



COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE  
AND LIFE SCIENCES  
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION  
Arizona Pest Management Center

**IPM Coordinating Committee  
Maricopa Ag Center  
Wednesday - April 30, 2014  
10:00 am – 2:00 pm**

*Membership:*

Paul Baker (Entomology)	Stacey Bealmer (Yuma County)
Paul Brown (ex-officio, UA CE)	Casey Butler (stakeholder)
Peter Ellsworth (Entomology, MAC)	Jim Farrar (Director, WIPMC)
Lin Evans (PCA, stakeholder)	George Frisvold (Ag Economics)
Dawn Gouge (Entomology, MAC)	Shawna Loper (Maricopa/Pinal/Pima Counties)
Mike Matheron (Plant Sci, YAC)	Bill McCloskey (Plant Sciences)
Tom Montoya (PCA, stakeholder)	Ayman Mostafa (Maricopa/Pinal/Pima Counties)
John Palumbo (Entomology, YAC)	Jack Peterson (AZ Dept. of Ag.)
Barry Pryor (Plant Sci, AZ PDN)	Bob Roth (ex-officio, MAC)
Ursula Schuch (Plant Sciences)	Karen Schumaker (Sch. Plant Sciences, corresponding)
Kai Umeda (Maricopa County)	

Attended: attended by teleconference

Also attending: Shaku Nair, Christopher Bibbs, Lucy Li, Wayne Dixon, Dave Kopec.

### Meeting Notes

#### Introductions

*New Members present:* Casey Butler (Syngenta), Jim Farrar (Western IPM Center).  
Karen Schumaker, Director, School of Plant Sciences could not attend but will participate a corresponding member.

#### Extension IPM: New 3-year grant planning discussion

We were anticipating the release of the RFA for USDA-NIFA's Extension IPM Coordination and Support program prior to this meeting, but it has not been released. So we will be speaking of it in hypothetical terms today. Extension IPM grant is institutional but competitive. We compete with other states for Extension IPM support. For us, we view this as a capacity grant that supports our infrastructure. Before 2009, this was a formula funded program.

Today is a focus and strategy session to help us plan the priorities and budget for the next grant cycle. We want to hear your ideas!

#### APMC chronology

- 2003: Concept of the Arizona Pest Management Center (APMC) was proposed to the CALS Executive Council.
- 2004: First funding received from the Western IPM Center.
- 2004: First IPM Coordinating Committee meeting, Peter became IPM Coordinator.
- 2005: Al was hired as IPM Program Manager.
- 2006: APMC Summit brought in 100+ stakeholders to help determine major priorities.

- 2008: Brought in Database Specialist to work on Pesticide Use data for IPM assessment.
- The formation of the APMC anticipated that formula funds would go competitive, which they did in 2008.
- 2009: Peter became state Pesticide Coordinator, taking Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) under the APMC.
- 2010: Hired Marco Pena, now Assistant in Extension (AiE) for Vegetable IPM Team and Wayne Dixon, AiE for IPM Assessment.
- 2011: Hired Lydia Brown AiE for Agronomic Crops IPM and Bryan Stevens, AiE for Community IPM
- 2013: Shaku Nair replaces Stevens as AiE for Community IPM, Lucy Li hired as AiE for Public Health IPM

### History of Funding

- Formula funding was about 100k / year until 2009.
- First competitive 1-yr grant: 81% increase to 181k.
- Next 3 year grant funded for 175k/year
- 2013: re-competed for a new 3-year grant: another 40% increase to \$250k/year. Second highest ranked proposal nationally.
- Funding authority for this program changed to a new “Crop Protection” budget line (includes EIPM, IPM Centers grant, Regional IPM Competitive (RIPM) grant and Pest Management Alternative Programs (PMAP). Because of this change, our year 2 & 3 funding has disappeared and we are now re-competing for what we presume may be a new 3-year grant (term could be shorter).
- Since we do not have the RFA in hand, we work from assumptions. We have heard from NIFA program leaders that input from stakeholders suggested the program itself not change much. So we are working from last year’s RFA to inform our discussions today.

### APMC Organization

Peter reviewed the organizational structure of the APMC, which was included in one of the handouts (Impact Statement). One slide showed how each of the Assistants in Extension and Al Fournier, IPM Program Manager are connected to the structure. Human assets are most important to what we do. We fund a portion Al and all the Assistants in Extension, which represents 95% of the competitive EIPM budget. Our philosophy is that we will fund up to 50% of these positions. The individuals and their teams have to come up with other competitive funds to support the balance of these positions. Each AiE works with faculty on a Leadership Team. The team manages the asset and the AiE helps coordinate and drive the team and support their goals. Each Leadership Team is made up of a small number of faculty, not everyone working an area, but they interface with other Extension personnel and stakeholders who may not sit on the Leadership Team. Leadership Team Chairs are:

- Vegetable IPM: John Palumbo
- Cotton / Agronomic IPM: Peter Ellsworth
- Community IPM: Dawn Gouge
- IPM Assessment: Al Fournier

### Group Exercise: Sharing IPM Insights.

From last year’s RFA: “available funds will be distributed among the highest ranked EIPM Coordination proposals. Not all applicants should expect to get funded.” Last year, only 2 states received no funding from this program. We will conduct a group activity to help identify the most important things the APMC does, to help us focus on what is most important to support.

#### Instructions:

1. Each person will consider the following (2 min.): “The best IPM outcome I am aware of or have personally experienced as a result of interacting with the APMC and its staff is...”
2. Starting with non-APMC staff, each person will then share their experience with their group & discuss (15 minutes)
3. IPM CC reconvenes and each group reports back their findings to the larger group (15 minutes)

#### Results:

##### Group 1: Peter, Dave and Shawna.

- Organizationally: the APMC structure allows us to move forward with a common vision. It has facilitated more conversation among individuals within multidisciplinary, integrated teams.
- Direct teaching and outreach to stakeholders: e.g., a school (Metrotech) that transformed their approach to bed bug management, irrigation management, etc., because of training and input from the Community IPM Team.
- Lydia, AiE for agronomic IPM, improves everyone’s awareness of pest conditions, which agents can communicate to clientele.
- AI’s role: increasing awareness and providing training in evaluation to enable gathering of evaluation data; organizing our outputs

##### Group 2: Dawn, Wayne, George, Jim

- Crop Pest Losses program is of significant value: a tool for evaluation, needs assessment and tracking of data; understanding why specific pesticides are used in various crops, and benchmarking practices. Peter, Bill, John, Mike, Barry, Marco, Lydia, Wayne and AI are all involved in this program. Also, the Pesticide Use Database is a great resource for understanding trends and evaluating outcomes.
- Example of looking at housing authority in Phoenix: they developed an IPM policy for how units were processed between residents. Great outcomes: one facility qualified for a multi-million dollar grant to help renovate a facility, facilitated by our involvement. With AI’s input, the team captured data on how many units were infested by bed bugs or cockroaches (about 30%, 500 people impacted by pests). Residents moved back into pest free environments.

##### Group 3: Ayman, Casey, Lucy, Christopher

- Issue driven research, the emphasis on stakeholder input. This research is quite visible to clientele.
- Educational activities and research are all leading to better engagement of clientele and developing ongoing relationships.

##### Group 4: John, Shaku, Tom

- Talked about the Crop Pest Losses program and the impact it has had. PCA perspective from Tom: it has improved awareness of costs and issues in these crops.
- Also talked about impacts of Community IPM Team at Metro Tech.
- Assistants in Extension: they increase our outcomes by acting as hubs to organize team activities. This increases the capacity for outreach across all teams.
- in particular, Christopher Bibbs has been a valuable resources for IPM diagnostics; quick turn-around of samples facilitates IPM decision making.

##### Group 5: Mike, Kai, AI

- Having AiEs in place across teams has translated into real outcomes and impacts on clientele out in the community: showing people the benefits of IPM in the various environments. For example,

the Veg IPM Updates really connect us to end users are improving knowledge and practices in the environment. It would not happen without Marco. Another example is the Field Crops IPM Shorts. Lydia's coordination of this is central to getting the information to stakeholders.

- APMC has brought IPM to the forefront within the college, increasing the visibility of all our IPM programs. It seems to be unique to have a cohesive multidisciplinary unit like this that bridges gaps between disciplines, departments, specialists and agents: all contribute the vision and the implementation of the program. Example is School IPM Inside and Out program implemented by the Community IPM Team. Now schools are getting the full range of IPM training across structures, trees and turf.
- Improved reporting by having the Outputs Database (created by Wayne) and contributed from by all AIEs, for their teams.

Other comments from discussion:

- Better and increased engagement and industry support, for example providing CEUs.
- Peter: This input is very helpful for development of the grant, which Peter and AI will write. "Showing up is 80% of life" – Woody Allen. Taken in context, this famous quote was not exactly about showing up, but it was more about actually doing something. For us it is about getting out and helping end users implement IPM in these diverse environments.
- Tom: You have to talk to different growers and end users about IPM in very different ways.
- We take great pride in all out teams have accomplished and measured in their IPM programs. The good work of these teams makes Peter and AI's task of writing a competitive proposal much easier.

### E-IPM Application

There is no uniform description of Extension. Our definition is: Extension is problem-solving issue-driven research plus engaged outreach with measured outcomes over a timescale sufficient to ultimately change behaviors and conditions. This view is not universal and we have to be carefully how we communicate what we do in the proposal.

From last year's RFA:

Primary Emphasis Areas (must apply for at least one, no cap on request beyond \$300k cap for full proposal):

- Agronomic Crops
- Animal Ag
- Communities
- Specialty Crops

Secondary Emphasis Areas (optional, capped at \$50,000)

- Conservation partnerships
- Pest diagnostics
- Housing – public housing, tribal housing, underserved
- Pesticide applicators – linkage of IPM to Pesticide Safety Education Program
- Public health – does not include bed bugs; ticks, mosquitoes, lice, disease vectors
- Recreational lands – parks, athletic fields, golf courses, etc.
- Schools
- Wide-area pest monitoring and reporting systems – IPM-PIPE is a national program, disease forecasting, etc.

Last year we applied for 2 primary emphasis areas: Agronomic Crops and Specialty Crops and one secondary area: School IPM. We did not apply for funds under diagnostics, but we did invest in diagnostics, supporting Christopher's assistantship. We wrote to only 3 emphasis areas last year in part strategically, to ensure we had enough space to write effectively about the things we do. Peter charted amount awarded to states versus number of emphasis areas they applied for. There was a weak positive relationship between the number of emphasis areas applied for versus amount funded. \

Should we apply for any additional emphasis area this year?

- Dawn: Public Health we currently have an investment in with Lucy. We might also apply for housing, pesticide applicators, community IPM (primary emphasis area focusing on master gardeners) and diagnostics. Graph suggests more emphasis areas in request are correlated with a larger award. Based on Peter's other chart, no states in the West applied for conservation or housing emphasis areas.

The new grant will allow Indirect Costs (IDC) at 30% of total award, which translates to 42.835% of direct (project) costs. EIPM previously did not allow IDC. So this reduces the amount of actually money to fund our programs. Everything we budgeted for through EIPM last year (not all investments the APMC made) could almost be funded if we increase what we ask for the maximum award of 300k. We also know that the total amount of funding to the EIPM program is not higher to compensate for the change in IDC.

Can the College reduce the IDC they take? This dialog has not yet occurred. CALS previous administration used to contribute additional funds, around 55k per year, to support IPM programs, but this is not likely to occur in the current administration.

#### APMC Investments: Group Discussion

#### **Review of APMC Staff and E-IPM Budget Investments**

All APMC funded staff were asked to leave the room so that the IPM Coordinating Committee could discuss their strategic roles in the function of the APMC. Notes were kept by Dave Kopeck and are excerpted here.

An online survey was distributed to IPM CC members prior to the meeting centered on the strategic investments of the APMC. This was in contrast to last year when the survey was sent out after this meeting. In the latter case, this gave "new" members a better context for understanding our investments. Given that we again have new members this year, it was agreed that Peter would re-issue a survey as follow-up to this meeting. The average survey time was just 5 minutes. So we hope to get a nearly complete set of responses.

**All of the funded positions of the APMC are highly valued**, as was evidenced by the exercise conducted earlier in the meeting. However, we don't know the specifics of the upcoming RFA and Peter wished to get some solid input from the committee on priorities for handling any potential shortfalls. It was clear from discussions that virtually all other funding could be reduced in favor of the APMC staff; i.e., travel and operations. Peter also made clear that E-IPM and the budget for it might not be the only source of funds to make us whole.

The group embarked on a process of discussing each APMC staff member relative to the investments made in the E-IPM proposal. Peter re-iterated that even if we don't apply to a specific emphasis area, we can (and have) invested in personnel to support those areas. He also pointed out that we were only able to fund the Pest Diagnostics student assistantship just 2 years out of the last 5. There was much discussion about the IT temp wages funds to explain what this person does and how they impact the function of the APMC and our programs. That said, as a temporary wage category, most were in favor of cutting this, if needed. We discussed scenarios where our funding might be cut 10% or >20% relative to current funding levels. Peter reminded the Committee that our present day spending is at about

1.5x of normal, meaning it is not sustainable. Teams will need to actively plan for and manage their leveraged resources (beyond E-IPM) invested in these valuable staff.

The group concluded that a series of remedies should be considered:

- 1) Increase our funding request to \$300,000 per year or higher, based on what the RFA will permit (this was the cap last time), a 25% increase over the current award.
- 2) Request endorsement from CALS to the VP of Research to take no more than 30% of Direct Costs, as is the spirit of the RFAs in Section 406 programs (where E-IPM will be located). This measure could save us 12.85%.
- 3) Zero out all travel and operations except where required for the IPM Coordinator (Peter's travel to report on our program). Teams would be expected to write-in more/all of their operational costs onto grants, gifts and contracts.
- 4) Reduce E-IPM investment from 50% to 40% for Al's position. Al is the only APMC staff who has state money assigned to his line (ca. 27%). This move would still provide at least half of the remaining moneys needed to fund Al's position. Al and teams have been very successful in garnering extramural funding for his position. So this is considered a low risk change.
- 5) E-IPM will reap some savings with the reduction of ERE on faculty lines from 30% to 28.6%.
- 6) If needed, consider reduction of E-IPM investments in each line from the previously established 50% cost-share to 40% cost-share. There was some discussion on how this might be perceived both by teams and by panel members evaluating our proposal and its budget.
- 7) Seek support from CALS. CALS supported our previous 3-yr term with about \$55,000 per year in state moneys that when managed at the time created value closer to \$75,000. This brought our \$175,000 budget to nearly \$250,000 per year, the level at which we operate now without CALS funds. Because we received our full funding request from E-IPM last year, we did not solicit CALS for additional funds. CALS fiscal situation is not terribly good and requests for support will require major justifications.

...

Conclusion from today's exercise is that human capital is the most important investment the APMC makes.

When the RFA arrives, Peter and Al will review and analyze and may seek further input from the committee group by email. We expect to be revising last year's proposal with some careful refinements. We will need a statement from each team on outputs and deliverables. "Identify at least one new thing you will be doing in your program / team that is new or different." Al will send a request out to team chairs the commitments from the last proposal and ask about any modifications.

### **Western IPM Center Update – Jim Farrar, Director**

The Western IPM Center is one of 4 regional IPM Centers. Based at UC Davis, one of their roles is to facilitate collaboration among states and territories, tribes.

Jim presented a map view of the various programs and the people they reach.

- Comment coordinators (including Al Fournier for the desert southwest) respond to pesticide information requests from EPA and USDA.
- Crop Pest Losses is one of 3 Signature Programs of the Western IPM Center. These are programs that have broad impact and which grantees are encouraged to interface and collaborate with. Al, Lydia and Wayne work in these programs along with Peter and John.
- The map shows how well AZ is connected to the WIPMC and colleagues throughout the west.
- Peter and Al are working with WIPMC on a committee to integrate IPM into IR-4 decision-making process.

- The WIPMC has a grant program that generally is released in the Fall. This past cycle, 2 out of 8 funded projects were from Arizona PIs: A handbook of urban pests (Shaku, lead PI) and an Outreach grant to incorporate natural enemies into whitefly decision making in cotton (Tim Vandervoet, Peter's Ph.D student lead PI).
- A pesticide safety project is being funded this year by WIPMC, one submitted by a commodity group.
- If funded as Western IPM Center again this year, anticipate center grants to come out in the Fall.

### **Pesticide Safety Education Assistant in Extension Position**

Peter and AI were funded on a 3-year Pesticide Safety Education Program Improvement and Modernization Initiative (PSEP-IMI) grant (\$25k/y). The purpose is to form an advisory committee of key stakeholders for pesticide safety training statewide and to work with this group to develop a plan for sustainability of PSEP in Arizona. We are leveraging this with other funds including general PSEP resources and a small college contribution to support a new position, Assistant in Extension for Pesticide Safety. In addition to convening the committee described above and coordinating their efforts, the person will work with faculty, ADA and other stakeholders to develop and implement pesticide safety education training throughout Arizona. The position was announced a couple of weeks ago. We currently have 6 applicants. Search committee, which Peter chairs, will meet May 22 to review candidates.

- If you are aware of any good potential candidates for this job, encourage them to apply.
- Please let Peter or AI know of any good contacts representing key stakeholders in agriculture, urban pest management or natural environments that may serve on the advisory committee. AI is maintaining a list.
- Position description here:  
[http://ag.arizona.edu/crops/jobs/Job\\_Openings/Assistant\\_in\\_Extension\\_PSEP.pdf](http://ag.arizona.edu/crops/jobs/Job_Openings/Assistant_in_Extension_PSEP.pdf)