



## **Community IPM Leadership Team Planning Meeting June 28 2013**

Participants: Dawn Gouge, Peter Ellsworth, Dave Kopec, Kai Umeda, Al Fournier

### **Agenda**

#### **Leadership Team Purpose & Process**

- What is a Leadership Team?

Must take leadership and responsibility which means participating in the group. Have the tough discussions as a group. Two main functions: (1) secure the resource; (2) representing all the interests in community IPM as much as possible while accomplishing the objectives / commitments we have made in Extension IPM.

We need to know if any individuals do not wish to participate. If this is not going to be as productive as the other EIPM investments that we make it could be discontinued. This group has not been as productive in terms of outputs, nor in funding the core resource of the Assistant in Extension.

We would like Shaku to be exposed to a positive and supportive environment. We can fund her for one year at 100% but any of you can buy out up to 50% of her time at any point. (Al provided an example snapshot of how other AiEs have been funded for the past year.) The team members must think about ways to support this shared resource or it will go away. We will likely need a diverse portfolio of grants to help fund 50% of Shaku. Last year: Dawn submitted 4 grants. Got one EPA contract and an Extension statewide initiative. Goal: get a RIPM together this next winter. Up to 3 years of support. Write to the Extension category.

Are there ways that Shaku could work with you in your individual programs? How can you make a component of your individual program fit into the overall scheme of the LT program. With Bryan, we concentrated on School IPM Inside and Out. Bryan got involved in other things: bed bug training and school IPM survey. Moving forward: how can we get all the school districts together for a major training involving multiple school districts. Collectively, the team did not know what was happening, what Bryan was doing. As a group – we were not aware of things going on. At the end of last year, Dawn sent out a summary of outcomes and outputs and sent to everyone for their APR. Better communication practices are needed.

Our reporting is not confined to school IPM. We are interested in the outcomes from your individual programs as well. Wayne has developed a database that helps us track meetings, publications, media articles. This will be presented to the group at the next meeting and Shaku will play a role in coordinating data entry for community IPM outputs statewide.

A great strength of this team is a well-defined group project: School IPM Inside and Out. It is more truly transdisciplinary and integrated than what the other teams are doing. In practice, each of the school sites had different priorities that drove their willingness to adopt the practices we

teach in these different areas. It is important that we are asking them and measuring their goals at the beginning and measure success on the end user's terms. In that initial meeting we figure out what their needs are and how individuals can contribute.

We need to reconnect with the school districts (Metro, Gilbert & Tucson) we previously worked with and use them as a vehicle to reach out to other school districts in the area (demonstration program). We need to follow up on what the current status is at these districts. We do not have complete baseline evaluation data for any of the school districts. Shaku will need to meet the contacts through each of the individuals who have those contacts. Timing? Schools will not be very available in August, some even earlier. Facility managers may be easier to deal with in the near future.

### **New grant opportunities**

**Grant Opportunity #1. EPA School IPM due July 29.** Up to 2 years project, maximum award \$250k (\$700k available). Focus on k-12 schools: research, development, monitoring, education, demonstrations. Must help EPA fulfill their national strategic plan for school IPM. (Separate document from the RFA.) Goals include working with environmental justice and public health; strengthening tribal and national connections. It will not support child care or school gardens. An ideal fit for Inside and Out Program. They favor partnerships and collaborations. They want to see an increase in regulatory compliance. (Ties in with PSEP.) Train-the-trainer? Favor multistate, tribal or regional efforts. Focus on geographic region of AZ and include as many tribes as possible. On site training. Conferences and seminars. Do a large training with public health pests on the agenda, invite tribes and non-tribal school districts. Want to see reduced pesticide use and reduced pests. Must highlight what is distinctive about this program. Indoor and Out is distinct. Unique issues: West Nile and RMSF (brown dog ticks), scorpions?

Team Brainstorming related to this grant proposal:

- Continue School IPM Inside and out
- On site trainings
- Multi-state / tribal involvement
- Write it around Inside and Out
- Include both public health, indoor and outdoor pests
- Define the deliverables
- We have assessment tools; what will we measure, how many times
- Can we get the school records
- Tailoring some outputs directly to tribal audiences. Some tribes have no written language; some have several languages. Sometimes training must be done door to door, one on one.
- Desert Southwest approach including tribes?
- Get a letter from contractor who works with the tribe.
- Work with CRIT? Salt River Pima, Ak-Chin
- Build in some assessment.
- Get letters of support soon.
- Do a central training in Phx, put on a show: what we offer – inside, outside – collect baseline data on current practices. As a method to stimulate additional interest.

- Or as part of a multiday training with CEUs. To draw them in: bed bugs for Phx. RMSF for the tribes. Something like a Summit based on School IPM indoor and out. Topical breakouts. At a school – practical demonstrations, building a consortium.
- Regulatory compliance – CEUs. Contact tribal EPA office – what regulations do they have that we can articulate with a school environment.

Plan for moving forward with the grant:

- Ask the group: apart from personnel, are there other needs? Get info to finalize the budget.
- Develop an outline that follows the RFA with bullet points – and send it to the group.

**Update:** Summary of grant as submitted, provided by Dawn. To increase adoption of verifiable IPM in K-12 schools, and reduce pest complaints, and pesticide use and risk, by implementing a comprehensive, national training and certification program for pesticide applicators and school staff in other key roles. Our national consortia, including professionals from land-grant universities, non-governmental organizations, school districts and others, will create a sustainable mechanism to increase the IPM proficiency of pesticide applicators, administrators, facility managers, custodians, teachers, and food service, maintenance, school health and grounds management staff, and school nurses. Lucy and Shaku are serving as national coordinators, assigning tasks to subject experts and formulating learning objectives for the different school roles.

**Grant Opportunity #2:** EPA STAR grant: student health and performance. Due October 8. Fund up to \$1 million to study pollution inside buildings in k-12 environments. Up to 4 years. (\$6mil available). They want pesticide residue analysis to be performed. It might be possible to articulate with them to process samples. If we are to pursue this we should explore who within or outside of UA has the toxicological expertise that would be needed. Academic achievement. How competitive would we be? Paul Jepson or Michael Guzy at Oregon State University may be potential contacts.

**Update from Dawn:** Lucy and Dawn will spearhead participate in a national grant being submitted by the IPM Institute, on a project that will focus on healthy learning environments. Both Lucy and Shaku will be involved but Lucy will coordinate collection of pesticide residue and allergen data from 4 sites nationally (1 in each IPM region).

**Dawn discussed the distinction between Lucy's role and Shaku's.** Lucy is Dawn's program resource and is focused on public health in many environments. Shaku is a team resource and will be primarily focused on School IPM Inside and Out. Programmatically, they are both working in areas that Dawn is engaged in. Lucy and Tilak are not in the budget for the new EIPM grant. At some point in the next 12 months, this team needs to discuss the merits of supporting those resources. We are not requesting CALS state monies this year in part because of the salary savings we have for the coming year.

- Email shaku's phone number out.
- Everyone needs to set up some time in the next few weeks to meet with Shaku. Invite her out to a site or visit her at MAC.

#### **Specific Goals funded through EIPM (Brief review)**

- Objectives from 2010-13
- Objectives for 2013-16

The team members present reviewed these.

### **Discussion: How can we improve Leadership Team function to accomplish goals?**

BS was frustrated by the non-responsiveness of the group. He felt he was supposed to get consensus on any action. Dawn proposes that consensus should not be required. We need to give her some general guidelines and some freedom to do the work and expand according to her own strengths.

Ground rules:

- If she feels like she is conflicted in some way, she needs to speak to Peter.
- Dawn is the supervisor

Group needs and commitments

- **What do each of us need / want?** Paul wants outputs. Dave wants to help people to help themselves. Kai wants education opportunities: small or big groups, facilitating those events; following up on details, coordination, maintaining contacts; especially dealing with schools and institutions; enable him to do more with only so much investment of time. Ursula's needs are similar. Peter just wants to see the group be successful: tell an important and impactful story; a big measure of that success is when this group feels ready to move the model to different environments. Al wants engagement and ownership – from Shaku and from the group. Dawn wants a communicator, a coordinator and change-in-condition person. Assistance in tracking outcomes and outputs. SN could collect this information from individual team members and record it. (Al will show her the database, as she meets with individuals, she can populate data.)
- **What are you willing to invest?** Dave: support, provide assistance and training to AiE, training in weed ID to clientele and general turf training and irrigation, provide resources to solve larger technical problems. Most of Dave's work is supported by gifts; he spends more than he brings in supporting his technician (Jeff). He gets few and small grants from USGA program. If we were to become very successful, would USGA provide support? Probably not – probably would have to be private funding. Kai: there was some talk with the Cardinals and sports turf managers association (Jimmy Fox) to support training for turf managers.
- **Resources for Shaku.** Kai: Does Shaku have wheels? Could use the Martix in coordination with Al. Computer: Lydia's old computer is available for Shaku or possibly Lucy if Shaku wants a PC. Kai: another resource is the agents at MARCO that are already working with schools: Monica (food safety), Wet program, SNAP ED program. Could we develop a single slide about SIPMI&O to present through these programs? Kai says it is a good idea.
- Specific Outputs needed or in progress (we should maintain an ongoing list):
  - Bed bugs in class rooms – for facility managers (steps on how to address)
  - Tree selection
  - Tree trimming
  - Tree irrigation
  - Standards of turfgrass low maintenance
  - 3 related to turf irrigation

- Scabies
- Troubleshooting turf issues
- FAQs?

Develop a closer relationship with the commercial industry that serves the schools: an industry that is willing to be the multiplier through our trainings. Kai: We need to become the recognized go-to entity by end users. Peter argues it is better to reach the multipliers in the professional industry.