

Western IPM Center Project Report Form

How to submit: Please submit this completed form electronically, as an attached Microsoft Word file, to Jane Thomas at jmthomas@tricity.wsu.edu. If you have questions, contact Linda Herbst, (530) 752-7010. **Content:** Complete each section below, and include responses to as many of the questions listed in Attachment A as are relevant to your project. *These are guidelines.* Provide your readers with enough detail that someone who is not familiar with your project can understand what you were trying to achieve, how you went about it, and what you accomplished, but please keep it concise.

A. Report Data

Date: 10/23/09

Reporting Period: 12/01/08 through 10/15/09

Report Type (please check one):

Progress Report Final Report

B. Grant Data

- Grant Agreement #: 07-001492-MONT9
- Title: Invasive Plants in Natural Areas: Connecting Regional Centers Across the U.S.
- Grant Type:
- Lead investigator:
 - Name: Elizabeth Galli-Noble
 - Title: Director
 - Institution: Center for Invasive Plant Management, Montana State University
 - Address: PO Box 173120, Bozeman, MT 59717
 - Phone: 406-994-6832
 - Fax: 406-994-1889
 - Email: elizabeth.gallinoble@montana.edu
- Team members (name, title, institution): Janet Clark, Assist. Dir. Policy, Center for Invasive Plant Management, Montana State University
- State(s) involved: MT, CA, CT, IN, GA, FL

C. Nontechnical Summary. An overview of the project, briefly outlining the problem(s), how your project addresses them, and your results, *written to a lay audience*. (500 words)

Funded by the WRIPMC, a two-day meeting of six regional invasive plant centers was held in Indianapolis in January 2009 to consider establishment of a national network of organizations focusing on invasive terrestrial and aquatic plants in non-crop areas. The hypothesis was that working together, these organizations could offer more comprehensive services more efficiently. Facilitated by the Center for Invasive Plant Management (Montana State University), the meeting provided a forum to explore ideas on how to build an efficient information-sharing network and possibly collaborate on multi-regional or national projects.

As a result of the meeting, the National Network of Invasive Plant Centers (NNIPC) was formed, a website was established (www.invasiveplantcenters.org), and monthly conference calls are held. NNIPC has written several grant proposals to fund projects that the partners agreed were high priorities nationally: EDRR /mapping, cooperative weed management areas, economics of invasive plants, and education.

NNIPC will continue to pursue funding to build its capacity as an organization and to aggregate and synthesize regional information and programs for the benefit of national resource managers, educators, and policy-makers nationwide.

D. Objectives and Progress. List your objectives and describe your progress for each objective.

1. Become familiar with other regional centers and organizations in the U.S. focusing on integrated management of terrestrial and aquatic invasive plants in natural areas.
 - a. A meeting of six regional centers was held Jan. 21-22, 2009, in Indianapolis. Participants were Center for Invasive Plant Management (MT), Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health (GA), Midwest Invasive Plant Network (IN), Invasive Plant Atlas of New England (CT), California Invasive Plant Council (CA), Center for Aquatic Invasive Plants (FL). Attendees gave presentations about their centers, including staff, funding, programs, constituents, areas of expertise, and plans for the future. Attendees recognized many similarities and differences among their organizations. (Participant travel expenses were funded by the WRIPMC grant.)
 - b. The centers have worked together to create a National Network of Invasive Plant Centers (NNIPC) website: www.invasiveplantcenters.org. They also developed a NNIPC logo. (Contracted services to create the initial website and logo were funded by the WRIPMC grant.)
 - c. The National Association of Exotic Pest Plant Councils sits in on conference calls as an ad hoc member.
 - d. Four of the NNIPC partners met during the Natural Areas Association meeting in Vancouver, WA, in September 2009.

2. Identify programs in which attendees might collaborate, potentially including sharing or developing educational resources regarding IPM in natural areas.
 - a. The centers discussed topics for which information aggregation and synthesis is needed at a national level. These will be the primary NNIPC focus areas for the future: EDRR / mapping (the human/social science side and the technical side); cooperative weed management areas; economics of invasive plants; K-12 education/curriculum (and perhaps adult and/or volunteer training).
 - b. The centers identified other potential projects that could be pursued with additional funding: Expand Wildland Weeds nationally; write XML standards for mapping using NAWMA standards; compile bibliography (based on CAIP bibliography); conduct volunteer training; establish national EDRR system; compile directory of researchers; serve as a national distribution network for products; mentor other organizations.
 - c. The centers agreed to support National Invasive Species Awareness Week in 2010 and present information about the network during the event.

3. Explore options for network funding.
 - a. The centers have collaboratively written grant proposals to:
 - i. USDA AFRI – early detection & rapid response (EDRR) system
 - ii. Dept of Defense Legacy Program – national mapping system
 - iii. Dept of Defense Legacy Program – NNIPC capacity-building
 - iv. Nat'l Fish & Wildlife Fdtn – EDRR awareness & implementation
 - b. The centers worked together to develop a proposal to create jobs for American Recovery Act funding.
 - c. The centers continue to discuss funding strategies and explore grant opportunities.

4. Establish a formalized communication process among attendees.
 - a. The centers have participated in conference calls at least monthly since January 2009. (The calls from February through September were funded by the WRIPMC grant.)
 - b. The centers have established a listserv, based at University of Georgia, to communicate among themselves.

E. Outputs. List your project's outputs, which might include publications, information, data, meetings held, attendance at meetings held, etc.

- Meeting of NNIPC partners, January 2009, Indianapolis, IN
- One-page NNIPC fact sheet
- NNIPC website (www.invasiveplantcenters.org)
- Interactive GoogleMap of cooperative weed management areas nationwide (NNIPC website)
- Eight NNIPC conference calls
- Written comments on USDA-REE Roadmap
- Article for WRIPMC newsletter (Fall 2009)
- Four grant proposals
- Proposal to create jobs through the American Recovery Act
- NNIPC logo

F. Impacts and Potential Impacts. The “impacts” and “potential impacts” sections of your report will help the Western IPM Center highlight the value of IPM research and education by detailing the real-world impacts of Center-funded projects. We will use the information in news articles, reports, and informational brochures to showcase the impacts of projects that our program supports. *See Attachment A at end of form for questions to assist you in describing the impacts of your project.*

1. Impacts. Describe any impacts of your work. *Impacts* are specific changes in condition for those affected by your work. Impacts include adoption of technology, creation of jobs, reduced cost to the consumer, less pesticide exposure to farmers, access to more nutritious food, and a cleaner environment and healthier communities.

- * Increased collaboration among among regional invasive plant centers - including proposal-writing, project development, and general assistance and advice.
- * Consensus on invasive-plant-related topics that need attention at a national level.
- * Increased communication and information-sharing among regional centers.
- * Streamlined access to information about 297 cooperative weed management areas nationwide - used by at least one federal agency to help prioritize projects.
- * NNIPC website statistics since January 2009: 7,880 page views, 3,191 unique visitors, 32,609 hits.

2. Potential impacts. Describe your project’s potential impacts. *Potential impacts* are the ways that your project’s outputs could directly lead to changes in condition that will unfold in the future.

- * Decreased redundancy (and therefore costs) in services provided by regional centers
- * Aggregation and synthesis of invasive-plant-related data, potentially including IPM approaches and results
- * Increased training opportunities
- * Increased communication and technology transfer among scientists and natural resource managers nationwide
- * Increased networking among centers, institutions, NGOs, and agencies involved in invasive plant management - to increase efficiencies and capitalize on existing resources
- * Coordinated, streamlined access to information and resources for natural resource managers nationwide

G. Appendices

1. With your report, please attach *at least two (2) photographs* that illustrate your project.

Please describe the photo and indicate the name and institution of the person who took the photo. (If you submit more than two photographs, please include those additional descriptions and photo credits under "H. Additional Information," below.)

Photo #1 description:

Representatives of six regional centers met in January to form the National Network of Invasive Plant Centers. (Left to right: Elizabeth Galli-Noble (CIPM), Les Mehrhoff (IPANE), Dave Moorehead (CESIH), Janet Clark (CIPM), Karen Brown (CAIP), Chuck Bargeron (CISEH), Kate Howe (MIPN).)

Photo #1 credit (photographer's name and institution):

Les Mehrhoff, Invasive Plant Atlas of New England, Univ. of Connecticut

Photo #2 description:

NNIPC partners discuss collaboration at their January 2009 meeting in Indianapolis.

Photo #2 credit (photographer's name and institution):

Elizabeth Galli-Noble, Center for Invasive Plant Management, Montana State University

2. Also attach any printed fact sheets or other publications resulting from your work that will enhance our understanding of your project and its impacts. Please provide a description of each attached publication below.

Document #1 description:

One-page fact sheet about the National Network of Invasive Plant Centers (NNIPC)

Document #2 description:

Agenda for the first meeting of the NNIPC partners, held in Indianapolis in January 2009.

Document #3 description:

Summary of the Minutes from the Jan. '09 NNIPC meeting.

H. Additional Information

Please see the NNIPC website at www.invasiveplantcenters.org.

Credit: Some of the language about impacts and potential impacts was adapted from a PowerPoint presentation by H. Michael Harrington,

Executive Director, Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, Colorado State University.

Attachment A

Questions to Help in Reporting Impacts and Potential Impacts

Below are some questions that will guide you in assessing and then describing the impacts and potential impacts of your project. The relevance of each question may vary depending on whether yours is a research or extension project. Please answer as many as you can to the best of your ability, and feel free to describe any additional types of impacts not mentioned below. Remember to identify any potential impacts.

1. Innovations in IPM:

Are there new IPM practices that have been (impacts) or could be (potential impacts) adopted as a direct result of your project? What is the total number of acres (or homes, schools, greenhouses, nurseries) on which these practices could realistically be implemented?

2. Safeguarding human health and the environment:

- a. Has the project reduced risk (or could it potentially do so) by changing the use of pesticides on farms, in homes, in schools, etc.? For example, could it result in fewer sprays per season or a switch to lower-risk pesticides? If possible, quantify the changes in condition. (Since there is no unanimous definition of *high* and *low risk*, investigators selecting this indicator are asked to categorize the pesticides they are reporting on as *high* or *low risk* according to the particular situation [e.g., lower risk to natural enemies]).
- b. Are there any other impacts or potential impacts on human health or the environment as a result of your project?

3. Economic benefits:

- a. What is (or could be) the economic benefit (e.g., dollars saved) for clientele who adopt IPM strategies and systems you studied? Do you envision potential commercialization or mass production of these systems?
- b. How many clients are satisfied with IPM results (such as improved yield, improved quality of yield, reduced pest populations, more effective pest control, greater preservation of nonpest species)?
- c. Are there other financial benefits that might be realized (potential impact) as a result of your project?

4. Implementation of IPM:

- a. How many IPM strategies and systems have been validated through this project (e.g., through on-farm trials, large plot tests, or other methods used to confirm efficacy)?
 - b. How many educational materials were delivered? To whom? And what are the impacts or potential impacts?
 - c. What is the number of growers/personnel trained? And what are the impacts or potential impacts?
 - d. For a Web site, what volume of traffic and type of use has the site experienced? (For example, number of visitors per day or month; number of page views; number of unique user sessions; change in volume during growing season; average viewing time.) And what are the impacts or potential impacts?
 - e. How many more people adopted IPM practices as a direct result of your project, or how many people adopted new IPM practices?
 - f. Are there other ways in which your work will result in improved use or increased implementation of IPM strategies in your region or across the West?
5. Has your project or study increased collaboration among stakeholders interested in the development and implementation of improved IPM strategies and systems?