

**Minutes**  
**Integrated Pest Management Centers Directors Meeting**  
**October 2, 2003**  
**Washington, D.C**

**Attending:**

John Ayers, Jeanne Bacheler, Jonathan Becker, Wilfred Burr, Shani File, Mike Fitzner, Mike Greifenkamp, Linda Herbst, Bill Hoffman, Tom Holtzer, Lynnae Jess, Monte Johnson, Dennis Kopp, Nikhil Mallampalli, Rick Melnicoe, Russ Mizzell, Norm Nesheim, Larry Olsen, Eldon Ortman, Sue Ratcliffe, Ron Stinner, Liz Thomas, Steve Toth, Jim VanKirk

**Status of e-Extension**

- John Ayers wrote a letter to Dr. Richard Wootton offering the support of the Centers in developing the e-Extension concept. He also invited Dr. Wootton to this meeting. Dr. Wootton appreciates our support but at this point, did not feel he needed to meet with us until he had more direction from the Extension Directors.
- A letter from John VanDyke, who runs the search engine for the Center for IPM from Iowa State University, states that the e-Extension proposal looks expensive and lacks the flexibility needed. He is concerned that the large scope of the project may make it obsolete by the time it is ready for the public. He questions whether we should support this project with its current design. Due to this concern, it is even more important to be at the table where the decisions are being made and a GOOD national plan would be helpful. This would also create a better communication link between the Centers and the individuals developing e-Extension.

**EPA Update – Jonathan Becker and Nikhil Mallampalli**

- *Federal Register and Pesticide Regulation Notices* – EPA publishes notice of all rulemaking activities usually including a public comment period.
- *Pesticide Re-registration Performance Measures and Goals*–This is a list of chemicals up for consideration in the next year. In the past fiscal year there were 14 new chemicals registered, five were reduced risk, four organophosphate reduced risk, and one methyl bromide alternative. Many are supported through an IR-4 partnership. Emergency exemption requests are running 400 to 600 annually.
- *Dimethoate* is being cancelled on apples, grapes, cabbage, collards, spinach, and head lettuce due to dietary risk. A few other uses are being dropped because they are not being supported by the registrant. These cancellations are currently in the public comment period.
- *Molinate*- a cancellation notice is out on this product.
- *FDA/CSFAN* –has sent out notice regarding trade policy for commodities with revoked tolerances. A 4-year lag time is estimated for pesticide residues to be clear from the channel of trade.
- *Methyl Bromide* – 72 requests for Critical Use Exemptions were filed this year. Fourteen of the 56 groups that submitted requests last year did not resubmit. 16 new groups submitted requests, primarily additional groups in existing sectors. Requests are on the Office of Air and Regulation (OAR) website and a response from Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (MBTOC) to the Technical and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) is expected by October 8, 2003 (<http://www.teap.org/REPORTS/downloads/TEAP2003.pdf>).

- *Student Internship* -EPA is offering an educationally beneficial internship for students interested in environmental careers for a period from 3 to 6 months. Funding is available for 1 to 2 interns this year including a stipend of \$500/week. Bachelor or masters degree students welcome. Contact Jonathan Becker (becker.jonathan@epa.gov) for more information
- *Short Courses* - BEAD is collaborating with the North Central and Western Centers to create short courses (3-5 days) aimed at educating BEAD scientists and economists on in-field agricultural practices with a focus this fall on ornamentals. The deliverable from each course will be a crop time line and multimedia presentations would be helpful for participants. To avoid some bureaucracy, the funding is through a sole source contract with EPA instead of through CSREES. Each course is envisioned to cost ~\$20K. Each center can apply under a separate contract for their region and BEAD hopes to interact with the other regions in 2004. The western region has offered to share its proposal with other regions. If interested, contact Nikhil Mallampalli at [mallampalli.nikhil@epa.gov](mailto:mallampalli.nikhil@epa.gov).
- *Discussion:*
  - Q. Shouldn't CARAT members have a role in this training process? A. Not all CARAT members are experts. Some of them should be in these courses not offering them.
  - Q. What type of crops are the focus of these courses? A. This list is forming, but crops that have no PMSP are preferred since there is no information available. Jonathan is working on this list now.
  - Q. Would multi-state courses be considered? A. Travel logistics become expensive when covering a large geographic area. A small area is recommended without air travel between sites.
  - Q. Is the overhead issue resolved? A. In the West, indirect costs are 27.5%, but the budget does not include indirect costs. Suggest checking into your own university's service contract details since each university is different.
  - Q. The ag issues forum is hosting conference calls regularly, but what is the reason? A. Burr- Just to speak about agricultural happenings in the regions.
  - Q. Do you know about independent crop consultants doing crop time lines? A. Jon and Nikhil will look into this.

### **CSREES Update – Mike Fitzner and Dennis Kopp**

- Awards for Centers have been made and the miscommunication over subcontracts resolved. It is critical that the proposal narrative include a description of the funds distribution process which demonstrates a process that is fair, open, and free of conflict of interest. Also annual progress reports must include a list of the projects funded through the prime contract. Inclusive annual progress reports will be key to streamlining the award process each year when adding 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> year funds. Other measurements of progress will be required. Bill Coli will help with the documentation of these measurements.
- Regional IPM grant will be administered through the Centers starting with FY 2004 funds. Mike will send out a communication to the state IPM coordinators regarding this issue (although this issue was discussed at all the regional annual meetings in April 2003), but the Centers are also paramount in this communication effort.
- 3D Funding: at this point, there are NO plans to change 3-d funding levels to the states.

- Discussion:
  - Q. There still is an overall concern that the 3-d funds will be incorporated into the Centers just as were the PIAP funds. A. Suggest bringing together these various groups at meetings to help alleviate concerns.
- Committee to Advise on Reassessment and Transition (CARAT)
  - CARAT met on October 1-2, 2003 with a large portion of the discussion evolving around issues related to the Centers. This is a production-oriented group focusing on the transition of agricultural tools as a result of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA). The group met with the deputy administrator of the EPA and USDA to give their recommendations which focused highly on NRCS and the IPM Centers. They were very positive about the Centers and the services that should be provided through them.
  - There is some concern among others attending the CARAT meeting that the recommendations are not realistic and may act as unfunded mandates.
  - It is expected that some of the key points in the CARAT report will include:
    - The IPM Centers being the key to many production systems.
    - The PMSP process focusing more on the crops with the greatest needs resulting from FQPA.
    - Questions about the PMSP priority setting processes and how they can be improved.
    - A review process is necessary to look at accountability of resources being spent on processes such as PMSPs.
    - Identifying new resources for the Centers

### **Review of National IPM Committee Meeting**

- Ed Rajotte is condensing the priorities from the IPM Committee meeting and will share with the IPM Center directors.
- Measurement and communication are the top 2 priorities.
- Bill Coli is now hired through CSREES to work with each regional center to create a product for measuring IPM adoption with risk reduction being the key focal point. Many methods of measurement exist, but IPM Centers need to decide on the method that will work best to create a unified national perspective. It is suggested that Bill organize a workshop to coalesce this project.
- Regional representatives are:
  - Tom Holtzer – Western Region
  - Jim VanKirk – Northeastern
  - Shani File – Southern
  - Larry Olsen – North Central

### **CABI (Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International)**

- Bill Hoffman demonstrated CABI's crop protection compendium. The pay-for-service system includes up-to-date information on 10,000 insects, diseases, weeds, and natural enemy species worldwide: 1,850 with complete datasheets. Over 1,100 specialists provided the datasheet information, which has been peer-reviewed and edited. The 6,500 images allow for easy identification of crop pests and their natural enemies. Information is also available on crop statistics and geographic distribution.

- CSREES recently purchased 2,000 access points to this compendium to be made available to the faculty and staff of land-grant universities (1862, 1890, and 1994). Taking a leadership role in coordinating the logistics of distributing these licenses gives the Centers an opportunity to be more visible to stakeholders. Publicity related to the introduction of the CABI site could also help promote the Centers.
- At this point, there are two proposals for distributing the licenses:
  - A. Centers define 3-15 access sites per institution
  - B. House the majority of the access points at pmcenters.org for users to log into and temporarily use an access point. Logistically, this plan would be simpler than setting up access points at various universities, but a user verification system would be required.
- Consensus of the Directors is to go with plan B.
- CABI is eager to make people aware of their site and is currently working with Ron Stinner's office to make use of the system go smoothly. Currently the CABI information will be in a frame with credit to CSREES, IPM Centers and NPDC. This same frame can be displayed on each regional IPM Center site to keep the regional focus. APHIS and ARS are also supporting the CABI Compendium through separate agreements for their agencies.

### **Priority Setting of RIPM Funds**

- Mike Fitzner pointed out that this process needs to be fair, open, and free of conflict of interest. This can be achieved through soliciting broadly through the region for the determination of IPM needs and priorities especially considering the opinions of the research, extension, and education committees in each region. Center advisory and steering committees may make recommendations for input into the RFAs, but should not be involved in the actual writing of the RFA, nor should they see the RFA before it is public. Centers should then organize review panels to make final funding determinations to be passed on to CSREES.
- In the discussion that followed, it was suggested that Extension and Experiment Station Directors be kept in the loop of the RFA development since they are several steps removed from a conflict of interest issue. In addition, they will be more likely to support the directive to move RIPM grant funding to the Centers if they have input into the funding process.
- The Northeast region uses a relevancy panel to determine whether proposals are relevant to the region and then passes the proposals on to a technical review panel made up of professionals from outside the northeast region.
- Centers should facilitate setting IPM priorities for the region and project directors need to address those needs and cite the origins of the priorities in order to help determine the importance of the project.
- The North Central region uses letters of support from grower groups and others to determine the justification of the project.
- Who writes the RFAs?
  - *West*-a committee of five people plus the three Center directors write the RFA for regional IPM Center funds after asking for input from the regional IPM committee. None of the RFA writers can apply for funding. The process for the RIPM grant will be determined later. However, the grant coordinator will be the one to write the RFA with input from stakeholders, including the regional IPM committee.
  - *North Central* – the grants manager writes the RFA then it goes through the regional IPM committee.

- *Northeast* – John Ayers and Jim VanKirk write the RFA after receiving recommendations from NEREAP-IPM.
- *South* – the RFA is written by a small group which includes the grants manager, the associate director, and one member of the regional IPM committee.
- Mike Fitzner stressed the importance of keeping a very small group involved in writing the RFA and those writing the RFA are not eligible to receive funding via that RFA.

### **National Plant Diagnostic Centers (NPDC) – Dennis Kopp**

- Dennis Kopp explained that although the PDN and Centers are funded from different sources, the expectation is that these two entities will work together. The NPDCs should be thought of as the first line of detection and diagnosis of a pest problem after which it becomes a management issue; i.e., IPM. After the regional diagnostic centers have had time to become established and build relationships, it is anticipated that communication will improve which is already happening in some of the regions.
- It is suggested that someone from the NPDC leadership be on the Center advisory councils/committees to help improve communication and synergy.
- A memorandum of understanding from CSREES would be help encourage collaboration between the diagnostic centers and the IPM Centers.

### **Pest Management Alternatives Program (PMAP) – Monte Johnson**

- There is a high probability that the management of the PMAP program will be moved to the regions through the Centers. One RFA can be used regionally to cover both RIPM and PMAP funds with explanations within the RFA separating the two. Review of proposals for both funding sources can be done using one review panel if desired. A separate proposal for funds to cover the management of these programs can be submitted by the fund manager to cover the panel costs, manager time, etc.
- Panel members should be from outside the region when possible and anyone from within the region should be chosen carefully to avoid the perception of a conflict of interest. Internal reviews are not usually required.
- It was proposed to split PMAP money into five equal pools; one for each region and a national pool. Ideally the manager of the national fund would like the regions submit proposals that have been reviewed by the regional process and have national or multiregional relevance. This would require that all the regions synchronize their grants solicitation and review processes. It was concluded that regions would probably not be interested in submitting their best proposals to the national pool since not all of them will be funded.
- Monte also announced the USDA is adding \$425K to the PSEP program bringing the total to \$1.25 million (approximately 57% of the FY 2002 amount).

## **CSREES/OEP – Vera Smith plus Grants Specialists**

- Vera would like the subcontract award procedures to be pulled out of the main text of each regional proposal so she can easily find the information.
- In order to release restricted Center funds leftover from the initial funding, Vera’s office needs a letter from the Center describing what the money will be used for and how the awardees will be determined.
- Any funds in the current grants can be moved as long as it doesn’t change the scope of the project or key personnel. Moving the money is meant to be flexible.

### **Logo – Jim VanKirk**

- The logo does not need to mention CSREES.
- Out of the group of six logos created by Liz Myers, E. has the most favorable votes with some suggestions: add a phrase such as “for our environment, for our future”, incorporate maps somehow, list the states in the region next to the logo, include Alaska although the size is not critical.
- The consensus is for Sue Ratcliffe to have her graphics person work on this with a deadline for completion of October 21.

E.



### **Committee to Address Reassessment and Transitions (CARAT) Feedback – Eldon Ortman**

- The CARET group has 30 members from across the agricultural spectrum. They recently met and the following are some of their recommendations:
  - Involve NRCS with minor crops
  - CARET views the IR-4 program as a great model and sees that program as highly important to growers. A primary reason for this view is the involvement of stakeholders and practitioners, and the program addresses real world problems in a specific and timely manner.
  - The IPM Roadmap is an excellent document that now needs to be implemented.
  - Fund the Centers as a line item to give them long-term stability. Grant funding of the Centers is not recommended.
  - The process to create PMSPs is evolving and now needs to be evaluated for how they are being selected, who is using them and for what.
  - All CSREES IPM-related funding programs should be regionally managed
- Center Directors need to pay attention to these recommendations and educate CARAT members about what the Centers do and what CARAT can expect of them.
- Members of the CARAT group would be a helpful addition to a National Advisory Council.

### **Communications via Listservs - Susan Ratcliffe**

- Sue would like to establish a method for people to subscribe to listservs that would sort out the type of information they wish to receive. She feels key people are not getting important information about the Centers.
- It is suggested that state contacts need to improve communication to spread the Center message. Another possibility is to create a web site with the ability to notify people when it is updated.
- One trouble with listservs is that it is not easy to see who is on the list. Jim VanKirk stated there is an easy way to review the names, and he will distribute directions.

## **Prioritizing PMSPs – Rick Melnicoe**

- So far, there has been no clear guidance on which crops are chosen to have a PMSP completed. In some regions, commodity groups will sponsor a PMSP but there is concern that the decisions are made by “loudest voice” or most money. Many are selected through being on the EPA request list but it is pointed out that state priorities should be included in the selection process. Some crops needing a PMSP are not on anyone’s official list. In the Southern region, the state project leaders decide which PMSPs will be done, usually with input from their advisory committees. In the Western region, PMSPs are done by anyone having an interest in seeing it done. One of the CARAT recommendations is for the Centers to set up some type of system for choosing PMSPs. Center members agreed as long as the system remains flexible. State and national needs should somehow be balanced in the decision-making process. Existing priorities can be one basis for selection, but as in the example of watercress, this is not on the EPA’s request list. Once again, IR-4 already has a system set up, and the Centers need to look at that method since it is successful.
- It would be helpful to have one spreadsheet documenting requests for PMSPs from all sources. Jim VanKirk will work on this.
- Some members would like to know how these documents are being used to “sell” the idea to some of the states that are not interested in producing PMSPs. How can this be made into one of their top concerns? EPA is one of the biggest users but so are commodity groups and grant review panels.
- A group consisting of Norman Nesheim, Lynnae Jess, Wilfred Burr, Jonathan Becker, and Rick Melnicoe will work to create a draft protocol for selecting PMSPs and will present it at the next meeting in February 2004.

## **Center Input into IR-4 National Work Priorities on Reduced Risk Pesticides– Rick Melnicoe**

- Each September, IR-4 holds a Food Use Workshop to identify their “A” priorities (i.e., projects to be funded during the next year) work projects for the year that involve reduced risk materials through a process involving stakeholders and their concerns. IR-4 is requesting that the Centers help in this selection by collecting input primarily through the PMSP process. In order for a project to qualify, the chemical must be a reduced risk product and represent the majority of national acreage. IR-4 will work on five of the Center recommended products, but Centers can make more than five recommendations. This information needs to be to IR-4 by July and be routed through OPMP. If work is recommended by the Centers and also by a commodity group, it is more likely to be selected by IR-4. This process will also help to coordinate national PMSP decisions.
- This ability to influence the work of IR-4 makes the Center’s job of prioritizing PMSP completion even more critical.
- IR-4 requires priorities derived from current PMSPs, therefore old ones need to be updated.

## **Opportunities for Regional Collaboration**

- Metrics coordinated by Bill Coli
- RIPM proposals that cross regional boundaries. It’s better not to be too sticky about this since one year money may flow out of one region, but another year it will flow in. It would be hard to keep track of the exact amounts on an interregional project and might be more trouble than it’s worth.

Also timelines for grants programs are different for each region so coordinating funding from 2 or more regions would be difficult. Centers should be aware of the potential problems, but make no particular standards now for interregional projects.

- Pest Alerts can be requested from any region and the North Central office will consider producing them if they have a national need. Urban and public health issues are easy to transport across the regions.
- Centers need to start moving on doing national collaboration. It might be a good idea to divide the work so that each region has something to contribute; e.g., North Central is doing Pest Alerts. Another region can specialize in something else.

### **Next Center Directors Meeting**

- Raleigh, NC on Wednesday and Thursday, Feb 25 and 26, 2004. Thursday's meeting will overlap with the meeting of the Southern region IPM coordinators. The IT group is meeting one day ahead on the 24<sup>th</sup>.
- The following meeting will be in Washington Tuesday and Wednesday, June 15-16 starting at 8:30 on day 1 and ending at 5:00 on day 2.
- Suggested agenda items:
  - CARAT recommendations
  - Reinstitution of conference calls the next being in November for directors only and to be hosted by the Northeast region. Tom will come up with the topic.

### **Communications – Bill Hoffman**

- Bill is developing a communication plan in the West and would like to share this with other regions to publicize important issues such as the release of CABI for use by university staff and faculty. He has the opportunity to obtain the domain [www.ipm.gov](http://www.ipm.gov). The decision was made to obtain this address and house it on one of Ron Stinner's servers.

### **National IPM Advisory Committee – John Ayers**

- This committee would comprise the heads of national organizations based primarily in DC to annually advise the Center Directors and National IPM Committee with the goal being to improve communication between agencies at a national level and to act as a multiplier. Comments on this idea include:
  - CARAT already performs this function and another advisory committee would be expensive and time consuming.
  - One federal group cannot advise another so this committee cannot be official (to prevent triggering FACA).
  - A national AC would give the Centers a national perspective that they may not currently have with their regional ACs
  - An annual review of our progress would give other agencies a more accurate picture of the goals of the Centers
  - National leaders are more likely to have the ear of the congress
- Regions vote on whether to create an unofficial advisory committee (2 votes per region):
  - 6-yes;2-no

## **Glossary**

APHIS - Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

ARS – Agricultural Research Service

CABI (Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International)

CARAT – Committee to Address Reassessment and Transitions.

CSREES – Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service

NPDC – National Plant Diagnostic Centers

NRCS – Natural Resource Conservation Service

OPMP – USDA Office of Pest Management Policy

PIAP – Pesticide Impact Assessment Program

PMAP – Pest Management Alternatives Program

PMSP – Pest Management Strategic Plan

PSEP – Pesticide Safety Education Program

REAP-IPM – Research, Extension and Academic Program for IPM

RFA – Request for Applications

RIPM – Regional Integrated Pest Management