UTAH EXTENSION INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT (IPM)
MINI-GRANT CALL FOR PROPOSALS
2006

WHAT IS IPM?

Integrated pest management (IPM) is the use of appropriate pest management tools and technologies to solve pest (disease, insect, weed, vertebrate) problems. IPM methods include cultural, biological and chemical techniques with an emphasis on reducing broad-spectrum pesticide use. Implementation of IPM should be based on knowledge of the pest and ecosystem, and should consider relevant economic, environmental, and social factors.

GOAL OF THE UTAH IPM MINI-GRANTS PROGRAM

To accelerate the adoption of IPM in Utah via education outreach to other professionals and to the citizens of Utah.

WHO CAN APPLY FOR FUNDS?

Proposals are requested from Utah State University Extension personnel for development of county, multi-county and state regional IPM educational and demonstration projects to be conducted during 2006. Projects are encouraged that take advantage of cooperative efforts between agents and specialists. Research faculty can be involved, but proposals strictly for research will not be funded. Education outreach must be an important part of each project.

TARGET AREAS

Proposals should develop a county(ies)-based project that educates and demonstrates how specific IPM techniques or methodologies can be used to solve pest problems of importance to stakeholders. On-site demonstrations and training workshops on implementation of practical IPM methods are appropriate and encouraged. Projects that develop IPM educational tools (publications, PowerPoint slideshows, educational resources, fact sheets, web-based material, etc.) are especially encouraged. Projects are encouraged to include the development of IPM educational materials that can be shared with others (e.g., within extension, with other agricultural professionals, and with interested stakeholders).

Preference for funding will be given to projects with:

- High potential for documenting reductions in pesticide use (gallons and acres (or other appropriate units))
- Increased stakeholder profitability/sustainability (dollars saved, increased profit, etc.)
- A major education outreach component to other professionals
- Collaborations with Utah stakeholders (growers, homeowners, public agencies, etc.)
- Planned presentation of project results at a professional meeting and/or utilization of outcomes in train-the-trainer workshops.

Please contact Diane Alston (x2516) and/or Robert Newhall (x2183) if you need assistance with development of project ideas.

FUNDING INFORMATION

$10,000 is available (funding sources are USDA CSREES National IPM Program and Utah WSARE Professional Development Program). Funds can be used in IPM projects for temporary assistance (wages), supplies, travel, and for development and dissemination of educational materials. Funding is only for one year. A second year of funding can be requested with a new proposal. Subsequent funding is contingent on submission of a satisfactory report from the previous year and demonstration of adequate progress. Most single county projects are funded in the range of $800 to $1,200 and multi-county projects in the range of $1,000 to $3,000.

PROPOSAL FORMAT

Proposals should be brief (2-3 pages) and must adhere to the following format:

Title – be descriptive

Project leader(s), collaborators (specialists, others), and cooperators (stakeholders)

Situation statement – include background and justification

Objectives – clearly stated and narrowly focused

Procedures – a clear, detailed, and concise working plan and methods (who will do what, where and when will they do it, and how will they do it)

Data analyses & presentations, and project evaluation plan – include experimental design if relevant, how data will be analyzed, how and where results will be disseminated to stakeholders and shared with other professionals, and how project impacts will be assessed

Budget – indicate specific categories of request (payroll wages, supplies, travel, publication)

PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated and funding awarded based on the following criteria:

1. Measurable impact to stakeholders
    a. Knowledge gained
    b. Documented pesticide reduction
    c. Increased stakeholder profitability/sustainability
2. Level of emphasis on IPM education
    a. Training methods
    b. Educational materials produced
    c. Presentations or Train-the-trainer workshops
3. Collaborations and relevance to Utah's important agricultural and green industry commodities and situations
    a. Importance of crop/commodity/situation
    b. Impact on stakeholders
    c. Impact on which and how many acres, or appropriate units
4. Feasibility of project
    a. Completion of objectives within stated time period

5. Appropriateness and expertise of project leader(s)
    a. Qualified project leaders, collaborators, and cooperators (stakeholders)
6. Appropriateness of budget
    a. Adequate request for stated work
7. Measurable magnitude of potential impact
    a. Use by other Utah counties and stakeholders
8. Evaluation of project
    a. Discussion of how project impacts and expected outcomes will be measured

Please see attached proposal evaluation form for more details on evaluation criteria. A review committee made up of the Utah Extension IPM Committee, WSARE, County Extension Agents, and relevant stakeholders will review and rank each proposal.

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Submit an **electronic copy (via an e-mail attachment) of the proposal by January 20, 2006** to:

Diane Alston, Extension IPM Coordinator
E-mail: dianea@ext.usu.edu
Voice: (435) 797-2516

FUNDING NOTIFICATION, PROJECT TERMINATION AND REPORTING

Notification of proposal awards will be made by mid February 2006, and funding will be available immediately upon notification. Projects must be completed by September 30, 2006. A final report documenting the project's results, outcomes and impacts will be due to Diane Alston by November 1, 2006. Project outcome products (publications, images, reports, etc.) will be posted on the Utah IPM website. Presentation of project results at professional meetings and other outreach training opportunities is encouraged.

Projects funded in 2005

1. Biological control of tamarisk – Craig Poulson and Matt Palmer ($3,000)

2. Biological control of leafy spurge, spotted and diffuse knapweed, and purple loosestrife in non-accessible areas – Clark Israelson, Lyle Holmgren, Mike Pace, and Darrell Rothlisberger ($2,025)

3. Evaluation of preventative alfalfa weevil control – James Barnhill, Mike Pace, Clark Israelson, Mark Nelson, and Craig Poulson ($1,635)

4. IPM for Master Gardeners– Larry Sagers, Loralie Cox, and Adrian Hinton ($1,700)

5. The effectiveness of new homeowner products and techniques for controlling codling moth larvae in backyard grown apples – Mike Pace and Tony McCammon ($1,640)

IPM Mini-Grant Proposal Evaluation Form - 2006

Project Title_____

Project Leader(s)_____

Rating Scores: 1=low score, not satisfactory
2=acceptable, but below average quality
3=average quality
4=good quality
5=high score, excellent quality

Score

1. Measurable Impact to Stakeholders

A. Impact on knowledge gained by stakeholders _____
(clientele trained in IPM/gain knowledge of IPM methods?, will clientele likely increase their use of IPM methods?, is an evaluation tool included to measure adoption of IPM?)

B. Impact on pesticide reduction _____
(will pesticide use likely be reduced or improved?, will IPM strategy likely reduce environmental impact of pesticides?)

C. Increased stakeholder profitability/sustainability _____
(will stakeholders likely increase profits or other economic indicators?)

2. Level of Emphasis on IPM Education

A. Emphasis on IPM training methods _____
(training workshop or field day included?, on-site/in-the-field demonstrations or clinic included?, one-on-one interactions with stakeholders?)

B. IPM educational materials will be produced _____
(development of fact sheet or other educational material?, utilize other media to disseminate IPM information?)

C. Presentations or 'Train-the-trainer' workshops _____

3. Collaborations and Relevance to Utah's Important Ag. & Green Industry Commodities and Situations

A. Importance of crop/commodity/situation _____

B. Impact on stakeholders _____
(will many clientele or a large area of land potentially be impacted?)

C. Impact on which crops; how many acres, or appropriate measured units _____

4. Feasibility of Project

A. Feasibility of completing objectives and methods within grant time period _____

5. Appropriateness and Expertise of Project Leaders

A. Appropriate, qualified and necessary project leaders, collaborators and cooperators included _____

6. Appropriateness of Budget

A. Appropriate and adequate funding request for proposed work _____

7. Measurable Magnitude of Potential Impact

A. Information can be used by other Utah counties and stakeholders _____

8. Evaluation of project

A. Discussion of how project impacts and outcomes will be measured _____

Total Score (70 points possible) _____

Recommendation for funding of project:

Fund project at level requested _____ Fund project at a reduced level _____

Do not fund project _____ Suggested funding level $ _____