

**IPM Planning/Advisory Meeting**  
**Video Conference between Princeton & Lexington**  
**Wednesday, March 4, 2009**  
**12:00 p.m.**

Those in attendance at Princeton location: Doug Johnson, Richard Preston (Producer), David Brandon (Consultant), Ric Bessin, Lloyd Murdock, Jim Martin, John Grove, Win Dunwell, Dottie Call, Chris Miller (KY Dept. of Ag.), Patty Lucas, and Don Hershman. Those in attendance at Lexington location: Janet Lindsey, John Obrycki, Amy Fulcher, Rick Durham, John Strang and J.D. Green. Taking notes at the Princeton location was Christi Forsythe.

Money for the IPM program for 34 years has been distributed to states by a formula. The Department of Entomology has been the contact for the program. The formula funds are now distributed by competitive grants.

Money for 1 year on a bridge grant was applied for fiscal year 2009. Doug will be attending an International IPM Meeting in Portland, Oregon in about 2 weeks. He hopes to be able to get some explanation on implementation of the programs that would be funded. He would prefer to have a program funded for 3 or 4 years instead of have to submit for funding each year.

At this point, he knows Kentucky got some funding on the grant that was submitted but not at the level requested. He probably will not know anything for sure for at least another month until the federal budget is passed. He has had no comments by the federal programs on how the board judged the grants. He hopes to find out something, but is skeptical on how much they will tell him.

We will have some money to operate on. There are outstanding questions that need to be answered, at both the federal level and in the college also.

He doesn't know what the recommendations for funding will be. Whether it will be individual group requests or in certain categories. Some categories may have gotten full funding, some partially and some not at all.

His question to the group was: If the federal program allows the money to be moved in order to allocate money to those that weren't funded would the individual groups that got funding be able to operate on a smaller allocation? This may not be an option; the federal program may only allow the programs that were funded to receive the money and not allow money to be allocated for programs that didn't make it. We will have to go with whatever they tell us.

Jim Martin's comment was that it depends on how much money was funded to carry out the project effectively. There may be a limit to get the job done right.

Lloyd Murdock asked if this was for this year only. Doug said yes, fiscal year 2009.

Doug said the percentage funded was slightly more than half.

Ric Bessin commented that it depends on how much it takes to get certain projects done.

John Grove commented that the feds should be admonished if they are not willing to say how they picked the projects that should receive the funding. Doug said that this information may be forthcoming, but he just didn't know.

Doug said they will make specific recommendations about what should or shouldn't be funded. He questioned the project coordinators, could you use considerably less money than you asked for?

Question was asked - Do you have a feel nationally if it is a merit distribution of money?

Kentucky funding probably is in the middle of the amounts institutions were funded. Some got less than asked; some probably got what they asked for. There was 7 or 8 million available.

The distribution of dollars was made on what states received in the past from formula funds – some more, some less.

We asked for more than would meet formula, we didn't limit the amount anyone could request. We have been getting about \$104,000/yr out of \$112,000/yr. We requested \$196,977 on this grant.

Question was asked - If decide to fund zero, how would it affect future funding? Don't know.

In the next week, Doug needs to have each group let him know a fair way to distribute the money if a project isn't funded.

Doug discussed - What do we need to do to be competitive as possible in subsequent years:

The competition for this money is now between 1890 and 1862 institutions and other state universities.

Successful proposals should be:

- Stakeholder driven – plenty of interaction, not sure we made our case

- Problem focused – specific items need to be identified, addressed and mode of action to provide solution – not as strong as should be

- Defined plan of work – built on previous work

- Sound delivery methods to the target audience

- Detailed outreach plan – a few field days are not sufficient, appropriate ties to extension, and clearly defined and MEASURABLE outcomes

- REALLY a team – demonstration of team was good

- Capacity building – training of end-users – was good job

A strong EVALUATION component – Logic models was for the whole program, maybe should be for each project

An IPM working group needs to be put together to identify items necessary to strengthen our ability to be more competitive. We will need to illustrate coordination, planning, and sufficient expertise to carry out and measure the impact of the effort.

IPM program in UK is an associate with the Pest Management Center located in North Carolina on the North Carolina campus. They have great influence and are an additional source of funding. Win and Amy have submitted a grant for funding through that center.

We need to have designated contact(s), define communications (list serve e-mail list, postal mail, and phone contacts), and a list of the working group members with their affiliation and expertise.

Membership in this working group should include:

University/County scientific/educational expertise (to illustrate that you can achieve your outcomes); clientele who are experts in representing the audience which would include producers, consultants, industry, etc.; a member from our 1890 counterpart (Kentucky State University) if there is an appropriate person available from that institution; and may consider a member from any of the other Kentucky universities (Murray, Western, Morehead, etc.) if appropriate.

We would need to hold an annual meeting to review the past year, plan next year, itemize and prioritize goals and objectives. Consider reporting requirements in light of planning objectives and goal setting. Develop an agenda and maintain records of decisions, especially concerning prioritized goals and objectives (including date, location, attendance). This does not have to be face to face, but could include any combination of face to face, video, phone, and/or web conferencing.

If you/we are not willing to collect data to show the impact of the project, there is no use in applying for funding.

We need to develop robust reporting abilities: This would include illustrating dollars saved/earned, reduction of inputs (particularly pesticides and nitrogen fertilizer); changes in practices by clientele (e.g. reduced applications; increase in sampling – pest scouting, plant physiological sampling for fertility), refine application techniques (e.g. much targeted; “precision” applications; changes in behavior – adopting science based recommendations).

We would need to maintain a list of who we receive calls from concerning, for example, fertilizer and pesticides (use, need, label) so that when we get a call from a government agency asking for this information we would have it readily available. An example of a call might be “What would happen if the aerial application portion of a label was dropped?” We wouldn’t have to go into a lot of detail, just have it on record.

There are two specific publications that will always be funded and are directed for EPA: Crop Profiles and Pest Management Strategic Plans. We need to consider developing some Crop Profiles and Pest Management Strategic Plans.

We need to find out where the holes in pest management are. If something hasn't been done in the past, would it be useful to do now.

For example to obtain an IR4 herbicide label for canola to do work, we would do a crop profile to identify the situation followed by a pest management strategic plan to identify pests and needs. This would provide/compile the information needed for an IR-4. Florida does a bunch to get funded.

In part this is what ornamental horticulture group is looking at.

Patty knows about getting things together for the grants because she has done more. If have questions, maybe check with her.

Hopefully, money in the future (2010, 2011, 2012, 2013) will be done to compete for 3 or 4 years at a time, not every year.

National program leader has indicated the competition will be very keen. The first step will be to build a central group of people to help give direction.

Every group will need a representative – will need producers, clientele, agribusiness.

Need fairly soon – a diverse group together

- Individual work groups

- What personnel

- Following years for funding

- Can't afford to let time go by

- Identify questions

Need contact information for all groups

- Pesticide applicator program

- Cap program

- Anything dealing with pest management

- Start competitive questions, etc.

Would love to have someone from Division of Pesticides involved, Chris indicated he would make the contact in Frankfort to get the ball rolling for that. There is no limit to number of persons. Need this to illustrate how the program is operated and to continue to be funded at a higher level.

Richard Preston asked if it would strengthen it to have the Corn Growers Assn, Soybean Assn, Wheat Assn., etc. involved. Yes, when we get funding from them, we can show our working relationship with them.

Stakeholder letters are worthless. Must identify priorities from stakeholders. Identify what needs to be worked on.

Groups involved helps – producer's clientele, etc.

Need a list set of priorities for corn, wheat, soybeans, ornamentals, etc.

Needs to be technically cited – put on website.

When do you want the information – fairly quickly. The grant we are receiving is for one year (2009 fiscal year) only.

This is similar to what funding has been over past 3 or 4 years, have had more to work on. Have gotten outside grants also. Doug indicated that he has rolled over anything left in the budget to the next year. There has been a deficit the last 5 years.

Question - Is the number of people requesting funding the same? There are more programs.

Doug hasn't gotten any specific, direct answers yet, he hopes to get some soon.

What Kentucky will receive relative to any other place will have to come up with accomplishments.

Once Doug receives the final decision, he will have to redo budget.

The federal program will recommend funding some 100%, some less than 100%, some no funding at all.

He could divide it among all people but needs to know a fair way to proceed, assuming the federal program will allow him to do this, should a group not get anything at all.

He would like comments from each project coordinator by next Wednesday, March 11, if possible.

Don Hershman said we are in a better position to make a judgment, if given a choice, let Doug go by what he knows about each project.

Of course, it will depend on what the federal program says.

Dottie asked if a project doesn't get anything is there any reason to resubmit next time? Doug said yes, resubmit it.

Need to get formalized to submit grant proposals.

When more information is available concerning the grant results, a meeting or video conference will be scheduled to continue this discussion and program planning.