

Minutes
Pest Management Centers Directors Meeting
June 16-17, 2003
Washington, D.C

Attendees during the two days:

John Ayers	Jonathan Becker	Wilfred Burr	Mike Fitzner
Shani File	April Gower	Michael Gray	Linda Herbst
Bill Hoffman	Al Jennings	Lynnae Jess	Kathy Kimble-Day
Nikhil Mallampalli	Rick Melnicoe	Rick Meyer	Russ Mizell
Therese Murtagh	Norm Nesheim	Larry Olsen	Eldon Ortman
Ralph Otto	Jim Parochetti	Susan Ratcliffe	Kent Smith
Ron Stinner	Liz Thomas	Jim VanKirk	Dick Wootton

Monday, June 16, 2003

Rick Melnicoe welcomed everyone to Washington, DC. Everyone introduced himself or herself.

CSREES Update

Mike Fitzner discussed Pesticide Safety and Education Program (PSEP) funding from EPA. EPA believes that approximately \$3 million in unobligated PSEP funds remain at USDA. EPA feels this can cover the \$1.8 million annual budget for the coming fiscal year and does not plan to fund this year's PSEP. There has been some progress in discussions between the two agencies. USDA believes the money is obligated and is in the process of being billed for and transferred to the states. This is complicated by the three levels of money handling. States are being urged to submit invoices immediately.

Mike discussed the creation of a Federal IPM Coordinating Committee. This committee will be comprised entirely of Federal departments and agencies by law. Non-federal employees cannot serve on the committee; however they can be guests at meetings. The committee will provide strategic direction for IPM in all 13 departments/agencies. The first meeting will be held on June 25, 2003. This will be a key link for the IPM Centers to the Federal system. A chair will be selected at the first meeting.

Mike provided an update on homeland security, invasive species and other topics.

A virulent strain of *Ralsonia* a new bacterial disease in the U.S. has shown up on geraniums. It can infect bedding plants, tomatoes and potatoes.

USDA has asked the Extension/Experiment Station Directors to identify a homeland security contact for each state.

An IR-4 review was conducted at the IR-4 headquarters. Chuck Laughlin chaired the review team. The report is still being written, however the exit report was very favorable.

It was suggested that IPM Centers regional people attend the annual IR-4 Food Use Workshop meeting when this meeting is held in their region. Rick Melnicoe volunteered to be the IPM Centers liaison to IR-4.

CSREES has been shorthanded for awhile. This created quite a strain on the system to

review grant proposals. The number of proposals submitted was higher than in previous years. Mike feels that the quality of funded proposals will be high. Forward funding of early RAMP proposals allowed for only 2 of 31 to be funded this year. Six of 30 CAR proposals will be funded.

Mike briefly discussed the phasing in of e-grants. All Federal grants are to be done electronically by 2005. This will include standardization of forms for all programs.

PMAP is still planned to be moved to the IPM Centers in the future. Twenty percent (approximately \$300,000 each) of the funds would go to each region, with CSREES holding 20% for multi-regional projects. Funding would be from CSREES after the regions recommended which projects to fund. This would be done in much the same way as the regional IPM grants.

Jim Green from Oregon State University was hired as a CSREES horticulturalist.

Eldon Ortman will be reducing his work with CSREES to a part time basis.

The CSREES web site redesign will be completed by October.

The Evaluation Accounting Unit is organizing and hiring staff. The tenor of the unit is to help, not micromanage.

OPMP Update

Al Jennings reported on the methyl bromide Critical Use Exemptions (CUEs). The U.S. sent a package to the international body. The international body recommended approximately 10% of the U.S. applications. Most of the others had additional information requested for further evaluation. EPA had received large amounts of data with each application. EPA distilled these data and submitted. Al thinks that much of the information requested may be readily available. Congress is to conduct hearing on the methyl bromide issue and may push concerns to international levels. Round 2 for CUEs is on-going. Meetings are being held around the U.S. to discuss the process and allocations.

Atrazine in drinking water will be handled at local levels. Triggers will be in place for violations. These may be at the watershed level. Sugarcane use may cause problems because of the high atrazine rates used. There are still ecological effects concerns with atrazine. The Scientific Advisory Panel is scheduled to review the conflicting amphibian studies. There is still a need for more data. Atrazine is the number one pesticide used in the U.S. with approximately 80 million pounds used per year.

Reldan (chlorpyrifos-methyl), used only for stored grains, is scheduled for stop sale at the end of 2003. By the end of 2004 all uses must be discontinued. There is not a suitable alternative to Reldan and it is a relatively small use. USDA has requested an extension of the use indefinitely. Products containing ½ Reldan and ½ cyfluthrin are quite effective. However, there is no CODEX MRL for cyfluthrin on small grains. Reldan/deltamethrin does have a CODEX MRL and EPA has extended the ½ rate of Reldan. EPA wants the full rate of Reldan to lapse.

EPA is concerned with a common metabolite in triazoles. All new tolerances for triazoles are on hold. PDP is gathering residue data on this metabolite. The hope is these data will show no levels of concern. This is important because of the soybean rust. Triazoles are the most effective fungicides for this pest and are used outside the U.S. for control. A draft Section 18 emergency exemption is on the PMC.org web site. It will be ready to submit to EPA when the disease arrives in the U.S. EPA would like to conduct a review of the request package soon.

Perchlorate is not a pesticide, but has been found in some produce irrigated with

contaminated water. Dr. Charles Sanchez at the University of Arizona is conducting residue studies to determine the extent of the contamination. Leafy greens appear to be the plants which accumulate perchlorate. Fruits and root vegetables do not. Dr. Sanchez will provide a report to the California Lettuce Board next week. The National Academy of Sciences will be reviewing perchlorate next year. Perchlorate contaminated sites are found in 20 states.

Courts have agreed with registrants that EPA did not go through proper rulemaking when the Agency stated it would not accept human subject's pesticide testing data. It is possible that some registrants may resubmit data on organophosphates to regain uses lost. Azinphos-methyl is a likely candidate.

APHIS obtained a registration for the active ingredient acetaminophen to control brown tree snakes. The active ingredient is placed in dead rodents that the snakes then eat. It is lethal to the snakes.

EPA is drafting a proposal to amend FIFRA to collect fees for service.

These fees would allow more ecological work on endangered species up front to cut down on consultation times.

IPM Centers

Mike Fitzner presented an overview of the panel process for the IPM Centers proposals. The panel met during the past two weeks. Dick Stuckey was the panel chair along with five panel members. The panel was asked to spend time on the broader operation of the centers. Mike promised specific comments and general discussions in letters to each P.I. in the next two weeks. Mike went on to state that all proposals were excellent. Broad items included:

Align with the IPM Roadmap. This is a key issue to show regional and national success.

Measure success and identify clear milestones to success.

Make strategic investments. Insure these relate to goals and priorities established by Advisory Committees.

Maintain resource and management flexibility. The panel liked the working group structure submitted by some. Avoid the more static bureaucracy.

Encourage state efforts on issues of common interest, rather than entitlement funding.

Engage multi-state regional committees such as WCC-69, leadership of ESCOP, ECOP, etc. in Center operations and priority identification and setting.

Search for additional funding. Serve as a magnet for additional funds to implement priorities as established.

The panel liked an organizational chart submitted by one region. They encourage each region to develop an organizational chart showing roles and responsibilities.

The panel liked the idea of a biennial stakeholder conference. This was seen as a way to assemble subject matter expertise and critique Center activities.

CSREES would like to see over the next four years a partnership, rather than competition in the states. This would result in cooperation and assistance – a positive force.

Centers are an important place to collect, analyze and report on the broad picture of IPM in the region. What has happened? What are the bigger needs?

Centers should have funding flexibility to move funding as they see fit and is needed.

The IPM Centers were funded equally. CSREES feels the scope of work for each Center is broad – production agriculture, ag/urban interface, community IPM, etc. Each Center has a piece of this. The work load is approximately equal. The number of states in each region is

equal. There is no existing formula that would be appropriate to divide the funds unequally because they do not take into consideration the breadth of scope. CSREES feels that \$1.1 million is base funding. If additional funding becomes available, the allocations of additional funds may not be dispersed equally.

The Regional IPM Grants programs will be managed by the IPM Centers. This has political connotations. It is an area the CSREES has to help happen. CSREES is concerned about hints of conflicts of interest – across the board. People who write the priorities may not be ones who apply for funding. One who applies for funding cannot make decisions on funding. Development of the RFA has been done in the regions. Because of this, there is a concern about a conflict of interest. Centers will write the RFA with input from Advisory Committee, WCC-69, NC-201 and others. The IPM Centers will do the business end of the grants and the IPM researchers will deal with programmatic issues. CSREES is prepared to take the heat on this issue. CSREES has started the process to notify. They will take the responsibility for making the decision. The only change that Mike Fitzner sees is in the process of writing and managing the RFA. This will not happen this year.

e-Extension

Dick Wootton presented e-Extension. This is a national web based information and education system that will allow the outreach arm of Land Grant Universities and USDA to better serve current and new customers who increasingly desire anywhere-anytime assistance with questions, issues and life events. This program is not designed to replace agents or personal contact. Rather, it will complement them. Additional funding will be sought from Congress. The Extension Directors will decide in November on their level of commitment. This program is still conceptual in nature. It was suggested that someone from Ron Stinner's office interact with the program.

IPM Roadmap

Eldon Ortman discussed the IPM Roadmap. There have been revisions since the IPM Symposium. The overall theme continues to be "Risk Reduction." IPM Centers should be leaders in implementing the Roadmap broadly. Centers can take the lead in some areas. The CAR and RAMP RFAs should also reflect the Roadmap.

The June 25 meeting of the IPM Coordinating Committee will discuss how each department/agency can buy into the Roadmap. Eldon does not believe that each agency will necessarily sign off on the Roadmap. But he expects general endorsement of the concepts. Eldon expects one or more revisions after this meeting.

Regional IPM Center Plans

Each future IPM Center Director discussed their proposal.

Ron Stinner does not know how much will change until he receives written comments.

He will have 5 staff at varying levels of commitment to the SR IPM Center. This includes Ron as Director, 2 Associate Directors (Regulatory Affairs and IPM), an Administrative Assistant and an Editor/Writer. There will be a large advisory committee (30 members) to advise on general policies and needs. A steering committee (12 members) will offer guidance and specific policy recommendations. Scientific review panels will select projects for funding.

Jim VanKirk and John Ayers described the NE IPM Center proposal. In this region, state based subcontracts will provide core functions. Crop profiles and PMSPs will be funded separately. Workgroups will have leaders that receive a stipend to use as they see fit. A regional IPM conference will be held every other year. There are co-Directors with Jim and John. A FTE will be hired to coordinate working groups and computer issues. Another 0.75 FTE will handle other functions of the Center. The NE IPM Center is eliminating the IPM Facilitator title.

Rick Melnicoe and Linda Herbst described the WR IPM Center proposal. Rick read the Vision and Mission Statements. The management consist of a 50% Director (Rick Melnicoe) and 50% Assistant Director (Linda Herbst). Rick will devote 25% of his time to the California program and Linda will devote 50% of her time to the California program. Tom Holtzer is the co-P.I. with Rick. The current WRPMC Steering Committee will continue as the WRIPM Center Advisory Committee until the membership can be reviewed and changed. A regional IPM Board is planned to be comprised of business and community leaders that can assist the Center in achieving its mission, maximizing the impacts of its programs and providing leadership in seeking access to new regional resources. The WR is proposed to be divided into four sub-regions with states taking leadership for various sub-regional and regional functions. A workgroup will be formed to review the current RIPM grants program. This workgroup will recommend how the program should be managed.

Larry Olsen, Sue Ratcliffe, Mike Gray and Lynnae Jess presented the NC IPM Center proposal. The organizational basis is through issue working groups for most of the Center's IPM core functions. Individuals in states will be invited to submit proposals for up to \$25,000 annually to be IPM Center state contacts. Larry (0.25 FTE) and Mike will be co-Directors. Sue (0.50 FTE) will continue as IPM Facilitator for the region. Lynnae (1.0 FTE) will spend ½ her time as assistant Director and ½ time as crop profiles and PMSPs coordinator. Michael Greifenkamp (1.0 FTE) will spend ½ time as web and database manager and ½ time as the publications writer and editor. A secretary (0.25 FTE) will assist in grants management.

Mike Gray presented some questions that have arisen regarding the IPM Centers. These were deferred until the next day in order to give Eldon and Mike Fitzner time to draft replies.

OPMP Role in IPM Centers

Al Jennings commented that OPMP's role with the IPM Centers will be to continue the partnership developed over the past few years. It will involve sharing information from DC to the regions and from the regions to DC. He wants to continue to draw on the strengths of both his office and the regional expertise. DC people know what is coming up. He sees a need to show results such as crop profiles and PMSPs and interactions on regulatory issues. Al feels that more research is needed on economic thresholds, especially if organophosphates go away. Crop timelines are important to show season-long activities and how often workers go into a field related to the crop's stage of growth. This helps EPA determine mitigation measures for exposure and risk reduction. Al is concerned that the delivery component of research and delivery may be lost.

IPM Center Web Site

Ron Stinner provided a web update. There are now 558 crop profiles posted. Dates have

been added as well as links to timelines. There are now 29 PMSPs posted and 11 timelines are coming from EPA to be posted.

IPM Centers Advisory Committee

John Ayers suggested that an IPM Centers Advisory Committee be considered. This might have organizations such as CropLife America, WWF, Aerial Applicators Association, MCFA, NRDC, etc. on the committee. It should be a group with broad interests. It could meet with the National IPM Committee each fall. It could provide contacts, ideas and support such as that found with the regional advisory committees. This cannot run afoul of the Federal Advisory Committees Act. It could be formed as a "Resource Group."

It was agreed that a brochure describing the IPM Centers be developed. John Ayers volunteered to take the lead on developing a straw man document. Sue, Ron and Mike Gray volunteered to assist John. All will have an opportunity to comment.

Tuesday, June 17, 2003

EPA Update

Nikhil Mallampalli and Jonathan Becker gave an EPA Update. Nik discussed the planned regional training for BEAD staff. He will submit proposals to EPA for funding projects in the regions for the next three years. Currently the NC and WR are proposing nursery training. The funds will be transferred to CSREES and then to the region hosting the training. Nik would like to see one training session per region per year for three years. He wants to focus on areas that crop profiles have not been developed or where there is a lack of NASS data. EPA is open to suggestions for additional training.

Jonathan Becker discussed EPA personnel changes. Senior managers are routinely moved every 3-5 years.

Christie Whitman will be leaving at the end of June. Linda Fisher will be the acting Administrator.

Marcia Mulkey left OPP. Jim Jones is the new OPP office director. Anne Lindsey moved into the assistant director position vacated by Jim Jones.

Denise Keehner has left BEAD. Tina Levine is now the acting director of BEAD.

Debbie Edwards is the Division Director of the Registration Division.

Lois Rossi has taken a special detail in Europe from the Special Review and Reregistration Division. Betty Shackelford is the acting director in Lois' absence.

Jay Ellenberger is the acting Division Director of FEAD.

Steve Bradbury is the new Division Director of the Environmental Fate and Effects Division.

Jonathan developed a crop profiles spreadsheet, which he had previously shared with the Directors. This spreadsheet contains all the crop profiles completed through February 2003. It also lists states with acreage of crops for which no profiles have been written. Other useful information is also detailed. This document is very useful in identifying priorities for future

profiles. Jonathan will maintain the spreadsheet through at least one more revision. Ron Stinner will add the latest crop profiles and add PMSPs.

Role of IPM Centers

Mike Fitzner and Eldon Ortman addressed the questions the NC region posed the day before:

1. Why Integrated Pest Management Centers?

A lot of USDA-LGU R&E investments have been made to develop the IPM “brand” — why would we NOT want to build Centers around this term?

The term "IPM" has a history & meaning to many different groups — it took many years to build the value of this brand.

- Is seen as a progressive, problem solving approach for addressing pest management problems/issues with science-based answers.
- Most stakeholders of our programs who are interested/concerned about pest management uses the term "IPM" to represent "good" pest management or the type of pest management we need to strive for — and that is exactly what all of our programs are trying to do (PSEP, IR-4, Extension IPM, PMAP, RAMP, CAR, MBT, ORG).
- Need to recognize (and acknowledge) that some aspects of our IPM effort is focused on today's needs & technologies (e.g., PSEP, IR-4), while other aspects are focused on tomorrow's (e.g., IPM R&E).

From the beginning, the goal was for Centers to reflect USDA-land grant university efforts in pest management in the broad sense, across the various pest management programs.

One thing for sure — stakeholders don't generally care what we call it, but they are demanding that we ensure resources are coordinated & are able to articulate how they relate.

We need to get beyond arguing over terminology and get behind a common goal — and IPM is the goal.

2. Who do Centers Serve (Directly)?

- Research & Extension (education) professionals (esp. Extn. IPM Coordinators)
- Coordination, priority-setting, resources
- Centers serve the states (e.g., West Nile publ.; Profiles; PMSPs) & the states serve the Centers (provide information for West Nile publ.; Profiles, PMSPs)
- LGU administrators — regional directors; administrative advisors for Center/IPM R&E committees
- Private sector advisors (consultants, dealer reps., PCOs, etc.)
- State & federal governments (including regulatory)
- Funders (coordination, efficiency, impact data/reports)
- Stakeholders via regional/national organizations

Who Do Centers NOT Serve (Directly)?

- Growers, pest managers. Centers do not generally deliver information to the end-user — This is done by state-based programs, consultants, etc. Center’s role is to invest in the knowledge & delivery tools to help them do this.

Comments included: How can we get better buy in? We need to work to make IPM program people feel a part of the IPM Centers and the Centers to serve them, too. IPM people need to view Centers as cooperators, not competitors. This should get better as we fund more IPM related issues. Need to articulate the relationship of IPM and the regulatory input process.

3. How Should Centers Use Stakeholders? (Center proposals have many good ideas)
 - Provide broad-based priority-setting & advice on strategic direction at the Center level
 - Stakeholders at working group level more specific “hands on” advice
 - State-level stakeholders should feed into Center’s steering/advisory committee — each state should/does have stakeholder input mechanism, Centers shouldn’t need to create a separate mechanism

Goal for Centers: Fitzner suggests stakeholder groups should be 50% people/groups you know & are comfortable with, 50% you aren’t comfortable with (in other words, not just the good ‘ol boys)

Stakeholders can:

- React to past activities & plans for the future
- Advertise Center within their communities
- Help generate political/budget support

Comments included: Advantage to have innovative people on stakeholder committees. Bring in some people who may not normally be involved. The ratio above is not so important.

4. Is There a Role for Existing Multi-state IPM and Coordinator Committees?

Yes — they can focus more on programmatic issues & opportunities, like they did during the pre-RFA development days.

Advisory to Centers on RFA development. Centers should get input from stakeholders and institutional committees (i.e., multi-state IPM research and extension coordinating committee). These committees are likely to have different perspectives. Research and extension committees should review stakeholder needs and priorities to identify what relevant information is already available. Also, they can identify what science and technology is available that might be brought in from other areas to quickly engage and address stakeholder needs.

Research committees should identify and prioritize needs and opportunities from a research perspective. How recent developments/advances in science and technology might be brought to bear in enhancing the IPM tool box.

Research committees should bring new science and technology developments “to the table” for potential engagement in RFA prioritization and development.

They can assist in developing list(s) of reviewers for panels.

Plan/strategize and develop proposals for other funding opportunities, for example, CAR and RAMP.

Review the multi-state research committee structure and programs in the region. Consider the question; is there a need for different committees, to combine committees, how do or should these committees relate to other regions?

5. Are There Niches for Centers? If So, How Identified?

Certainly — states do things in behalf of Centers so Centers would be expected to do things in behalf of other entities from state through national.

Niches are/have already developed; for example: Website & databases - South, National IPM Symposium - NC, etc.

Niches will evolve naturally as a result of Center interest and expertise, as well as through requests by other Centers and organizations.

- Developing niches for Centers is viewed as an important component for an effective and efficient national IPM program.
- Extension coordinators could identify and prioritize regional, user and general public publications.

6. Measuring Impact - Who, How, When?

There is a need to develop some common measures, templates as well as some tailored products. These can be developed through workshops, planning sessions, consultants.

CSREES has added a Planning and Accountability unit that might be engaged.

Developing an accountability system based on impact and outcome must be a high priority agenda item for Centers and national leadership.

Federal budget decisions will consider what entities and programs have provided measurable benefit to their clientele and the public.

This represents one of the most pressing priority challenges for IPM, but is not unique to IPM. Documenting impact/outcome/accountability is a high priority for all programs with a federal investment.

Discussion continued on developing an IPM Centers brochure. This is needed to show people what the IPM Centers are about. Sue Ratcliffe will take the lead on developing a brochure. Linda Herbst will assist.

NASS Update

Kevin Hintzman from NASS discussed the USDA NRCS Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP). This project will assess the benefits of funding spent on conservation projects. It will only survey field and row crops. The first report will be issued in 2005. This is a field level survey with 9600 interviews planned.

Information Gathering and Reporting

Rick Melnicoe described the Pacific Northwest Comment Coordinator position. This person reviews Federal Register notices, requests from USDA and EPA and gathers expert responses from people for a reply back to the requestor. Both USDA and EPA have commented on the value of this information. The WRPMC is posting these comments on the web.

PDP Program

Therese Murtagh discussed the PDP microbiological testing program that she was detailed with. The sampling did not find many pathogens. Two samples contained *Salmonella*. No pathogenic strains of *E. coli* were found.

PMSPs

Wilfred Burr spoke about pest management strategic plans (PMSPs). He related that one PMSP submitted only had one grower at the meeting. It was noted that additional growers did provide later input to this document. A discussion ensued on how to get better grower participation at PMSP meetings. Some suggestions included: timing of meetings to slow times of the year; have pre-meeting conference calls to get everyone on board; get commodity organization (where they exist) support; make sure that crop consultants participate; follow written invitations with a personal phone call to stress the importance of attending. The template for how to organize a PMSP meeting needs some revision. It is important to make sure organizers of PMSPs use the template.

Elections

John Ayers was elected chair of the IPM Centers Coordinating Group and Larry Olsen was elected vice-chair. Both were by unanimous consent.

Center Leadership Roles

Sue Ratcliffe introduced the topic of IPM Centers taking leadership roles at the regional and national levels. This is an area that the Directors have agreed upon in proposals to USDA. One possible area is the measurement of IPM adoption. We agreed that as issues arise and a leadership role is needed, we will step up to take on responsibilities, as appropriate. Rick Melnicoe volunteered to be the IR-4 liaison.

Partnering with the Entomological Foundation

April Gower with the Entomological Foundation presented a partnership opportunity for educating youth (pre-K through 12 grades) on IPM issues. This will be accomplished by training

educators – a sort of train the trainers approach. Currently, an inventory of what is available is underway. The plan is to have a downloadable virtual library of activities and resources to work with youth. Materials would be developed where gaps exist. April suggested that the IPM Centers could be nodes of learning for developing and delivery of IPM materials and training.

Next Meeting Sites and Dates

The next meeting will be held in Washington, DC on October 1-2, 2003. The regional IPM coordinators will be invited to attend.

The following meeting will be held on February 25-26, 2004 in Raleigh, NC.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Minutes recorded by Rick Melnicoe.