



IPM Coordinating Committee

April 28, 2006

Maricopa Agricultural Center

Membership:

Paul Baker (Entomology)

Peter Ellsworth (Entomology, MAC)

Al Fournier (MAC)

Dawn Gouge (Entomology, MAC)

*#Rick Melnicoe (ex-officio, WRPMC)

*#Mary Olsen (Plant Sciences)

Bob Roth (ex-officio, MAC)

*#Deb Young (ex-officio, CE)

Pat Clay (Maricopa County)

Lin Evans (stakeholder)

*Rick Gibson (Pinal County)

*#Kim McReynolds (Cochise Co)

*#John Palumbo (Entomology, YAC)

*Jeff Silvertooth (SWES)

*Not present for the meeting

#Provided comments/scores for proposals

APMC Logo

Peter Ellsworth and Al Fournier presented some logo designs for an Arizona Pest Management Center logo to the committee members present. These new logo designs were developed based on input provided at the last meeting, and incorporated the UA colors into modifications of earlier logo developed by Ellsworth. There was some urgency to finalize a logo prior to submission of an extension publication on Monday. There was a good consensus among those present that we should go with the logo shown above in the header.

Discussion of (3d) IPM proposals

Review Process/Suggestions for Next Year

Al Fournier outlined changes in the RFP from last year:

- The addition of APMC priorities
- The use of specific review criteria in the RFP and in the review process
- The addition of the requirement that funded PIs submit a final report indicating outcomes, as discussed in the previous meeting

Question: Did the use of specific criteria make it easier to review and rank proposals? Most said yes, but some indicated they were comfortable with simply ranking the proposals as before.

Suggestion: It would help reviewers to be provided with more specific information on the duration of the proposed project. Consider adding start and end dates to the proposal format requirements next year.

Suggestion: If possible, post the RFP earlier and have the committee meet sooner so that PIs will have more time to spend the money. The RFP could be released earlier, prior to knowing the exact amount of federal IPM funds available, but the committee's decision process is dependent on knowing the final amount. This year's decision comes about one month earlier than last year's. There is an advantage to meeting closer to the annual cycle for the other CALS extension grants.

The Process

Based on committee discussion prior to this meeting (face-to-face and by email) some changes were made in the proposal review process.

- Committee members now use the criteria as a guide to ranking the proposals. The criteria are meant as a guide only, to ensure that reviewers are considering all aspects of each project in their review. The final ranking process will be the result of committee discussion on the relative merits of each proposal.
- Lead PIs on a given proposal will not be allowed to vote on that project, and, if present, will be asked to leave the room while their proposal is being discussed. In addition, we will ask review committee members to excuse themselves from voting on any proposal/project with which they are materially involved. (This does not mean that anyone listed as a project partner cannot vote.)

Decisions

\$50,000 in funding was available this year through the IPM program. A total of 11 proposals were received, requesting total funding of \$86,102. The committee reviewed the proposals and ranked them, incorporating rankings provided to Al Fournier by all but two committee members who were not present. Comments of committee members not present (if provided) were read aloud as each proposal was considered. After discussion, the committee decided to fund 7 of the proposals, some of these at reduced rates, as noted below. All IPM funds made available through this program must be expended by September 30, 2006.

Al Fournier will inform the funded PIs of the committee's decisions regarding their proposals and will work with Patti B. to set up the accounts. Two of the proposals not funded by the committee have been prioritized below, in case additional funds become available through CALS.

The following proposals were selected for funding in the amounts shown:

<u>Title</u>	<u>PI</u>	<u>Amt</u>
Arizona Crop Information Site Technical Support	Fournier	\$7,500
Educational Materials to Support Pest Control Licensing	Silvertooth/Fournier	\$10,100*
Education Materials II: ACIS component	Silvertooth/Fournier	\$3,500
Statewide Termite Survey	Baker	\$2,300
Children's Environmental Health Program	Gouge/Snyder	\$9,514*
Trapping and Monitoring for Managing Desert Turfgrass Insect Pests	Umeda	\$6,000*
1080 Pesticide Use Reporting Database	Fournier	\$8,000
Which Wasp?	Byrne	\$3,086
Total Funded		\$50,000

*Funded at a reduced rate

Recommended for funding through CALS-Extension, if available:

<u>Title</u>	<u>PI</u>	<u>Amt</u>
Hercon Verbenone Flakes to Prevent Engraver		
Bark Beetle Colonization of Pine Slash (high priority)	DeGomez	\$7,680
Evaluation of Soil Solarization as a Management Tool for Fusarium Wilt of Lettuce (low priority)	Matheron	\$6,000

Not recommended for funding:

<u>Title</u>	<u>PI</u>	<u>Amt</u>
Web-based Approach to Monitoring and Mapping Disease in Turfgrass	Umeda	\$5,550
Surveying Plant Parasitic Nematode Populations On Golf Courses	Umeda	\$10,000

APMC Pest Management Summit

We had a brief discussion of progress on the Arizona Pest Management Summit scheduled for June 6 at MAC. Al Fournier has been working with certain faculty members to help organize breakout sessions around different commodities/topics. We expect to have breakouts focused on urban/school IPM, cross-commodity (agricultural) IPM, noxious and invasive weeds, possibly turf, possibly citrus, possibly ornamental horticulture. In the coming week, the invitation list will be finalized and additional contacts will be made (email and phone) to get the word out. The group brainstormed additional contacts for the meeting.

Next Meeting - The next IPM Coordinating Committee meeting will be held within a few weeks of the APMC Summit meeting of June 6. This will provide an opportunity to reflect on the meeting, what went right, what went wrong, and to review the summarized priorities from the meeting and discuss next steps.