Units**
  Assessment of test areas and utilization of spray units, which would treat invasive weed species and apply native species seed (grasses) at the same time, in infested areas. A major problem with controlling invasive species is the resulting bare ground and lack of viable native seed remaining in the seed bed.

- **Portable Weed Seed Wash System-Loan Program (SD)**
  Establish a program to make available portable, weed-seed wash systems that would be loaned out for use by multi-agencies organizations, local entities and land managers.

- **Regional Rapid Response Team**
  Formation and utilization of a multi-agency/state/landowner/county Rapid Response Team to provide rapid pre- and post-assessment, equipment, treatment, containment and follow-up of new invasive species sites in the region. Funding would be provided through grants and joint contributions from all participating members. The Rapid Response Team would operate as an independent entity but would utilize funds, equipment and resources from all state members, similar to Emergency Management Groups.

Awareness, Outreach & Education
Prevention is the most efficient and economical invasive plant management strategy. Key components of prevention are increasing public education and awareness. The six headwaters states value prevention and education programs, and through the Coalition they plan to launch a public relations campaign, as well as to expand successful education and awareness state-based programs across the region in 2009.
• **MRWC Public Relations Campaign at the Watershed Level**
  CIPM will undertake a public relations campaign for the MRWC in 2009. We will develop a targeted marketing strategy to achieve public awareness of invasive species that will tap the many roles MRWC members can play at all program levels. A logo is being designed for the Coalition, press releases on MRWC activities will be regularly released, MRWC presentations will be made to potential watershed collaborators (MoRAST, MRNRC, MRRIC, YRCDC, others, etc.).

• **Expand State-based K-12 Educational and Public Awareness Programs for Watershed Application**
  Sponsored and organized by the MRWC Education Workgroup and CIPM, state-based outreach and education (adult and K-12) coordinators will be encouraged to share products and programs with other states within the watershed. MRWC will assist with their travel expenses and host educational special sessions during or in conjunction with regularly scheduled MRWC semi-annual meetings.

• **Invasive Species Mapping Training for Private Landowners**
  Formation of an educational/GIS/GPS mapping group utilizing conservation organizations, recreation groups and participating landowners as field operatives. Counties and/or states would purchase GPS units and provide training and field logs for the landowners. This would vastly increase in-the-field mapping capability and GIS documentation of invasive species in the watershed.

---

**Forest Health Protection Program & the MRWC**

Invasive species have been identified by the Chief of the US Forest Service as one of the four significant threats to our nation’s forest and rangeland ecosystems. The 2004 *National Strategy and Implementation Plan for Invasive Species Management* incorporates four key elements for invasive species management:

1. **Prevention** — Stop invasive species before they arrive.
2. **Early detection and rapid response** — Find new infestations and eliminate them before they become established.
3. **Control and management** — Contain and reduce existing infestations.
4. **Rehabilitation and restoration** — Reclaim native habitats and ecosystems.

In addition, the national strategy identifies four critical themes common among the key management elements:

- **Partnerships and cooperation**
- **Scientific basis**
- **Communications and education**
- **Organizing for success** (including long-term commitment).

The MRWC program is based on all of these same elements, and Coalition actions complement the USFS invasive species management strategy. The MRWC, first and foremost, emphasizes prevention as their most efficient and economical management strategy; and they use the coalition of states to both promote awareness and communicate possible new threats within the watershed. In 2008, the MWRC identified EDRR as a priority management tool that would be most valuable if coordinated on a regional scale. On-the-ground and research projects proposed for 2009 target new approaches for control and management of riparian invasive species with particular attention paid to restoration on saltcedar degraded sites.

The MRWC employs a science-based, watershed approach to invasive plant management. The Coalition is collaborative in nature and has worked to expand its partnerships throughout the basin. Having
developed a watershed management plan in 2007, the Coalition is able to apply a system for taking action and works to improve their efficacy and accountability by conducting a program evaluation on an annual basis. The Coalition strives to be proactive and not reactive in its actions, and has taken invasive species management to the watershed level. Much like the Forest Service itself, originally, the Missouri River states focused on terrestrial and forest invasive species management. In recent years, they have broadened their emphasis to include aquatic invasive species and are working collaboratively to increase their preparedness for preventing and managing for them. With USFS funding in 2008, the Coalition took the crucial step to organize and better coordinate their effort. Feedback from the membership affirmed strong support for a collaborative approach to invasive species management in the Missouri River watershed and partner commitment. The stage has been set for a watershed awareness program and implementation of multi-state research and management projects in 2009.
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From: Missouri River Watershed Coalition - Saltcedar Management Plan

Evaluation and Measures of Success

The success of the Missouri Headwaters Coalition will be evaluated annually at a joint meeting. The Coalition will review the Action Plan each year and assess the status of each of the items in the plan. The key measures of success will be:

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

CIPM proposes:

- To put MRWC evaluation on the spring 2009 meeting agenda.
- To add an evaluation of CIPM’s program coordination (May 2008 – May 2009) to the overall program evaluation process.
- To send out a request for feedback from MRWC membership prior to the spring MRWC meeting.
The past 12-18 months of the MRWC Saltcedar Project was evaluated by the membership, according to “key measures of success” set forth in the *MRWC Saltcedar Management Plan*.

**Buy-in (to the plan) from additional agencies, groups, and individuals.**
- In 2007, the state of Colorado joined the MRWC at that state’s request.
- The USFS State and Private Forestry division has expressed interest in supporting the MRWC.
- USDA-NRCS is taking a more active role in invasive plant management in South Dakota.
- Several congressmen and senators are interested in the project.
- The National Wild Turkey Federation has requested to be included in all correspondence.

**Commitment of the states to continue the group.**
- Representatives of the original five (and now six) states have attended every MRWC meeting. When the state weed coordinator has been unable to attend, (s)he has ensured that someone else will participate.
- Representatives of the six state Departments of Agriculture have contributed to building the regional management plan, compiling a regional map, and developing a constitution and bylaws for the MRWC.

**Increased awareness of the saltcedar problem.**
- More questions about and sightings of saltcedar are being received by the South Dakota Dept. of Agriculture.
- Interest in and support of riparian-area management are increasing within the Nebraska state administration.
- Montana is seeing more buy-in to weed management by conservation districts.
- PowerPoint presentations about saltcedar have been given all over North Dakota. The public is aware of saltcedar as “that plant sucking up all the water.”
- County Weed and Pest Districts in Wyoming are working on saltcedar and Russian olive management. They are receiving more questions from the public.

**Increased funding from internal and external sources.**
- A new $2 million grant program for invasive plants has been created in Nebraska. State environmental trust funds are shifting interest to invasive species.
- In Colorado, EQIP programs (NRCS) are funding more weed projects.
- Montana funding for weed programs has remained flat, although the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are ramping up programs around the Fort Peck Reservoir.
- The BLM and state game and fish department have become active in saltcedar management in Wyoming. State funding remains flat.
- In South Dakota, Bureau of Reclamation support for saltcedar management has increased.
• After committing many dollars to eradicate early populations of saltcedar, North Dakota has been able to level off funding to focus on prevention and EDRR.

**Increased research on all aspects of saltcedar.**
• In October 2006, Colorado State University hosted a regional saltcedar research conference to bring together scientists from different disciplines, share information, and note gaps in research.
• MRWC has not seen an increase in saltcedar research in other states. Members stress that research is needed on seed viability and other aspects of saltcedar biology (including water usage) in northern states.

**Increased coordination of management efforts.**
• Wyoming, Colorado, and Nebraska are working together on the Platte and Republican rivers.
• Wyoming and South Dakota are collaborating on management of the Belle Fourche River.
• South Dakota and Nebraska are keeping in touch about weeds on their common border.
• All six states share information at semi-annual MRWC meetings.
• The MRWC is beginning collaboration with the Missouri River Association of States and Tribes.

**Areas identified for more attention**
• Increase collaboration with more non-governmental organizations, e.g., Ducks Unlimited, Federation of Fly Fishers, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Trout Unlimited, The Nature Conservancy, Wild Turkey Federation
• Increase interaction with the Bureau of Reclamation
• Increase group advocacy – tell more people about the MRWC and what it’s doing
• Quantify increases in funding and public awareness

**Conclusions**
In the 18 months since five state Departments of Agriculture signed a Memorandum of Agreement and the MRWC Saltcedar Management Plan was created, the MRWC has grown and increased collaborative work on the Missouri River watershed and its tributaries. Notably, the state of Colorado joined the original five states (Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming) in 2007. The public is much more aware of saltcedar and it impacts throughout the region, according to widespread anecdotal evidence. Funding for saltcedar management has remained steady or increased in the region. More research on saltcedar biology at its northern limits is needed.

The MRWC is committed to continuing work to maintain productive, healthy, stable, and biodiverse riparian ecosystems that are able to provide water, habitat, recreation/tourism, and power to meet the needs of its six member states.

November 2, 2007
This report was compiled for the MRWC by the Center for Invasive Plant Management, www.weedcenter.org
Proposed
CIPM/MSU Designated Account for MRWC

RE: The Center for Invasive Plant Management (CIPM) was directed by the MRWC Executive Committee to inquire about establishing a Montana State University (MSU) “designated account” for contributions to the Missouri River Watershed Coalition.

MSU Designated Account:

IDCs: Indirect Costs of 9% will be taken by MSU on all funding that passes through this designated account.

Funds Collected: Money collected in support of the MRWC may come from any or all of the following sources: MRWC membership dues, state departments of agriculture (MT, WY, ND, SD, NE, CO), Tribes, private businesses, private foundations, non-profit organizations, private citizens, and local, state and federal agencies.

Note: Grant funding received by the MRWC cannot be held in the designated account. Instead, a separate account specific to the grant funding program/project would have to be set up for this purpose. This could also be done through the CIPM/MSU, if the MRWC chooses to do so.

Spending MRWC Funds: MRWC funds held within the designated account may be used for any of the following needs of the MRWC: provide services, educational materials and training, labor, salaries, supplies, contracted services, travel, small equipment purchases and repairs, communications, rent and other incidentals in support of the MRWC effort.

Restrictions when using an MSU Account: All MRWC expenditures made using funds held within the designated account must adhere to University and Montana State policies and procedures: Examples include but are not limited to:
1. MSU does not allow expenditures for alcohol at MRWC events.
2. Only Montana State Rates for travel and per diem are permissible (see Montana state rates below).
3. All MRWC purchases and contracting (i.e., mapping, contracted services, supplies, materials, etc.) must adhere to Montana state policies and procedures.

Contributions to MRWC:
Contributions (checks) should be made out to: “MSU – LRES – MRWC” (Montana State University, Land Resources and Environmental Sciences Department, Missouri River Watershed Coalition).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTANA State Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meals - Per Diem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total per day</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lodging - $70/day (in state & out of state)
Mileage - Personal Vehicle - $0.55/mile for 1st 1,000 miles; after $0.52/mile
Summary of Presentations from the Tamarisk and Russian Olive Research Conference, February 18th and 19th, 2009

Submitted by: Dr. Erik Lehnhoff, CIPM

Biological control of tamarisk using leaf beetles (*Diorhabda elongata*) – General Information

- There was a general consensus that, with limited resources, more beetles at fewer sites is a better option than fewer beetles at more sites.
- Approximately 10,000 beetles per release is a good goal.
- Beetles pupate in litter underneath trees, so spring flooding will wipe out beetle population.
- In some southern and southwestern states, ants can be a serious predator on leaf beetles.

Biocontrol alters litter chemistry and short-term decomposition in a Tamarisk-invaded ecosystem

Uselman, Shauna¹, Snyder, Keirith¹, Blank, Robert¹ and Jones, Timothy¹
¹USDA-ARS, Exotic and Invasive Weeds Research Unit, Reno, NV

The investigators tested the effects of the biocontrol leaf beetles on the quality of tamarisk litter. Leaf litter was collected from trees with and without the leaf beetles, stored and allowed to decompose in mesh bags. Several characteristics often correlated with decomposition rates, including % Nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P) and lignin, ratios of Carbon (C):N, C:P, lignin:N and lignin:P, were then analyzed. Results indicated that litter resulting from beetle herbivory had higher nutrient (N and P) content and higher rates of litter decomposition. The researchers speculated that this may lead to changes in nutrient availability at these sites and could have ramifications for the restoration of tamarisk-degraded systems.

Comparative water use by native and non-native riparian species on western U.S. rivers

Nagler, Pamela L.¹ and Glenn, Edward P.²
¹USGS-Southwest Biological Science Center, Sonoran Desert Research Station
²University of Arizona, Environmental Research Lab

Contradictory to previously reported results, Nagler and Glenn report that tamarisk evapotranspiration is low to moderate compared to other riparian species. Based on data from moisture flux tower studies, tamarisk water usage on western rivers was calculated to range from 0.75-1.4 m/yr which is less than many native species. Also, in sap-flow studies, native the species arrowweed, mesquite and creosote had higher transpiration rates than tamarisk. This suggests that removal of tamarisk and replacement with native species would not result in water salvage. The authors further state that tamarisk provides valuable avian habitat on salinized and regulated rivers which can no longer support native trees, and thus its water use cannot be classified as non-beneficial. Finally, the authors suggest that replacement species would be limited by salinity along regulated river stretches that no longer support overbank flooding, and thus without changes in hydrology, tamarisk may be the best species under the current conditions.
Erosional consequence of tamarisk control
Friedman, Jonathon M.1, Vincent, Kirk R. and Griffin, Eleanor R.
1USGS, Boulder, CO

The authors report that widespread control of saltcedar in riparian areas can result in extreme erosion. In a case study on the Rio Puerco, herbicide was aerially applied to a 12-km stretch where tamarisk as well as the native sandbar willow were killed. A flood three years later increased mean channel width of the sprayed reach by 84%, and 680,000 m³ of sediment was eroded. While erosion is a natural hydrogeologic process, the authors point out that erosion can be very problematic in certain situations. In this case, tamarisk was intentionally introduced to Rio Puerco to control erosion and prolong the useful life of the downstream Elephant Butte Reservoir. Therefore, removal of the tamarisk in this situation is counterproductive.

Tamarix as habitat for birds: implications for riparian restoration in the southwestern United States
Paxton, Eben H.1, Sogge, Mark K.2 and Sferra, Susan J.3
1USGS Colorado Plateau Research Station
2USGS Flagstaff, AZ
3Bureau of Reclamation, Phoenix

Many southwestern riparian ecosystems have been invaded by tamarisk raising concerns about the suitability of tamarisk as habitat for birds. The authors state that while tamarisk may support fewer species than native habitats, 49 bird species do use tamarisk as breeding habitat. Furthermore the relative use of tamarisk and its quality as habitat vary substantially by geographic locations and bird species. Few studies have investigated how the use of tamarisk as breeding habitat affects bird survivorship and productivity, but research on the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher showed no negative effects. It is also stated that, given the likelihood that tamarisk removal will not result in replacement with high quality riparian habitat at many sites, restoration efforts could in some cases reduce the net riparian habitat value for some local or regional bird populations. The authors conclude that the goal for any restoration project should be no net loss of riparian habitat.

Biocontrol of tamarisk in the western United States: an event underway with significant ecological and societal implications
Hultine, Kevin R.1 et al.
1University of Utah, Department of Biology

In this presentation the authors discussed many of the ramifications of using the saltcedar leaf beetle (Diorhabda elongata) to control tamarisk in the western U.S. Two items of particular interest were discussed: impacts on large scale evapotranspiration changes and impacts on avian habitat. First the authors presented evidence that the amount of water used by tamarisk is ~17 gal/day and not the 200 gal/day as has been frequently reported. Therefore, they state that the amount of water potentially salvaged as leaf beetles defoliate tamarisk is much less that many models predict. Second, the authors discussed the degradation of avian habitat by the leaf beetles. They showed that as tamarisk is defoliated, birds are less likely to use it for habitat, and nests will be abandoned.
Riparian plant establishment limited by tamarisk insect herbivore interactions
Siemion, Gibney¹ and Stevens, Lawrence²
¹Grand Canyon Wildlands Council
²Museum of Northern Arizona

The researchers experimentally investigated the interactions between a non-native tamarisk insect herbivore (leafhopper, *Opsius stactogalus*), tamarisk litter microorganisms and riparian vegetation recruitment. They found that the honeydew secreted from the leafhopper increased fungal colonization of cottonwood, Baccharis as well as tamarisk seeds, and thereby decreased seed viability. It was demonstrated that multi-trophic interactions may inhibit the establishment of native species under saltcedar canopies. A schematic of the relationship is shown below.
MRWC Public Relations Blitz -- CIPM was instructed to undertake a “public relations blitz” for the MRWC in 2009. Melissa Brown, CIPM Science Communication Specialist, and other CIPM staff are spearheading this effort. In May 2009, a logo was designed for the MRWC and tentatively approved by the MRWC Executive Committee. Final approval will happen at the June meeting. Press releases on MRWC activities will be regularly released, other outreach materials (brochures, posters, maps, summary documents, reports) will continue to be produced, MRWC presentations will continue to be made to potential watershed collaborators, and an evaluation component will be part of this effort to determine whether public awareness increased.

MRWC Education/Outreach/Awareness Campaign -- CIPM was also instructed to initiate an education/outreach/awareness campaign for the MRWC, and to expand successful state-based programs to other states and, ultimately, to the watershed level. Sponsored by the MRWC, state-based awareness, outreach and education (adult and K-12) experts will be encouraged to share products and programs with other states within the watershed. MRWC will assist with travel expenses and host awareness/educational special sessions in conjunction with or in addition to regularly-scheduled MRWC semi-annual meetings.

RESPONSE - June 2009
CIPM will begin a collaborative effort with Carla Hoopes (Coordinator, Montana Noxious Weed Awareness and Education Program) to assist with initiating an education/outreach/awareness campaign for the MRWC. CIPM will compensate Carla to work with CIPM staff and the six states to:

- Poll the MRWC membership concerning their invasive species education/awareness challenges, highest priorities, potential resources available to the MRWC, targeted audiences, desired products and the like.
- Expand western state-based educational and awareness products to the Missouri River Watershed level.
- Assemble key education/awareness contacts from each of the six MRWC states to collaborate with the MRWC Education Workgroup and work on a few focal issues/projects in 2009/2010.
- Visit any of the six states to promote invasive species awareness or to teach techniques to concerned parties, including: teachers, watershed groups, NGOs, recreationists, tribes, private landowners, and local, state and federal partners.
- Produce educational and awareness products for watershed-wide distribution.
- Etc.

Compensation: $10,000
Research Projects

From Liz Galli-Noble, CIPM

1. Evaluating Salt Cedar and Russian Olive Treatment Success: A Comparative Study on the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers

Effectiveness of salt cedar and Russian olive control treatments and the re-establishment success of native and non-native vegetation in a select number of river channel types on a regulated (dammed) and unregulated (undammed).

Does a naturally occurring flood regime (flood events) provide a positive impact for the control of riparian invasive plant species, such as salt cedar and Russian olive? If the answer is yes, IPM managers can use flood events as a tool for controlling riparian invasive plant species, then can we quantify over time the economic impact that those events would have on a states’ budget for controlling and restoring infested sites? If a flood event would have to mimicked in a regulated system, what frequency and velocity would be needed to have the most positive impact?

- Select sites in three or more states (Montana, North Dakota, Nebraska, others?)
  Note: 35% of the Missouri River is impounded, 32% has been channelized, and 33% is unchannelized. The only significant stretch of free-flowing stream on the lower Missouri is the Missouri National Recreational River section between Gavins Point Dam and Ponca State Park, Nebraska. This federally-designated “wild and scenic river” is among the last unspoiled stretches of the Missouri, and exhibits the islands, bars, chutes and snags that once characterized by its historic state.

- Establish research plots in three(?) different reach types (braided, pool-riffle and entrenched) on the mainstem river channels and on tributaries of the Missouri and Yellowstone rivers

- Missouri River (highly regulated/multiple dams) and Yellowstone River (unregulated/no mainstem-channel dams).

- Document the re-establishment success of native (cottonwood and willow) and non-native vegetation (salt cedar, Russian olive, thistle, etc.). Long term could also document the more shade tolerant species (look at long-term plant diversity, succession, impacts to wildlife and fish habitat, etc.)

- This would be a long-term project. Establish study plots and collect data in year 1, 3, 5 and 10.

- Partners:
  MRWC – lead – 6 headwaters states
  YRCDC – co-lead/partner; tap their extensive data on the YR and establishing plots where they are doing extensive control and restoration thru their 2009 RDGP grant. Landowners and CDs in Montana and ND; research partner, management partner.
  US Army Corps of Engineers – have regulatory authority for both rivers; have a multitude of exiting research and management efforts already being conducted on both rivers. Funder, research partner, management authority.
  USGS-BRD – this group has done extensive research on the YR (fisheries and hydrology) and has conducted a great deal of recent research on salt cedar linked to hydrographs in the SW US. Research partner.
  MoRAST and MRNRC – project support

2. Establish a MRWC Tamarisk Control & Restoration Projects Database

Has this already been done? Would this info be useful to the states, to land managers? How will the database be maintained over time? How will it be communicated? Funded how?

CIPM will hire a graduate student to set up a database and collect data and other information from the six state departments of agriculture (and other potential information sources: TNC, Tamarisk Coalition, etc.) for: saltcedar presence and absence, saltcedar treatment areas, methods used, restoration actions taken, costs associated with actions, monitoring of treated sites, successes, failures, etc.
3. Phragmites Monitoring and Genotyping
Partnerships with government agencies concerned with environmental management in western states will be essential in expanding phragmites research and will enable exploration of many more potential *P. australis* sites. Sharing of information among these state agencies will be critical in ‘getting the word out’ about the threat of invasive genotypes in the region.

MRWC member states could partner with Dr. Adam Lambert (Eastern Connecticut State University) and Dr. Bernd Blossey (Cornell University) to locate native (*Phragmites australis*) and non-native phragmites populations in the region, and provide those data to established regional and national genotype databases.

A secondary project could include assisting research teams with determining the relative importance of direct plant competition and indirect effects of exotic aphids on native *P. australis* growth and survival.

Note: WSWS held a one-day symposium March 13-14, 2008 on giant reed and phragmites in the West. Tom Dudley (UC-Santa Barbara) was the organizer.

From Erik Lehnhoff, CIPM

4. Saltcedar Monitoring and Research
Saltcedar (*tamarisk* spp.) has invaded many riparian areas within the Missouri River watershed and restoration efforts have had minimal success. Saltcedar eradication often leads to invasion by other species including Canada thistle, houndstongue, cheatgrass and others. Part of the reason for this may be that there is often little baseline data regarding the status of the invaded plant community and the chemistry of the soil. Successful restoration can’t be expected, without tremendous revegetation efforts, if native species don’t exist or are very sparse on the site, or if saltcedar has altered soil chemistry such that native plants can’t be supported.

Based on this, we would like to conduct the following monitoring and research:

- At the Hell Creek site on Fort Peck, saltcedar was eradicated but revegetation did not occur. We have monitoring data from one monitoring event subsequent to saltcedar eradication. We would like to conduct follow-up monitoring to track the trajectory of vegetation at a site where saltcedar was eradicated, but follow-up restoration efforts were not implemented. This multi-year effort will gather information to help understand vegetation succession after saltcedar removal.
- Little is known about how saltcedar may affect soil chemistry in the MRWC region. We would like to conduct comparative soil studies of invaded and un-invaded vegetation communities to evaluate the effect of saltcedar on soil. This work could be conducted in a single field season.
- Based on the results the above, we would like to conduct greenhouse, and then field scale, experiments to determine what vegetation is suitable for use in site restoration on saltcedar degraded sites. This research would likely take one year in the greenhouse and several years in the field.

5. MRW Early Detection – Rapid Response System
We hope to facilitate the development of a mapping and Early Detection – Rapid Response system for non-indigenous plant species (NIS) within the MRWC states. It is anticipated that the system will be interactive, allowing a diverse group of users to enter NIS location data into a central database. The information would be automatically disseminated to interested users including county weed supervisors, state weed coordinators, CWMAs, FWP, private landowners and others. An immediate goal will be to evaluate the numerous mapping and EDRR systems that currently exist. It is possible that a currently available system can be adopted and/or adapted for use in the Missouri River watershed.

Obstacles / challenges
- All data need to be collected in the same manner
  - Point vs. polygon
  - Same attributes including patch size, density, cover and treatment
- Data must have same geographic projection
- Data validation
- Security
- Sensitive data
- System maintenance
- Funding
On-the-Ground Projects

From Ron Moehring, South Dakota

- **Evaluate the Effectiveness of Using Fire in Combination with Other Control Treatments for Salt Cedar**
  Work with SD’s Wildland Fire Division to study the effectiveness of saltcedar treatment after fire. Wildland fire personnel would do a controlled burn verses treatment without fire. Note: Similar research may have already been done. Joint Fire Services group may be a good funding source if pursued: [http://www.firescience.gov/JFSP_About_JFSP.cfm](http://www.firescience.gov/JFSP_About_JFSP.cfm)

- **Regional Rapid Response Team**
  Formation and utilization of a multi-agency/state/landowner/county Rapid Response Team to provide rapid pre- and post-assessment/equipment/treatment/containment and follow-up of new invasive species sites in the region. Funding would be provided through grants and joint contributions from all participating members. The Rapid Response Group would operate as an independent entity but would utilize funds/equipment/resources from all members, similar to Emergency Management Groups.

- **Invasive Species Mapping Training for Private Landowners**
  Formation of an educational/GIS/GPS mapping group utilizing participating landowners as field operatives. Counties and/or states would purchase GPS units and provide training and field logs for the landowners. This would vastly increase the in the field mapping capability and GIS documentation of invasive species in the watershed. Possibly work with Kim Goodwin (MSU), who has done similar work through her Weed Prevention Area program.

- **Develop and Evaluate Combination Spray-and-Seed Units**
  Assessment of test areas and utilization of spray units, which would treat invasive weed species and apply native species (grasses) seed at the same time in infested areas. A major problem with controlling invasive species is the resulting bare ground and lack of viable native seed remaining in the seed bed.

- **Portable Weed Seed Wash System-Loan Program**
  Establish a program and make available portable, weed seed wash systems that would be loaned out for use by multi-agencies/entities/land managers. Lessons learned in MT and other states; MRWC could help coordinate these efforts region wide.

- **Evaluate Eco-System Safe Bio-Glaze Spray Treatment for Noxious Weed Control**
  Develop an “eco-system safe bio-glaze” (fructose syrup) spray treatment and assess its effectiveness for covering noxious weeds, stabilizing seed distribution, controlling heat, surfactant, killing target species, and providing soil nutrients and a native seed source.

- Remote control helicopters for spot spraying in difficult terrain.

Outreach & Education

From Dave Burch, Montana

- **MRWC Public Relations Blitz**
  CIPM will undertake a public relations blitz for MRWC in 2009. A logo will be designed for the MRWC, press releases on MRWC activities will be regularly released, MRWC presentations will be made to potential watershed collaborators (MoRAST, MRNRC, MRRIC, others, etc.) and an evaluation component will be part of this effort to determine whether public awareness increased. ANSTF program could be a good model to use.
From the Group

- **Expand State-based K-12 Educational Programs and Public Outreach for Watershed Application**
  
  Sponsored by the MRWC, state-based outreach and education (adult and K-12) experts will be encouraged to share products and programs with other states within the watershed. MRWC will assist with their travel expenses and host educational special sessions during or in conjunction with regularly scheduled MRWC semi-annual meetings.

**Ideas from MRWC Members:**

*Greg Sundstrom, Roger Stockton, John Simons*

1. MRWC could spearhead writing voluntary BMPs for invasive plant management (woody weed removal) in riparian zones; these could be based on BMPs from other state forestry programs [http://clfa.org/pdf/files/Montana.pdf](http://clfa.org/pdf/files/Montana.pdf). A web search can find other state forestry BMPs - Google "forestry BMP." Could use 319 Grant funding though state nonpoint source programs to develop riparian invasive vegetation removal BMPs for water quality protection.

2. EDRR - Tie MRWC EDRR system to inventory and monitoring; evaluation of the effectiveness of the actions.

3. Education and Outreach – We need to establish a language and protocol; MRWC could help do this for the region. What information does the region need versus the individual states?

4. Look to the South Platte River Watershed WMA ([www.weldweeds.org](http://www.weldweeds.org)); they have a very good *Platte Invasives Endeavor Plan* or PIE that the MRWC could learn from; contact: Tina Booton tbooton@co.weld.co.us

5. MRWC must tie our message and projects to *water availability*.

6. Potential focus for MRWC - Ecological Site Descriptions: USFS and NRCS are already using this method; it could help weed managers see the bigger picture; we could have a presentation on this at a future MRWC meeting. As far as the ecological site description subject, it might be good to bring in a state or area level range specialist from NRCS to present the information.

7. Conservation Innovation Grant through NRCS to bring riparian reforestation techniques and practices developed at the Los Lunas Plant Materials into areas where planting in riparian areas have not had much success.
Healthy Habitats Coalition Update

June 12, 2009
From: John Cantlon
   Government Resource Manager
   Denver, CO
   303-716-3932 (office)
   720-289-1906 (cell)
   www.landmanagement.dupont.com

HHC is making strides in building its partnerships and developing clear, sharp actions. We do have some work to do in the next 90 days that will help the good of the whole.

* Here are some highlights.
1. Addressing Federal funding on an efficiency level vs getting more dollars. The funds are not getting on the ground and HHC is providing communications to improve this shortfall.

2. The Stimulus funding has turned into a debacle and we are pointing out that salvage logging is not Invasive Species control with Vilsak.

3. We are attempting to build an alliance with the Western Governors with Otter as the Chair. Schweitzer is our next ask. Lack of policy and on the ground actions with more uniform and consistent results state to state is a detrimental aspect we need to overcome.

4. We are focusing on bringing the Executive Order to law. We feel this would be a great move for all. (See attached: Plan to Legislate EO 13112 by Congress and Administration June 2009)

5. We are looking at hosting a conference on advocacy efforts with new partners this fall in Montana. We are aligning with the Wildlife people as well.

6. We have selected a steering committee and an advisory committee to build a clear Action Plan for the next two years. This will start June 22.

From a solution perspective at DuPont, we have a great herbicide in Clearstand and will register Streamline some time in early 2010. Streamline will be selective in controlling brush while leaving understory grass.
Legislate Executive Order (13112)

A Healthy Habitats Coalition Request

June 1, 2009

Introduction

Executive Order 13112 was signed by President Bill Clinton on February 3, 1999. E.O. 13112 established the National Invasive Species Council (NISC) and outlined federal responsibilities and objectives concerning invasive species (IS). Legal authority associated with an Executive Order is not as binding as a bill created by Congress and signed into law by a President. This reflects an inconsistent and unacceptable approach to IS management by federal land management agencies and other state agencies responsible for controlling (IS).

ASK

There is a distinct need to change E.O. 13112 into law by Congressional action.

Plan

1. Gain State alliance with Governors to support EO 13112 legislation.
2. Identify members of the House and Senate that will sponsor and carry a bill to change E.O. 13112 into a U.S. statute to create the United States Invasive Species Act (ISISA).
   a. Coordinate with HHC Steering Committee and lobbyists
   b. Create a 'must do' philosophy within this bill and clearly place the authority and responsibility for its successful implementation with the National Invasive Species Council on a federal and state level.
   c. Create and circulate a ‘dear colleague’ letter for the House and Senate to encourage those members that are not bill sponsors to support passage of USISA with HHC Steering Committee and lobbyists.
3. Lobby the Congress and Administration to pass and sign USISA into law with a HHC campaign aligned with hunters, anglers, and scientific societies in concert with NGA and WGA Governors concerned about natural Resources.

OUTCOME EXPECTED

1. More efficient use of public funds resulting in effective state and federal structure and implementation of the necessary tools to control IS acres harming our resources.