

**IPM Centers Coordinating Committee - Meeting Notes**  
**June 13-14, 2006**  
**Washington, DC**

**TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 2006**

**Attending:**

Bob Nowerski, Dennis Kopp, Ann Sorenson, John Butler, Regina Langton, Monty Johnson, Eldon Ortman, Harold Coble, Ron Stinner, Steve Toth, Sue Ratcliffe, Carol Pilcher, Bill Coli, Steve Hopkins, Larry Olsen, Mary Kay Malinoski, Lynnae Jess, Liz Thomas, Nikhil Mallampalli, Mike Fitzner, Jim Van Kirk, John Ayers, Rick Melnicoe, Linda Herbst, Carrie Koplinka-Loehr, Jill Auburn,

**ARS – Office of Pest Management Policy (OPMP) - Harold Coble**

Recent work:

- EPA – assist with new registrations especially in light of the phase out of azinphos-methyl.
- National plant disease recovery system.
- Facilitation of the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee (FIPMCC).

**EPA BEAD – Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) - Nikhil Mallampalli**

- Re-registrations and tolerance reassessments are due this year creating a huge amount of work at EPA. Reregistration review will change in August 2006.
- EPA's decision to phase out azinphos methyl is being legally challenged.

**IPM Center Updates**

Western IPM Center – Rick Melnicoe

[Western Front](#) – Newsletter of the Western IPM Center.

Other recent projects:

- Involved in school PMSP
- Still working with water quality partners
- International conference on sustainable agriculture
- Arizona held an IPM summit where ~100 people identified and prioritized IPM needs in the areas of both agriculture and urban IPM.

North Central – Sue Ratcliffe

[Center Update](#), January to June 2006

Most recent newsletter, [the Connection](#)

Southern – Jim VanKirk

Personnel:

- Working with reduced personnel until Jen Hodorowicz's replacement is found
- Most of Jim's time is devoted to Legume Risk Management Tool Development Project. Funds from that project will cover up to 50% of his salary, and with these extra funds the southern center is considering hiring more staff.

IPM Enhancement Grants

- Steve Toth managed the review panel for State Contacts and IPM Document projects.
- IPM Startup and Capstone projects will be funded by the currently open RFA

Southern RIPM

- 42 proposals submitted, 10 funded

#### Grant-writing Workshop

- Plans for a one-day workshop at Clemson University are underway targeting less experienced faculty to highlight sources of IPM funding.

#### BEAD Training

- Timelines for 4 crops were produced as a result of the BEAD training.

#### 1890, IPM Centers, and 1862s

- Plans are underway for a one-day session to improve collaboration on IPM programming among 1890 and 1982 land grants.

#### Northeastern – Carrie Koplinka-Loehr

[See handout](#) (in MS Word)

#### CSREES Update – Mike Fitzner

[Update](#) from Mike Fitzner (in MS Word)

Proposed [CSREES budget](#) (in Excel)

#### Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) - James V. Parochetti

[See handout](#) (in MS Word)

#### IPM and Water Quality Program – Mike O’Neill

Mike O’Neill’s [handout](#) (in MS Word)

Agricultural Water Security Listening Session – [final report](#)

#### Discussion:

- Nutrient and pest management are key issues for water quality
- Art Gold is presenting a session on pesticides at the next Water Quality meeting in Savannah, GA in January 2007 to talk about common ground and possible collaborative opportunities. They expect 400-500 participants and encourage those involved in IPM to attend. The agenda is open now, and Art is looking for ideas.
- Urban watersheds can heavily affect water quality, but the 406 Water Quality program mostly focuses on the impacts on water from agriculture and leaves urban water quality issues to the EPA.
- Mike encourages more cooperation between IPM Centers and Water Quality. This may open opportunities to leverage funds.
- Migration of 406 Funds to NRI: WQ is unsure what impact the move to NRI might have on their program, but their priority is to protect their current level of funding.

#### Strategic Agricultural Initiative (SAI) – Regina Langton

- Regina is meeting with some IPM Center representatives on Thursday, June 15 to look at how SAI can contribute to the value of pest management strategic plans (PMSPs) and how to optimize their use. Those who help to draft PMSPs are very interested in how the EPA uses these documents and what benefits result as a result of a PMSP being written.

- The IPM Interagency Group is meeting in Chicago in October to continue with their collaborative efforts currently focusing on evaluation of impacts, but they will be exploring other avenues of work.
- EPA Eco-regions are being used in an effort to measure outcomes from EPA projects to detail how well granting programs are serving their clientele. Two efficiency measures were established by EPA and SAI: *grant funds per acre impacted*, and *grant funds per potential acres impacted*. This method of evaluation puts the Northeast at a disadvantage since the value per acre of commodities is generally higher.

### **EPA IPM Memorandum of Understanding – Kathy Seikel**

- Kathy presented a Powerpoint illustrating the long history between EPA and various IPM programs. Currently, agencies like Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Center for Disease Control (CDC) are more interested in implementing IPM techniques for pest management within their areas of influence. Kathy feels that multiple agencies could benefit from working together to address IPM issues within each agency's purview and suggests a memorandum of understanding. What is needed by HUD, CDC, and EPA are links to qualified IPM service providers and her proposed memorandum of understanding (MOU) would do this through building bridges with the National Pest Management Association since they provide the majority of applied pest management. The overall objective is to shift the commercial pest control realm to "green" pest management techniques through promotion of Land Grant approved IPM methods.
- Discussion:
  - JVK suggests IPM Centers join in the MOU. IPM Centers should be involved in a project such as this, but Dennis Kopp suggests that this type of MOU is signed at a higher agency level. Rick mentions that Centers can participate without signing on, and that it is likely that those who have contributed to the effort will be recognized for their work.
  - Kathy will send us a draft of the MOU to see if IPM Centers want to sign on (if appropriate).
  - Kathy mentions that a brochure about the mission of IPM Centers would be helpful for her in communicating with others about this effort. Carrie offers assistance with this brochure. Kathy is unaware of the work of the Centers and would appreciate any communications that would keep her up to date.

### **National IPM Interagency Group – Carol Pilcher**

#### Current status of the Evaluation Efforts:

- The subcommittee met several times this past year and developed IPM models for each cell of the IPM Matrix. Each model represents a "**starting point**" to 1) explain what a successful IPM program looks like and the steps necessary to get to that point, 2) provide indicators for future grant programs and reporting systems and 3) provide a framework for applying existing sources of data to show current IPM impacts.
- IPM models will be sent to IPM experts in respective areas of IPM asking for their suggested changes and to provide any existing impact data that can be used to determine impacts in their area of expertise. These are living documents, which can continually be revised so comments and suggestions are welcome.
- The end product will provide outcome level indicators for grant programs and reporting systems to show practices that had real impact on human health, the environment, or economics.

- Discussion:
  - Indicators need to be incorporated into grants programs. Extension needs to make their Land Grant University leaders aware of the benefits of IPM. The GAO needs to hear the same message.
  - Encourage funding of projects that can document changes like developing IPM guidelines/standards for use by eco-labeling organizations, SYSCO, and NRCS. Example: IPM guidelines are being defined for cotton, then, using the Dilman method, an economic analysis will be done.
  - Target the use of logic models for 2007.
  - Sue Ratcliffe and Carol Pilcher will work on providing evaluation training programs.
  - Steve Hopkins offers the expertise of EPA experts to review logic models.

### **Response to IPM Centers' Review – Eldon Ortman**

- Eldon handed out a summary of the peer panel review recommendations. There is consensus that a response to the review recommendations from the IPM Centers is important. Eldon's original notes are incorporated into the discussion notes below (in italics). The report should be sent to Gary Lemme and Colien Hefferan and possibly Ralph Otto. A committee of Eldon, Carrie, and Liz T will put together a first draft of the Centers response and send out by August 4. Response to this draft should be sent to Carrie.

### **Communication**

- *Strengthen links among Centers*
- *Annual Reporting: National and Regional* – Mike Fitzner suggests that Amy Rhodes can coordinate creation of a national report from all Centers. The 406 Water Quality and the IR-4 annual impact reports are good publications to refer to while planning a Centers publication.
- *Create Center marketing documents.* In response to its advisory council, the Northeast Center made a publication that outlines the function of its Center. It is aimed toward an audience that knows little or nothing about the Center. We need a national version of this type of document. The existing 2-page document from all the Centers (from 2005) is aimed at a different audience. It was used as an educational piece for legislators, and was used in defense of threats to our budgets. The Centers need something for the broader audience that is polished.
  - In the perfect world there should be two marketing pieces: one for those who know the term IPM and one for those who don't. The WIPMC is hiring a writer who can help.
  - A marketing subcommittee is established: Sue (chair), Linda, Liz Myers, Amy, Steve Toth, and Mike F.
- *Follow-up on PMSPs with participants* – the Centers need to let PMSP panel members know if the PMSP they helped write, resulted in funding being awarded. They should also be kept apprised when EPA or OPMP makes regulatory decisions as a result of the priorities set in the PMSP. This type of follow-up can be time consuming.

- *Stakeholders (regular, scheduled)* – give examples of how stakeholders are regularly being engaged. Centers have plenty of examples of how they are interacting at different levels, but this message needs to be stronger.
- *Host institutions – provide timely grant post award management process.* For those grant programs that are within Centers, provide documentation of how fast the award notices are going out. For those within RIPM, point out the improvements over time and that some of the delays are out of the jurisdiction of the Centers.

### **Support**

- *Expand the number of funding agencies (ie have other agencies contribute funds to work that Centers do on their behalf)* – a subcommittee is formed: Steve Hopkins, John Ayers, Mike Fitzner, and Eldon Ortman
- *CSREES – develop a remittance plan for “user” agencies (like EPA)* - ask NRCS and EPA to commit a certain amount of funding for IPM work done by IPM Centers.

### **Partnering**

- *Explore/create opportunities with other agencies for programming both at Center and agency, not limited to federal agencies.* – Centers need to partner at the national level and at the regional level e.g. NRCS funds are directed at the local level, but Centers need to urge use of IPM at the upper levels of NRCS administration to create IPM policy. Centers need to highlight their current successful partnerships as with SAI, IPM Symposium, Plant Diagnostic Networks, NRCS, etc.
- *Develop linkages with graduate programs.* RIPM cannot fund graduate tuition, but graduate students can work under a grant project director on extension and research projects that are funded through IPM Centers. The doctorate of plant medicine offers practical training in IPM.

### **Operations/Rules**

- *Define role(s) of CSREES in leading and supervising Centers.* – Centers would like CSREES to interact on the Centers’ behalf at the national level (with NRCS, EPA, SARE, etc). Centers enjoy considerable freedom in choosing the scope of their work, and that is good, but there are times when Centers need promotion and partnering from the top. Centers need a “Bob Holm” type advocate, but it is unclear who that person would be from the Centers since IR-4 is structured differently.
- *Request agencies give advance notice of their needs* – for EPA and OPMP information requests: it would be helpful to have a plan of work from these agencies so Centers can know what chemicals are being considered for reregistration and the timeline for this work (EPA says this is already on the web). Centers should meet annually with EPA and other agencies to discuss what needs to be done. Steve Hopkins can help identify who should be at those meetings.
- *Use consistent interpretation of CSREES rules.* – Centers would like help from CSREES in creating better budgeting rules, in negotiating grants.gov submissions, in including in the next round of funding that funds from the 1<sup>st</sup> year can be spent throughout the four years of

funding, etc. Centers would like one person at OEP assigned to deal with all 4 regions RIPM grants so the rules are all interpreted the same way.

### **Regional Strategic Plans within the National Roadmap**

- All Centers are now in the process of developing strategic plans

### **Regional meetings to supplement National Workshop**

- Various regions are already holding regional meetings, but in the Southern region, their Center's AC recommended not investing time and money into large regional conferences and workshops although they are gathering a group to work on invasive species. On-going collaborations in other regions include: NC – Food Safety, PMSPs, IPM in schools, environmentally friendly lawns and landscaping, sudden oak death, and evaluation; NE – residential IPM. Alternatives to big conferences can be teleconferences, PMSP workshops, and other smaller venues.

### **Explore farmer grants**

- Centers encourage and will try to facilitate growers acquiring grant funds through NRCS and SARE that already have specific grower grants funds. IPM Centers will help to fund development of IPM guidelines that can be used to increase IPM use by growers.

### **Encourage a whole systems pest control approach**

- Centers need to point out that we DO encourage whole systems approaches, and that SARE also does this type of work. Possibly cite examples of funded projects that work on the whole systems approach.

### **Electronic grants submissions – Jason and Tony**

- In the upcoming grants cycle, Centers will need to give the option to RIPM applicants to submit proposals through grants.gov. Each Center can decide whether a paper copy is also necessary, and each can decide to give applicants the option of submitting via paper OR electronic submission. In the S and NC, they will only allow electronic submissions. The NC will use its own internal software.
- Grants.gov will compile information from the electronic submission, put it on a CD, and send it to the Centers. The turn around time between submission and sending the CD will be a matter of days.
- Jason is not completely sure if all land grant universities are currently set up to use grants.gov, but NRI requires submission through grants.gov and most of their funding goes to LGUs, so he feels that most LGUs are now capable of submitting through this software. The grants office at each LGU needs to do the final submission to grants.gov.
- Changes to proposals will require a whole new submission, therefore changes do not need to go through grants.gov, but instead a paper copy of the changed proposal can be sent directly to Kathy.

### **Plant Management Network**

- Dick Stuckey requested that the Centers become partners in the Plant Management Network. Benefits include: Public exposure via web site, partner logos cycle through on each web page randomly, access to listing news and announcements on site, database search of web materials indexed on the site, up to 50 users from the Centers could have access, would serve on the PMN advisory board, publish

sponsored research, indexed with national Ag Library, subscribers are 6,000 and growing, monthly update sent to all subscribers.

- The cost would be \$5000 per center annually if all our logos were displayed. The cost would be reduced to \$2500 for one logo.
- The Centers decide NOT to become members since their colleges are already members and budgets are tight.

### **National Search Engine – Jim Van Kirk**

- The current IPM search engine managed out of Iowa is out of date and not working properly. Jim suggests using a Google search instead and estimates the cost at \$24,000 annually. Ron, Mike G, Joyce, and Liz will look at price and suitability of Google search for finding IPM resources. This would not go into affect until 2007.

### **IPM Symposium – Sue Ratcliffe**

- Sue would like to step back from her heavy involvement in the IPM Symposium and asks if anyone else from Centers would be interested in taking on more of a leadership role. Carrie offers assistance from the NE on symposium subcommittees. Jim will maintain the web presence. Anyone else interested in participating should contact Sue.

### **Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education (PIPE) – Jim Van Kirk**

- Jim is attempting to acquire new funding of approximately \$1M for sentinel plots, \$130k for outreach and education, \$70K for soybean aphid, \$175K for modeling, \$125K for the database and website, and \$50K to NCSU for fund management totaling about \$2.2 million. Soybean rust is now a line item in the federal budget. Work on soybean rust modeling will be expanded to barley, wheat, and some pulse crops. RMA also has funds for this problem, possibly \$3.5 million.
- The PIPE steering committee will meet in August to work on mission issues, output, and policy. The long term stability depends on the industry paying for it.

### **Pest Alerts – Sue Ratcliffe and Rick Melnicoe**

- Pest Alerts need to be peer reviewed and written in a particular format. Sue has written guidelines for developing Pest Alerts and she would like to see these posted on the web. All Pest Alerts need to be submitted through Sue. Bedbugs would be a good next Pest Alert topic.

### **Marketing the Centers – Carrie Koplinka-Loehr, Sue Ratcliffe**

- no report.

### **Calendar of Events for Centers – Jim Van Kirk**

- the idea of creating a calendar of events was presented as a service from the Centers. The problem is that it must be kept up to date and all of the Centers are too busy to feel confident about committing to this task. **The group votes to not pursue this idea even though it is a good one.**

### **IPM Guidelines – Liz Thomas**

- There is no common term used to define IPM practices in the field with some referred to as IPM elements, others use protocols, standards, guidelines or definitions. Liz is working to create a website where visitors can access all the IPM (insert your favorite term)s and she suggests using “IPM Guidelines” and would like all Centers to use the same term. **All agree to use “IPM Guidelines” for these documents that define IPM users.**
- Funding the creating of IPM Guidelines is key since they can be used as a basis for measuring IPM adoption and therefore provide Centers (and others) with badly needed data for success stories.

### **WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 2006**

Each Center makes a short presentation to Gale Buchanan and Colien Hefferan.

### **SYSCO – Tom Green and Shane Sampels**

- Tom and Shane handout an impressive 2006 update of their program.
- Their system is based on the IPM Elements out of New York State, but Tom emphasized that more IPM “guidelines” are needed for projects like SYSCOs. Processors are required to construct plans but they cannot find enough IPM information to do this well.
- **What Centers can do to help:**
  - Reach out to SYSCO suppliers to help them create their plans. Shane will send out his list of suppliers to all Center directors to help facilitate the connection between them and the Centers.
  - Share any success stories especially financial ones.
  - Provide training to suppliers about what IPM is and how it is done.
  - Designate someone from IPM Centers to serve on the SYSCO advisory council (Carrie makes assurance that this will happen).
  - Include field guides on the Centers web clearinghouse of IPM Guidelines.
  - Send Shane the contact information for Center Directors.
- Jill Auburn is interested in helping especially as plans relate to sustainability issues.
- Bob Nowierski wonders if his new IPM<sup>3</sup> Training Modules might help.
- Sue R is preparing a combination of teleconference and conference call on this subject.
- Carrie offers to outreach to SYSCO suppliers to come to any of the 4 workshops being offered in the Northeast.
- Centers fund proposals based on the IPM needs that have been submitted by various stakeholder groups. If SYSCO and its processors can describe in a list what they most need to implement their IPM plans, Centers can post that list on their websites to help direct grant funding.
- Shane suggests it would be good for Centers to have a SYSCO supplier on their advisory councils.

---

## Hot topics and Action items

- *Communications in response to review* –
  - Carrie will expand on Eldon's suggestions for responses to the review and then send back to IPM Center Coordinating Committee by August 4<sup>th</sup> for responses. Other Centers can review and make subsequent edits.
  - A committee with one person from each center will work to finish a unified IPM Center publication by early 2007. Content should be ready before October. Amy Rhodes will take the lead on coordinating the publication and come up with a draft by November.
  - This committee will also review other communications and decide which tasks to undertake.
  - There is a need for two marketing pieces; one for those that know about IPM and IPM Centers, and another for those who don't. A two-page document about the Centers would be useful to quickly inform others about the Centers.
- *EPA MOU* - Kathy Seikel from EPA is working on a memorandum of understanding between EPA and IPM. She would like to be on our contacts list since she doesn't know what the IPM Centers are doing. Carrie will forward information about the Centers on to Kathy to keep her apprised of what's new. Jim suggests constructing a way to communicate across agencies to make sure people like Kathy Seikel know what the IPM Centers are doing.
- *Evaluation* – Carol Pilcher contacted experts to vet the logic models her group has initiated but she needs help finding the experts. IPM Centers will ask IPM Coordinators for help finding the experts, but Jim asks if Bill and Carol can craft the email he should use to ask for their help.
- *User agencies* – a subgroup of Mike Fitzner, Steve Hopkins, Eldon Ortman, and John Ayers will work to resolve issues about remittance for other agencies and other “support” issues (sorry, I don't have more than this in my notes)
- *Next meeting* in Orlando, FL
  - Tues, January 30 – afternoon is IPM Centers only
  - Wed, January 31 – all day – IPM Centers only
  - National Plant Diagnostics Network meeting: Jan 28-31
  - Water Quality meeting: Jan 28-Feb 1, Savannah, GA (Carrie will contact Art Gold about attending this meeting)
- *Plant Management Network* - IPM Centers decided NOT to pay to become partners in the Plant Management Network.
- *National IPM Search Engine* – Jim suggests using a google search instead of the current system managed by John VanDyke. Ron, Mike G, Joyce, and Liz will look at price and suitability of Google search for finding IPM resources.
- *IPM Symposium*- Sue asks for help from other Centers on IPM Symposium leadership. Carrie offers assistance from the NE on symposium subcommittees. Jim will maintain the web presence. Anyone else interested in participating should contact Sue.
- *Pest Alerts* – Sue has written guidelines for developing Pest Alerts. She would like to see these posted on the web.
- *PIPE* – Jim is submitting proposals for multimillions.
- *Calendar* – Do not develop a calendar of events generated from the IPM Centers.
- *IPM Guidelines* – IPM Centers agree to the term “IPM Guidelines” when referring to documents that define what a grower or other IPM user needs to do to qualify as using IPM. Alias' for IPM Guidelines include IPM Elements, Protocols, Standards, Definitions.
- *SYSCO* –

- Asks IPM Centers to serve on their Advisory Committee. Carrie offers a commitment that someone from the IPM Centers will serve, but that person is not appointed at this meeting.
- Tom expresses the need for more IPM guidelines to be developed.
- SYSCO uses thresholds that are in many field guides as one basis for determining IPM adoption. They ask that these documents be added to the web clearinghouse of IPM Guidelines developed by the NE IPM Center.
- IPM Centers ask to be put on Shane's email list. We need to send him our contact info.
- Shane will send IPM Center directors the SYSCO list of crops and processors. He suggests this is a good opportunity to reach out to SYSCO suppliers to offer our help in defining IPM techniques.
- Jill Auburn wants to also work with IPM Centers and SYSCO.
- SYSCO is willing to help provide data that can be incorporated into IPM success stories.
- Web-based training of suppliers would be helpful for SYSCO. He needs formalized training of suppliers for what IPM is and how it is done.
- See if Bob Nowerski's IPM<sup>3</sup> training modules would work as a basis for training.
- IPM Centers ask Tom Green and SYSCO to submit their list of IPM needs and priorities to help direct funding decisions within our grants programs.