



**IPM Coordinating Committee
Biosphere II, "Big Theater"
Dec 10, 2008**

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, YAC)	Rick Melnicoe (ex-officio, WIPMC)
Kim McReynolds (Cochise Co)	Mary Olsen (Plant Sciences)
Carl Olson (Entomology)	John Palumbo (Entomology, YAC)
Barry Pryor (Plant Sci, AZ PDN)	Erin Taylor (Maricopa / Pinal County)
Bob Roth (ex-officio, MAC)	Kai Umeda (Maricopa County)
Jeff Silvertooth (corresponding member, SWES)	

Also Participating: Ursula Schuch, Bill McCloskey

Notes

Purpose: This will be a working session dedicated to reviewing the budgets, logic models, etc., developed by the EIPM team and formulating the final plan for our Extension IPM competitive grant proposal.

Background and Initial Discussion

At the last IPM-CC meeting, this group developed input for the Extension IPM competitive grant RFA itself. The program is capped at \$650k. But this is more than most states could justify. This is a 12-month call. Next year, the RFA will likely be for 3 or 4 years. We reviewed the Organizational Chart and our IPM strengths. The goal is to align our programmatic efforts with this RFA, develop the budget, and organize details for the proposal. Proposals are due Jan 6. APMC has been designated by Jim Christenson's office as the authorized entity to submit a proposal for UA.

Prior to this meeting, Peter & Al developed task lists and identified leaders for each area of emphasis (AOE). Minimum of 2 and maximum of 6 may be applied for.

- IPM Coordination (cap = 25k) – Al & Peter – *Including IPM Budget review*
- IPM Collaboration (cap = 25k) – Al & Peter
- IPM in Agronomic Crops (cap = 125k) – Rick Gibson
- IPM in High Value Crops (cap = 300k) – John, Bill & Peter
- IPM Support for Pest Diagnostics (cap = 50k) – Mary & Carl (the Olsen twins)
- IPM in Schools (cap = 50k) – Dawn & Al
- IPM on Recreational Lands /Turf (cap = 50k) – Kai

- Consumer / Urban IPM (cap = 50k) – Ursula & Rick Gibson

Review process: Proposals will be reviewed as a whole, but they will also selectively review and edit proposed budgets in each area of emphasis. State programs will be compared in their requests relative to other states and their capacities. We asked leaders to develop logic models, budgets and detailed budget narratives, and evaluation plans for their program areas. Evaluation is no longer optional, but critical and should be addressed for each AOE.

Note: this is a 12-month grant that starts when we determine it. Could start it as early as maybe 1/1/09 (retro) or late as 9/29/09. Program leaders should consider this and advise Peter on their preferred start dates. Bear in mind we have about 1 year's worth of IPM carryover funds to spend.

Our minimal goal is to maintain the infrastructure for the APMC; AI estimated the cost of this at about 101k. If we are cut in individual emphasis areas, this amount will have to be made up somewhere else. So if they cut us, we will have to cut back some of the AOE budgets to cover infrastructure. We can do a re-distribution of the budget in post-award.

The review panel will be made up non-Western reviewers: we need to be clear on how the West is different to justify our needs. AZ is near the lowest end of the pack for either IPM funds or for Smith Lever funds. For 35 years we have been under-funded!

Peter went over budget overview chart. Total of 4.3 FTEs proposed, total of \$485,876.

Review of Areas of Emphasis

Coordination – describes organizational structure and function of the APMC, stakeholder input, etc. Nearly all salary support.

Collaboration – Arid Southwest IPM Network – goal is to enhance partner state's ability to engage stakeholders in pesticide information requests; ADA collaboration on 1080 database; ACRPC mapping information coordination through APMC; AzCPA collaboration focuses mainly on PCA manual but also includes training.

Agronomic Crops – Rick G. Alfalfa hay, green chop, corn, silage, grain, durum wheat, grain sorghum. Goal is to assemble the team, conduct a survey of producers & PCAs, identify needs and gaps, update publications, add info to ACIS.

High Value IPM – John Palumbo provided good justification. His draft could serve as a model for what to develop (SEND THIS OUT). Lots of good statistics related to our needs. A good description of “where we are starting.” Focus is on support for Extension, since we are already successful in research / project funding. Participatory outreach and demonstration is a big, good output to provide. Show stakeholder engagement. 1.0 FTE for Extension Asst or similar position. 5k for digital stereoscope for the team, housed at YAC.

Diagnostics. We have gaps in capacity; no central diagnostic clinic; they propose two, one for plants and one for insects. Bill points out: the herbarium does diagnostics and should be represented in this. Phil is not supported through the AZ PDN. Mary will talk to Phil: what are his needs? Sounds like his FTE may be cut. Mary only does plants, Carl only does insects, animal systems. McClure nematology work. Its fine to mention other capacities we have that are not funded through this effort. How does this interface with the AZ PDN? The PDN is a parallel structure that has an independent budget and a specific regulatory function. We are focusing on diagnostics in support of IPM.

IPM in Schools. Developed multiple logic models and a long list of metrics for measuring impacts. Dawn provided good data on number of schools and students that will be impacted by her program. Provided detailed school IPM assessment instrument.

IPM in recreation. Focused on turf recreational facilities, i.e., golf. They have identified key stakeholder needs in turf. Data on chemical use is needed. Cite turf PMSP for stakeholder engagement. ID departure of Gabe Towers as key need and gap to be filled.

Consumer / Urban IPM. Ursula developed with input from Rick G. Will develop IPM curriculum in MG manual or improving what's there. Ursula has identified 3 key areas, based on conversations with people in the state: weeds, IPM training for MG, abiotic disorders of landscape plants. Weeds could be a high-impact area because people just spray without ID. Need info on: number of consumers, number of residential acres, number of landscape professionals, etc.

Letters of Support and Collaboration. A few key letters will be important to support our proposal, but they specifically do not want a laundry list. And letters must be very specific about roles of partner organizations, etc.

Budget notes: Is our overall request reasonable? \$486K at this point and Bill will add 20k for tree crops. Brings it to 509k.

Comments from Rick Melnicoe: We should clarify how much is what we are already doing versus what is new. It looks like we are asking for a significant increase in investment. We are doing this with clear justification of how we have been under-funded historically.

Next Steps: We have identified some bits and pieces we still need from leaders. Budgets will be critical. Tell us who is on your team. We need to do the routing next week. Peter and Al as PIs. Team leaders and others will be listed as collaborators.

Leader tasks:

- ID team members
- Detailed budgets
- Justification situation
- Individual assignments noted earlier

- Peter will send out APMC membership list as word doc, John P's and other's drafts as PDFs, Send Bill Kai's logic model as word document.
- Deadline for everything: send info as soon as possible, but Tues AM at latest.

Other Business

- No mini-grant program this year. This EIPM program will replace it. It doesn't mean we would be devoid of all resources. We have some operational dollars built in that people can tap into. With the current budget we would like to extend our database specialist and continued partial support for AI and web work. Plus it is what little cushion we have if our funding is less than anticipated.
- IPM Coordinating Committee will be expanded to include new "task managers" and participants: Ursula, Bill McCloskey, Rick Gibson. Will probably meet 3 times a year.
- Ed sent out an Extension Publications list and requested people either revise or remove these older pubs. In the coming year, we as IPM committee will have to ID what needs to be done and people to work on them. Extension has a new publication review system that will be online early next year. Peter would like to propose that any IPM-related publication would be routed through our APMC system with Peter, AI, or committee volunteer as main editor / gate-keeper. This is something we will move forward on next year.