



**IPM Coordinating Committee  
Feb 20, 2008**

**MINUTES**

*Membership:*

*Paul Baker (Entomology)	Pat Clay (Valent)
Peter Ellsworth (Entomology, MAC)	Lin Evans (stakeholder)
Al Fournier (MAC)	Dawn Gouge (Entomology, MAC)
*#Chris Jones (Gila Co., Nat Res)	#Ed Martin (ex-officio, CE)
*#Mike Matheron (Plant Sci, Yuma)	*Rick Melnicoe (ex-officio, WIPMC)
Kim McReynolds (Cochise Co)	*Mary Olsen (Plant Sciences)
John Palumbo (Entomology, YAC)	*#Barry Pryor (Plant Sci, AZ PDN)
#Kevin Rice (Pinal County)	Bob Roth (ex-officio, MAC)
#Kai Umeda (Maricopa County)	
Jeff Silvertooth (corresponding member, SWES)	

\*Not present for the meeting

#New member

**I. Committee Membership Changes**

- New committee members: Chris Jones, Ed Martin, Mike Matheron, Barry Pryor, Kevin Rice & Kai Umeda
- Other changes: Rick Gibson and (following this meeting) Kim McReynolds have rotated off the committee. Mary Olsen is considering rotating off.
- Ed Martin, Associate Director of Extension Programs, will participate in the committee Ex-Officio, replacing Deb Young.

**II. Arizona Pest Management Center: History and Organization (Peter)**

Peter reviewed the history and organizational structure of the APMC. A brief discussion followed on the APMC organizational chart. While it has always been viewed as fluid, some changes are called for based on recent changes at UA. With the loss of David Kerns, the future of the citrus IPM program is questionable. Tim Dennehy's departure raises questions about the resistance management program and PITO has closed its doors. Questions were also raised about the "Community IPM" area and some of the boxes there (e.g., urban programs and master gardeners). Further discussion and revision of the organizational chart are necessary. (Topic for next meeting.) The point was made that even after several years of the APMC, many in UA and beyond are not as involved / engaged or even aware of APMC as they might be.

Peter presented on the federal funding structure for IPM and how AZ compares to other states. We get 100k in federal dollars with no state funds for IPM. We continue to seek expanded state support for IPM efforts. Peter briefly reviewed some other states' mechanisms for funding IPM. Later, the committee reviewed a draft cover letter to the legislature that will be sent along with the "IPM Delivers" publication, to help raise awareness of our IPM programs and their impact.

### **III. Comments from Ed Martin**

This is his first IPM CC meeting. He is here to learn about the group. Ed is now 50% Associate Director of Extension programs. Responsibility for the working groups have been split between Ed (Ag & Natural Resource programs) and Linda Houtcooper (FCS), Kurt Esteroff (4H). This new team is developing their philosophy of programs. They will conduct a survey to get faculty input on the Extension working groups, which were created to increase coordination and communication among faculty statewide and to facilitate extension programming. There is some concern that not all working groups are effective. No decision has been made yet on the availability of Extension funding initiatives. Ed sees his duty as supporting programs that are successful and to facilitate success in others; also developing strategies to bring in more extramural funding. He's on campus usually Mon and Thurs and can be reached on his cell phone at 520-709-0939.

### **IV. Other Business**

- The Western IPM Center Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for March 11. This committee advises Dawn and Al are committee members. Let them know if you have comments or information to share with the committee.
- Update on Pesticide Applicator Training budget and plans for 2008 (Al). On Dec 15, 2006, this committee approved a memo drafted by Paul Baker, Al Fournier and Peter Ellsworth, regarding the process for allocation of Pesticide Applicator Training (PAT) funds. Basically, the policy states that the IPM Coordinating Committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the Pesticide Coordinator (currently Paul Baker) with respect to PAT funding decisions, parallel with the committee's current role in advising the State IPM Coordinator, Peter Ellsworth, on the expenditure of Federal 3(d) IPM funds. The committee can consider input from faculty and other stakeholders on PAT needs and make recommendations on the use of PAT funds to address these needs. Last year, the IPM-CC approved a \$3,700 proposal for Jeff Schalau to conduct pesticide applicator training, and it was agreed these funds should come out of the PAT budget. Apparently, Jeff failed to receive the full funding from Pesticide Coordinator as promised in the last grant cycle. In the current grant cycle, Paul Baker informed Al Fournier that PAT funds would not be made available through committee review to address agent or stakeholder identified PAT needs as outlined in the memo. Following our last meeting in November 2007, Jim Christenson indicated he would speak to Paul about the situation. As of today, there has been no resolution. Ed Martin agreed to follow-up on the situation.

- APMC draft agreement with Arizona Cotton Research & Protection Council (Peter). The ACRPC have developed data resources that are relevant to our education and research. Peter and Al met with Larry Antilla of the Arizona Cotton Research & Protection Council (ACRPC) recently to discuss sharing of statewide cotton mapping data for a Regional IPM competitive grants project. Previously, Tim Dennehy has been the defacto liason to the ACRPC. While we maintain a good relationship with ACRPC, there are concerns about sharing of data because of grower privacy issues. At Larry's suggestion, we drafted a memo to propose that the APMC be the clearinghouse for sharing of data with UA parties. (Memo was circulated.) Larry has a board meeting with the council next week and will seek approval of our proposal. (Later, this was, in fact, approved.)
- Budget overview (Al). Al provided an overview of the budget. And proposed committee approval of \$12,000 Information Technology budget for the APMC to include funds for ongoing web maintenance and other IT needs, including the 1080 pesticide use reporting database, outside of the competitive IPM grants. The IT funding request was approved by the IPM-CC. Jim Christenson recommended a policy of holding back about \$50k for contingencies in any given year.

2/20/08

**2008 IPM Funds**

3(d) funds received	100408
Carryover	85,236
<b>Beginning Balance</b>	<b>185644</b>
IPM program mgr	35502
Operations	5000
IPM projects	50000
Proposed IT allocation	12,000
<b>Balance after allocations</b>	<b>83142</b>

### III. IPM Proposal Review

- Review of proposal criteria (Al)
- Proposal review (discussion)
- Funding decisions

**The following proposals were selected for funding in the amounts shown from the IPM 3(d)**

**funds:**

<b>Title</b>	<b>PI</b>	<b>Amt</b>
Dispersal by the Sweet Potato Whitefly	Byrne	\$5,600
Predicting Invasiveness of Q Biotype Whitefly	Carriere	\$10,000
Bat IPM: Addressing Stakeholder Needs	Gouge/Snyder	\$8,500
Statewide survey of distribution of Q Biotype Whitefly	Li	\$9,000
GIS Based Mapping Tool for Noxious Weeds in SE AZ	McReynolds	\$1,500

Integrating Monitoring, GIS & Geostatistics for CYSDV	Nolte	\$9,000
Monitoring of CYSDV & Whitefly in Maricopa County	Taylor	\$6,600
		<b>Total Funded \$50,200</b>

Discussion about RFP and what to solicit next year:

- Concern about the lack of quality and the lack of communication among submissions.
- What about doing one or two larger grants?
- Stakeholder engagement: ask them what is important and direct efforts toward it.
- With only 50k we have to go one way or another – large or small grants.
- Themed RFAs that have minimal requirements.
- There needs to be some outreach to the community at large: identify for each year 1 theme or a few key issues for this year.
- We could do pre-proposals then bring people together who are working together on the same thing.
- It was suggested that we survey past grant recipients and ask them to rate their experience with the program.

#### **IV. Development of New Resources for the APMC (group discussion)**

- “IPM Delivers” /letter to legislators (Peter and Al). We discussed the need to make state legislators more aware of UA excellent work in IPM. One way to do this may be by sending copies of “IPM Delivers” to state legislators. The pros and cons of this approach were discussed.

#### **Follow-up / Action Items**

- Fund all submitted grants at full amount
- Notify recipients of award decisions
- Continue discussion on next year’s RFP with committee via email; possibly follow-up with a faculty survey