

This document is merely an example of how you might communicate a programmatic breakdown of your program costs by category and by Project. Individual universities may have specific internal requirement on how to complete this process. The panel will require this information to make a proper appraisal of your application.

Budget Justification/Narrative *(Please do not just plug in your numbers!)*

Note: The overall program budget justification example is typical for any grant.

Overall Institutional IPM Program

This top section should look like any other Budget Narrative section. Budget numbers from the lower, component budget section must match the upper section (additively). This example is ONLY an example. Something like this would be appropriate.

The IPM program at XYZ Tech University is a thing of beauty and all clients and residents of the state benefit from our work. Success of the program is dependent on the capacity provided through federal funding.

Budget Justification for Dr. Buzz Lightyear, IPM Coordinator:

A. Senior/Key Personnel

Wage and fringe for Dr. Lightyear (12 month period): \$ 80,000
 Percent effort on project: 3 month, 0.25 FTE =
Requested amount..... \$ 20,000
 Salary for IPM Coordinator (0.25 FTE)..... \$ 15,000
 Fringe benefits..... \$ 5,000

B. Other Personnel

Wage and fringe for Extension area educators (12 month period):
 \$ 30,000 Research technician, effort on project for 42 month period:
 3.5 FTE= **Requested amount..... \$140,000**
 Agronomic IPM
 Salary for IPM Educators (3.0 FTE)..... \$ 90,000
 Fringe benefits..... \$ 30,000
 IPM on Recreational Lands
 Salary for IPM Educator (0.5 FTE)..... \$ 15,000
 Fringe benefits..... \$ 5,000
 Hourly workers for **Recreational Lands IPM**
 Local science teachers hired hourly (\$ 8/hr x 400 hrs).... \$ 3,200
Subtotal..... \$163,200

C. Equipment: none

D. Travel (to training and program delivery sites):

1. Domestic
 Travel to multistate committee meeting\$ 1,200
 Program planning and travel costs for Stakeholder Advisory panel \$ 3,000
 In-state travel for **Agronomic Crop IPM**\$ 3,000
 7 trips to day camp X 150 miles/ea X 2 vehicles @ \$0.46/mi for
Public Health\$ 2,208

Conservation Train the trainer travel costs	\$ 1,000
Recreational Lands IPM In-state travel	\$ 8,000
School IPM Train the trainer travel costs	\$ 3,000
Subtotal.....	\$ 21,408

2. Foreign (none)

E. Participant Trainee Support Costs (none)

F. List of material and supplies and cost:

1. Purchase resin to mount mosquitoes and mosquito suit.....	\$ 1,400
2. Publication development and printing costs (none)	
3. Consultant Services (none)	
4. Computer services (none)	
5. Subawards (none in this example – will be paid by host institution)	
6. Equipment Facility Rental	
7. Alterations and renovations (none)	
Subtotal.....	\$ 1,400

G. Contractual Services

Print and Design.....	\$ 7,392
Includes Agronomic Crops IPM Materials development and printing, development costs for Conservation IPM training materials, print materials for IPM in Public Health , and development costs for School IPM training materials.	
Sample processing at the state biochemistry laboratory Recreational Lands	\$ 18,800
Host 4 Conservation workshops with Extension/NRCS field staff ..	\$ 3,000
School IPM survey development, validation and mailing	\$ 4,000
Subtotal.....	\$ 33,192

H. Indirect costs and rate: None

TOTAL..... \$219,200

The following section allows the Panel to better understand the commitment of the program to a given project. This is your opportunity to sell specific activities and explain the associated costs.

Through these funds we are able to reach our clients and advance the goals of IPM as defined in the National IPM Roadmap. The specific allocation of our request is as follows:

Coordination Component

Our coordination program will address coordination of IPM efforts at XYZ Tech University to include planning and coordinating IPM outreach efforts across the university. We will specifically host quarterly IPM committee meetings at the university to plot strategic directions for the programs and coordinate program content and major program thrust for the time period. This planning will be done with the input from a stakeholder advisory panel that will help identify major areas to target for improvement. We will deliver these programs to our stakeholder groups with a coordinated effort of our entire IPM team including county-based field educators.

Annually we will participate in the Multistate IPM Committee to build community support and develop potential for shared programming that reaches beyond the direct influence of XYZ Tech University.

Salary for IPM Coordinator (0.25 FTE).....	\$ 15,000
Fringe benefits.....	\$ 5,000
Travel to multistate committee meeting.....	\$ 1,200

Program planning and travel costs for Stakeholder Advisory panel . \$ 3,000

Subtotal \$ 24,200

It is not necessary to attribute portions of salary to specific program areas unless that is a requisite part of the cost. See reasoning in note above.

Areas of Emphasis - Primary

1. IPM Implementation in Agronomic Crops..... \$ 125,000

Agronomic crops are significant in our state. This is the primary focus of three regional IPM educators stationed across the state. Wheat, corn and sorghum provide about 80% of the gross farm income in a state where agriculture is the number one industry. Farm gate income approaches \$ 3.2 billion each year, in large part from these main crops. Pest management costs account for about 40% of the inputs for these crops, especially weed control. Locally supported educators will design and deliver on-farm research-based demonstration to show comparatively the advantage of pest monitoring and targeted application efforts in the tradition of Seaman Knapp.

Salary for IPM Educators (3.0 FTE).....	\$ 90,000
Fringe benefits.....	\$ 30,000
Materials development and (on-demand) printing.....	\$ 2,000
In-state travel	\$ 3,000

Subtotal \$125,000

We will be participating in collaboration hosted by LMNOP State University to deliver our corn IPM programs through the contiguous Wetandep River Valley. The Wetandep Valley is the most productive land in both states and deployment of a common IPM program is to the benefit of producers on both sides of the border. Migratory lepidopterans are a common problem for corn produced in the valley and the cool, heavy valley soils favor root diseases. A coordinated effort will favor producers in both states. The popcorn and blue corn for human consumption are particularly prone to disease under the irrigated production practices that are becoming prevalent. LMNOP State will provide primary entomology support for this project while XYZ Tech will provide plant pathology and weed science expertise. The collaboration proposal for this Area of Emphasis is included in the LMNOP State University application. The contribution from XYZ Tech will include authorship in a new electronic newsletter that will target producers on both sides of the border and participation in field days in both states. Six field days are planned. A letter of collaboration from the Extension Director at XYZ Tech is included in the LMNOP State application and copied in the appendix of this application.

2. IPM Implementation in Animal Agriculture.....\$ 0

We will not participate in a program in this emphasis area.

3. IPM Training for Consumer/Urban Environments.....\$ 0

We will not participate in a program in this emphasis area.

It is not required to participate in all primary program areas.

4. **IPM Implementation in Specialty Crops**.....\$ 0
 We will not participate in a program in this emphasis area.

Areas of Emphasis - Secondary

1. **IPM Coordination within Conservation Partnerships**..... \$ 5,000
 A pilot program will be launched in the Big Muddy watershed to encourage IPM adoption in conservation tillage programs. Cool soils with heavy residue are seeing an increase in root disease. A program to help identify specific root pathogens and assist producers in choosing the correct cultivars with appropriate resistance to the prevalent pathotypes will be launched. Three local conservation districts have agreed to participate and the state conservationist has provided a letter stating that he supports the concept of additional training for his staff and looks forward to working together with XYZ Tech Extension to increase the adoption of the 595 Pest Management standard in the local EQIP programs and principles of IPM behind the standard. Federal statute prohibits the state NRCS office from issuing a letter of collaboration, but they have agreed to support the concept of the joint project.

Develop training materials	\$ 1,000
Host 4 workshops with Extension/NRCS field staff.....	\$ 3,000
Train the trainer travel costs	\$ 1,000
Subtotal	\$ 5,000

2. **IPM Support for Pest Diagnostic Facilities**..... \$ 0
 The diagnostic facilities at XYZ Tech University are excellent and do not need additional support.

3. **IPM Training and Implementation in Housing** \$ 0
 We will not participate in an IPM in housing program.

It is not required to participate in all secondary program areas.

4. **IPM Education for Pesticide Applicators**..... \$ 0
 We will not participate in an Education for Pesticide Applicators program.

5. **IPM in Public Health**\$ 5,000
 We will provide materials and conduct training on West Nile Virus and protection from mosquitoes at 4-H day camps (target audience: 7-10 yr-olds). Sessions will include appearances by ‘Stripe’ the Asian Tiger mosquito (A mosquito costume worn by a project technician). ‘Stripe’ has proven to be a well received ambassador for vector control and holds the students attention very well. We anticipate seven sessions with about 500 youth contacts.

7 trips to day camp X 150 miles/ea X 2 vehicles @ \$0.46/mi.....	\$ 2,208
Purchase resin to mount mosquitoes.....	\$ 400
Purchase of custom mosquito suit (one time cost).....	\$ 1,000
Print materials @ \$2.78/ea X 500 participants	\$ 1,392
Subtotal	\$ 5,000

6. IPM on Recreational Lands \$ 50,000

An outgrowth of the School IPM program is a program to launch an IPM on school athletic fields program. This pilot effort in four school districts of varying size, one in each of the state’s athletic classes, is set to compare the cost savings and reduced exposures of student athletes and adjacent watersheds to pesticide inputs. Each participating school will be contrasted with a comparable facility that is not implementing IPM. Surface water will be sampled on a weekly schedule at three locations downstream from the test sites. Each sample will be tested by HPLC for 10 common pesticides as well as nitrogen and phosphorus runoff. Data will be compared across locations and will be used in programs during winter training. In-state travel is complicated by the distance and the weekly frequency. Local science teachers have been enlisted to assist with water sample collection. This may increase local support and allow a local story to be told in classroom and to PTA Boards. The PI has already accepted three invitations to report back to a school board, PTA and Rotary club about the effects of the program locally.

Salary for IPM Educators (0.5 FTE).....	\$ 15,000
Fringe benefits.....	\$ 5,000
Sample processing at the state biochemistry laboratory.....	\$ 18,800
Local science teachers hired hourly (\$ 8/hr x 400 hrs).....	\$ 3,200
In-state travel	\$ 8,000
Subtotal	\$ 50,000

Please note the collaboration component associated with this IPM in recreational lands project (above).

7. IPM Training and Implementation in Schools.....\$ 10,000

We have initiated a program to launch an IPM in Schools program that will focus on management of indoor pests in school buildings. Many of the state schools are aging and pests are common in those facilities. Rising cockroach populations are increasing the risk of allergy related asthma in the educational environment. The XYZ Tech University IPM program will initiate a training program for school custodial staff, pest control specialists and teachers to raise awareness and minimize the risk to students. Training sessions will be conducted in 15 school districts with problem facilities and a follow up survey will be distributed at training and again six, nine, 12 and 24 months after training. A short monthly school IPM newsletter will be initiated to keep IPM in the front of the minds of workshop attendees.

Develop training materials.....	\$ 3,000
Survey development, validation and mailing	\$ 4,000
Train the trainer travel costs	\$ 3,000
Subtotal	\$ 10,000

8. IPM Partnerships in Wide-Area Pest Monitoring & Reporting Systems..... \$ 0

We will not participate in any wide area IPM Program.

Total program costs..... \$ 219,200

This document is merely an example of how you might communicate a programmatic breakdown of your program costs by category and by Project. Individual universities may have specific internal requirement on how to complete this process. The panel will require this information to make a proper appraisal of your application.