

**Community IPM Leadership Team  
Conference Call  
June 28, 2011**

Participants: Bryan, Peter, Kai, Al and Paul (on phone)

**Housekeeping**

- Dawn won't be applying for the grant with the national steering committee. It does not fit their action plan.
- Dawn does indoor training each year for City of Phoenix. They would like to add an outdoor component to the training in Spring 2012, a six-hour training for parks and rec personnel. Would need to get outdoor IPM specialists involved. Kai suggested expanding this to include not only PHX, but also other county park and rec people statewide. Many counties might be interested. Hit the big counties. Use a cost recovery model. Possible locations: Tucson, Casa Grande, Yuma, Flagstaff? **Bryan should send a blurb to the County directors to find out the level of interest.** Kai and Paul might collaborate on a PSEP minigrant to help support these trainings. **The team should put together a draft agenda for the workshop, who are speakers, etc. Further discuss this via email. Paul will send out his last agenda to be included in the notes.**
- We did not get the reduced risk grant from ADA. Jack felt it did not fit the call, which was for agricultural crops.
- Peter suggested: **Bryan should take this proposal as it is and send it to Rick Melnicoe, Director of WIPMC. Do you have any ideas on how this might be funded? First, Peter will call Rick to explain the background.**

**Next Steps in Indoor-Outdoor School IPM Program**

- We planned to do 2 schools in Tucson and 2 in Phoenix. What type of school sites should we seek to work with? Questions: Do all sites need to be the same school level, do they all need to have athletic fields, do we want new or existing landscapes to work with? Do we want schools already practicing some IPM? It may not matter. **Bryan: Get specific contacts from Dawn, Kai and Ursula for both school districts and schools, and include information about what level of interactions they have with the schools now.** The school where Bryan's wife will work near Queen Creek will have a brand new landscape and they have expressed some interest in possibly participating.
- Kai suggested Tempe Union school.
- The main question is who is willing to cooperate? Once we have that list of possible cooperators, we can choose from them based on other criteria. Paul thinks it is important to use a specific statistical model and have it in mind when we select the sites.
- Peter thought we had already identified through team member's existing contacts, some potential schools we could work with. Is this not the case?
- **We need each of the specialists to come up with the key items that need to be taught to the participating school districts. Before this, Bryan will review the detailed outcomes already provided from meeting in April (beyond the broader logic model) and the get further input from the specialists.** For example, to develop a survey to

measure changes in knowledge, we need to know what knowledge is most important to measure. **Ultimately, this should result in a working draft that can be reviewed by agents and others beyond this leadership committee.** What is the process? Who are the internal stakeholders? Agents, specialists, program coordinators.

- Paul: Where is the input from the external stakeholders about what is important? Some such input is critical to the development of the program. For each participating school, we need a process to identify what is important to them. We could develop an advisory committee including these folks. Kai suggested we do needs assessments at ongoing workshops we all do. In a previous meeting, we talked about developing an informational piece to be used when we approach potential participants. Develop as a flyer for what we think is important, but at that first meeting with potential participants, ask them what is important to them. Start by asking them their most important goals, and then measure success for their school against their own goals. In formulating what is important, we should highlight economic benefits of IPM, because of tight budgets.
- Bryan and Kai developed a rough draft of an “initial survey” for the outdoors. At the last meeting, we talked about reviewing some of the other survey tools that already exist. Bryan reviewed a survey from Rutgers that provides a series of Yes/No questions for the outdoors, with a rating system. Target audience is facility managers. Provides a picture of the environment and what they are already doing. Bryan suggested using this as a tool to evaluate potential school districts that might participate. Paul: not that it is not potentially useful, but how much of a priority is this? High, medium or low? Kai: this would provide baseline data to identify where a school needs help. It could help focus the teaching effort. It could be modified and used as part of the site assessment process at participating schools. But it is probably not appropriate for use as a pre-and-post measurement survey.
- We may have a very small target audience for our assessment: perhaps 2 site managers per school. Is a survey appropriate or would an interview be more effective? It is important to keep whatever we do fairly short and easy to ensure good participation.
- Bryan suggests we get the full team together soon face to face to better map out the specifics of what we are going to do: tie each expected outcome to specific activities.
- Kai pointed out there are different target audiences for the training and will require different questions for different people. This could even include community members beyond the school personnel. But only if that is a key need or issue for a specific site we work with.

#### **Next steps:**

1. Specialists need to identify key contacts from schools we already have relationships with. **(Before July 18)**
2. Bryan needs to review information from previous meetings to develop a “topic pool” from this; then send out for review, first to leadership team **(by July 11)**, then to get broader internal stakeholders such as agents, etc. **(later)**, (possibly do a face-to-face meeting later in the process). Potential selective participants to get input from: Stacey Bealmear, Peter K, Kelly Young, Mary Olsen, Paul Brown, Bill McCloskey. A part of this process is ensuring that specialists identify their Top Key outcomes for what people learn and what people do.

3. Develop a flyer / informational packet of things we see IPM having an impact on. This will be used to “sell” the program to participants.
4. **Next phone conference: July 18 at 11 am.**

Action items:

**Bryan:**

Send blurb to county directors to find out the level of interest in having us present an indoor outdoor program in their area.

After Peter talks with Rick Melnicoe about indoor outdoor package, maybe send him the grant proposal in hopes of getting some funds.

Create working list of outcomes from April brainstorming and put items into topics and then send out to committee for further comment/development of list.

Get specific contacts from Dawn, Kai and Ursula for potential school districts and schools and include information about what level of interactions they have with the schools now.

**Specialists:**

Gather specific school contacts and level of interaction to Bryan for potential sites

Develop the key items that need to be taught to the participating school districts.

Paul will send out his last agenda from pima county parks and rec training to be included in the notes.

Maybe Dawn could include an agenda for what she does with the city of Phoenix so we can develop a plan for combining the indoor and outdoor training.

The team should put together a draft agenda for the workshop, who are speakers, etc. Further discuss this via email.

**Finalized notes:**

COP and other municipalities:

Need to further discuss this project and define our true goals.

Paul agenda:

Park and Recreation CEU Class-Program  
May 17, 2011  
3500 W. River Rd. NRPR Office  
Tucson, AZ The course number is **0511/13/6.0**

7:30-8 Registration

**Presentations are 50 minutes with 10 for transition**

8-9 Dave Kopec- “New products in weed control”

9-10 Javier G.M. Bada-U of A “Ants in Tucson Parks: Diversity, Importance and Management”

10-11 Dave Kopec- “Sports turf maintenance calendars, cultural and chemical

11-12 Andrew Greess – “Spray Equipment –Top 10 Tips to Avoid Problems”

12-12:45 Lunch on your own

12:45-1:35 Scott Richardson – “The new OPM and the Laws, Rules and why do I care?”

1:45-2:35 Bryan Stevens- “Using IPM in Tucson City Parks”

[Dawns agends:](#)

Dawn H. Gouge Monica Rabb Robert Tolton

University of Arizona City of Phoenix Arizona Office of Pest Management

## **Integrated Pest Management Assembly Room Phoenix City Hall 200 W. Washington St. Phoenix, AZ**

**March 18<sup>th</sup> & 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011 7am-2:30pm**

**Agenda Day 1 Friday March 18<sup>th</sup> 2011 IPM philosophy and pesticide safety (3 CEUS)**

7:00-10:30am

7:00 – 7:10am 7:10 – 7:50am *Break* 8:00 – 8:50am *Break*

9:00 – 9:50am continued

Pop quiz

**10:30-11:00am**

Introductions IPM philosophy

Pesticide safety

Pesticide safety

**Lunch**

*Rodents and bees (3 CEUS) 11:00am-2:30pm*

11:00-11:50am

*Break*

Noon-12:50pm

*Break*

1:00-1:50pm Pop quiz **2:30pm adjourn**

Reasons for managing rodents, biology, ecology, monitoring.

Rodent control

Feral honey bees

1Dawn H. Gouge Monica Rabb Robert Tolton

**Day 2 Friday March 25<sup>th</sup> 2011**

Biology, Ecology and management of: bed bugs, ants, cockroaches, mosquitoes. (6 CEUs)

7:00 – 7:50am

*Break*

8:00 – 8:50am

*Break*

9:00 – 9:50am Pop quiz **10:30-11:00am**

11:00-11:50am

*Break*

Noon-12:50pm

*Break*

1:00-1:50pm Pop quiz **2:30pm adjourn**

Introduction to bed bugs

More on bed bugs

Cockroaches

**Lunch**

Mosquitoes

Ants

Spiders and scorpions

University of Arizona City of Phoenix Arizona Office of Pest Management

2

Potential grants to apply for:

Hi Bryan,

I think your proposal would fit in two upcoming RFAs that I know of. First, the Regional IPM Grants Program from USDA-NIFA. You can access last year's RFA from the Western IPM Centers funding opportunities archives. This year's should be similar and is expected to be released in late September.

Second, and more complicated, I will be applying for one more year of managing the Western IPM Center if an RFA comes out for one more year of funding in the coming weeks. This is more complicated because normally it would be for a four year grant, but congress only provided 75% of annual funding for one year. We don't know if the Regional IPM Centers will be funded after this one additional year. Regardless, if we are successful in obtaining the additional year's monies, we plan to release an RFA before the end of this year. Your proposal should be eligible under our current priorities and thinking.

I have added you to my RFA mailing list, so you will receive direct notification.

Welcome aboard!

Rick