

# National IPM Center Directors Meeting Report

February 25, 2004 Raleigh, NC

## Attending:

John Ayers, Kitty Cardwell, Harold Coble, Bill Coli, Shani File, Mike Fitzner, Michael Gray, Michael Greifenkamp, Linda Herbst, Jennifer Hodorowicz, William Hoffman, Tom Holtzer, Dennis Kopp, Al Jennings, Lynnae Jess, Arnet (Skee) Jones, Rick Melnicoe, Russ Mizell, Therese Murtagh, Clayton Myers, Norm Nesheim, Larry Olsen, Eldon Ortman, Susan Ratcliffe, Burleson Smith, Ron Stinner, Joyce Strand, Elizabeth Thomas, Steve Toth, Jim VanKirk

## CSREES Update – Mike Fitzner

### *Plant Science Update*

This CSREES publication gives a comprehensive look at current topics: funding opportunities, reports from stakeholders, upcoming meetings, national budget issues, personnel changes, and contact information. It is available on the web at

<http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/whatnew/psupdate04/feb-march.pdf>. Contact Bill Hoffman for suggestions or to have the publication delivered via listserv.

### *Budget*

- The 2004 federal budget was late this year, creating repercussions in the flow of funds for the 2000+ grants that need to go through the CSREES office by September 30, 2004.
- Total funding for CSREES is level in 2004, although most CSREES programs sustained approximately a 10% cut. This cut is in no way a reflection on the quality of CSREES funded programs. Budget lines for Special Grants and Federal Administration increased by approximately \$150 million or over 10% of the total CSREES budget. The Special Grants line is full of congressional earmarks this year, but it appears from the President's 2005 budget that funding will be restored more closely to 2003 levels in 2005.
- CSREES programs would benefit from partnering in bio-security issues since this is an area of growth (proposed in the President's 2004 budget to be \$16 million, appropriated at \$8 million; proposed in the President's 2005 budget to be \$30 million).

### *Pest Management Alternatives Program (PMAP) – Eldon Ortman*

- Management of this source of funding will not go to the regions this year, but should be ready in 2005. Eldon Ortman passed out a draft of operational guidelines dated February 2004, which outlines the program's background, purpose, timeframes, methods of program evaluation, and how the program administration will be transferred to the IPM Centers. Since 1996, PMAP has awarded approximately \$1.6 million supplemented at various levels by the EPA. These funds are not limited to LGUs.

Eldon is preparing a plan where 70% of the PMAP funds are divided equally between the four regions (17.5% each) to address regional issues. The remaining 30% will be used to address national issues. Timing of the RFPs for this program will need to be synchronized across the regions since each Center will need to forward national or multi-regional proposals to the national program at the same time for review. Centers will write the programmatic part of the RFA and the rest will be written at the national office. For more information, contact Eldon Ortman at [eortman@csrees.usda.gov](mailto:eortman@csrees.usda.gov).

Points from the discussion on the migration of PMAP management follow:

- Is there a different set of criteria for choosing whether a project is of national importance such as consumption or environmental impact rather than simply the geographic region into which it is relevant?
- Make sure PIs are aware of both the regional and national PMAP program and include a space in the proposal forms to indicate into which pool of money the proposal should be directed.
- Multi-regional projects can tap into the national or regional pools of funding. There are some issues to be sorted out regarding what constitutes national and regional.
- Priorities from PMSPs should be very influential in determining a PMAP award. Letters of recommendation should not supercede PMSP recommendations. Letters of support from grower organizations should weigh more heavily than letters from individuals.
- Eldon wants feedback on draft by March 1 (or asap) before he proceeds with writing the RFA.

#### *Presidential Directive-Ron Stinner*

- Early in February, the President signed a Homeland Security Presidential Directive (HSPD-9) requiring the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Health and Human Services, the EPA, and other related organizations to work together under the Department of Homeland Security. Although not in the directive, word has it that \$560 million is available to make this happen. The full document can be found at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/02/20040203-2.html>

#### **Office of Pest Management Policy (OPMP) - Al Jennings**

##### *Section 18*

Through a proposed rule to streamline the Section 18 process, recertification of an emergency need for a pesticide would be allowed up to 3 years. The economic test would become a tiered approach based first on yield loss, then through a number of more complex steps. The proposal would not allow for exemptions based on the avoidance of resistance.

##### *Part 158*

Soon the Part 158 requirements for EPA will be consolidated into a more comprehensive document for testing requirements. This consolidation was last done in 1987

##### *Endangered Species*

The proposed “counterpart rules” are intended to streamline EPA compliance in making pesticide registration decisions. Risk assessment methods need to be solidified and detailed to help accelerate pesticide registrations.

##### *Phase II of Methyl Bromide*

Sulfuryl fluoride was recently registered as an alternative for methyl bromide for use in post-harvest grain and grain processing fumigation and for dried fruits and nuts. Dow Chemical is the registrant. California is considering putting it on an expedited schedule. The status of methyl iodide for pre-plant uses is not certain.

##### *Carbamates*

An assessment of the cumulative effects of carbamates is on its way. There will be more information on this in the future.

##### *Human Testing*

The National Academy of Science recently published a lengthy report accepting the value of human testing of pesticides if a number of scientific and ethical tests are met.

##### *Perchlorate*

Although the media coverage has died down lately, the issue of concern about contamination in many agricultural products and drinking water is still an issue. The National Academy of Sciences is currently assessing the scientific basis of a health standard proposed by EPA.

### *Fee for Pesticide Registration Service*

EPA has set up a system for registrants to pay an additional fee to achieve a quicker turn around in pesticide registration service. The accumulated fees will pay for hiring personnel to work on these registrations. The EPA web site will carry more information on this soon.

### *Soybean Rust*

It is presumed that soybean rust will eventually show up in the U.S. and emergency exemptions from EPA are almost in place to use if APHIS locates the disease. Pesticides in the Triazole class seem to be most effective.

### *Personnel*

Adam Sharp has moved into the EPA agricultural advisor slot formerly held by Jean-Mari Peltier. Lois Rossi has switched jobs with Debbie Edwards. Lois is now Director of the Registration Division and Debbie the Director of the Special Review and Re-registration Division.

### *Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA)*

The FQPA deadline for tolerance review is 2006 and much work remains. EPA is developing a roadmap to identify the key milestones.

## **Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) - Skee Jones**

### *Methyl bromide*

For 2005, the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBOC) recommended a target for the U.S. of 35% of its 1991 baseline use of methyl bromide. The final decision on the approved quantity will occur the week of March 22, 2004

### *Training workshops*

Workshops created with the cooperation of the Western and North Central IPM Centers are helping to train EPA personnel about real world needs in various cropping systems. Nursery crops are pinpointed as the next focus area since EPA has little experience in this area.

### *OPMP*

EPA personnel have initiated monthly meetings with the Office of Pest Management Policy on re-registration issues in hopes of improving the communication between EPA and the USDA offices. OPMP receives the Outputs Report from OPP and has assigned staff members to each chemical going through re-registration.

### *Summer Interns*

Send information on potential candidates to Skee Jones (jones.arnet@epa.gov)

### *Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSP)*

EPA uses PMSPs to varying extents and the more detailed they are, the more useful they will be. Skee feels that a representative from the EPA regional office (usually the FQPA contact) on PMSP panels is important although EPA prefers to send headquarters staff when possible, especially when there is the potential for worker exposure to pesticides from hand labor or other activities in the culture of a crop. EPA headquarters representatives try to attend between eight and ten PMSPs per year, but with the cuts to the EPA budget, travel costs are an issue. Nikhil Mallampalli, Jonathan Becker, and Skee Jones are the EPA headquarters contacts.

CSREES feels that one of the best ways for EPA to support PMSPs is to help promote them.

### *National Foundation for IPM Education (NFIPME)*

Rick Melnicoe brought up a concern that EPA's PESP program, administered by Mike Wallace and Janet Andersen at the NFIPME ([http://www.ipm-education.org/NFIPME\\_2004\\_PESP\\_RFP.htm](http://www.ipm-education.org/NFIPME_2004_PESP_RFP.htm)), duplicates existing programs. He feels that they should work through the Strategic Ag group to better coordinate with the IPM Centers. Within the group of IPM Center Directors, there is concern

about duplicate programs and about clientele hearing mixed messages, although some Directors feel that different initiatives with different outcomes are sometimes useful.

## **IPM Center Updates**

### *North Central*

- Distributed an impressive final report on year 3 of their State Projects, which completes the first funding cycle.
- Handed out an equally impressive quarterly update in newsletter format. To order a copy, contact Susan Ratcliffe.
- Iowa State has published a regional fact sheet titled *Weeds to Watch* on 16 new weed threats for corn and soybean fields titled.
- State Projects – Twelve were funded, with letters of approval going out in January 2004. The subcontracts flow through Michigan State University.
- Other funding – Working groups are a newly established part of the NC IPM Center activities. They are being funded at \$150K for one to three year projects.

### *Western*

- Information Networks - The RFA was issued on September 29, 2003, with proposals due on November 7, 2003. A review committee made up of two out-of-region experts and four members of the Steering Committee reviewed seven network proposals. All 7 networks were funded, representing the states of Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming. The maximum funding per network was \$25,000, and each was funded for one year. The Pacific territories will be represented to a limited extent by Hawaii. Arizona is making efforts to include New Mexico and will work with cooperators in California. Montana, Nevada and Utah did not submit applications.
- Work Groups – The review committee reviewed 13 work group proposals, and 8 work groups were funded. Each group is oriented around issues rather than commodities and membership to be from across the region.
- PMSPs – Funding for PMSPs is now independent of the State Information Networks. An impressive list of PMSPs are in the pipeline, and the WIPMC is speeding up the time period from inception to completion.
- New Personnel – Two part-time Comment Coordinator positions have been regionally funded: one is located at Washington State University to cover the Pacific Northwest (PNW) and the other is at the University of Hawaii covering the Pacific Islands.

Also, two part-time PMSP staff have been regionally funded: a PMSP Coordinator for the PNW is located at Oregon State University and a PMSP Research Assistant is located at the University of Idaho. Monthly conference calls keep everyone involved.

- IPM Planner – A special project has been funded with carry-forward funds from the WRPMC to develop the IdahoOne IPM Planner.
- Web Site – The WIPMC web site has undergone some recent changes and additions. Most noteworthy is an expanded “Center News and Events” page. News and events across the region are updated on a monthly basis. Joyce Strand heads this effort with her staff.
- Plant Diagnostic Network (PDN) – Rick Melnicoe continues to represent the WIPMC on the Western Plant Diagnostic Network Advisory Committee. Training of University of California first detectors is being held in conjunction with pesticide research and safety training conducted by Rick.

- Many of the WIPMC state contacts have been working with local NRCS programs on advisory committees and as resources for the state NRCS programs.
- Information Requests – At the request of Burleson Smith, a meeting of key people from Washington, Oregon, and California was arranged as a focus group on the 54 pesticides involved in the Washington Toxics Coalition lawsuit. Burleson was advised on which pesticides are key and should be reviewed by USEPA and NOAA Fisheries first.
- IR-4 – On October 7-9, 2004, the Western Region Pest Management Center held its final annual meeting in Palm Springs, CA. Most of the discussion was related to the new IPM Center. A joint half-day meeting was held with the Western Region IR-4 Program.

### *Southern*

- Advisory – In October, the SRIPMC held its first AC and SC meeting under the new leadership of Ron Stinner. Current Project Leaders and IPM Coordinators were invited. The AC and SC elected chair people. The SC chair is from Monsanto.
- Priorities – A committee was formed to help the SRIPMC develop goals and outline steps to achieve them.
- Outsourced Funding – The RFA for outsourcing SRIPMC funding will be posted in February 2004. Wording for this RFA borrows heavily from RFAs in other regions.
- State Networks – These networks will be funded at up to \$25K with \$150K of funding for PMSPs being offered separately. An additional \$150K will be released for emerging issues and special projects.
- Personnel – Jennifer Hodorowicz has been hired as the new writer/editor. An associate director will be hired soon.
- PESP – the SRIPMC is partnering with PESP to create a network. Glen Williams is the contact. Skee Jones hopes that other regions will also partner with this group and he offers help in creating these connections.
- State Communications – Between visits from either Shani File and Ron Stinner, almost all the states are now aware of the new structure of the SRIPMC and its purpose. These visits help to strengthen relations between states and the Center.
- Information Requests – the SRIPMC developed software to track information requests and responses in order to document communication.
- Workshops – a workshop is being planned in cooperation with the Southern Plant Diagnostic Network to address the region's response to soybean rust.
- Plant Diagnostic Network – As part of an attempt to build bridges, the SRIPMC is partnering with the PDN on a \$450K grant addressing bio-security training.
- Awards – Dennis Kopp announced that Ron Stinner was awarded the ESAs First Award for Excellence, a prestigious accomplishment. Ron is now a candidate for the national award.

### *Northeast*

- Newsletter – The most recent newsletter was distributed in January and can be found at <http://nepmc.org/pubs/IPMnews/jan2004/index.html>
- Regional Grants Program – 2003 is the first year these funds were officially managed at the NEIPM Center, although the process and personnel changed little. The granting process is now complete for 2003 and successful projects will be public sometime in the spring or early summer. Of the 33 proposals submitted, 10 were funded (up from 4 in 2002) mainly because the projects warranting funds were less expensive this year than in the past.

- Partnership Grants – the term Partnership Grants refers to the NEIPM Center’s internal funding program, which covers working groups, state networks, PMSPs/CPs, publications, and critical issues. More proposals were submitted than will be funded. Proposals spanned all states and categories. Decisions on this funding should be made public sometime in April.
- Critical and emerging issues are in a section of the Partnership Grant funding. Applications for this money are accepted at any time of the year and will be determined in a timely manner based on approval by the SC and availability of funds.
- Web site – A private company, Spider Graphics, is entirely redesigning the web site, resulting in the merging of the NEPMC.org and Northeastipm.org sites. The new site can be viewed at <http://132.236.191.46:8080> for now until it goes live sometime this spring at <http://neipmc.org>.
- Northeast Research, Extension, and Academic Program (NEREAP-IPM) – This group met this past February 19-20, to discuss among other subjects, the role of NEREAP in the overall IPM picture, especially as it relates and complements the work of the NEIPM Center. Discussions were frank and useful in determining future steps.

### **National Web Development:**

The new NEIPM Center design can be taken nationally. An IT person from each region has looked at and discussed the merits and drawbacks of the site. Center Directors are encouraged to speak with their IT people to see if it should become the design for each region. The National IPM Network site and the National Centers sites would be combined in the Spider Graphics version with more emphasis on the region. Work done by John VanDyke at Iowa State would also be incorporated into the new site. With Web Services, each region can share the same data, but the URL will appear to be generated from each individual region.

### **Committee to Advise on Reassessment and Transition (CARAT) – John Ayers and Al Jennings**

- After looking at the CARAT draft of recommendations circulated after their October 2003 meeting, John Ayers and Al Jennings drafted a response from the Regional Centers as a starting point for discussions. The main CARAT recommendations impacting the Centers are to:
  - Strengthen the Regional IPM Centers and model them more along the lines of the IR-4 program in order to develop and deliver improved pest management systems.
  - Improve specialty crop access to Conservation Title funds and fuse the funds to assist in grower adoption of IPM practices.
- In the CARAT meeting, a list was generated of the things they would like to see Centers involved with, mostly relating to NRCS programs and mostly in major field crops with very little focus on minor use crops. CARAT wants more IPM delivery in the field and especially in minor use crops. The North Central IPM Center has been working with carrot growers and the NRCS on a cost sharing partnership sponsoring scouting, and training workshops in various conservation districts in Michigan. This process has taken months and NRCS is not generally set up as a regional agency but rather on a state-by-state or even a county basis. Possibly the role of Centers is to set up models for local use. Al Jennings would like to see a copy of the Michigan plan
 

In a conference call following the October CARAT meeting, it was suggested that the Centers choose a state where IPM and NRCS are already working together and hold a workshop on how to succeed with this partnership in other states. In general, all the Directors think this is a good idea, but no action has been taken yet. In California, they are providing training to help the NRCS recognize a good IPM plan.
- Burleson Smith pointed out that the NRCS targets soil, air, or water quality issues and he wonders if there are other criteria that should be added.

- Eldon Ortman supports the idea of regional approaches to promoting connections between NRCS and IPM and also to facilitate demonstrations and training. He feels that a written response to the CARAT recommendations is not enough and that a face-to-face meeting would be more productive since it allows time for discussion, which is what fosters understanding and partnerships. CARAT members need to understand that the Centers are not intended to deliver IPM information to growers, but that individual states do this type of work.
- Al Jennings will take responsibility for this type of meeting with assistance from Eldon Ortman. Skee Jones supports this idea and offers his help and that of Jonathan Becker and Nikhil Mallampalli too.
- Burleson Smith suggests the Centers move toward better and safer pesticides realizing that this is not an easy goal, but could possibly be done better on a regional level than nationally. The Centers should not be perceived as replacing Extension or NRCS, but as a resource for these entities. He needs to hear back from the Center Directors soon, before the next CARAT meeting about what the Centers can do. He needs to know about areas where progress really can happen including budgets associated with these ideas. Each Center AC, SC, and staff can and should be involved in this brainstorming process. There are no promises of additional resources, so Centers need to define what they can do within the resources available and then describe what could be done with additional funds. The CARAT committee indicates that change is needed not only in USDA programs but also in the EPA. CARAT members believe a regional approach can bring some degree of integration and innovation.

While these recommendations are challenging and an acceptable response is to say that they can't all be accomplished under current funding levels, Burleson wants specific information on what can be accomplished.

- Rick Melnicoe wonders how the CARAT recommendations can be implemented without additional funding which is why Centers need to be specific about what they can realistically accomplish. At the same time, Rick is pleased with the support from CARAT and is cautious about wording its response.
- A coordinated response from the Center Directors needs to be out to Burleson as soon as possible but no later than the end of May 2004.

#### **IPM Evaluation** - Mike Fitzner, Bill Hoffman, and Bill Coli

- A major push within the Bush Administration is on accountability of programs and a reduction in duplication of services to determine their value. This push is occurring in a short time frame and a timely response from CSREES programs is important. Cooperating in this effort will help Centers to set their own agenda and define our role in the overall IPM mission.
- Accountability demands are coming from two sources, the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the Office of Management and Budgets (OMB), which spawns from Bush's office in the executive branch. Although the two offices have evaluation systems that are not the same, both offices agree that some version of evaluation is necessary to prove to Congress that IPM programs are worthy of funding. The Bush administration has launched an effort to review performance and identify duplicative efforts in federal programs with the goal of cutting programs based on these evaluations. The GAO method looks for a preponderance of evidence supporting the achievement of the IPM Roadmap goals. Centers are expected to help facilitate the collection of objectives and indicators from the states.

This is part one of a 3-tiered reporting system that also includes PPRS reporting and focused evaluation projects intended to broaden the scope of the reporting system to include non-3d funded activities. In summary, the existing style of reporting will remain in place but be more closely tied with the national objectives outlined in the Roadmap. Multiyear impact forecasting will be phased out, but impacts will still be shared through success stories. This new reporting systems will begin in 2005-2006.

Questionnaires will be distributed to IPM Coordinators through the IPM Centers in April 2004 and are due back to Bill Hoffman with objectives and indicators by May 15<sup>th</sup>, when input will be gathered from

regional technical committees, regional IPM steering committees, CSREES planning and accountability units, and other federal government agencies.

### **Pest Management Strategic Plans**

- *PMSP Stakeholder Input* - Stakeholder input is critical to PMSPs, and Linda Herbst is concerned about how stakeholders are found. Mike Fitzner responded that each Land Grant University has a 5-year plan for gleaning stakeholder input, which can be updated annually. Furthermore, research and extension specialists from the LGUs should have insight into what is happening in the industry and their expertise should be utilized and considered strongly as stakeholder input. LGUs also need to document how this input will be used i.e. for what programs.
- *PMSP Coordination* – Norm Nesheim  
Although the Centers the system for coordinating PMSP completions is not perfect, at least there is a master list of PMSPs residing at the National Center site in North Carolina. When agencies other than Centers fund PMSPs, these completed documents are not always sent through the National Center and don't enter the database causing problems in quality and consistency. It is felt that the Centers need to be the gatekeepers for **all** PMSPs and that this communications needs to begin at the inception of the PMSP not at the end when it is “complete” but not correct. Too many negative feelings spawn from a reactive approach; it's more important to be proactive. Communication is the key here, and Centers need to be in contact with agencies such as EPA, OPMP, PMAP and any others who are sponsoring this work.
- *Database Approach to PMSPs* – Jim VanKirk  
Writing and editing a PMSP is, at best, a tedious process currently requiring the author to scroll, cut, and paste repeatedly. In order to speed up this process while also making it more accurate, Jim suggests a form approach feeding into a database, which will also allow for ease in searching the data and gathering statistics that is not now available. The technical committee met on February 24 to discuss the logistics of this project and Center Directors are encouraged to get an update from them. Efficacy tables would be generated automatically, and this system would enforce adherence to a national structure for PMSPs. Skee Jones offers Jonathan Becker to help support this project.

### **Future Role of state contacts** - Larry Olsen

- The North Central IPM Center is struggling with the role of state contacts in its Center system. Expectations of this state contacts are to revise crop profiles, facilitate PMSPs and IPM guidelines, respond to requests, develop priorities, maintain a web site, and other tasks. But the SC for the NCIPM Center wonders where the IPM Coordinators fit, what type of cooperation exists between these two sets of people, and how much of their efforts are redundant. The NCIPM Center is considering abolishing the state contacts and recycling the funds supporting them back into a general competitive fund for IPM related projects.
- In other regions, particularly the West, the state contacts perform a critical job in providing information to agencies such as EPA and are plenty busy. Historically, IPM Coordinators have not provided the same type of information as the state contacts and do not have the **expertise** or the **time** to contend with this additional workload. Many Directors comment that the state contacts are often in contact with the IPM Coordinator and together they work well. There is a lot of proactive work in making contacts within the state, and maintaining a pool of information necessary to answer questions. Generally funding from the Centers is so low that it might only be 20% of a state contact's salary which makes the work a fairly low priority in relation to pay. Many Center Directors feel they are getting a good deal for the amount of money

expended and there are ways to incorporate IPM Coordinators into the Center without removing state contacts.

- Since funds from Centers need to be competitive, the state contacts can still apply for funds, but then would a state contact be penalized since it has little regional merit?
- Mike Fitzner reiterated that each Center needs to maintain autonomy in these issues and that some may choose to keep their existing system while others may change according to their vision. Each Center needs to be clear in defining the functions of the state contacts. Pesticide registration work is not the job of IPM Coordinators.
- Many in this group repeat that IPM Coordinators do not have the time or expertise to take on the responsibilities of the state contacts especially at the current level of funding which is not enough to hire someone with the skills to be successful.
- Defining the responsibility of the state contacts leads to a discussion of the definition of an IPM Coordinator. The national office hesitates to dictate what each state IPM Coordinator should do, but accountability in the form of PPRS and other evaluation methods helps create positive results in their programming.

### **Pest Alerts – Sue Ratcliffe**

- To date, six Pest Alerts are in print. The process the NCIPM Center uses to determine the necessity of a Pest Alert is to first identify who has issued the request. This step is followed by a literature search, a draft, a call for review, and a final edit. Finally the graphics crew loads the alert into the standardized format. Only pest problems of regional concern are considered for Pest Alerts in order to keep the number of requests reasonable. Sue feels it is necessary for all Pest Alerts to have the same format and go through the NCIPM Center office. Besides, the price is reasonable, she has staff in place to do the work, and a product coming from the Centers looks good in the Congressional eye.
- Pre-ordering is a problem for some, and it is suggested that the final copy go on the web in PDF format for viewing before placing an order. This would help the NCIPM Center know how many to print.
- Most of the Pest Alerts have broken even financially even with the free delivery of orders of less than 200, but this would change if less consequential pests were covered. In this case, a subsidy would be necessary.
- Adding the names of authors is a sticky subject since many of these alerts have numerous authors and not much space to give credits.

### **Grants**

#### *Streamlining the RIPM Application Process through Pre-proposals – Jim VanKirk*

In the Northeast, the NEREAP committee suggested the RIPM funding process consider adding a pre-proposal stage to help screen proposals and avoid the excessive amount of time required to write a full proposal especially when the success rate is only one in seven in some years. The system needs to become more efficient.

#### *Making CSREES Forms More User-friendly – John Ayers*

- CSREES is required to use the e-grants system as part of a new initiative but there are a few flaws iron out. It is suggested that either these forms be developed to be more use-friendly before the next granting cycle or offer an alternative.

### **Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International (CABI) – Bill Hoffman**

- In the near future, each IPM Coordinator and each Plant Diagnostic Center will receive a CD from CABI for use by LGU, 1890, and 1994 school staff and faculty free of charge. This service is sponsored by

CSREES. Normally subscriptions can cost up to \$300. There are 2000 licenses available. Bill will contact Centers to let them know when this happens.

- Signing into CABI requires only an email, name, and affiliation and then a password will be sent to the user to change if desired. Honesty is required by this login method, but CABI is not overly concerned.
- Centers need to think about how to advertise this service. Bill Hoffman will issue a press release that can be used by all the Centers.

### **National Plant Diagnostic Network – Kitty Cardwell**

- The consensus is that Centers, PDN, APHIS, and Departments of Ag and Extension all need to be involved to develop a plan of action in the event of a dangerous pest being introduced. Kitty suggests that a Center representative attend their regularly scheduled conference calls, and Mike Fitzner feels that each region should have a representative on the calls. Bill Hoffman takes part in the calls already. Tom Holtzer is interested in the summarized version of the conference call minutes.
- Sue Ratcliffe asks how information from outside the diagnostic labs is being integrated into the PDN
- The PDN has established a list of select agents and they would like the Centers to create Pest Alerts for all of these and may be able to help finance these with help from APHIS.
- Rose Loria is leaving the post as director of the NE PDN and will be replaced by George Hudler.
- Eldon Ortman suggests that PDN information going out to the states should go through the Centers for dissemination

### **National IPM Committee Meeting Review – John Ayers.**

- At last October's Directors meeting, three groups (IPM Coordinators, Center personnel, and federal agencies) went through an exercise to determine the major priorities that Centers must address. The raw notes from this list are passed out but have not been organized. The Centers need to look at the priorities from the 3 sets and identify what is important to all the groups. Once compiled, each Center can use its own discretion to possibly share the list with its AC, SC, state contacts, and IPM Coordinators. This process will establish a link between the needs of the 3 groups and can then be drafted into a document showing collaboration and responsive action. This list can also be connected to the CARAT recommendations.
- It is suggested that regions look at this priority list and the CARAT recommendations and develop a response. Steve Toth offers to condense Ed Rajotte's document and send it off to others.

### **Universal Crop List – Ron Stinner**

- In order to create consistency in the database of Crop Profiles and PMSPs, there needs to be a standard list of crop names. Rick Melnicoe has a shortened version of the EPA list for the West and Liz Thomas has one for the Northeast. Liz will synthesize one list and send to Ron.

### **The Future of Regional IPM Committees – Dennis Kopp**

With the removal of the RIPM Grants work from the Regional IPM Committees, a discussion arises about the future function of these committees and how they are included in the makeup of the Centers. Primarily it is felt that they are one of the most valuable sources of advice for the Centers and that they can (and surely will) still give input into the IPM Grants programs even if they are no longer part of managing the funds. These are the people most closely involved with IPM work in the region and our most important set of stakeholders and because of this they should remain a strong force influencing each Center's mission. However, all four regions have seen these groups struggling about their future.

Centers should maintain communication with Ed Rajotte (the ECOP representative) and Frank Zalom (representative for ESCOP). These two are the official national contacts for the Center Directors, and with them, we have an opportunity to create a solid liaison between the groups.

### Next Meetings

- The next Directors meeting will be in Washington from Tuesday, June 15<sup>th</sup> to Wednesday the 16<sup>th</sup>, 2004 starting early on the first day and finishing late afternoon on the second day. Some will be coming in on June 14<sup>th</sup> to work with Bill Hoffman and Bill Coli on evaluation
- The September meeting will be on the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>. Since this meeting usually includes the IPM Coordinators, John Ayers needs to ask Frank and Ed as soon as possible if these dates will work. Harold, Eldon, Mike, and some others will be gone from 1 to 3pm on the 15<sup>th</sup>.

### Timelines and Promises:

<i>Timeline (if any)</i>	<i>Task</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ron Stinner will send the information on the executive order requiring CSREES, APHIS, and other related organizations to work together under the Department of Homeland Security. Mike Fitzner will forward on to others</li> </ul>
March 1 or ASAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback concerns about the PMAP grants process before he proceeds with writing the RFA.</li> </ul>
ASAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Send information on potential candidates for summer interns to Skee Jones (jones.arnet@epa.gov)</li> <li>• Al Jennings will take responsibility for organizing a meeting between CARAT representatives and Center Directors with assistance from Eldon Ortman. Skee Jones supports this idea and offers his help and that of Jonathan Becker and Nikhil Mallampalli too.</li> </ul>
May 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burleson Smith needs to hear back from the Center Directors SOON (before the next CARAT meeting), responding to the CARAT recommendations. Centers need to create a unified response defining what they can do within the resources available and then describe what could be done with additional funds</li> <li>• Kitty will send Sue the PDN prioritized list of requested Pest Alerts.</li> <li>• Tom Holtzer is interested in a summarized version of the PDN conference call minutes.</li> </ul>
May 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bill Hoffman will send questionnaires for Centers to distribute to IPM Coordinators in April 2004. Responses are due back to Bill with objectives and indicators by May 15<sup>th</sup></li> <li>• Liz Thomas will synthesize a standardized crop list and send to Ron Stinner</li> <li>• Steve Toth offers to condense Ed Rajotte's document of priorities created at the October 2003 joint meeting of Center Directors and ECOP/ESCOP representatives and send it off to all attendees of this meeting.</li> <li>• Al Jennings would like to see a copy of the Michigan plan developed jointly between the North Central IPM Center and the NRCS for carrots</li> </ul>
ASAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Ayers needs to ask Frank Zalom and Ed Rajotte if the dates chosen for the fall Directors meeting will work.</li> </ul>

## **Glossary of Acronyms**

AC – Advisory Council

APHIS – Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

CABI – Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International.

CARAT – Committee to Advise on Reassessment and Transition

CSREES – Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service

ECOP – Extension Committee on Organization and Policy

EPA – Environmental Protection Agency

EQIP – Environmental Quality Incentives Program

ESCOP - Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy

FQPA – Food Quality Protection Act

GAO – General Accounting Office

IPM – Integrated Pest Management

LGU – Land Grant University

NFIPME – National Foundation on IPM Education

NRCS – Natural Resource Conservation Service

OMB – Office of Management and Budget

OPMP – Office of Pest Management Policy