



Montana Invasive Species Council

Meeting Materials Packet for June 1, 2022

Contents

Note: Documents are hyperlinked for ease of navigation

1. Meeting Agenda for June 1, 2022
2. March 2, 2022, Meeting Minutes
3. AIS Grant Cycle 2 Awards
4. MISC Firewood Science Advisory Panel Key Findings Draft
5. Aquatic Invasive Species Grant Guideline Recommended Revisions
6. MISC Framework Work Plan and Timeline

MONTANA INVASIVE SPECIES COUNCIL

AGENDA



Note: Agenda is subject to change and times are approximate. Actual times may vary by up to one hour.

Montana Capitol, Room 102, Helena, MT. Hybrid meeting.

WEDNESDAY, June 1, 2022

9:00 a.m. – 9:10 a.m.

INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Bryce Christiaens
Welcome and roll call

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

9:10 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

*ACTION: March 2, 2022 meeting minutes
AIS Grant Cycle-2 Report

9:30 a.m. – 9:50 a.m.

FIREWOOD SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL UPDATE

Leigh Greenwood, The Nature Conservancy
Amy Gannon, DNRC

9:50 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.

BREAK

10:00 p.m. – 10:20 p.m.

MONTANA SALT CEDAR TEAM

Dan Rostad - Yellowstone River Conservation Districts Council

10:20 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.

FERAL SWINE RESPONSE PLANNING

Dr. Tahnee Szymanski, Dept. of Livestock (invited)
Jared Beaver, MSU Extension (invited)

10:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

MT NOXIOUS WEED EDUCATION CAMPAIGN

Jane Mangold, MSU Extension

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

AIS UPDATE & GRANT GUIDELINE REVISIONS

Tom Woolf, FWP
*ACTION: approve revisions

12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

LUNCH

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

MISC FRAMEWORK UPDATE PLAN

Review Framework to identify key areas for stakeholder input; develop plan in preparation for Summit

4:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

WRAP UP AND ADJOURN

Location September meeting
Final discussion
*Public Comment

This meeting is open to the public. The most current meeting information including meeting materials are available on the MISC website at: <https://invasivespecies.mt.gov/misc/meetings-schedule>. A live stream of the meeting can be found on the Montana Legislative Division website at: <http://sg001-harmony.sliq.net/00309/Harmony/en/PowerBrowser/PowerBrowserV2/20220601/-1/44632>

Members of the public who wish to participate via Zoom may do so by using the following link: <https://mt-gov.zoom.us/j/82495795535?pwd=MEZOWEN6Yjh1T2REdWlwd2xLN1Jpdz09>. If you have trouble registering using the link, please email EMoran@mt.gov with your name and a request by 5 p.m. the day before the meeting.

*Public comment will be available during times the Council acts on items as indicated on the agenda and during the end of the meeting. To provide public comment, participants may "raise their hand" and participate after being recognized by the presiding officer or Zoom manager. Comments will be taken in order. Written public comment may be sent via email in advance of the meeting to emoran@mt.gov and will be provided to council members.

Any oral or written public comment provided to the committee is a public record that is recorded and archived.

The Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation will make reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities who wish to participate in this public meeting. For questions about accessibility or to request accommodations, please contact Emily Moran at 406-444-2613 or emoran@mt.gov as soon as possible before the meeting date.

MEETING MINUTES

These abbreviated summary minutes will become the official adopted minutes at the next Montana Invasive Species Council meeting when they will be approved. Until then, they are considered a draft.

Meeting/ Project Name:	Montana Invasive Species Council		
Date of Meeting:	March 2, 2022	Time:	9:00 AM
Minutes Prepared By:	Emily Moran and Liz Lodman	Location:	Montana Capitol, Room 472, and virtual via Zoom
Attendees			
<p>MISC Voting Members: Bryce Christiaens (County Weed Districts – Chair), Tom Woolf (FWP- Vice Chair), Michael Bias (Fishing Organization), Martin Charlo (Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes), Bob Cloninger (Montana Department of Transportation), Amy Gannon (Department of Natural Resources and Conservation), Bob Gilbert (Private Landowner), Leigh Greenwood (Conservation Organization), Dennis Longknife Jr. (Fort Belknap), Jane Mangold (Montana State University-Extension), Paul Rossignol (Wildlife Organization), Jan Stoddard (Department of Commerce), Steve Tyrrel (Agriculture Representative), Andy Welch (Hydropower Representative)</p> <p>MISC Federal Partners: Gary Adams (USDA-APHIS), Philip Holmes (CBP), Monica Pokorny (NRCS), Wendy Velman (BLM)</p> <p>Other Attendees: Jason Allen (MDT), Ben Casscles (Member of the Public), Stephanie Criswell (DNRC), Beth Eiring (MDA), Elizabeth Emeline (Gallatin CD), Sean Flynn (FW), Ian Foley (MDA), Josh Gaskin (USDA-ARS), Shantell Frame-Martin (MSU), Russ Hartzell (FWP), Jill Hautaniemi (DNRC), Leif Howard (FLBS/UM), Stephanie Hummel (FLBS/UM), Phil Matson (FLBS/UM), Bryce Maxell (MNHP), John McLaughlin (Daily Inter Lake), Sara Owen (EMMA), Pam Schwend (Carbon CWD), Abigail St. Lawrence (Member of the Public), Tahnee Szymanski (DOL), Lauri Teig (BLM), Kate Wilson (DNRC- UC3), Lori Witham (USDA-APHIS)</p>			
Agenda and Notes, Decisions, Issues			
Topic	Discussion		
**Change of Agenda Note: MISC orientation presentation will be during the Invasive Species Summit agenda time.			
Welcome & Roll call	<p>Bryce opened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. conducted roll call and confirmed quorum.</p> <p>Liz Lodman, the new Montana Invasive Species Council Coordinator, was officially introduced.</p>		
Administrative Business	<p>Action Item: Approval of December 9th, 2021, Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Motion: Steve Tyrrel to approve the December 9th, 2021, meeting minutes. Second: Jane Mangold Discussion: None Public comment: None Action on motion: Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>AIS Grant Cycle-1 Report, Grant Cycle-2 Applications</p> <p>The Fiscal Year 2022 AIS Grant Program had \$250,722 available for funding. The first grant cycle received nine applications, seven were approved to fund totaling \$164,728. The second grant cycle is open until March 13th, 2022 and has \$85,992 available for funding. The grant hearing is scheduled for April 18th as a hybrid (virtual/in-person) meeting.</p>		

All grant management and future applications will be conducted through the Submittable web application, there has been a few issues with the system, but overall, the system is working well.

Discussion:

None.

Action Item: [Pacific North West Economic Region \(PNWER\) Conference in Calgary, Canada-MISC Representation](#)

PNWER will be held in Calgary, Canada on July 24-28, 2022. One full day will be dedicated to invasive species including feral swine and AIS. Tahnee Szymanski will be a featured speaker and Liz Lodman is helping plan the presentation schedule. MISC having representation at PNWER is essential to create critical partnerships, networking for additional funding, as well as preparing for legislative session. Steve Wanderaas volunteered to represent MISC at PNWER.

Motion: Steve Tyrell motioned to send Steve Wanderaas to PNWER with his travel and compensation paid by MISC, as well as the purchase of a booth at the PNWER conference

Second: Jane Mangold

Discussion: None

Action on motion: Motion passed unanimously.

Amy Gannon, Pest Management Specialist, DNRC: Science Advisory Committee Update

The 2022 Science Advisory Panel (SAP) on Firewood will be held at the Missoula Library, with a virtual option, May 3-4. The science advisory committee has met twice to draft the purpose statement, guiding questions, and expected outcomes. The guiding questions fall into five general categories:

- Outreach
- Policy
- Intercept
- Markets
- Treatment

Amy suggested the Science Advisory Panel could be combined with the MISC meeting. Next steps are to finalize guiding questions and send panelist invites out.

Jill Hautaniemi compiled a draft [Emerald Ash Borer \(EAB\) Resources document](#) that compiles known information about EAB and how it pertains to Montana. This document is not exhaustive but contains many linked resources for resource managers. Jill Hautaniemi, Laurie Kerzicnik, Leigh Greenwood, and Jane Mangold have been collaborators on the draft. Both documents will live on the SAP webpage on the MISC website. MSU extension will help distribute the EAB resources document. DNRC will be working with groups monitoring ash draws and will report any signs of EAB.

Discussion:

Bryce Maxell would like the information to be incorporated to the Montana Natural Heritage Program database.

Bob Gilbert emphasized the importance of sharing these two documents with county, state, and federal partners.

Action Item: Invasive Species Information Document

The Oregon Invasive Species Council published the [Invasive Species Threats & Opportunities](#) document to inform the Oregon policymakers. It showcases invasive species threats and the organizations that address different taxa and pathways. The Executive Committee have agreed this would be a beneficial deliverable for the council to create in preparation for the 2022 legislative session. The Montana document could showcase the state of the Montana's invasive species programs. Liz Lodman would work with statewide taxa leads to compile the information for the document.

Pages and/or topics that are important to include:

- "Prevention is the lowest cost for investment." This phrase/topic should be featured prominently at the beginning of the document.
- Economic impacts:
 - Could focus on one species.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research exists for impacts of eastern heath snail, invasive mussels, and noxious weed impacts on grazing on public lands in Montana. ○ Oregon, Washington, and PNWER also have economic impact studies. ○ Fort Belknap compiled a one-page document of Noxious Weeds within Fort Belknap. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ USDA-APHIS helped fund other tribes to create similar one-page document. These documents can be housed on the MISC website. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Page 5: The time to respond is now ● Page 7: List of all partners who work to control invasive species ● Page 13: Invasive Threats <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Keep information simple and use graphic/visuals to have a larger impact. <p>This document would live on the MISC website and can have stand-alone pages or a shortened version to present to larger audiences and legislators.</p> <p>MISC budget has an allocation for education and outreach materials to fund this project.</p> <p>Motion: Jane Mangold moved for MISC staff to begin developing a document about Invasive species threats and opportunities as a primer for policy makers. Second: Bob Gilbert Discussion: None Public comment: None Action on motion: Motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>Invasive Species Summit</p>	<p>Bryce Christiaens, MISC Chair Liz Lodman, MISC Coordinator</p> <p>MISC hosts an invasive species summit every 2 years. Past summits were held in 2016 and 2018. In 2020 MISC partnered with NAISMA to host the summit, but due to covid, was pushed to 2021 and was converted to a virtual summit.</p> <p>The 2022 summit will take place in Helena, MT. October 25-26 at the Best Western Hotel. FWP/Tom Woolf will hold their annual AIS meeting on Monday October 24 before the summit begins. The 2022 MISC summit theme will tentatively be the revision of the MISC Framework. There will be no breakout sessions during the 2022 summit and participants will be charged a nominal fee. Hosting the summit will require a large number of volunteers; we can potentially solicit help from Big Sky Watershed members, Montana Conservation Corps members, and/or Conservation Districts.</p> <p>MISC should consider inviting elected house and senate members; previous summits have included ‘Legislative Champions’. DNRC Director Amanda Kaster is working with the Governor’s office to provide an update of the state of invasive species. Staff will invite Director Kaster and the Governor’s office to be the Keynote of the 2022 MISC summit. Neighboring states resource managers could be invited to participate in a panel featuring their state’s top priorities.</p> <p>Summit Planning Committee is composed of Bryce Christiaens, Tom Woolf, Jane Mangold, Jasmine Chaffee, Steve Wanderaas, Michelle Cox, USDA-APHIS Helena staff, Liz Lodman, and Emily Moran. Updates from future Summit Planning Committee meetings will be shared.</p> <p>Bryce Christiaens gave a brief overview and Council Orientation Presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There are very broad terms listed: economic, environmental, and cultural values. Do they need to be more defined? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It has been suggested to replace ‘cultural’ with ‘social’ <p>Discussion: Council members and staff participated in a ‘sticky note exercise’ to identify the status of tasks and priorities listed in the MISC framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It is important to remember that the MISC framework contains tasks that include statewide priorities, not just tasks MISC needs to complete as a council.

<p>MISC Webinars</p>	<p>Bryce Christiaens, MISC Chair Liz Lodman, MISC Coordinator</p> <p>MISC Webinar Committee is comprised of Bryce Christiaens, Tom Woolf, Michelle Cox, Jane Mangold, Liz Lodman</p> <p>The webinar planning committee is concerned the target audience of the MISC webinars are oversaturated with webinars. MISC will need to find 'untouched' topics before field season starts. No dates have been scheduled, planning committee still needs to reach out to potential speakers to schedule dates.</p> <p>The intended audience for the webinars is MISC members and partners. The potential topics include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is a species deemed invasive? • How can regional collaboration combat invasive species? • A Montana perspective: how to model and map invasive species. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will reach out to the Montana Natural Heritage Program, Bryce Maxell. • Incorporation of climate change in prioritization of invasive species. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bryce Maxell suggested the prioritization would focus on Montana layers. ○ Michelle Cox will reach out to the University of Amherst to invite the authors of <u>"Incorporating climate change into invasive species management: insights from managers"</u> <p>Discussion: Potential to have two webinars one week apart before the field season starts. In the past, Jane Mangold had success hosting 'Weedy Wednesdays' from 1:00-2:00 pm to respect lunch hours.</p>
<p>Feral Swine Updates</p>	<p>Tahnee Szymanski, State Veterinarian, Montana Department of Livestock (DOL)</p> <p>Through the collaboration between MISC and DOL, reports have increased from 1-2 reports per year to 10 reports within the last 12 months, none of which have been confirmed feral swine. People are becoming more aware of signs of feral swine and how to report them.</p> <p>Recent feral swine reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helena North Valley: believed to be a domesticated pot belly pig. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Don't shoot pigs because they are typically owned • Wheatland County: sow with litter running loose. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hunter believed they were feral swine but were deemed to be owned animals and were returned to owner. • Whitlash, MT: Report of significant damage to the land suspected to be caused by feral swine on June 10, 2021. USDA Wildlife Services responded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There have been previous reports of feral swine north of the Montana-Canada border in the same general area. ○ USDA-WS conducted helicopter flights around the area but could not spot any pigs or additional damage. USDA-WS confirmed damage was consistent with feral swine. ○ In response, DOL reached out to residents and landowners in the area to increase awareness of the potential threat of feral swine. <p>DOL attended meetings during the past year about feral Swine including the Stockgrowers Conference in December 2021 to speak to the Cattlemen's College.</p> <p>Items to further discuss include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send Montana staff to Texas to learn about feral swine response work. • Training to use remote deployed traps. • Community meetings, specifically with the highline communities due to proximity to Canada. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Target other areas since feral swine can be transported into Montana for hunting. • Continue conversations through PNWER and other outlets to discuss the differing jurisdictions on the landscape. • Tribal, Federal, and National Park partners are essential to create a unified and swift

response.

Discussion:

- What is the current DOL response plan if there were a confirmed report of feral swine? Is there anything MISC can do to assist in building a response capability?
 - DOL does small scale exercises, like the detection in Whitlash.
 - The response plan will be somewhat circumstance specific, determined by location of detection, snow cover, and time of year.
 - The USDA-WS would utilize flights and aerial removal if the report was in a location where permission is granted.
 - Idaho is willing to loan Montana their remote deployed traps, this would be utilized in areas where flights are not possible.
 - Does Montana need traps of their own or is borrowing neighboring states trap adequate?
 - Response and action time is very important and can be improved upon.
- Has DOL considered using trail cameras if a disturbance is detected?
 - Using trail cameras would be the first step in a response but funding is an obstacle. Trail cameras are tools that will be considered going forward.
- What does a remote deployed trap cost?
 - A trap costs \$5,000. Lives stream camera, charging systems, and other essential parts will cost an addition \$1,200. The total for all trap parts and training would be close to \$10,000.
 - Bob Gilbert and Steve Tyrrel believe the traps and training are a good investment for the DOL to be proactive in feral swine response.
 - Steve Tyrrel is willing to facilitate with trap manufacture [Jager Pro](#) to receive an accurate quote.
- If MISC and DOL collaborated, could a tabletop exercise be planned? Could the training incorporate the use of a remote deployed traps and be structured off the Whitlash report?
 - If the conversation starts now, a training could happen after the spring.
 - DOL has a framework in place to facilitate a tabletop discussion and other training.
 - MISC can assist with planning and logistics. MISC has sponsored previous tabletop exercises.
 - DOL is planning meetings across the Hi-Line, instead of focusing on community meetings, tabletop trainings could be done.
 - DOL has received feedback that a response plan needs to be in place when there is a positive feral swine detection.
 - There is value in the public knowing the response plan but saving the tabletop training for appropriate agency and partner attendance.
- Can MISC help with identifying a funding source for DOL to purchase the tools?
 - Need to have a conversation with USDA-WS on who would own the traps and cameras.
 - Steve Tyrrel suggested DOL create a prioritized list of tools needed for feral swine response in preparation for seeking funding.
 - Potential for thermal imaging drones or cameras that can be added to helicopters.
- Important to include local law enforcement and Customs and Border Protection Control agents in discussion. There have been instances where local law enforcement receives reports of feral swine and do not know where to share the reports.
- The Feral Swine Fact sheet will be updated, including current distribution maps.

Next steps: Bryce will set up a time for DOL and interested MISC members to discuss the tabletop exercises.

<p>Grant Recipient Presentations</p>	<p>Phil Matson, Leif Howard, and Gordon Luikart, Flathead Lake Biological Station (FLBS)</p> <p>Presentation: FLBS joint effort to improve AIS early detection with eDNA collected via tow nets & alleviate remaining concerns of managers.</p> <p>Discussion: Please send any AIS grant presentation suggestions for future meetings to Emily Moran or Liz Lodman.</p>
<p>2022 Agency & Partner Updates</p>	<p>Leigh Greenwood, North America Forest Health Program Director, The Nature Conservancy</p> <p>Published Firewood Comparison Report, which analyses every state and territory's relevant firewood regulations, certifications, and outreach statuses. The report is designed for professional education, not public outreach. The report can be found on the Don't Move Firewood Website.</p> <p>Leigh will be presenting two webinars to overview the report, one on March 1 and another on March 4, 2022.</p> <p>Based off Leigh's analysis, Montana ranks in the middle of the road based on relevant firewood, regulations, certifications, and outreach statuses compared to the rest of the United States.</p> <p>Discussion: This is a great resource for the 2022 Firewood Science Advisory Panel.</p> <p>Eastern states have more proactive regulations because their forest pest conditions are worse. Specifically, ME, NH, NY, VT, FL, PA, and TN have ranked the highest for firewood regulatory environments in the report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does MT need to adopt these proactive regulations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Montana has the capability to require established heat treatments of firewood. There is no requirement currently. • Is there any metric to measure how firewood regulations affect the in-state production of commercial firewood and if they affect the economy of Montana? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The report does not measure this metric, but SAP questions do focus on these topics. Will share results after the May 3-4 Science Advisory Panel. • What are the next steps for researchers who developed this report? Will the group develop recommendations and for different regions with different threat levels? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The next step is for individual states who want to improve their methods to look at their standing in the visibility rank and work with the appropriate staff to incorporate the recommendations that are described in the report. ○ Leigh can work with regulatory staff in Montana, but not other states. This report is meant to empower the states. <p>Tom Woolf- AIS Bureau Chief, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (FWP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watercraft inspection trainings starts next week, March 7. • Some watercraft inspection stations open early to intercept boat traffic from western states and to inspect boats coming from Confederate Kootenai & Salish for Mack Days. • Last year was a record year for mussel boat interceptions, anticipating similar interception numbers this year. • The process to delist Tiber as a mussel positive water body has been initiated. FWP is working with Secretary of State and posting a public comment period before the rule can be repealed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not currently planning on opening inspection stations in Tiber. Boat launch requirements and inspector presence will be gone. • Conservation Districts (CD) are managing additional inspection stations this year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Beaverhead CD is taking over the Dillion station. ○ Bighorn CD has managed St. Xavier and is taking over the Hardin station.

- Early detection sampling will continue with early detection surveys being done in collaborations with partners like FLBS.
 - Trying to expand partner involvement in early detection surveying. FWP is looking to train groups.
- Liz Lodman moved from FWP to MISC. FWP will continue the current marketing plan. AIS staff will staff in-person events.
 - Liz's previous position has not been filled and the job description will be modified
- Turtle and Bullfrog Project from the first AIS Grant Cycle of 2022 will continue working closely with Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes (CSKT).
- Nighttime Operations of inspection stations:
 - CSKT conducts nighttime operations at the Ravalli station.
 - 95% of watercraft are inspected during daylight hours.
 - CSKT has a great relationship with Tribal and local enforcement who have a presence during night operations.
 - In 2021, the Hardin inspection station tested operating at night during the 4 nights leading up to the 4th of July. They inspected about 22 boats, all very low risk and/or local boats.
 - FWP is focusing their inspections resources during daylight hours in targeted high-risk corridors.
 - Steve suggests looking at expanding Wibaux operations due to Midwest traffic patterns.

Jane Mangold- Noxious Weed Specialist, MSU Extension

- Working to create training for Weed Free products for the new extension agents.
- Dr. Lisa Rue (MSU) is working with Jasmine Chaffee and Greta Dige (MDA) to create standardized protocols for monitoring how noxious weed management works.
 - This would be an opportunity to monitor and assess the effectiveness of agencies invasive species management practices. There will be field testing this summer. Jane obtained funds from BLM.
- Would there be a centralized place where the data will be held?
 - The plan is to provide tools for individuals to do their own analysis. Potential for increased capacity if this becomes a common noxious weed management practice.
 - The Noxious Weed Trust fund has added permanent monitoring plots in new grants and will assess the results going forward. The end goal is to have data stored in a centralized place.
- Spring training for MSU Extension is mid-May in Bozeman. An agenda is being compiled, if you have topic suggestions, please send an email to Jane Mangold.

Jan Stoddard- Industry Services & Outreach Bureau Chief, Department of Commerce (DOC)

- FYI: Tourism grant funding opportunity through the American Rescue Plan Act. The Department of Commerce received a \$2.3 million grant to create a resiliency plan that includes long-term strategic planning for the tourism industry. DOC will be hiring a contractor.
 - Contractor will conduct stakeholder meetings across the state later this summer to discuss what is sustainable for tourism in the future? Includes appropriate behavior on tribal, federal, and public lands.
 - Fantastic opportunity for MISC to spread awareness of invasive species and their pathways.

Steve Tyrrel- Integrated Ag. Services, Vice President/CEO

- Steve has received a cleaning protocol and policy that Wyoming uses for wildfire equipment.
 - Great protocol to spread to DNRC Land Offices with wildlife season approaching.
 - DNRC has a firefighter AIS Protocol. This will be pushed to be promoted nationally for uniformity.
- Central and Eastern Montana Invasive Species Team (CEMIST) is meeting March 3rd, 2022, in Winnett, MT.
 - Potential feral hog impacts are scary, especially for the agriculture industry.

- Steve will invite CEMIST to have a meeting with MISC, and DOL to discuss a collaborative approach.

Andy Welch- Hydropower Compliance Specialist, Northwestern Energy

- Andy attended a Northwest Hydro Electric meeting last week. Tom Woolf spoke on an invasive mussel panel and his presentation was well received.

Dennis Longknife- Climate Change Coordinator, Fort Belknap Indian Community

- 72nd Annual Seed show March 10-12, 2022. It is one of last seed show in Montana.
- MISC has previously attended, will plan to attend in March, 2023.

Bryce Maxell- Program Coordinator, Montana Natural Heritage Program (MTNHP)

- Will release a Weed Risk modeling effort as a PowerPoint and web application on the [MTNHP website](#).
- Developing an application programming interface to allow ED maps to download information from MTNHP website. This will allow anyone to download this information under password protection.
- MTNHP will provide assistance to the FWP and CSKT Bullfrog and Turtle monitoring effort.
- MTNHP will expand models to include future climate scenarios for about 65 species.
- Spatial Analysis Lab will be mapping the Green Ash Communities. Surveys for species of concern will follow.
- Infrastructure funding and Recovering America's Wildlife Act
 - Montana has the potential to receive \$17 million per year for wildlife and habitat conservation efforts. Can be used to manage and control invasive species, disease, and other risks.
 - \$95 million available to tribal nations through a non-competitive process that does not require a match. This could assist tribal nations in invasive species control efforts.
- If anyone needs 123 survey development for the upcoming field season, please reach out to the MTNHP.

Gary Adams-USDA APHIS Plant Protection Quarantine (APHIS)

- APHIS has a presence and good relations with the Custom and Border Protections.
- Lori Witham is the smuggling and compliance officer; her position is important for forest pests.
 - Currently in CA there are meat products that have been improperly imported. USDA is working to close pathways.
 - USDA regulated moss balls but not the mussels within the moss balls, multiple jurisdictions.
- European Cherry Fruit fly is a new pest found in New York that seriously threatens commercial cherry production.
- MDA conducted National Honeybee survey in partnership with domestic beekeepers. Funded through the Plant Protection Act.
- APHIS also funds the MSU Pulse lab (peas and lentils)
- APHIS is working in coordination with Indian Nations Conservation Alliance to develop emergency response plans.
 - Rocky Boy Reservation has reached out to all tribes in Montana for participation.
 - Looking for species coordinators to partner with the project.
 - MISC will help Gary with coordinate of this training.
- APHIS is adopting the Spongy Moth name for *Lymantria dispar*.
 - Press release and implementation materials can be found on [Entomological Society for America](#).

Jasmine Chaffee- State Weed Coordinator, Department of Agriculture (MDA)

- Infrastructure Bill has three main components that mention invasive species:
 - Ecosystem Restoration, \$200 million over the next 5 years. Money will go to USFS and BLM, all for invasive species detection, prevention, and eradication.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A portion of the money may be distributed to the states, the method and how much is not known. ○ Invasive plant elimination and control effort in transportation corridors. \$50 million per year for the next five years. ○ Grant for states to eliminate and control invasive plant encroachment in land adjacent to transportation corridor rights-of-way. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MDT has been notified. ○ Improvement of watershed health, which are grants for BOR impacts. Not much else is known. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cost share and competitive grants to states for restoring native species. • First week of June will be Montana Weed Awareness Week. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Governor needs to re-sign proclamation. ○ MDA has a new Task Force Program and team coordinator Josh Wagner. • Materials program will be certifying gravel pits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MDT and many counties are excited for the certification. • So far, 57 applications for Noxious Weed Trust Fund. Expected to cut \$250,000 worth of requests. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Grant hearings next week at the Delta hotel in Helena. • Currently there are five open positions on the Noxious Weed Trust Fund council. Applications due May 1st. • Pesticide container recycling grants. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Build or improve containment structures for pesticides containers. Applications are available. • Pesticide waste disposal training will be held in eastern Montana for 2022.
Wrap-up Adjourn	<p>Location for June and September MISC Meeting Discussion/ Final Discussion:</p> <p>Currently, the June 1st meeting has a conflict with the UC3 meeting. Emily Moran will send out a doodle poll to determine June meeting date and if the Firewood SAP should take place May 3-4, or in collaboration with the June MISC meeting. Final decision will be made at future Executive meetings.</p> <p>Any MISC members with field trip ideas for the September MISC meeting should reach out to Liz Lodman or Emily Moran.</p> <p>Public Comment: None</p> <p>Motion: Bob Gilbert moved to adjourn the meeting. Second: Amy Gannon Discussion: None Public Comment: None Action on motion: Motion passed unanimously Meeting adjourned: 3:30 pm</p>

AIS Grant Requests - FY22

CYCLE 1					
Rank	Average Score	Applicant	Project Name	Request	MISC Rec./DNRC Approved Award
1	92.8	Gallatin Invasive Species Alliance	Clean.Drain.Dry. In the Upper Gallatin	\$22,227	\$22,227
2	83.3	Sanders County	Sanders County 2022 Invasive Milfoil Management	\$20,000	\$20,000
3	83	Flathead Lake Biological Station, University of Montana	2022 Flathead Lake Biological Station, University of Montana: AIS Early Detection and Monitoring at a High-Risk Montana Waterbody	\$29,046	\$29,046
4	82.5	Montana State University	Reprint of "A Guide to Montana's Freshwater Aquatic Plants"	\$14,000	\$14,000
5	79.5	Montana Conservation Corps	2022 MCC/FWP/CSKT Continuing Survey, Control and Outreach for Non-native Frogs and Turtles in the Flathead Valley	\$41,445	\$41,445
6	74	Montana Natural Heritage Program	AIS Data Centralization and Exchange to Support Educational Outreach, Early Detection, Prevention, and Planning and Permitting	\$18,010	\$18,010
7	73.5	Montana Biocontrol Coordiantion Project/Missoula County Weed District	2022 Missoula County Weed District Flowering Rush Biological Control	\$20,000	\$20,000
8	55	Little Bitterroot Lake Association- Non Profit	Aquatic Invasive Species Active Boater Program	\$21,630	\$0
9	50.8	Yellowstone Conservation District	2021-2022 Lake Elmo Asian Clam Eradication & Restoration	\$5,500	\$0
		Total Amount Requested		\$191,858.00	\$164,728
CYCLE 2					
		Applicant	Project Name	Request	DNRC Approved Award
1	89	Yaak Valley Forest Council	2022 Yaak Valley Forest Council Early Detection and Clean-Drain-Dry E&O	\$18,110	\$18,110
2	85.3	Flathead Lake Biological Station, UM	2022-2023 GLBS Decontamination Study	\$36,283	\$20,223
3	83.5	Whitefish Lake Institute	Strengthening the Whitefish AIS Inspection and Decontamination Program, 2022	\$22,856	\$15,600
4	79.8	Yellowstone Conservation District	2022 Lake Elmo Asian Clam Eradication & Restoration E&O	\$11,000	\$11,000
5	76.8	Clearwater Resource Council	AIS Monitoring in the Clearwater Valley 2022	\$13,103	\$13,547
5	76.8	Missoula Co Weed District- MT Biocontrol Coordination Project	2022 Montana Biocontrol Coordination Project, Establishment of Flowering Rush Biocontrol Pre-Release Monitoring	\$7,512	\$7,512
7	55.8	Little Bitterroot Late Association	2022 Aquatic Invasive Species Active Boater Program	\$25,630	\$0
				\$134,494	\$85,992
		FY22 Cycle 2 Amount Available		\$85,992	
		Balance		\$85,992	



Montana Invasive Species Council

Key Findings of the Firewood Science Advisory Panel: A review of firewood management and communicating risk with partners and the public.

A six-person panel including industry, tourism, researchers, and managers met on May 3 & 4, 2022 in Missoula, MT to evaluate opportunities for managing out-of-state transport of firewood into Montana; to optimize the current external quarantine on ash material and understand enforcement or outreach options; to explore opportunities to promote in-state firewood production and commercial distribution while managing forest conditions; to optimize public outreach by pooling resources amongst diverse stakeholders.

Challenges

- Firewood transported from long distances poses a risk of spreading pests and diseases to Montana's forests.
- Out of state firewood can be brought in by visitors or returning residents for use at campsites or homes throughout the state.
- Montana hosts about 12.5 million visitors per year who bring about \$5.15 billion in revenue and support 47,800 jobs. About 24% of visitors noted that they would camp using a car or recreational vehicle and many would use more than one campsite.
- Insects and diseases that are introduced have an ongoing impact as control is difficult to achieve.
- New pests arrive in North America every year. Oregon has documented 16 new established wood boring pests since 2007 and firewood is the second most frequently identified source of these introductions.
- Ongoing communication about the risks of moving firewood results in about an 85% awareness of the issue among visitors surveyed in the Great Smokey Mountains National Park. Bringing firewood when camping is a common occurrence.
- There are many messages provided to visitors and residents. Messages about firewood compete with other priority messages for visitors.
- Firewood regulations are not currently harmonized across the west.
- If the USDA Plant Protection Act has a federal rule for a pest or disease, states are not allowed to have more strict rules in place. Rules must not preempt interstate commerce.
- The Montana Quarantine and Pest Management Act 80-7-401 MCA authorizes quarantines but is typically pest by pest and not used for recreation or a pathway (like firewood at campgrounds). No constituents are currently asking for assistance in developing firewood regulations.
- Providing infrastructure to treat firewood to reduce the risk from insect and disease spread is resource intensive. One option is to incentivize kilns for treatment and improving firewood quality.
- Forest health and wildfire hazards are being actively managed through harvesting activities. In 2015 the USFS identified about 1 billion standing dead trees in Montana and the number has likely increased. This promotes catastrophic fires like the Great Fire of 1910 that burned 3 million acres. Harvesting small diameter wood for firewood is an option but improving local labor availability and reducing barriers to markets is necessary for increased utilization of the resource.
- The market for most small producers are in-state customers, and intra-state firewood use and movement which does not necessitate risk reduction via heat treatment. Heat treated firewood could increase opportunities for Montana wood product to be sold out of state.
- State Park Enterprise system is not centralized so while recommended practices can be promoted, procurement decisions about firewood offered for sale at state parks are made locally.

Recommendations

Markets:

- Explore [Firewood Scout](#) or [Stacked.camp](#) to determine whether either website could effectively promote local businesses selling firewood.
- The Department of Commerce has offered to sponsor and pay for the Firewood Scout registration fee. Firewood Scout requires a list of vendors thus, a partner agency or funding source will need to be identified to compile the initial list and then maintain verification of the status of the vendors. Suggestions for partners include an intern through the arborists' association or other related group.
- Promote access to the "[Made in Montana](#)" and "[Grown in Montana](#)" labels for local firewood producers to increase appeal and boost sales.
- Align labeling for firewood in Montana with recommended standards found on National Plant Board Firewood Guidelines site to improve access to out-of-state markets and ease of understanding by the public.
- Support firewood as a market for small diameter biomass generated from forest management projects. Montana's Forest Action Plan recommends thinning forests to reduce hazard fuels and promote health, and locally sourced firewood also achieves the Plan's intent to manage invasive species.
- Promote local forestry businesses as partners in managing forest health and protecting forests.
- Address scale requirements for USFS sales that generate firewood. Currently, driving to distant facilities is too cost prohibitive given the firewood profit margin.

Coordination:

- Identify inconsistencies and contradictions in firewood messaging across Montana based agencies and private campgrounds and work to resolve.
- Partner with [visitMT.com](#) and other tourism sites to include firewood messaging.
- Update outreach to campgrounds (federal, state, local and private) in the distribution of common firewood messaging.
- Commit to maintaining the message and keeping materials current.
- Emphasize firewood in discussions through the Western Governors Association and Pacific North West Economic Region relevant committees.
- Encourage the Western Plant Board to make recommendations for regional firewood policies.
- Maintain consistent and timely communications and notifications of new pests and rangemaps of infestations in the region, to allow for accurate dissemination of areas of high risk between states' regulatory authorities.

Communication:

- Target audience: Visitors to Montana as reached prior to departure (from their home state) who are planning their trips (includes ORV pass purchases, hunting tags, campground reservations, RV publications).
- Use partners to distribute uniform information about firewood. Commit to educating front line partners (people who interact with out of state visitors) about threats posed by out-of-state firewood so they communicate the consistent message.
- Consider contacting organizers for events that draw out-of-state attendees who may be arriving with firewood. Examples include Red Ants Pants music festival and the Crow Fair.
- Consider including firewood messages in the larger "Recreate Responsibly" bundle as developed for Montana.
- Recognize that we ask a lot of visitors and consider how to consolidate the messages.
- Attend Tourism Advisory Council to understand how MISC's interests intersects with this council.
- Utilize Montana's Institute for Tourism and Recreation Research (ITRR) data to target outreach and messaging.

Positive Messages:

- Local firewood supports both local forest products industry partners and invasive species mitigation as a forest health goal. Promoting the use of local firewood therefore has two aligned positive outcomes.
- Provide a pilot grant to supply firewood at high risk or high visibility sites as a demonstration to encourage a shift towards purchasing firewood locally.
- Work with Region 1 USFS staff to run a pilot program of providing, and communicating, free firewood at established national forest campsites.
- The goal of reducing untreated firewood importation is to reduce harm to natural ecosystems and urban forests. Promote the messages through “Managing forests” and “Protect Montana”.

Next Steps

MISC has identified the following steps to utilize the information from the panel:

- Research the volume, origins, and species of firewood being moved into and through Montana.
- Determine where visitors are buying the highest volumes of firewood and for what intent (home heating, personal heating of unhoused persons, outside recreational fire pits in residential areas, campfires, other).
- Review and share models for regionally comparable requirements for entrance of out-of-state firewood into neighboring states.
- Identify what is needed to support local industry in certification and compliance with export requirements and growing the local capacity.

Outcomes

The council provided a list of specific questions to the panel on managing firewood that were addressed by the panel.

- Provide examples from other states that have used external quarantines to prevent the entry of pest-infested wood.

Species based approaches: Similar to Montana’s current list of five quarantines, California has adopted an approach in which pests that threaten economically significant crops or forests are covered by individual pest-specific quarantines. Proactive inclusion of pests not known to occur in the state under quarantine rules allows for broad protections by a relatively comprehensive list of pest specific quarantines. This effectively requires that most firewood imports are heat treated.

Treatment required: Tennessee’s approach is to require a heat treatment at the broadly effective level of 160 F for 75 minutes for all firewood imported into the state or moved from a quarantined area within Tennessee. This applies to any wood four (4) feet or less in length, split or not split, offered for sale, or sold as fuel, including but not limited to kindling, logs, boards, or timbers. The [rule](#), updated in June 2021 excludes all chipped wood and any wood products intended for further processing.

A national map of the approaches currently taken by each state has been developed by the Don’t Move Firewood coalition and is available on the [web](#).

- Determine whether our current restrictions on EAB-contaminated materials sufficiently protect Montana trees and forests.

The quarantine for Emerald Ash Borer reduces the risk to Montana from this pest and may be effective across a somewhat broader range of hardwood species found in central and eastern US forests. It does not proactively address the introduction of pests more likely to be found in other species of trees, other regions, or pests of conifers.

- Identify opportunities to improve production and markets for locally produced firewood.

The Montana Logging Association has approximately 500 members with an average operation size of 5 to 7 staff each. Small operations are limited in the range of their distribution and scale of production as the shift to automated firewood treatment and packaging requires a substantial change in equipment. Adding the “Grown in Montana” and “Made in Montana” labeling would support local business as would investing in a directory like Firewood Scout that identifies places to purchase firewood locally. A uniform label for firewood bundles that includes the origin will make it easier for retailers to identify firewood that is low risk to their customers.

- Determine whether a firewood exchange program at interception points could be effective or feasible in Montana.

No. This model has been tried in both Maine and Prince Edward Island (PEI). Due to the geographically restricted nature of the entrances into PEI the exchange is able to function. It is time and labor intensive as firewood must be moved into a containment unit and adequate supplies of replacement wood must be maintained and stored. Containment for surrendered wood until disposal is problematic logistically, physically, and legally.

- Identify opportunities to increase efficiency and efficacy in outreach efforts amongst diverse agencies and stakeholders.

There is good will and a high motivation to continue to provide and improve a consistent message to the public. The guidelines from the national Don't Move Firewood campaign include a concise statement about firewood and a link to more information. The panel encourages partners to develop joint plans for coordinated material in both online formats, and for printing and distribution, so that federal, state, local, and private campgrounds are providing a consistent message to visitors that buying firewood locally protects Montana's forests. Areas for improvement include identifying the most effective ways to reach visitors to Montana before they depart and ensuring a message about firewood is kept current and present in front of visitors by reviewing and maintaining relevant materials.



Montana Invasive Species Council

Aquatic Invasive Species Grant Guideline Recommended Revisions

Note: **yellow highlights** indicate changes. **Red text** indicates new additions to the document.

AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES GRANT ACCOUNT

80-7-1017. Invasive species grant account. (1) There is an invasive species grant account in the state special revenue fund established in [17-2-102](#). Subject to appropriation by the legislature, money deposited in the account must be used pursuant to [80-7-1018](#) and this section.

(2) Deposits to the account may include but are not limited to grants, gifts, transfers, bequests, donations, appropriations from any source, and deposits made pursuant to [80-7-1016](#).

(3) Interest and income earned on the account and any unspent or unencumbered money in the account at the end of a fiscal year must remain in the account.

(4) Money deposited in the account may be used for costs incurred by the department of natural resources and conservation to administer the provisions of [80-7-1016](#) through [80-7-1018](#). Except for startup costs incurred in the first year of the program, the administrative costs in any fiscal year, including but not limited to personal services and operations, may not exceed 10% of the total amount of grants and contracts awarded pursuant to [80-7-1018](#) in the previous fiscal year.

AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES GRANT PROGRAM—RULEMAKING

80-7-1018. Invasive species grant program -- criteria -- rulemaking. (1) Money deposited in the invasive species grant account established in [80-7-1017](#) may be expended by the department of natural resources and conservation through grants to or contracts with communities or local, state, tribal, or other entities for invasive species management.

(2) For the purposes of this section, the term "invasive species management" includes public education and planning, development, implementation, or continuation of a program or project to prevent, research, detect, control, or, where possible, eradicate invasive species.

(3) A grant or contract may be awarded under this section for demonstration of and research and public education on new and innovative invasive species management.

(4) In making grant and contract awards under this section, the department of natural resources and conservation shall give preference to local governments, collaborative stakeholders, and community groups that it determines can most effectively implement programs on the ground.

(5) If the governor appoints an advisory council on invasive species, the department of natural resources and conservation shall consider recommendations by the advisory council for awards made under this section.

(6) The department of natural resources and conservation is not eligible to receive grants and contracts under this section.

(7) The department of natural resources and conservation may accept federal funds for use pursuant to this section.

(8) Any funds awarded under this section, regardless of when they were awarded, that are not fully expended upon termination of a contract or an extension of a contract, not to exceed 1 year, must revert to the department of natural resources and conservation and be deposited in the invasive species grant account established in [80-7-1017](#). The department of natural resources and conservation shall use any reverted funds to make future awards pursuant to this section.

(9) The department of natural resources and conservation may adopt rules to administer the provisions of [80-7-1016](#) through [80-7-1018](#).

Application, Submittal, and Review Process

AIS GRANT PRIORITIES AND PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

AIS grants are intended to increase local capacity and involvement to address AIS issues.

Projects that address the following AIS management components are eligible and include:

- Prevention
- Early detection
- Education and outreach
- Research
- Treatment

Current state-wide priorities that have been identified and supported by former grantees and stakeholders include grants for projects related to:

- Early detection survey and monitoring to expand local capacity and involvement in multi-AIS taxa early detection efforts.
- AIS education and outreach that expand AIS awareness at the local and statewide level.
- AIS research including eDNA research related to dreissenid mussel early detection addressing eDNA Science Advisory Panel recommendations.

Locally-led proposals that address state-wide priorities will receive ranking preference, as well as proposals addressing AIS species on the Montana Noxious Weed List and AIS under the authority of Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (FWP) (see Appendix A). However, all eligible grant requests will be evaluated and considered.

Projects must align with state AIS priorities, show local support, and be coordinated with related AIS efforts in the area including aquatic invasive species management plans. Priority will be given to local partnerships that demonstrate the administrative, financial, and management capacity to implement the project. The project must commit to using statewide AIS protocols and reporting.

The state AIS program includes the Clean-Drain-Dry campaign and associated materials and products. Education and outreach projects must be coordinated with the state campaign for consistency, accuracy, and brand recognition to ensure maximum effectiveness. FWP will provide outreach materials for distribution and customization. For more information about AIS education and outreach, contact [Liz Lodman at liz.lodman@mt.gov, 406-444-9940](mailto:liz.lodman@mt.gov). [Tom Woolf at 406-444-1230, thomas.woolf@mt.gov](mailto:thomas.woolf@mt.gov).

While match funding is not required, it will be considered in the grant review and ranking process.

APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

AIS grants are available to Montana communities or local, state, tribal, or other entities within the state and to Montana-based non-governmental organizations.

GRANT LIMITS AND TYPES

- \$50,000 per project. Projects can be up to 18 months with a one-year extension if needed. Grantee must request any extension or scope modification in writing to DNRC for approval.
- **On-the-ground projects:** Projects or programs that address statewide AIS priorities and other eligible projects. Typically, these are monitoring and control projects.
- **Education and outreach projects:** Expand capacity and distribution of AIS outreach and education to improve AIS awareness and reinforce the CleanDrainDry message.
- **AIS research projects:** Applied research investigating techniques and strategies to improve AIS prevention, early detection, education or control. Projects must be applied research that address existing AIS priorities, gaps, questions or needs.

CONSIDERATIONS

- Applicants may submit applications for more than one project during a cycle.
- Multi-year projects are eligible; however, applicants would need to reapply for follow-on activities occurring beyond the original grant term, and funding is not guaranteed.
- Grants are not intended to fully fund and maintain long-term projects, positions, or programs.
- Coordination is required with FWP AIS program to ensure continuity and consistency in Montana's AIS program. Grantees must follow FWP protocols and materials produced through this grant program must be reviewed prior to production to ensure consistency with state-wide program.
- Applicants are encouraged to coordinate with FWP prior to application submission.
- Matching funds are not required but will be considered in the review process. Match can include hard dollars or in-kind contributions. Match will be accounted for in grant reporting.
- Preference will be given to proposals that address the listed AIS priorities included in these guidelines, ranking criteria, and high-priority AIS species.
- Cost-share reimbursement to host a Big Sky Watershed Corps members performing AIS project activities is eligible if the cost-share payment is requested in the grant application and payment is made within the term of the grant agreement. Big Sky Watershed Corps members are not eligible to receive wages through grant funds.
- On request, proposals can be reviewed for feedback prior to submission.

INELIGIBLE COSTS

- Activities outside of the scope of work
- Costs incurred outside of the contract term
- Routine maintenance and operation
- eDNA sampling/processing unless related to an eDNA research project
- Salaries/wages, travel, and other expenses not directly related to the project, including travel for in-person presentations about the grant.
- Administrative costs greater than 10 percent of the total project cost. Administration costs are costs directly related to grant management and reporting requirements.
- Indirect costs (for example, facilities, rent, and utilities administration).
- Research publication fees.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED

- Projects that seek funding for salaries/wages will provide the names, titles, and experience of staff members.
- Standard Operating Procedures if noted in application.
- Projects that lead to construction or any other environmental degradation must complete the Environmental Checklist or submit Environmental Assessments (EA) if already completed.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Applicants will be required to submit a full proposal on [Submittable](#). Application cycles will be announced via the MISC Bulletin and on its website. Visit misc.mt.gov to subscribe to the bulletin and view cycle announcements and application information. Typically, cycles will be announced in the fall with applications due 6-8 weeks after being announced. If submitting more than one project for funding consideration, applicants are required to complete a separate application form and include all required information for each project.

Proposals will be reviewed and ranked by the AIS Grant Review Committee as described below.

AIS GRANT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Montana departments that have responsibility for AIS in the state have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) per MCA Title 80, Part 10. In keeping with the law and MOU, those departments will comprise the AIS Grant Review Committee, which are all voting MISC members. The Departments include: Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Montana Department of Transportation, Montana Department of Agriculture, and the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation. The MISC hydropower representative will also be on the committee representing the industry's interests as funders

of the program. The MISC Coordinator will assist the review committee and coordinate the review process and AIS grant hearings.

AIS Grant Review Committee Member Responsibilities

The AIS Grant Review Committee is an integral asset to the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation and the Montana Invasive Species Council. The review committee is responsible for reviewing and ranking AIS grant applications and providing a ranked list of projects and project summaries to the full MISC for consideration. The AIS Grant Review Committee may work with applicants on project adjustments prior to the grant hearings to address concerns or application issues.

Secondary Reviewers

Secondary reviewers are technical experts that provide input into AIS grant applications. The AIS Grant Review Committee will consider input for the ranked list of projects.

GRANT REVIEW PROCESS OVERVIEW

- A MISC meeting will be scheduled following the grant review process to conduct AIS Grant Hearings, which include applicant presentations, project Q&A, and MISC funding deliberations and vote.
- Prior to hearings, AIS Grant Review Committee will review applications and provide a recommended ranked list of all proposed projects and a summary of each of the projects to include application strengths and weaknesses, recommendation justification, and constraints and stipulations. Project summaries will also include a list of secondary reviewers, if applicable.
- AIS Grant Review Committee can recommend less funding than requested, and/or recommend constraints/stipulations around project (e.g. remove task), or recommend project is ineligible/not recommended.
- During the hearings, grant applicants will have the opportunity to present their project(s).
- Following presentations and Q&A, MISC deliberates and then votes on the project list. MISC can approve the recommended list or adjust recommendations by consensus of a majority of present Council members.
- The funding recommendations voted on and adopted by MISC are provided to DNRC for final approval.
- A quorum of the full Council is not required to vote on the list of funding recommendations. Rather the list can be voted on by a consensus of Council members present at the grant hearing.

APPLICATION PRESENTATIONS

Applicants of eligible applications will have the opportunity to provide a 5-10-minute presentation describing the scope, schedule, and budget of their project during the grant cycle's AIS Grant Hearing. Applicants may attend in person or provide their presentation via

teleconference. MISC members will be able to ask the applicant questions following their presentation.

APPLICATION EVALUATION, AIS GRANT HEARINGS, AND FUNDING DECISIONS

Evaluation of applications by the AIS Grant Review Committee will include a **quantitative component and a qualitative component**. Each reviewer will evaluate projects using the criteria below to score them and those scores will be averaged to generate a list of quantitative rankings. The review committee will also meet prior to the MISC grant hearing meeting to discuss the qualitative merits of the project and determine funding recommendations. The committee may reach out to applicants during the evaluation period to ask clarifying questions or request additional information.

MISC staff will compile the ranked list and add qualitative information to the project summaries prior to the AIS Grant Hearings. Applicants will present their project(s) during the hearing followed by Q&A. After presentations are complete, the Council will discuss the projects considering both quantitative rankings and qualitative information and vote to adopt the list or adjust funding recommendations based on the presentations, questions, and deliberation. A quorum of the full Council is not required to adopt the list, but rather consensus of Council members present at the grant hearing. The final recommendations will then be submitted to DNRC for approval. DNRC may approve the list as recommended by MISC or make adjustments.

All applications will be scored using the following criteria for the **quantitative component** of the evaluation:

1. project purpose and scope and project management; and
1. **one** project type, which is indicated on the application.

SCORING SUMMARY	MAXIMUM SCORE
Project Purpose and Scope	70
Project Management and Likelihood of Success	10 20
Sub-total	80 90
<u>Applications will be scored on ONE of the following project types</u>	
On-the-ground projects scoring criteria	30 40
Education & Outreach projects scoring criteria	30 40
Research projects scoring criteria	30 40
TOTAL MAXIMUM SCORE	110 120

PROJECT PURPOSE AND SCOPE	SCORING RANGE
<p>Does the proposed project focus on priority aquatic invasive species for prevention, detection, eradication, control, or management (see Appendix A)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Proposed project focuses on multiple AIS for more than one category of prevention, detection, eradication, control, or management. • 5 = Proposed project focuses on two or fewer AIS for only one or more categories of prevention, detection, eradication, control, or management. • 0 = Proposed project focuses on one AIS for only one category of prevention, detection, eradication, control or management. 	0-10
<p>Does the proposed project directly address statewide AIS priorities in these guidelines and/or address local, regional, tribal or federal agency plan(s) that are cited/provided in the project application?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Proposed project addresses a statewide, tribal or federal priority and is strongly linked to AIS plan(s). • 5 = Proposed project addresses a local statewide priority and is linked to AIS Plan(s). • 0 = Proposed project does not address a statewide, local, tribal or federal priority nor is it linked to any AIS plan. 	0-10
<p>DELETED Are the proposed project tasks goals and deliverables outcomes clearly stated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The proposed project has clearly stated tasks project goals and the objectives and methods are appropriate to achieve the objectives. The tasks and methods are appropriate to achieve the deliverables. • 5 = The proposed project has identified goals, and objectives tasks, deliverables and methods but they lack clarity. but methods are not completely described. • 0 = The proposed project lacks clear tasks and deliverables goals and objectives and the methods are not described. 	0-10
<p>Are the proposed project methods and protocols appropriate for accomplishing the tasks and deliverables goals and objectives?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The project design is clear and employs acceptable methods and/or established protocols. • 5 = The project is plausible, but it is unclear whether the tasks can be accomplished using the proposed methods. • 0 = The project design is unclear or does not include appropriate methods. 	0-10

<p>Is there a demonstrated level of community support and commitment to prevent or control AIS and opportunity to provide specific ecological and community benefits?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Level of community support is clearly documented through past efforts and current letters of support. • 5 = Level of community support is somewhat documented through past efforts OR current letters of support. • 0 = Level of community support is not documented through past efforts nor does the application contain any letters of support. 	0-10
<p>Are the proposed project tasks adequately described?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Task descriptions are clear, and it is evident what they will accomplish and the related expenses that will require reimbursement under an agreement. • 5 = Tasks are adequately described, but not all information requested was provided in the application. • 0 = The task information provided lacks detail and it is unclear how the task will accomplish project goals and objectives. 	0-10
<p>Overall, the grant application was presented well, and the information provided in the application demonstrates a strong likelihood of success.</p>	0-10
<p>The proposed project includes matching funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = 1:1 or greater match • 5 = Some match • 0 = No match 	0-10
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	
<p>Does the project team have the collective experience, education and capacity to lead the proposed project to a successful outcome?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The team has documented their experience, education, and capacity to lead the project successfully. • 5 = The team has some experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management. • 0 = The project team has no experience in leading projects regarding invasive species management 	0-10
<p>DELETE, include information in grant brief. Past performance (if applicable). The applicant previously received AIS grant funding, and successfully completed the project, met project goals, and administration/management of the grant was acceptable.</p>	P/F
<p>Does the budget for the proposed project utilize state grant funds efficiently to complete the tasks and achieve the deliverables?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The budget is free of mathematical errors and proposed costs are allowable, contain adequate information to assess how each line 	0-10

<p>item is calculated, and utilizes grant funds efficiently to achieve deliverables.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 = The budget contains some mathematical errors, is unclear how each line item is calculated, and/or could utilize funds more efficiently to achieve deliverables. • 0 = The budget contains many mathematical errors, line items are not clearly calculated, and/or funds are not used efficiently to achieve deliverables. 	
<p>ON-THE-GROUND CRITERIA</p>	
<p>This project was developed in cooperation with AIS managers and builds coalitions and partnerships to address AIS issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Multiple stakeholder groups are identified, and the project demonstrates that it will help them connect with AIS resources. • 5 = One or more stakeholder groups are identified, and the project vaguely describes how it will help them connect with AIS resources. • 0 = Stakeholder groups are not identified, and it is unclear how they will connect with AIS resources. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>The project expands hands-on learning that expands AIS management and the trainees' capacity and. The project contains clear training protocols that increase the trainees' AIS management capacity. The project encourages participants to become more knowledgeable about managing AIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The project is action oriented and provides clear ways in which participants will learn about AIS management. • 5 = The project is vague about how project participants will expand their AIS management knowledge. • 0 = The project does not address how participants will expand their AIS management knowledge. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>This project incorporates an appropriate monitoring or evaluation plan that will effectively track progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = A descriptive monitoring plan is included in the application. • 5 = The application refers to a monitoring plan but does not provide specifics. • 0 = The application does not mention a monitoring plan. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>The project utilizes integrated management techniques that are both appropriate and applicable for the AIS species to be treated in the designated area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Multiple management techniques will be used and are both appropriate and applicable to treat target AIS species. • 5 = More than one management techniques will be used but not all are appropriate or applicable to treat the target AIS species. 	<p>0-10</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = Only one management techniques will be used to treat the target AIS species. 	
<p>EDUCATION AND OUTREACH CRITERIA</p>	
<p>This education project will promote public awareness about the impacts of AIS on aquatic habitats and natural resources and illustrate opportunities for action.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The project will reach multiple stakeholder groups and the public with direct actions. • 5 = The project reaches a fair number of stakeholders and the public. • 0 = It is not clear who the project would reach and how broad reach would be. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>The project emphasizes hands-on learning that encourages participants to become more knowledgeable about AIS and its management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The project is action oriented and provides clear ways in which participants can engage in AIS. • 5 = The project is vague about how hands-on learning would be achieved. • 0 = The project does not include any hands-on learning opportunities. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>This project includes evaluation of its effectiveness using acceptable methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The project clearly demonstrates how impact and reach will be measured. • 5 = The project includes some metrics for measuring impact and reach. • 0 = The project does not provide metrics, or the metrics are not acceptable methods. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>This project was developed in cooperation with AIS managers and builds coalitions and partnerships to address AIS issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Multiple stakeholder groups are identified, and the project demonstrates that it will help them connect with AIS resources. • 5 = One or more stakeholder groups are identified, and the project vaguely describes how it will help them connect with AIS resources. • 0 = Stakeholder groups are not identified, and it is unclear how they will connect with AIS resources. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>RESEARCH CRITERIA</p>	

<p>This project was developed in cooperation with natural resource managers to address management needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The project clearly demonstrates coordination and strategic actions with land managers. • 5 = The project demonstrates some coordination with land managers. • 0 = The project is not coordinated with land managers. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>This research project will increase knowledge of AIS and/or improve an important aspect of management. Results will be effectively disseminated so it reaches the on-the-ground manager.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Research results will be disseminated and will clearly increase knowledge of AIS and/or AIS management particularly for high-priority species or methods. • 5 = Research results will provide some benefit to increase knowledge in AIS and/or AIS management. • 0 = Research results are not that important to AIS or AIS management. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>The results of this research project will be effectively disseminated so it reaches on-the-ground AIS managers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = Project describes how research results will be clearly and effectively disseminated directly to on-the-ground AIS managers. • 5 = Project does not describe how research results will be clearly and effectively disseminated to on-the-ground AIS managers. • 0 = No dissemination plan was included. 	<p>0-10</p>
<p>The research will enhance a new or existing method for addressing AIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 = The research project is a gap in existing methods of AIS and is needed. • 5 = The research project may enhance a new or existing method of AIS. • 0 = The research project is unlikely to enhance a relevant new or existing method of AIS. 	<p>0-10</p>

INELIGIBLE APPLICATIONS

Ineligible applications are those which are submitted after the due date. Applications not submitted on the proper forms, or are incomplete, may also be considered ineligible for funding assistance.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Council members may participate in project discussion and deliberations but should abstain from promotion of a project they are actively involved in (including the organization they are representing). This does not preclude council members from voting on the final ranked list of projects that is derived by consensus of the members. If a conflict of issue arises, the project(s) in question will be voted on separately and the member with the conflict of

interest will abstain from that vote. A majority of council members present at a grant hearing is sufficient to vote and adopt the ranked list of projects—a quorum of the full council is not required.

REQUIRED GRANT AGREEMENT DELIVERABLES

Upon award of a grant, **the grantee must enter into a grant agreement with DNRC**. Under terms of the agreement, the grantee must submit periodic progress reports and a final report of project activities.

PAYMENT

The grant agreement will not be effective until signed and dated by representatives of DNRC and the grantee. **Expenses incurred before the grant agreement becomes effective will not be reimbursed**. The agreement termination date will depend on the project schedule. Term extensions may be granted upon request and justification for up to, but no longer than one year, beyond the original termination date.

DNRC will reimburse project costs upon **receipt and approval of requests for payment, supporting documentation, and accompanying progress reports**. The Project Sponsor shall report on total project costs, including those funded by the Project Sponsor and other matching funds. The Project Sponsor will receive the final payment based on the total of actual costs submitted, not to exceed the total contracted amount, upon delivery of a final report and a final invoice.

REPORTING

Progress reports are required with each reimbursement request or on a quarterly basis, whichever occurs sooner. Progress reports must include project activities during the reporting period, costs incurred, funds remaining, anticipated activities during the next reporting period, and expected changes in scope, schedule or budget. Reported project costs must include those funded by the Project Sponsor and matching funds.

DNRC will release final payment based on the total of actual costs submitted, not to exceed the total contracted amount, upon delivery of a final report, final invoice, and other deliverables as outlined in the grant agreement, e.g., survey data sets. The final invoice must accurately account for all grant expenses for contractors and grantee expenses for time and materials, including hourly rates and work hours, contract award amount, total grant amount expended, grant amount received, and remaining grant balance, if any.

PROCUREMENT AND PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS

Grantees agree to comply with all relevant procurement and contracting requirements related to work performed under DNRC grant agreements. In some cases, DNRC retains the right to approve subcontracts.

Grantees are responsible for conducting all necessary environmental assessments and obtaining all necessary local, state, and federal permits for the completion of projects

approved for funding through the AIS Grant Program. Landowner permission must be secured for projects on private land before contracting.

Appendix A:

*Indicates present in Montana

1. Montana Noxious Weed List under the authority of MT Department of Agriculture

Effective: June 21, 2019

PRIORITY 1A These weeds are not present or have a very limited presence in Montana. Management criteria will require eradication if detected, education, and prevention:

- a. Yellow starthistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*)
- a. Dyer's woad (*Isatis tinctoria*)
- a. Common reed (*Phragmites australis ssp. australis*)
- a. Medusahead (*Taeniatherum caput-medusae*)

PRIORITY 1B These weeds have limited presence in Montana.

Management criteria will require eradication or containment and education:

- a. Knotweed complex (*Polygonum cuspidatum*, *P. sachalinense*, *P. × bohemicum*, *Fallopia japonica*, *F. sachalinensis*, *F. × bohemica*, *Reynoutria japonica*, *R. sachalinensis*, and *R. × bohemica*)
- a. Purple loosestrife (*Lythrum salicaria*)
- a. Rush skeletonweed (*Chondrilla juncea*)
- a. Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*)
- a. Blueweed (*Echium vulgare*)

PRIORITY 2A These weeds are common in isolated areas of Montana. Management criteria will require eradication or containment where less abundant. Management shall be prioritized by local weed districts:

- a. Tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*, *Jacobaea vulgaris*)
- a. Meadow hawkweed complex (*Hieracium caespitosum*, *H. praealtum*, *H. floridundum*, and *Pilosella caespitosa*)
- a. Orange hawkweed (*Hieracium aurantiacum*, *Pilosella aurantiaca*)
- a. Tall buttercup (*Ranunculus acris*)
- a. Perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*)
- a. Yellowflag iris (*Iris pseudacorus*)
- a. Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*, *Myriophyllum spicatum* x *Myriophyllum sibiricum*)
- a. Flowering rush (*Butomus umbellatus*)
- a. Common buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica* L.)
- a. Ventenata (*Ventenata dubia*)

PRIORITY 2B These weeds are abundant in Montana and widespread in many counties. Management criteria will require eradication or containment where less abundant. Management shall be prioritized by local weed districts:

- a. Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*)
- a. Field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*)
- a. Leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula*)
- a. Whitetop (*Cardaria draba*, *Lepidium draba*)
- a. Russian knapweed (*Acroptilon repens*, *Rhaponticum repens*)
- a. Spotted knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe*, *C. maculosa*)
- a. Diffuse knapweed (*Centaurea diffusa*)

- a. Dalmatian toadflax (*Linaria dalmatica*)
- a. St. Johnswort (*Hypericum perforatum*)
- a. Sulfur cinquefoil (*Potentilla recta*)
- a. Common tansy (*Tanacetum vulgare*)
- a. Oxeye daisy (*Leucanthemum vulgare*)
- a. Houndstongue (*Cynoglossum officinale*)
- a. Yellow toadflax (*Linaria vulgaris*)
- a. Saltcedar (*Tamarix spp.*)
- a. Curlyleaf pondweed (*Potamogeton crispus*)
- a. Hoary alyssum (*Berteroa incana*)

PRIORITY 3 Regulated Plants: (NOT MONTANA LISTED NOXIOUS WEEDS)

These regulated plants have the potential to have significant negative impacts. The plant may not be intentionally spread or sold other than as a contaminant in agricultural products. The state recommends research, education and prevention to minimize the spread of the regulated plant.

- a. Cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*)
- a. Hydrilla (*Hydrilla verticillata*)
- a. Russian olive (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*)
- a. Brazilian waterweed (*Egeria densa*)
- a. Parrot feather watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum aquaticum* or *M. brasiliense*)

1. Aquatic Invasive Species under the authority of MT Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

This list is dynamic and is subject to change as knowledge of individual species increases.

*Indicates present in Montana

Aquatic Invasive Plants

- a. Fragrant waterlily* (*Nymphaea odorata*)
- a. Starry stonewort (*Nitellopsis obtuse*)
- a. Yellow floating heart (*Nymphoides peltata*)
- a. Variable-leaf milfoil (*Myriophyllum heterophyllum*)
- a. Fanwort (*Cabomba caroliniana*)
- a. Common water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*)
- a. Brittleleaf naiad (*Najas minor*)

Aquatic Invasive Animals

- a. Quagga mussel (*Dreissena rostriformis bugensis*)
- a. Zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*)
- a. New Zealand mudsnail* (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*)
- a. Asian clam (*Corbicula fluminea*)
- a. Chinese mysterysnail (*Cipangopaludina chinensi*, *Cipangopaludina chinensis malleata*)
- a. Faucet snail* (*Bithynia tentaculata*)
- a. Red-rim melania* (*Melanoides tuberculata*)
- a. Fishhook waterflea (*Cercopagis pengoi*)
- a. Spiny waterflea (*Bythotrephes longimanus*)
- a. American bullfrog* (*Lithobates catesbeianus*)
- a. Rusty crayfish (*Orconectes rusticus*)
- a. Virile crayfish (*Orconectes virilis*)
- a. Red swamp crayfish (*Procambarus clarkia*)

Invasive Fish

- a. Bighead carp (*Hypophthalmichthys nobilis*)
- a. Black carp (*Mylopharyngodon piceus*)
- a. Silver carp (*Hypophthalmichthys molitrix*)
- a. Grass carp (*Ctenopharyngodon idella*)
- a. Tench (*Tinca tinca*)
- a. Ruffe (*Gymnocephalus cernua*)
- a. Round goby (*Neogobius melanostomus*)
- a. Zander (*Sander lucioperca*)
- a. Northern snakehead (*Channa argus*)

Aquatic Pathogens

- a. Chytrid Fungus (*Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis*)
- a. Proliferative Kidney Disease (PKX) (*Tetracapsuloides bryosalmonae*)
- a. Viral hemorrhagic septicemia (VHS) (*Oncorhynchus 2 novirhabdovirus*)
- a. Whirling disease (*Myxobolus cerebralis*)

Work Plan for the Montanan Invasive Species Council

Purpose: The Montana Invasive Species Framework describes the tasks to meet invasive species management goals identified by the Council. The operational plan to carry out the tasks and the priority of addressing the tasks has been left up to the partners. To align and support the work of the Council, staff, and partners the 2022 invasive species summit will develop a work plan that can be accomplished over a short-term or two year timeframe. The priorities can be assessed on a regular basis with reference to the framework that takes a longer-term view.

Focus areas

Proposed topics for the development of the Montana Invasive Species Council (MISC) work plan:

- **Science Advisory Panel Suggestions.** MISC Scientific Advisory Panels are composed of scientists, researchers, natural resource managers, and other experts brought together to provide independent scientific advice for stakeholder identified issues related to invasive species management in Montana.
- **Economic Impact of Invasive Species Suggestions.** MISC has collaborated with researchers and economists to determine the economic impact of invasive species in Montana, including the potential impact of the introduction of invasive aquatic mussels to Montana waterways and the economic impact of the expansion of eastern heath snails.
- **Suggestions for increased collaboration with law enforcement to improve compliance with Montana’s Invasive species laws and priority invasive species laws gaps and needs.**
- **Suggested needs for increased capacity for existing invasive species management programs.**
- **Statewide priority species for prevention and management**
- **Funding mechanisms and priorities**

Stakeholder groups to engage:

Stockgrowers	Woolgrowers
Grain growers	Agribusiness association
Wheat & barley committee	Weed districts
Conservation Districts	MWCA
TU	Walleye unlimited
FOAM	TNC
City foresters	Nursery association
Audubon	County extension agents
Watershed groups	Farm Bureau
Montana cattlemen	Federal agencies
State agencies	tribes

⇒ **Which additional groups of stakeholders should be contacted?**

Timeline

June 1: MISC meeting, input into participants, timeline, and outcomes

August (week of the 22nd): Listening Sessions with stakeholders

September 7: MISC meeting, review input from stakeholders, finalize topics for October

October 24 & 25: Summit

June 1: MISC meeting

Input into participants, timeline, and outcomes

August (week of the 22nd): Listening Sessions with stakeholders

Format: Zoom meetings with a core administrative and Council team in Helena, MT. Each discussion session will be hosted by Council members and supported by staff.

Day 1

- Terrestrial weeds
- AIS
- Feral Hogs?
- Forest pests and firewood

Day 2

- Industry groups
- Federal Agencies
- Conservation/outdoor recreation
- Tribes

⇒ **Are there groups that should be added to this list? Should the list of stakeholder groups be organized differently?**

⇒ **Which groups would you like to host or join in for the preliminary discussions?**

September 7: MISC meeting

Review priorities and current projects described by stakeholders and finalize the structure of the summit.

October 24-25 Summit:

Format: In person meeting

Purpose: Engagement, commitment, and development of a Council Work Plan

Day 1:

AM Session

- Governor's office
- Legislative perspective
- Retrospective on Science Advisory Panels
- Stakeholder concerns (from August)

PM Session

- Panel 1: Regional priorities
Neighboring states and partners
- Panel 2: 5 Areas of MISC focused effort

Day 2:

AM Session

- Reporting out from Day 1, panel outcomes
- Council led breakout groups to rank and discuss issues

PM Session

- Prioritization
- Reporting and conclusion