



IPM Coordinating Committee
Maricopa Agricultural Center
Friday, Dec 15, 2006

Membership:

Paul Baker (Entomology)	Pat Clay (Maricopa County)
Peter Ellsworth (Entomology, MAC)	Lin Evans (stakeholder)
Al Fournier (MAC)	*#Rick Gibson (Pinal County)
Dawn Gouge (Entomology, MAC)	
*#Rick Melnicoe (ex-officio, WRPMC)	Kim McReynolds (Cochise Co)
Mary Olsen (Plant Sciences)	*#John Palumbo (Entomology, YAC)
Bob Roth (ex-officio, MAC)	Deb Young (ex-officio, CE)
*Jeff Silvertooth (corresponding member, SWES)	

*Not present for the meeting; #Provided comments/scores for proposals

1. Brief Update on APMC Activities

- National School IPM Pest Management Strategic Plan. Dawn Gouge and Al Fournier participated in the meeting for this PMSP (NV, Oct 24-25), and the final document should be available by this summer.
- Cotton PMSP. Peter Ellsworth and Al Fournier plan to coordinate a Cotton PMSP for Arizona, with support from the Western IPM Center. With cooperation of the Cotton Growers Association, this is expected to happen in Feb 2007; date and location TBD.
- APMC Website is now available at cals.arizona.edu/apmc. We posted the finalized priorities from the APMC Summit meeting.
- ACPA Manual project. This is the project that was funded through the APMC call earlier this year to revise the training materials for certification of agricultural Pest Management Advisors. In an early Nov meeting, good progress was made on a plan for completing the project. Target date for completion is early May 2007, prior to the Desert Ag Conference.
- Discussion of Pesticide Applicator Training needs for weed mgt. The APMC hosted a meeting of UA faculty, ADA and Structural Pest Control Commission leadership, and representatives from numerous federal agencies, to document needs and resources relative to PAT needs, particularly for weed management.

The discussion was productive, and resulted in several action items expected to reduce training need and maximize efficient use of resources. The group agreed to meet at next year's Southwest Vegetation Management Association meeting for a follow-up discussion.

- Report on Regional and National IPM Program Committee meetings. A major topic of the National IPM meeting was the Endangered Species Act. Development of a new national database that will be referenced on the pesticide label to provide application guidelines /prohibitions for very specific areas.
- Western IPM Center Advisory Council participation. Al Fournier and Dawn Gouge have both accepted offers to serve on the Western IPM Center Advisory council. The Council meets once per year with additional phone and email work throughout the year, and serves in conjunction with a separate steering committee to advise the WIPMC on activities and direction.

2. Policy Issues

- Approval of operations funding for the APMC. The committee is already aware of approval of \$5000 in operations funds for the APMC that have been made available to Al for travel and operations expenses related to the APMC, per the policy memo that was circulated and approved by the group over email. This committee will review annual expenditures and these unused funds will be returned to the IPM pot.
- Al Fournier emailed a memo to the IPM Committee by Paul Baker, Peter Ellsworth and himself on the process for PAT allocation decisions. Basically, the memo suggested that the IPM Coordinating Committee could serve an advisory function to Paul Baker (Pesticide Coordinator) on decisions about PAT allocations. Deb clarified that, while Paul is the coordinator responsible for the funds, that actually Jim Christenson, as Director of Extension has final signature authority on these decisions. Paul explained that, while he currently gets \$15,700 in PAT funds, this resource is expected to go competitive through a regional center approach, probably in 2007. So this suggested policy change may only be relevant for one year. In the past, these funds have supported a technician to answer the phone, assist in the running of the PITO office and keeping the website going. Paul wants to maintain a virtual office presence with a portion of the funds. A motion was passed to make the suggested policy changes official, with the addition of a reference about Christenson's signature authority.

3. Review of 3(d) IPM proposals

Discussion: Purpose of these funds:

- A leveraged source (existing or future) to help people accomplish IPM goals (seed or capstone funds).
- Something to expand the impact of IPM.
- Some committee members don't like the idea of funding something that is ongoing (e.g., "program funds," websites). If something is a repeat proposal, an ongoing effort, does it

make sense to keep funding these through a competitive process? For example, perhaps certain core activities should be funded separate from the call.

- It is important that projects go from research through the extension/outreach component; the extension plan needs to be addressed in the proposal.
- While there was some disagreement over some of these issues, it was pointed out the purpose of having the IPM Coordinating Committee is to ensure that diverse views on IPM funding issues are represented.

Funding Decisions

Funds available: \$40,000 (2007 3(d) IPM funds – AI’s Salary – 5k in operations = 40k)

A total of 13 proposals were received, requesting total funding of \$109,168. The committee reviewed the proposals and ranked them, incorporating rankings provided by all committee members who were not present (except for Jeff Silvertooth, who is now a corresponding member of the committee). Comments of committee members not present were read aloud as each proposal was discussed. After discussion, the committee decided to fund 7 of the proposals, all but one of these at reduced rates, as noted below, for a total of \$33,000. In addition, Jeff Schalau’s proposal for Pesticide Applicator Training (PAT) will be funded for the full amount from PAT funds. All IPM funds made available through this program must be expended by September 30, 2006.

PI	Topic	Requested Budget	Funded Budget
Byrne	Whitefly parasitoids	2,807	Don't fund
Degomez	Slash management for bark beetles	8,836	Don't fund
Dennehy	Management of mosquitoes	10,814	Don't fund
Fournier	The 1080 database	8,000	8,000
Fournier	ACIS	5,500	3,000
Gouge	Children's Environmental Health	8,092	4,000
Kubota	Grafting in Arizona melon production	10,986	7,000
Li	Detection of whitefly biotype Q	8,000	Don't fund
Northam	Updates to Guide to AZ Weeds	13,500	4,500
Orr	2007 Bufflegrass Summit	11,300	2,500
			3,700, fund through PAT
Schalau	Pesticide Applicator Training in N. AZ	3,700	through PAT
Stock	Nematodes against nematodes	7,133	Don't fund
Umeda	Pest status of billbugs in AZ turf	10,500	4,000
TOTAL		109,168	33,000

After funding decisions for priority projects were made, \$7,000 remained. The committee discussed the possibility of leaving some funds on the table rather than funding lower-priority projects. Two projects in particular were discussed that, while having the potential to address important IPM issues, were not deemed consistent with the goals of this call in their current form. Several options for the use of the remaining funds were considered:

1. Hold the money; add it to next year's funds (10% carry-over is allowed)
2. Seek a targeted request – go back to specific PIs and ask them to revise their proposals to better address the goals of the call
 - Mosquito project (we may have funded more of an outreach project with Extension involvement and stakeholder input)
 - Project for a Q biotype survey (different from what was proposed by Li)
3. Hold the funds; request that specific PIs [Willot & Dennehy] put together an Extension working group then submit an IPM proposal next year or in between (so the submitted IPM project would address an extension component)
4. Hold funds for contingencies that may come up during the year.

4. Further discussion of RFP

- The wording of the current RFP stresses that projects need to have an extension component to deliver IPM strategies and information to end users. However, we should revise the wording to more explicitly state that the call won't fund anything that doesn't include an extension component.
- Timing of the call: some indicated that December was bad timing, coinciding with many extramural calls related to IPM. Next year, we may push the deadline forward to Mid or late January.

5. Action items

Immediate

1. Al Fournier will draft letters to PIs to communicate funding decisions. For projects with reduced budgets, PIs will be asked if the full scope of the proposed project can be addressed. (Peter and Deb will review.)
2. Al Fournier will inform the funded PIs of the committee's decisions regarding their proposals and will work with Patti B. to set up the accounts.

For next meeting:

3. Al will solicit more input on the timing of the call from faculty, and on the page length.
4. Al will follow up with Deb on revised wording for next year's call, and send to committee for review.

Next meeting: Possibly in conjunction with Western IPM Committee meeting hosted in AZ this year, likely to be at MAC, in April or May. Weds is a good day for Lin, or Friday PM.