

**National IPM Center Directors
Meeting Report**

June 15-17, 2004 Washington DC

Attending:

John Ayers, Jeanne Bacheler, Kitty Cardwell, Harold Coble, Bill Coli, Shani File, Mike Fitzner, Michael Gray, Linda Herbst, Jennifer Hodorowicz, William Hoffman, Tom Holtzer, Al Jennings, Lynnae Jess, Mary McDonough, Rick Melnicoe, Russ Mizell, Steve Morrill, Therese Murtagh, Rick Myers, Bob Norwerski, Larry Olsen, Susan Ratcliffe, Burlson Smith, Kent Smith, David Stangel, Ron Stinner, Elizabeth Thomas, Steve Toth, Jim VanKirk

Day 1 – Tuesday June 15th

OPMP Update – Al Jennings

Perchlorate Update

- Perchlorate contamination remains an issue, with contaminated milk routinely being found in several states. In California, 33 of the 35 samples taken have shown contamination.
- Findings show that perchlorate accumulates in any exposed plant, especially leafy greens such as alfalfa. Contamination is not just limited to California with West Texas showing high levels of contamination and a USDA herd at Beltsville testing positive too.
- The National Academy of Science has not determined at what level perchlorate becomes a problem and although levels were to be set this August, the Academy has asked to extend that deadline for at least another 4 months.
- EPA says there may be toxic effects, thyroid problems, and interference with iodide uptake; however researchers at University of California-Irvine claim the effects are not as bad as EPA claims.

Endangered Species

- Arty Williams of the EPA's endangered species group, is researching the likelihood of endangered species being present where pesticides are applied. She will present this information on day 2 of this meeting.

Homeland Security

- Presidential directive HSPD-9 was signed at the end of January for the defense of US agriculture and food in the event of a plant disease emergency. In response, Homeland Security's plan of action is to contain, control, and recover by preparing with items such as germ plasm, resistant varieties, and potential pesticides.
- ARS is the lead agency and is developing an interagency roadmap and plan of action. Al Jennings is advocating to include Land Grant Universities because of their strength in communication and resources.
- No budget comes with this presidential directive.

Soybean Rust

- Soybean rust has two fungicides (myclobutanil and propiconazole) approved under Section 18s in several states. Other fungicides are expected to be approved.
- These fungicides have a three-year quarantine exemption for several states. The soybean association is concerned that only a handful of states have section 18s, including the lead states of Minnesota and South Dakota. Other states are being pressured to take action.
- There is a concern about the lack of control measures for organic soybean acres, and they are looking at options if soybean rust infects organic farms.
- In addition to soybeans, there are 50-100 alternative hosts including green beans, chickpeas and other crop plants. Utah is currently submitting Section 18s for these crops in addition to soybeans.
- EPA is being extremely cooperative with these exemptions.

Committee to Advise on Reassessment and Transition (*CARAT*)

- *CARAT* wants IPM Centers to work more with IPM programs. Center directors need to describe more effectively the current scope of Center work and what additional work could be done with increased funding.
- It would be helpful if *CARAT* could go to one web location to view the projects funded by the IPM Centers. CRIS has information on funded projects, but it is not comprehensive. But CRIS could be added more prominently to the IPM Center websites. The Northeast IPM Center site is attempting to provide a more comprehensive site to meet these needs.
- The Centers also need to be able to measure the impacts of IPM more effectively. Many look to the PPRS system to provide insight because they can generate reports of how IPM has affected human health, economics, or the environment. The problem with this approach is that PPRS does not use aggregated data because the data is not uniform and the reports are not consistent. Each state measures different activities in the PPRS system. While there may be ways to aggregate better, the system is not currently formatted with consistency.

Proposed rule for Section 18

- Allow self-certification for 2-year renewals.

Methyl Iodide

- Methyl Iodide is being looked at as a Methyl Bromide substitute. EPA is looking for a registration decision by the end of 2004, but until a decision is made anything other than critical use will not be allowed.
- There are concerns about Methyl Iodide dermal safety problems.
- The Montreal Protocol report identifies crops and quantities allowed for Methyl Bromide. The report is available on the web (Al Jennings will distribute the URL).

POPs – Persistent Organic Pollutants

- The administration submitted legislation years ago but wants it in place soon. POPs deal with numerous chemicals both pesticides and non-pesticides, and both Ag and non-Ag committees are involved.
- There are currently four different versions of this legislation circulating, and their goal is to bring the committees (ag, environmental, and other) together to make decisions this year, but this is not a likely goal. The main issue they are dealing with is how to add new chemicals to the list. May try again after the elections this year.

CSREES Update – Mike Fitzner

Budget

- CSREES needs to move the FY 2004 money totaling \$958,686 per Center after budget cuts. The budget office needs progress reports, funded projects, and a budget submitted by July 15 or earlier.
- For FY 2005, there are positive signs that the 10% cuts will be restored, but there could be some serious problems in FY 2006 because federal money will be restricted by then.

Priorities

- Homeland security and Biosecurity - Both of these are big with \$33 million requested for those activities including National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN) and National Animal Health Network (NAHN).
- Invasive species are still a high priority.
- Centers and university administrators need to help make sure the 3d funding meant for state IPM programs is accounted for by the state IPM coordinator. Without this knowledge, there may be a perception that this money is drifting from its IPM purpose.
- Organic Agriculture – \$5 million in 2004 with a similar request for 2005. Over 100 proposals were submitted for that program. The review panel has not met yet.
- Accountability is an increasing issue even as budgets shrink. Questions that arose as a part of the GAO audit need to be addressed. The new evaluation system will help.

- Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) – Had a review of the plant production portfolio in May 2003. There is no response yet but they need a good score. There will be an equivalent review for plant protection which will be headed by Rick Meyer. The OMB wanted one score, but instead is accepting a portfolio of the program as the score. Panel members need to be identified.

Personnel

- Bill Hoffman took Bob Smith's place with the National Animal Health Network
- Amy Rhodes (Williams) is starting at the end of June as program specialist. Her position is similar to the ones held by Bill Hoffman and Kathy Kimble-Day. She will focus on portfolio review and communications including updates, web presence, and informational pieces.

General Announcements

- Mike met with Janet Anderson's EPA group last week, and they are interested in Center activities and want to strengthen Center involvement. Programs discussed included PESP, strategic ag, and IR-4.
- 5th National IPM Symposium is planned for April 4-6, 2006 in St. Louis, Missouri. Sherri Glick and Sue Ratcliffe are on the organizing committee.
- Tom Bewick (CSREES Horticulturist) wants to develop a national strategic plan for horticulture. He is working directly with the industry and wants to start with subsets of horticulture. Currently working with grape growers.

Funding – Rick Meyers

- Received 31 CAR proposals, 23 RAMP proposals. Of these, the panel recommended six CAR and three RAMP projects for funding. He has contacted PIs but results are not yet public. Received a broad spectrum of proposals submitted this year; better than ever.
- RAMP – 1st year program was forward funded for \$3.4 million. Next year will have \$4.5 million since set aside is over.
- CAR - \$1.26 million available for funding.
- Summary of critical pest and diseases – \$230,000 on plant side, funded four projects out of the 14 pre-proposals submitted:
 - Post harvest grain study
 - Hancion mealy bug on barley (new pest)
 - Soybean rust – fungicide efficacy and delivery studies
 - Horseweed resistant to herbicides – Tennessee and Ohio
- Those proposals that were not funded were put back into the pool for the next round of funding.

Invasive species and IPM training – Bob Nowierski

- See handout
- The conceptual model of Federal Agency IPM Training and Certification includes the following:
 - Overview of IPM Training and Certification presented to Federal Agency Administration and Regional IPM Coordinators
 - IPM Need Assessment (Federal Agencies) assisted by the Minnesota Center for Survey Research
 - IPM Core Course influenced by IPM Needs Assessment and survey input
 - IPM Course Certification includes passed IPM core course
 - Agency-Specific IPM Training provided through a series of short course modules
 - IPM Implementation
- CSREES is involved with invasive species through the following coordinating committees:
 - USDA Invasive Species Coordinating Committee (Nowierski, Bewick, Bolton)
 - FICMNEW (Weeds) (Parochetti, Nowierski)
 - ITAP (Terrestrial Animals and Pathogens) (Nowierski)
 - Federal IPM Coordinating Committee (Fitzner, Ortman, Nowierski, Bolton)

- TAG (Technical Advisory Group) for the Biological Control of Weeds (Bewick, Nowierski)
- USDA/NASA Invasive Species Focus Area Working Group (Nowierski)
- Hilda Diaz-Soltero is the new USDA coordinator heading invasive species. Reprioritization of invasive species management available at www.invasivespecies.gov.

Tom Bewick – National PMSP plans for horticultural crops

- National tree fruit strategic plan is done, and grapes are already organized – growers had already started a strategic plan process.
- His vision is to work together with academia and others to create a plan for all horticultural crops by pulling together all commodities nationally, then seeing where they differ state to state. In this way, horticultural crops could gain more leverage as a unified group in order to drive funding and program decisions.
- Ornamentals has teamed up with florists to develop a strategic plan for IPM needs
- Tom is trying to finish within a couple years, but the vegetable group will be more difficult because of the huge array of crops.
- Mike Fitzner suggested using existing PMSPs to build from.
- Consistent in all the plans is a need for more IPM, making involvement with the IPM Centers important. He is working with national grower groups to help fund and coordinate the plans.
- Extension is also involved in spite of the heavy hits to their budgets. Tom relays the message that many extension personnel don't realize the IPM Center structure exists yet.
- Tom would like to break out into work groups at his meetings, and would like Centers to be present. The grapes meetings will probably be in November 2004. He will keep us updated.

Center Reports

Western (handout provided)

- Recently held Advisory Council and Steering Committee meetings to work on critical issues RFA.
- Expanded Advisory Council membership - currently soliciting new members and want to increase to 25 by next meeting.
- The Steering Committee discussed holding a regional conference in February/March 2005. The tentative theme will be IPM and Water Issues.
- Selecting grants manager: Three nominations will be discussed with Steering Committee.
- Attended the Western IPM Coordinator committee in spring. Concerns from past have been resolved.
- Rick and Linda have been meeting with NRCS contacts. The IPM manual, which is in its final draft, will assist growers to incorporate IPM into their planning and help NRCS to recognize IPM methods.
- Arizona consolidated their IPM activities and are hiring an assistant to Peter Ellsworth (new coordinator)
- EPA Ag Initiative- better proposals are coming in. There will be a closer tie between the Center and the Ag Initiative program.
- Not many comments were received in response to Bill Hoffman's evaluation request.
- Have completed, started, or planned several Pest Management Strategic Plans such as celery and citrus in California, macadamia nut and watercress in Hawaii, alfalfa seed in Idaho, PNW beef cattle in Montana, PNW onion in Oregon, and wine grape in Washington.

North Central (3 handouts)

- Released an RFA on May 11 to establish Working Groups with a proposal deadline of August 30, 2004. Up to six Working Groups will be established in 2004 and awarded up to \$30,000 each.
- NC IPM Extension Coordinators are taking on the duties and serving as state contacts for the NC IPM Center beginning October 1, 2004 with the hope that this will help improve

coordination of state IPM programs within the region and will increase the level of competitive funding available for regional IPM Working Groups and new and emerging IPM issues.

- Created and re-printed many of their publications including their National Pest Alerts. The newest National Pest Alert features *Ralstonia solanacearum* race 3 biovar 2 on geranium, potato, tomato and peppers. Sudden Oak Death was reprinted to meet demand and Soybean Rust was slightly revised and reprinted.
- The first edition of the NCIPMC newsletter, Connection, was printed for June 2004, and will be a monthly publication.

Northeastern (handout)

- Grant programs
 - partnership grants
 - State networks – six proposals were funded covering all states except NY.
 - Funded four regional publications
 - two proposals were funded that address priorities set by IPM working groups.
 - three projects qualified under the critical and emerging issues section of the RFA.
 - RIPM
 - Funded 10 proposals, three in the critical steps category which are restricted to no more than \$15,000 over two years. The most costly proposals received were not the best ones this year resulting in the ability to fund a higher than average number. The panel had a hard time understanding the critical steps section.
 - IPM Coordinators requested that the Center consider using pre-proposals.
- The new, revised website is up and active.
- A regional IPM conference will be held March 15, 16 2005, with a Community and Urban IPM theme. The Community IWG has a leadership role on this.
- IPM Working Groups -Working on accountability for them starting with the submission of a report prior to the release of \$2,000 for leadership pay.
- Personnel
 - Jim is leaving to go to the Southern Region Center on August 15.
 - The Center is in the process of writing job description for a national search for a co-director based at Cornell.

Southern

- Released \$550 of the \$600K available through SR IPM Center grants programs:
 - State projects – did not fund all states. They are thinking about how to rearrange the system to cover states with no state contacts.
 - Crop profiles, and PMSP - only a few states funded. Some states misread the RFA.
 - Special projects – funded some. There were no strict guidelines for panel as to what should be funded.
- The Center is working on building bridges. Currently that involves organizing a workshop with the Southern Plant Disease Network (SPDN) on Southern soybean rust. They are also involved with national SPDN biosecurity grant, working on the National IPM Symposium, and EPA PESP.
- New items
 - Purchasing new software based on the Northeast IPM Center new site created by Spidergraphics, a private computer consulting firm
 - Newsletters – 3rd out already and new brochures
 - Working on Southern region priorities based on the IPM Road Map
 - Southern pine beetle funding still in the federal budget although not passed yet.
 - Working with US AID collaboration for overseas work in IPM in developing

countries. \$17 million is available over 5 years. This could be an opportunity for organic agriculture.

- On November 7, 2004 the Center will hold a workshop on wood boring insects on trees (but excluding forestry) featuring eight speakers. CSREES is a co-sponsor and is publicizing this event for regulatory people or others who need to know about the importance of these pests. There are currently very few tools to manage wood boring insects. Pheromone disruption is sometimes the only option but can be expensive.
- Personnel
 - Norm – retiring soon.
 - Russ and Norm are winding up outstanding commitments and will have the final report at the next meeting.
 - Jim VanKirk has been hired as Associate Director
 - Jennifer Hodorowicz is the new Southern region writer.

Update on EPA's Voluntary Pesticide Programs - Steve Morrill

- Their goal is to work with members to reduce the risks from the use of pesticides in Ag and non-Ag settings through non-regulatory means. Members have access to EPA, recognition, information-sharing, and networking. The Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program works in voluntary partnerships.
- They are under pressure to measure results and are currently developing a set of measures for the Strategic Ag Initiative, a grant driven program used to assist growers in identification and development of alternative pest management approaches coordinated by EPA headquarters. This was initiated as a pilot program in four regions in 1998. By 2000, PESP had expanded to all 10 EPA regions.
- Currently they have ~\$2million and 1 FTE per region and are advised by EPA and CARAT.
- They also work with IPM in schools initiative, with Sherry Glick heading the program.
- Have a lawns and the environment initiative to encourage environmentally responsible lawn and landscaping practices.
- Provide funding through assistance agreements to organizations that support EPA's goal of promoting IPM and reducing the risk of pesticides.
- National Foundation for IPM Education – formed in 1992 and has been an EPA ally for nearly 10 years. They oversee a competitive grants program of \$5 million over five years. Expect an RFP in late summer or fall.
- The American Farmland Trust is a 5-year cooperative agreement that funds individual IPM projects, and models changes in pesticide exposure based on data collected from IPM systems.
- Biopesticide demonstration projects are being used to reduce barriers in the understanding of how to use of registered biopesticides. In this joint effort between IR-4, USDA, and EPA they will show how biopesticides can be integrated into existing crop protection
- Steve's people are willing to help out Centers in any way possible including having PESP representatives on Center committees and possibly working on grants together.
- Steve provided handouts of on-going projects within his organization.

Risk mitigation measures- David Stangel (with EPA's Office of Compliance)

- After hearing from states about label enforceability issues, he learned that states generally want to be more involved in labeling
- Registrants are happy to contribute to risk mitigation measures as long as they can keep current uses on the label. David wants to involve states systematically in making these decisions. He wants information in order to notify EPA of what has worked in the past and what has not in order to develop an historical database that provides decision-makers more data on which to base their decisions.
- He welcomes the help of IPM Centers in determining whether labels are practical or not.

Registration review – Therese Murtagh (handout)

- FIFRA 3g was amended to require periodic review of pesticide registrations with a goal of reviewing each of the approximately 1200 pesticides every 15 years. The proposed new ruling is estimated to be out in February 2005 with the final rule in mid-2006. This is an ambitious schedule so when the proposed rule comes out, Centers should review and comment promptly. Centers should also comment using e-docket. EPA also encourages the IPM Centers to advise on the proposed rule quickly when it is released.

PMSP checklist

Update of guidance document

- The draft of the guidance document has been revised several times and the committee determined that the document is a list of suggestions with minimum requirements included at the end.
- Requirements are
 - Date and title
 - Contact person
 - List of participants and affiliations
 - Table of contents.
 - Process statement
 - Executive summary
 - General description of crop and pests
 - Control measures
 - Priorities
 - Worker activity table
 - Pest occurrence tables
 - Efficacy table
 - Beneficial organisms table
 - Acknowledgement
 - References
- If PMSPs are published by the Center, they need to meet Center standards. For those funded independently, Centers are expected to encourage adherence to these standards.
- Pat Bills is working to develop a system that would increase the efficiency of PMSP development through the use of database forms. Pay for Pat is an issue as no funding is explicitly set aside for this work. When complete, the system will have pull down menus to enter pests and will allow repeating information to be easily added. PMSPs will also be searchable.

Pest Management Alternatives Program (PMAP) – Eldon Ortman

- Some background on PMAP: there was a verbal agreement to move money to the four regions, but that agreement fell apart. The agency was worried about the possibility that proposals will not come in equally from each region, and they want to fund the most meritorious proposals. The agency has to consider the Regional Relevancy and it is the Center's responsibly to help determine the relevancy. While the Centers may not be in direct control of the money, they will have significant control of where it goes.
- John Ayers suggested two alternative proposals one of which received an initial positive reaction. He suggests proposals undergo a two-tiered review for relevancy and technical merit. Each Center will organize a relevancy review for proposals submitted from that region. A national review panel will review proposals for technical merit and will provide CSREES with funding recommendations. A meritorious evaluation in both relevancy and technical merit will be required. There will not be a pre-determined division of PMAP funds across the four regions. Eldon feels there is a better chance for this approach to be accepted.

- Using one national panel would be less expensive than four separate panels and a director from each region can present feedback on relevancy for each region.
- Relevancy panel will look at abstract and relevancy statement only, not the whole proposal.
- Relevancy panels could consist of the Advisory Council, Steering Committee, or IPM committees using the same conflict of interest criteria for the relevancy panel as for the peer review. Using the Advisory Council would provide a good number of reviewers resulting in an accurate average score.
- Proposals must show relevancy to have real clout. The RFA must be clear that both relevancy and technical merit are important. The panels also need to be carefully instructed. The technical panel reviews the science method only, and the relevancy panel reviews only the relevance. Each panel needs to understand their role. Want an individual from each Center on the panels.
- There was no dissent among the Center Directors to this new proposal.
- CSREES needs to present all regional priorities in the same format. Centers need to collect their own regional IPM priorities to be included in the RFA
- Give feedback to eortman@perdue.edu feedback by June 30 (2 weeks)

National Plant Diagnostic Network – Kitty Cardwell

Soybean Rust

- The NPDN is currently preparing for the arrival of soybean rust. Kitty has a guideline for states to follow with a line of communication that goes up to the Secretary of Agriculture.
- Currently the NPDN is working with all hub labs to have certified diagnosticians and the same equipment.
- The job of APHIS is to identify soybean rust when it arrives and that is where their responsibility ends. The NPDN has been asked to help with next response, working with the Centers. Sue Ratcliffe is working with Ray Hammersmith in Michigan to address the response issue. She is holding a general regional informational call and then states can create their own individual response plan.
- Kitty is currently working on predicting where and when soybean rust will show up. Growers are stockpiling fungicides in some areas of the country, which may foil the distribution line for areas that may need chemicals first. It is not legal to apply the stockpiled fungicides to soybeans until soybean rust is diagnosed. Growers need to be assured that chemicals will be available when the need arises.
- Work is still needed on first detector training and outreach at the grower level. Growers need to know what will be done to their farm, and what can they do about it.
- Sue – states in North Central region have done a great job at communicating about the disease at winter meetings. She feels like growers are well informed. Illinois and Iowa have advanced plans.

Sudden Oak Death

- Plant Diagnostic Networks are involved. APHIS did the trace forward work to find where it came from (Monrovia nurseries), but by that point most of the infected stock had left the nurseries. Now there is a national survey to detect infected trees. They estimate about 10% of stock was infected.
- One idea being considered is to train Master Gardeners to either identify SOD or better yet train them to do the sampling. Training Master Gardeners to identify SOD would be nearly impossible since it is very difficult to diagnose outside a laboratory.
- There are two possible plans for spending the \$400K offered by the Forest Service for this project: 1) use a large portion of the money to train the Master Gardeners to reduce the number of unusable or inaccurate samples coming in, or 2) do little training on sampling method for the Master Gardeners but instead allot more money to gather greater quantities of

samples.

- There are many concerns that NPDN is not suited to train Master Gardeners. Concerns include the fact that Master Gardeners would be handling quarantine material. Jim Green will present more on this later in the meeting.
- A plan needs to be in effect within three weeks.

Communications

- The NPDN holds conference calls every two weeks and Kitty really wants someone from the Centers to be on each call which is held every other Monday at 11am Eastern Time.

Benefits of Transition to IPM Centers – Steve Toth and John Ayers

- After deciding that most of the concerns in the original document have been resolved, Sue Ratcliffe volunteered to draft a brief document to list the priorities of the Center. The document will be ready for the September meetings at which point we should look at these issues with the group to see if there are remaining concerns that have not been met.
- The Directors decided to not initiate a national advisory committee as suggested in the priorities since they feel the national communication needs are being met.

Process and Timeline for Setting IR-4 PMSP National Priorities – Rick Melnicoe

- Rick requested that the Centers begin the process of gathering regulatory priorities for IR-4 from PMSPs conducted in their region during the past year. The timeline he outlined was included in a handout (in abbreviated version):
 - On July 1, each IPM Center gather identified regulatory needs from PMSP workshops completed in the previous year (July-June)
 - An IR-4 Project Clearance Request (PCR) must be submitted for any identified residue/efficacy needs not already in IR-4.
 - Rick, as Center IR-4 liaison, will collect all the identified regulatory needs and coordinate with IR-4.
 - A list of regulatory needs will be provided to Jerry Baron (IR-4) by July 15.
 - Criteria for receiving a PMSP top priority are: must be a reduced-risk use; be a researchable project; represent the majority of the commodity acreage.
 - Rick will send a letter to each Center with a list of their specific regional priorities and the IR-4 status by August 16,
 - Each Center will communicate with the specific commodity groups and ask them to choose the most important need.
 - These needs are sent to all Center Directors to check with their growers
 - The highest needs will be reviewed by the Centers
 - The top five national priorities will be finalized via conference call prior to the food use workshop in September.
- An IR-4 Food Use Workshop will be held in Orlando in mid-September. Someone from the Southern IPM Center will attend.

Day 2 – Wednesday, June 16th

EPA Update – Jonathan Becker

- EPA is trying to coordinate risk assessments for all fumigants and look at them more broadly, to consider substitutes. He is coordinating risk assessments with California.
- An internal working committee is looking at crop profiles and PMSPs to promote their use within the pesticide programs and making people familiar with them and their use. The group will then report back to CARAT about changes that could be made and recommend enhancements. Nikhil Mallampalli is on this committee. Jim VanKirk wants to know what Centers can do to make PMSP documents more useful and offers whatever aid is helpful to the

- EPA working groups addressing this issue.
- Registration review is important. There's passed out a copy of the statute which uses the word "goal" rather than "mandate" meaning there is more flexibility in when things are done. The goal is to review each chemical every 15 years (FIFRA section 3g)
- Methyl bromide – 3 years worth of nominations, allocations
 - 2005 allocation - decided 35% of 1997 baseline.
 - Of that, 30% is new production, 5% from stockpiles.
 - Decisions for 2006 nominations are still pending.
 - Each country must have national management strategy by 2006. The US needs a strategy to do this.
 - Packages for 2007 are due on August 8, 2004.
 - 10 full-time people per year from EPA will work on methyl bromide issues; a big drain on EPA staff.

Master Gardeners/Sudden Oak Death – Jim Green

- Southern Oak Death (SOD) was first diagnosed in the mid-90s in California and was determined to be a new species: *Phytophthora ramorum*. It then slowly spread through Oregon where officials enacted a combination of quarantine and eradication. The disease has spread across the nation as a result of shipments of infected stocks of camellias from the Monrovia Nursery. Spread of the disease occurs through mass proliferation of spores spread by wind, rain, and humans. The National Forest Service is very concerned.
- Although already well known as Sudden Oak Death, a more accurate name is Plant Diseases Caused by *Phytophthora ramorum*. Besides SOD has a vulgar connotation in England.
- There is no known control and over 60 susceptible species including rhododendrons, viburnums, blueberries, maples, beech, oaks, lilacs, and other indigenous and native species. They are looking at research options for management and control.
- Jim Green presents the suggestion of using Master Gardeners as first detectors. He contacted all state Master Gardener coordinators inviting them to participate in SOD detection training. Both the Forest Service and National Plant Diagnostic Network are helping to work on this issue.
- Master Gardeners' programs are available in most of the 50 states. Training included 30-80 hours of classroom instruction, field training, and a good mentoring program for at least one season.
- SOD is not easily identified visually, which is why they need the Master Gardeners to help collect the numerous samples and send them into trained diagnosticians to track its spread.
- NPDN has extensive training materials that they would like to get out on web. Each state is set up a little differently to deal with samples and they want to tailor training for each state to make sure it is relevant.
- \$400K is available from Forest Service to get outreach on SOD; want to set up a training program similar to Florida's (http://spdn.ifas.ufl.edu/fl_sod_conference.html).
- California has a training manual that they are in the process of putting on the web.
- This may be the first trial of cooperation between NPDN and the Centers. NPDN does not have good outreach. NPDN feels Centers have pathways and experience in getting educational materials out and they request that this information go on each regional web site.
- Sue Ratcliffe is offering assistance through the NC Center to offer educational opportunities to the states. Participation from each state is NOT required and each state may construct their own plan according to their needs and available resources.
- This can be a pilot program for how we handle future invasive species.
- Jim VanKirk suggests a memorandum of understanding or proposal submitted from the Forest Service to the IPM Centers in order to clarify the mission. Jim Green will work on this.
- There will be a conference on SOD in California in 2005. Centers are encouraged to be

present.

SARE Program with the Forest Service in Colorado - Mary McDonough

- Mary wanted to give us a heads up on what is going on in the program. She is working on a recommendation to integrate expertise within the regions involving no sharing of money, just expertise. This summer she is sending out a strategic plan to all regions for comments. Mike Fitzner will send the plan to the Centers when it is completed.

Endangered Species – Arty Williams

- Arty heads a group doing risk assessment of pesticide use on endangered species. Her group looks at what pesticide products are being used geographically and determines the likelihood of the presence of an endangered species in that location, and the effect the pesticide might have on those species or their habitats.
- Based on their findings, actions including permits, etc. may be necessary to insure no harm will come to any endangered species. Every pesticide registration is considered an action; every use of pesticide is an action. Each species/pesticide use has to be assessed and therefore there are millions of actions. Arty's group decides if any action restrictions need to be put in place. This work will coincide with pesticide registration reviews, which happen every 15 years.
- Their method determines if a pesticide will harm a species if the species were there. If so, then look to see if the endangered species is there; first on a county basis. If species not in county, then they will go no further. They ask questions like: Is it likely to be exposed at the modeled levels? Is it resident or migratory? Is it likely to be there when crop sprayed? Are there geographic limitations such as areas of high altitude?
- Geographic Information Systems (GIS) helps to display all information through interactive mapping.
- Once the impact of the pesticide on the species is determined, the Department of Fish and Wildlife may issue a biological opinion. There is time for public comment and for a look at the economic impacts of the ruling on farms in the area.
- Once they have decided on specific mitigations, a supplemental bulletin will be released with the pesticide label. They are currently working on a system to tie old county bulletins with GIS systems, but before this is done the bulletins need to be reviewed to see if they need updating.
- What can the IPM Centers do? We can send out announcements for review, make sure the information is disseminated, and use our connections to facilitate communication.

E-Extension – Sally Rockey

- E-extension has approval to move ahead with this extension initiative of providing extension information through the web.
- Progress since the last update: wrote a business plan and developed a non-profit organization; created a governing board; advertised three positions with a target of hiring by this July; and have a web site up. This Fall, the pace will quicken.
- The program contains science and university based resources of information that focus on users and communities of interest.
- To decide on the content of each community of interest, a content team will be developed and Sally feels the IPM Centers can be involved at this level and also on the board. The board will decide which community of interest will be completed first although nutrition and IPM are thought to be top priorities. The IPM Centers should check with E-Extension to see when the content teams are being formed.
- Being on a content team is a time consuming job with many decisions to make. In spite of this, she feels there may be a lot of competition for the spots.

- Some of the E-extension funding comes from an assessment to each state extension program and 85% of the state extension directors agreed with the assessment.
- E-extension may change jobs of some extension people, but there will not be a net loss of jobs. They want to consolidate extension resources to make it easier to get meaningful information.
- All content will be peer reviewed by content teams. There will be an opportunity for Centers to be more involved. Right now they are trying to get management in place, then get teams together.
- Centers can plug into the IPM team and be behind the extension directors in supporting the concept. Start thinking about the IPM team, encourage Centers to think about how they want to be involved, and invite e-extension representatives to Advisory Council meetings.
- E-extension web site: <http://e-extensionproject.info/index.html>. Greg Crosby is the CSREES liaison for e-extension.
- Mike Fitzner will send a letter to Greg Crosby that Centers are the logical choice to be part of the IPM content team since we already have an IPM focus and an established line of communication with many other programs.

Federal IPM Committee

- Rick provided a detailed description of the Center functions and each director discussed the uniqueness of their Center.
- Al Greene from the GSA discussed IPM in and on Federal properties. He evaluates success on customer satisfaction, amount of pesticides used, and costs.
- Peter Egan and Herb Bolton discussed IPM on Department of Defense properties. They have three measures of merit:
 1. reduction of pesticide use
 2. installation level pest management plans
 3. number of certified applicators

CAB International Update – Bill Hoffman

- There are 912 registered users on CABI and 1340 user sessions thus far. CSREES has licenses for 2000 simultaneous users, but to date the maximum has been only 20-30 simultaneous users. They may consider reducing the number of licenses, but the 2000 are relatively inexpensive.
- Use of CABI is free for land-grant university faculty and staff at www.ipmcenters.org/cabi
- Centers should continue to promote this service to our circle of influence.

Center Communication Strategies: Keeping the Right People Informed – A General Discussion

Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP)

- There is a fear that funding from EPA for PSEP will be cut and that within the new system of competitive funding of programs, small states will be left behind. IPM Centers need to show support of these programs specifically that there are trained people at the universities whose jobs won't be continued without some type of hard funding. Once the infrastructure of the program is eroded, the program will be impossible to rebuild. The judicious and informed use of pesticides is the focus of these programs, and to lose that would mean losing an important cog in IPM. We should not wait for a lawsuit from a farmer worker organization to convince the EPA to continue funding these initiatives. These programs are under funded as is, and any future cuts would be devastating.
- Many members of the Directors meeting agree that the IPM Centers need to lobby on behalf of the PESP and PAT programs.

Examples of More IPM Center Communications:

- The Centers need to identify successes in individual state programs, and communicate how we help and who we serve. We also need to let people in the states know about our involvement with e-extension.
- Southern Pine beetle money was granted to the Southern Region Center.
- Jim VanKirk will visit with each state IPM contact in the South.
- North Central and South have made extensive state visits and North Central has the pest alerts to help let people know about campus visits. Mike Grey visits campuses to get communication down to the faculty level.
- On state visits, the Center personnel should meet with the IPM Coordinator, the State Network Contact, and head of the Plant Diagnostic Center. Part of making Centers successful is making an appearance. Do not wait to be invited since people are short on time and are not familiar with the Center mission.

Relationship to Other CSREES Programs

- Sudden Oak Death – Jim Green says we should ask for the \$400K of Forestry Service money. Of that, \$270K will be used for 9000 samples at \$30 a sample, \$40K for tracking of samples, \$40K for negotiated 10% overhead. If we want this money we need to act soon and need to sign off on the Center’s involvement with APHIS, USDA, NPDN and the Plant Board.
- Sue has volunteered to write up a plan for the Forest Service money. Centers need to get items to Sue for her to write up the main objectives such as how we will work with NPDN, and communication logistics like state contacts, teleconference services, website presence (Sue encourages everyone to look at the site for soybean rust to see if it might work for this disease), and publications. The Centers want to make it clear that training in proper sampling methods is critical.
- The NPDN is not handling this because they do not having the training and outreach experience that the Centers do. Also not all the states will want to participate and the NPDN does not have experience getting buy-in from states.
- One center should take the lead and cooperate between the Centers. This could be model for this type of cooperation.

Day 3 – Thursday, June 17th

Center Directors Business Meeting (including CSREES staff)

IPM evaluation - Bill Hoffman.

- Disappointingly, only 1 or 2 survey replies were received per region, and he has not done anything with the information yet. Bill gave a handout of the proposed agenda for comment for October meeting in Vermont.
- There were internal discussions at CSREES on how they might proceed with the IPM evaluation, and they want to work with Federal IPM Coordinator Committee to get input before the Vermont meeting. They need more input than what was received from IPM coordinators.
- Jim VanKirk doesn't think the survey was understood by IPM Coordinators. They need a longer and stronger introduction to explain the big picture. But there needs to be more feedback of both qualitative and quantitative data before proceeding.
- A logic model takes time to sell, and it will still be hard to get complete buy in. They may not have requested quantitative indicators, but realize they need to talk about both types of data. The draw back is there are costs associated with quantitative data, and time costs. Possibly they could fund an evaluation project through a grants program.
- NRCS data could be very useful in these evaluations. Look at what IPM practices they have cost shared or look at approved farm plans. Good third party data.
- The GAO wanted impacts nationally, not just local stories, to give the big picture on what is being done across the country. They are less interested in the practices used, but more in the

reduction in risk, pesticide use, increased worker safety, etc. We need to answer the GAO question of “so what?”

- Strengthen PPRS system by throwing out the bad indicators and standardizing to make stronger and better for aggregation. Make it clearer to state people what is needed. Ask them, “What has your state program done to contribute to specified success?” Claim your part of that success.
- Start with two questions to get third party data. What type of data should we collect? Then where do we get that data? Use two columns to address.
- Learned in this meeting that the last approach did not work. Bill Hoffman will put together a matrix with his own brainstorming comprised of 45 questions in three roadmap areas.

Specialists from OEP – Shawn Bennett, Debbie Ogden, Shirley Smith.

- Vera could not make the meeting and others were not available.
- Awaiting our proposals by July 15. Only a one year budget is necessary. The contracts will extend to the end of the grant period in 2008 when the grants are renewed.
- Indirect costs remain at 19% for this grant but the federal rate for new contracts has increased to 20%

Mid-Term Evaluation of IPM Centers

- Each Center must conduct a mid-term evaluation; recommend doing after Sept 05. Dennis Kopp is willing to help with process and perhaps lead reviews.
- Yet to be determined is whether there will be a different panel for each region, one panel that goes to each region, a series of reviews at each region, or a single review at a site for all Centers collectively.
- What is purpose of review? Mike and Dennis say it is required to assess the need for mid-course corrections. Probably need outside reviewers, Advisory Committees, stakeholders, related programs, etc. Should have leadership from outside of USDA since the review must look at USDA's role too.
- This will be a programmatic review, looking at any need for mid-course corrections. Ron would like to see comparison between regions. What is different and good? Opportunity to fine-tune for next RFA.
- A core group plus members from the each region make up the review committee.
- Think about dates; Nov 05, or Jan-Feb 06 for a 1.5-2 day review. The date should be set a year in advance if reviewing by region or 8 months if reviewing all regions together.

Regional IPM Grants Program

- A coordinated RFA release by Centers is not necessary, except if trying to coordinate a project across regions.
- Draft RIPM RFA must be approved by CSREES, and the earlier the better for quick approval.
- RFA needs to go to 1862 Land Grant and vet schools. This funding is not open to other Land Grants, ARS, or other organizations although they can be cooperators.

EPA wants both Headquarters and regional people on regional centers.

Decision: Do we need indicators for VT meeting? Should we go to meeting without our indicators? Yes.

Future meetings:

September 15-16, 2004; Washington, DC It was suggested to have the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee meet with us on the 15th, if the time is okay with Harold Coble. Invite the coordinating committee to any or all of the agenda.

February 15-17, 2005; Washington, DC

Glossary of Acronyms

APHIS – Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
ARS – Agriculture Research Service (USDA)
CABI – Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International.
CAR – Crops At Risk
CARAT – Committee to Advise on Reassessment and Transition
CSREES – Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service
EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
FTE – Full Time Equivalent
GIS – Geographic Information System
HSPD-9 – Homeland Security Presidential Directive
IPM – Integrated Pest Management
IR-4 – Interregional Research Project 4
IWG – IPM Working Group
NPDN – National Plant Diagnostic Network
NRCS – Natural Resource Conservation Service
OEP – Office of Extramural Programs
OMB – Office of Management and Budget
OPMP – Office of Pest Management Policy
PESP – Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program
PMAP – Pest Managements Alternative Project
PMSP – Pest Management Strategic Plans
PNW – Pacific North West
POP – Persistent Organic Pollutants
PPRS – Performance Planning and Reporting System
RAMP – Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program
RFA – Request For Applications
RIPM – Regional Integrated Pest Management
SOD – Sudden Oak Death
SPDN – Southern Plant Diagnostic Network
UCI – University of California-Irvine, Urban Water Research Center
USDA – United States Department of Agriculture