

Steering Committee Meeting
June 18, 2009

Attending: Roy Boykin, John Mayne, Ames Herbert, Clayton Hollier, Harold Coble, Steve Toth, Michelle Foo, Mike Weaver, Tom Brennan, Carrie Harmon, Jim VanKirk, Eric Young, Rosemary Hallberg

Drafting a letter to the Extension Directors about shifting money from RIPM.

- Clayton: shifting the money is a bad precedent.
- Jim: it's the only Extension-only money in RIPM.
- Ames: it is the only way to get Extension projects funded. Asked Eric to draft a paragraph that we could sign off on. Jim will work with Eric on that.
- This should be sent to Ed Smith (chair of directors) and cc'd to Marty Draper.
- The first place this was heard was in the North Central region at the listening session in Portland.

Action item: There were no objections to the letter.

- Eric and Jim will draft the letter
- It will go out under Ames's signature and have the names of the SC members on it.

Should the center become a clearinghouse for distribution of publications and research ways of cost recovery?

- Harold: we should look at how much that will involve
- Jim: would talk to Keith Douce and call NRAES.
- Ames: there is a member cost to working with NRAES.
- Clayton: do you physically want to be a warehouse for that information, or do you want to point people back to the state?
- Mike: I like the idea of Center promoting those projects and providing a way for those things to get printed.
- Jim: the problem is that some places charge, other places don't charge. Is there a way we could charge and put a value on these publications?
- Carrie: the Southern Center is known for using technology. Look at all of the options we have. If you can do it in-house as opposed to making something like Bugwood an operational arm that you will have to perpetually fund, that might work better.
- Ames: maybe you should investigate and use the guide as a model. See how you can use it for cost recovery, etc.

Action item: There was consensus for the Center to investigate this

Should the Center search for ways to do evaluation?

- We could ask someone to do this, pay someone to do it, and farm it out in an RFA.
- We might find that the IPM program from the University of Tennessee has resulted in X percent of IPM adoption in Tennessee.
- Do an up-to-date study on the surveys that were done 10 years ago. Maybe you could extrapolate that when better IPM is used, water quality gets better.
- Harold: I would like to see the Center participate with Bill Coli's national effort of evaluation and make sure a crop from the southern region is represented. Maybe pick sweet potatoes to be included in Bill's national program.
- Jim: I don't want to put all of my impact evaluation in that basket.
- Tom B: I'm worried that you're going shopping without a list. I don't have a sense that this group knows what they want.
- Ames: we'll try to identify the programs that have identifiable impacts. We need to have southern region success stories that are distinct.
- Steve T: to be successful in the EIPM grant, you need a good evaluation plan. To use the logic models, you have to have data. If we can find a project where someone collects the data and it fits the logic model, we can use that project.
- Jim: IPM scientists who have not done evaluation. Right now Bill Coli and George Norton are the only ones doing evaluations.
- Tom B: If you want to see how working protection has been advanced in the past 10 years, you could pull out the data set and put it in the frame of something bigger than Christmas trees.
- Mike W: Put out a request to the State Contacts and ask for that data.
- Michelle: if we had a uniform set of criteria to all of the projects that have been done and equate them to worker protection or human health, we could tell a bigger picture story.
- Jim: we need to build that story, but if we build that story block by block, that's realistic. First we may look to see how much simazine is being used by growers, and then we can see how much simazine is in the Mississippi River.
- We need the studies, but we also need a person to look at the studies and do follow-ups.
- Jim: need to spend \$50,000 for a year for evaluation. If we take this on as a responsibility, it will get done.
- Carrie: let us know how you will communicate that back out so we can do it ourselves.
- Heather Boyd at Virginia Tech is trying to help everyone in the college with evaluation. Ames suggested that we call her.
- Steve: it's the Center's job to fund an evaluation to use as a model for others.
- Tom B: the senior folks want to know if they give us \$4 million dollars, is the Chesapeake Bay going to be better?
- Jim: We're going to make sure the evaluation study is properly designed before we fund it. If we put it out as competitive, we will say that we'll fund the following type of things that has all of these components.

- Harold: you're going to study how you can change that field, the data is out there on how the stream has been changed.

Final decision: the Steering Committee recommended going ahead with pursuing evaluation.

Do we want the Center to pursue the Homescapes concept?

- Clayton: whoever rights this needs to be familiar with growing conditions.
- Tom: It's a great idea, and you get homeowners involved.
- Jim V: at this point, we will work with a couple of people in the field and facilitate a working group type of meeting. It could result in a grant proposal to EPA or a grant request to the Center.
- Ames: if you're picking your panel correctly, you have to think that the projects are benefiting IPM in the region.
- When bad government funding is being picked on, some of our projects could be picked out.
- Michelle: are you concerned that \$75,000 will not be available for other projects?
- Jim: there may be 3 fewer projects that year. With Homescapes, that money would be off the top. With evaluation, if we hire someone or contract with someone, that's money off the top. If it's an RFA, we just fund a different kind of proposal.
- Jim: With funding, we get a little under a million dollars. About 10 percent goes out in indirects. Half of that is spent on staff and expenses. The other half goes to IPM Enhancement grants.
- Jim V.: Homescapes probably wouldn't affect the Enhancement grants program. The evaluation would hit the Enhancement grants program.
- Carrie: if we do the evaluation, you can report back to us about how to use this for ourselves.

Final decision: Pursue the Homescapes idea.

Next meeting:

November 9-10, Raleigh

Conversation about the State Contact issue

- Maybe an electronic form
- Conference call
- Won't be resolved electronically