



**IPM Coordinating Committee
 Maricopa Agricultural Center
 June 3, 2010 – 12pm to 3pm**

Participants:

Paul Baker (Entomology)*	Stacey Bealmer (Yuma County)
Pat Clay (Valent)	Peter Ellsworth (Entomology, MAC)
Ed Martin (ex-officio, CE)	Rick Gibson (Pinal County)
Mike Matheron (Plant Sci, YAC)	Erin Taylor (Maricopa / Pinal County)
Bob Roth (ex-officio, MAC)	Ursula Schuch (Plant Sciences)
Al Fournier (Entomology, MAC)	

*joined by phone.

I. Pesticide Safety Education Program

The Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) supports CE faculty efforts related to developing and/or delivering pesticide safety education to clientele throughout the state of Arizona. UA faculty members submitted six proposals totaling \$48,714 to the IPM Coordinating Committee in response to a request for proposals (RFP). This year, \$23,276 was available in PSEP funds. We have also requested an additional \$15,000 from EPA region 9 to add to our mini-grant program. This additional money will also help us develop and deliver fumigant training needed to address new fumigant labels coming in 2011. Preliminary funding decisions were made based on proposal merit as determined by committee member scores and comments, and on budget discussions of the committee members present. All six proposals were recommended for funding, some at reduced levels. Preliminary funding levels shown below are contingent upon receipt of the additional \$15,000 from EPA Region 9.

PI	Title	Request	Preliminary Award
Gouge	Advanced IPM Service Providers for Green Communities	\$5,000	\$3,176
Grumbles	Mohave County Pesticide Training and Continuing Education Workshops	\$4,000	\$4,000
Kopec	Turfgrass Pest Management for Arizona	\$6,500	\$3,500
Norton	Development and Implementation of a Statewide Training and Education Program for the Use of Soil Fumigants in Arizona Crop Production Systems	\$10,000	\$10,000
Schuch	IPM and Pesticide Safety Training for Arizona Green Professional	\$2,600	\$2,600
Umeda, Schalau & Northam	Pesticide Applicator Training/Testing for Arizona Weed Management Personnel	\$20,614	\$15,000
Total		\$48,714.00	\$38,276.00

II. NIFA Update

- **The status of IPM nationally, 406 programs, IPM Centers (what we know)**

IPM research and extension is funded in three ways: through the Extension IPM (EIPM) program, through the Regional IPM Competitive grants (RIPM), and through 406 programs (which includes the regional IPM Centers, and RAMP and CAR, two large grant programs, and Methyl Bromide Transitions program). Funding for the 406 programs has been zeroed out of the President's budget. This funding could potentially be restored by congress, but is uncertain at this time. The Regional IPM Centers serve as an important funding source for implementation of "local" state and regional IPM projects. This is distinct from AFRI, which requires all grants be multi-state, multidisciplinary, etc. The potential elimination of 406 funding, especially the IPM Centers, has been a source of much debate. Advocates for the 406 programs are proposing two possible options for restoring this funding. Option 1: lobby congress to sustain the old 406 line. Option 2: restore funding, but move funds into the new AFRI programs. (Note: If the Regional IPM Centers are to continue, there will be a competitive call in about a year.)

- **AFRI grant programs call for public comment**

AFRI, the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative, has replaced NRI as the new funding arm of the USDA. It is quite different. Unlike NRI, AFRI requires multidisciplinary, multistate and integrated programs. It remains to be seen if AFRI will provide enough support for IPM Extension. On June 2 there was a public meeting to solicit input on the AFRI grant program. Public comments in writing are due June 7. This is a short timeline for the APMC to provide organized comments. Wording of AFRI implies less emphasis on urban IPM.

III. EIPM Program Update & Budget Review

Presentation

Peter presented information on our EIPM proposal, review panel comments and budget. A copy of this presentation has been posted to the APMC website at <http://cals.arizona.edu/apmc/coordinating.html#notes>. Presentation highlights follow.

- Grant goal: to put IPM into practice in diverse environments. Approach was to enhance local outreach through deployment of additional personnel resources, Assistants in Extension (AiE). We provided a sound rationale for this approach and for our proposed activities and areas of emphasis.
- Fiscal support from Extension and from Ag Experiment Station (Hatch funds) to Specialists is minimal to non-existent. Point is: the solution to supporting our IPM vision is not going to come from these sources.
- Vision for success: (1) Strengthen & stabilize our IPM infrastructure; (2) Invest in human resources critical to deployment of IPM programs (AiEs); (3) Achieve this through aggressive leveraging of other research and outreach funds.
- In the last 4 years of 3(d) formula funding for IPM, we leveraged the \$402K federal investment, increasing funds for IPM 10-fold, mainly through competitive grants, but with some intramural support. With the new competitive EIPM program, we have had about a 75% increase in the federal investment over the first 4 years for the competitive

program, \$706K. However, this is after a 50% cut from what we requested in the new (3-year) EIPM grant.

- **Panel comments on new EIPM grant.** Some biases were evident. Comments on balance were positive, especially with respect to technical aspects. But reviewers focused on budget and hiring of “new” personnel. Net rankings were punitive and taken out on the budget. (For more comments, see full presentation online.)
- **Take home message from presentation:**
 - No one person or activity is funded more than 50% from EIPM in our UA EIPM budget; participation in EIPM requires partnership by individual PIs and IPM Teams.
 - We need creative ideas to enhance funding! (e.g., Center for Insect Science gets a portion of IDC).
 - To fully implement what we proposed, some investment from CALS and / or Extension is needed.
 - We need to develop our revised budget and scope of work.
 - We need to recognize that EIPM cannot fund everything.
 - Major leveraging of programmatic and IPM project-based dollars will always be crucial (not just project-based support).
 - IPM Teams must develop their own plans for sustainability through aggressive leverage of extramural IPM funds, including support for Assistants in Extension.

Budget Review

- Peter presented a draft EIPM budget for one year. Funding will be flat over the 3 years.
- The proposed budget, with additional state and external investments shown, would fund our original plan to support three Assistants in Extension.
- The Urban AiE in Maricopa County is the only position with no leveraged external funding.
- All leveraged resources (personnel) in this budget will have other commitments. So the scope of work will need to be revised. AI will send out request for a revised scope of work to each team leader. The goal is to start new funding this summer.
- At the last meeting, the IPM Committee requested that Peter calculate the number that we are short on making the whole thing work. This amount is \$67,238 (inclusive of ERE).
- Jim C has said that the only commitments Extension can make are short term, perhaps 1–3 years.
- We did well on extramural grants that were pending when the committee last met. Three pending proposals that provide leveraged support for EIPM were all funded. (One each for Palumbo, Ellsworth and Fournier.)
- The group suggested Peter and AI can present our budget proposal to the Executive Council and request that CALS / Extension make up our funding gap of \$67,238. We will try to schedule a meeting with the EC in June.

IV. Other Issues

- Someone suggested that CALS deploy people (e.g., the Dean) to speak to the cities and urban people to generate matching dollars, to help us be successful in competitive grants. Upshot of the discussion is that communication needs to be improved.

- People are portraying Extension as a regulatory agency. Dairy industry, nurseryman's association, are perceiving CE as a regulatory agency. (What can be planted or not, quarantine issues, etc.) It is a common imaging problem for Extension. We need to educate our stakeholders that we are in fact educators and not regulators.
- At the April 12 Horticulture Extension meeting, an issue was raised about the Office of Pest Management (OPM) and the difficulty of getting CEUs approved on a timely basis. Dawn Gouge spoke with representatives of that agency and has been told that their system for CEU approval has now been improved. There should be a quicker turn around on CEU requests. They are asking that sponsors submit programs for approval at least six weeks in advance.