



**IPM Coordinating Committee
Maricopa Agricultural Center
Oct 22, 2009 – 12pm to 3pm**

Participants:

Peter Ellsworth (Entomology, MAC)	Erin Taylor (Maricopa / Pinal County)
Rick Melnicoe (ex-officio, WIPMC, phone)	Bill McCloskey (Plant Sciences, by phone)
Ursula Schuch (Plant Sciences)	Kai Umeda (Maricopa County)
Al Fournier (MAC, Entomology)	Dawn Gouge (Entomology, MAC)

AGENDA

Purpose: This session will be dedicated to discussion and specific planning for the upcoming Extension IPM competitive grant. The RFA is scheduled for imminent release, but is not yet in hand. Our goal is to develop a strategic 3 to 4 year “vision” for statewide IPM Extension. Come prepared to present needs and goals for your area of interest.

I. Misc. Issues

(These are mostly the same as covered in Sept. 30 notes, with minor additions / revisions.)

- **WEDA Award for UA IPM Program.** The UA IPM Program was awarded Honorable Mention in the Western Extension Director’s Award of Excellence. Award certificates were made out to all IPM Coordinating Committee members, and were distributed to those present at the meeting.
- **Pesticide Safety Education Program update.** Peter Ellsworth was recently appointed Pesticide Coordinator by Jim Christenson. This is a federal designation and means Peter is responsible for the statewide Pesticide Safety Education Program. He represented our programs this year at the annual national meeting in Charleston, SC, where he presented information on the 1080 database and Crop Pest Losses data for evaluation of IPM programs. Fund received this year, about \$24,000, were distributed by the IPM CC in minigrants to faculty. This has resulted in a number of pesticide safety trainings throughout the state. We have heard very positive feedback from agents and clientele on this new system. This year, a new National CORE exam has been adopted in Arizona. At a recent Flagstaff training, 16 out of 17 people taking the exam passed it, a much higher percentage than in past years. Other trainings have taken place in Holbrook and Tsaille, with another planned for Casa Grande in November. Side note: Peter got a call from Tom Holtzer at CSU, who was asking for advice to emulate what we are doing in merging the PSEP program with the APMC.
- **Extension publication review process update.** The new system for reviewing IPM related Extension publications online is in place. Peter and Al are serving as editors. So far, we have had 9 publications submitted by faculty, 7 were accepted with various levels

of revision, and one was rejected and later resubmitted and accepted after substantial revisions. Any IPM publications this year will be reported as outcomes of the EIPM grant.

- **Budget Update.** This year accounting was challenging because we were managing carryover formula funds and new EIPM funds on two different systems. We have spent the remaining carryover funds by Sept 30, partly by using these funds for new EIPM project expenses. This has allowed us to “bank” about \$52,000 of EIPM funds, most of which will be carryover or emergency funds. (\$9,000 is reserved for collaborations.) Please note that we have some flexibility with the new EIPM funds. If funds designated for one PI or area of emphasis are more than are needed, funds can be shifted or saved as carryover funds.

II Preparing for the EIPM submission: What we know

- The RFA has been delayed several times. No word on an exact release date. The due date will be 60 days from its release. Proposals could be due before or after Christmas holiday, depending on the release date. We do not have details on page limits or funding limits within areas of emphasis. But we have been told that last year’s RFA is a good place to start.
- From national IPM committee meeting: Marty Draper reviewed 9 major points of feedback they received on last year’s RFA and proposal review process. These are copied below from those meeting notes, with comments and discussion points from today’s meeting in *italics*.

Nine major feedback comments from stakeholder input:

1. Recognize great value in having a network of IPM programs across states and funding of infrastructure is critical to maintaining program function.
2. Base IPM funding is requisite to states’ leveraging of additional IPM funds.
3. Importance of stakeholder involvement recognized. [Rick Melnicoe: *Make sure that stakeholders have identified the priorities you are addressing in your proposal.*]
4. Need a more formulaic distribution of funding for all or part of program. [Rick Melnicoe: *This was a comment that some people had that we should go back to formula funding or a similar approach. Others disagreed.*]
5. Duration of awards should be longer than one year.
6. Make extra effort to enhance review panel instructions and evaluation criteria due to the complexity of the program. [Rick Melnicoe: *There is a strong feeling that previous formula funding levels entered into review panel discussions and decisions.*]
7. Request the ability to host mini-grants/sub-awards in state programs. [Rick Melnicoe: *If this is allowed, you will need to describe the process in detail to satisfy reviewers.*]
8. Request that FY2010 RFA be simplified in the budget portion, remove funding caps from areas of emphases, increase page limits, emphasize program flexibility, and release RFA earlier.

9. Support a limit of one application submission per institution

Discussion of E-IPM Program (from national IPM committee notes):

“Concern expressed that we don’t want to give the impression that the way the program was run before changing to competitive was not working well.” Rick’s interpretation: *When communicating about the new competitive Extension IPM program, we should make it clear that these comments and suggestions for revising the RFA are not an indication that the new program is deficient in some way, or that we will not be able to develop and deliver effective IPM programs in the future.*

Rick: The new NIFA theme areas are going to be very important in the competitive process. We will need to explain in the proposal where we fit in well and where we do not fit with these themes.

New NIFA Themes

Current version of themes that will direct RFAs and funding and will serve as new organizational units for personnel:

1. Youth and community development
2. Bioenergy and climate change and environment
3. Food production and sustainability (IPM staff will likely be housed in this unit)
4. Food safety and nutrition

We discussed that IPM can fit into any of these themes.

III. Moving Ahead without the RFA: Strategic Discussion

Collaboration with other states. In the feedback on the previous EIPM RFA, some people thought we should eliminate the collaboration component from the grant program. Others thought the funding limit on it should be increased. Peter suspects the former opinion may win out. However, Peter believes that collaboration will be rewarded within the body of the proposal. We should argue that our in-state infrastructure allows us to successfully collaborate with other states. Ursula is interested in abiotic factors in the landscape; she’d like to work with Farm Advisors in California on this topic. Another way to handle it is to work out cooperation between the two states and have each state submit their own budgets for a joint project. It would be critical to have letters of collaboration on both sides to support the proposals, if this were done. Now is the time to have these kinds of discussions with colleagues in other states.

Start with the end in mind. Within each area of emphasis, team leaders should start by identifying concrete 3-4 year outcomes (behavior change, adoption of IPM, etc.) they would like to achieve. Then, they should identify what specific research and extension needs to happen to achieve these outcomes. We have to be careful about how we use the “research” word in the proposal. Ursula described a plan to implement and evaluate an education program for homeowners on abiotic factors, with a control group, using before and after measures of change. Increasing knowledge of abiotic factors will decrease pesticide use, which is one of the selling points for this concept. Suggestion: integrate her efforts with the Smartscape program. Possibly, this could be a 2-pronged program that targets both homeowners and professionals.

Dawn's goals for her Community IPM program are:

1. To have more than 50% of AZ school districts involved in IPM implementation. She will conduct a survey to get baseline data on current practices.
2. A fully-functioning Pest Management Professional (PMP) training program and IPM-endorsement program, with a goal of 20% of professionals certified by the end of the grant term.
3. A pilot training program for Section 8 public housing that would lead to adoption of IPM. She will do pre and post allergen testing to measure the overall health impact of these programs.

Desired Outcome: reduced allergen levels.

Kai: A few years back, he was involved in a national collaboration on an IPM Template for golf course superintendents. He may want to examine how this would be implemented in Arizona.

Diagnostics. We had a discussion about this at the previous meeting. At that meeting, Lin Evans commented that diagnostics was a service that clientele expect from CE. It was not clear that Mary Olsen plans to pursue funding for diagnostics through the EIPM proposal. If Mary or Carl do not intend to apply for funds, it was suggested that we might collaborate with Utah on diagnostics.

IV. Proposal Process.

Whoever is interested may participate in the proposal development process. The RFA, once released, will list the Areas of Emphasis available that we may choose to apply for. For each Area of emphasis, we will designate a Team Leader who is responsible for coordinating the input related to their area of emphasis.

What we need to develop the proposal for each Area of Emphasis:

1. Identify outcomes for each area of emphasis.
2. Determine what needs to happen to achieve this outcome.
3. Determine what resources are needed: existing and / or new human resources; travel and other needs. Provide a detailed budget and budget narrative. Funds could be used to recruit agent-level (non-continuing) positions. It would be good to get matching funds from industry, stakeholder groups, or from CALS. It may be more effective to request an "assistant in extension" rather than a "research assistant." Assistants in extension could be technical support or largely independent agent-like positions that could support multiple programs.
4. Document through stakeholder input why the problem you are addressing is important to clientele. Answer the question: How does this work fit with the IPM Roadmap, the RFA and the new NIFA themes?
5. Identify existing or intended leverage funds for what you are doing.
6. In general, we do not need letters of support. However, letters can be provided when absolutely necessary to document one of the following: (1) collaborative arrangements; (2) existing leverage or (3) stakeholder needs not otherwise documented.

We will not know the deadline for proposals until the RFA is released. Regardless of the deadline, we will have 8 weeks to complete the proposal after the RFA is released. We will need a plan in place for the process and the deadline. (See steps above.) If an emphasis area team cannot formulate concrete outcomes, that are probably will not be included in the final proposal. Teams/ team leaders can provide the above information to Peter and Al in prose or in bullet form. If anyone would like more material involvement in the drafting of the proposal, let Peter or Al know. Otherwise, we will work with what team leaders provide to draft the proposal.

Timeline

- Deadline of Nov 17 for proposal components from Team Leaders.

Note: Dawn will be unavailable in Dec. She will need to complete her proposal components prior to that time.

Note: Peter and Al will be out of town from Nov 4 to Nov 17.

Note: Al will coordinate the reporting process for this year's grant once we get more information from USDA. Reports will likely be due from current team leaders in July or August, 2010.