

Table of Contents

Attending	Page 2
Summary of last year's meeting	Page 2
CSREES Update	Page 2
Office of Pest Management Programs Update	Page 3
EPA Update	Page 3
IPM Regional Research and Extension Committee and Regional IPM Research Grants Program Updates: Priorities for the Coming Year	Page 4
Transition to IPM Centers: Mike Fitzner's View of Center Progress	Page 5
Regional IPM Center Updates	Page 5
PMAP Transition	Page 6
IPM Roadmap and Implementation Progress	Page 6
Federal IPM Coordinating Committee - What is it? Is there a need/opportunity for Regional/ State input?	Page 7
IR-4 Program Update; How might IR-4 priority setting process relate to Regional IPM Research RFA's?	Page 7
IPM Training needs for NRCS personnel; Discussion: How can state IPM programs, Regional Centers and NRCS programs collaborate to ensure that IPM is included in NRCS offerings?	Page 8
National IPM Symposium	Page 8
Discussion: Future Opportunities and Challenges for IPM.	Page 8
IPM Roadmap Impact Indicators/Measuring Risk Reductions: What we have found so far?	Page 8
Update from PMSP Guidelines Subcommittee	Page 9
CSREES Organic Grants Programs Update: Projects funded and IPM involvement.	Page 9
CSREES biotechnology programs	Page 10
Invasive Species: Potential Role of State IPM Programs and Regional IPM Centers	Page 10
Opportunities for State IPM Programs and Regional IPM Centers to collaborate with APHIS programs	Page 10
Can joint IPM Center/National IPM Committee subcommittees be used to address specific issues?	Page 11
Future Meetings	Page 11
Glossary of Acronyms	Page 11

National IPM Coordination Meeting Report

September 14-15, 2004 Washington DC

Attending:

John Ayers, Joe Bagdon, Jonathan Becker, Tom Bewick, Harold Coble, Bill Coli, Jerry DeWitt, Mike Fitzner, Zane Helsel, Linda Herbst, Jennifer Hodorowicz, Bob Holm, Al Jennings, Lynnae Jess, Joe Kovach, Nikhil Mallampalli, Rick Melnicoe, Therese Murtagh, Liz Myers, Bob Nowierski, Coanne O'Hearn, Larry Olsen, Eldon Ortman, Ed Rajotte, Susan Ratcliffe, Ron Stinner, Steve Toth, Elizabeth Thomas, Ann Marie Thro, Jim VanKirk, Frank Zalom

Day 1 – Wednesday, September 15

Summary of Last Year's Meeting – Ed Rajotte and Frank Zalom

- One of the topics discussed at last year's meeting was what they wanted to name these meetings. They decided on the "National IPM Coordination Meeting" because it brings together the IPM Center leadership and the NASULGC National IPM Committee, which represents the Land Grant colleges and universities, to discuss IPM as it relates to USDA CSREES and other federal programs. Ed and Frank are open to other name suggestions for this meeting.
- A copy of the meeting report with summaries about the Program Planning and Reporting System (PPRS), IPM Roadmap, NRCS programs, IPM in Schools, Biosecurity, Invasive Species, CARAT Recommendations, Organic Sustainable Agriculture Programs, and Integrated Pest Management Centers can be downloaded [here](#).

CSREES Update – Mike Fitzner

- Mike reminded us of the Plant Science Update which is now put together by Amy Rhodes. The document contains a lot of good information, and if you are not on the mailing list, contact Amy Rhodes (arhodes@csrees.usda.gov).
- Staff updates – Amy Rhodes joined CSREES in June as a Communications Outreach Coordinator. Bill Hoffman has continued with the IPM Evaluation project and has taken on the role of interim Program Leader for Homeland Security in CSREES.
- Extension IPM implementation program - \$10.8 million dollar range, makes IPM possible in Extension.
- The National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN) remains a key activity and high profile item for CSREES.
- SARE is planning their bi-annual conference in Burlington, Vermont October 19-21. Preceding the conference (October 17-18) is a workshop on IPM performance measures, sponsored by EPA.
- Rick Melnicoe was added to the Western SARE Administrative Council.
- The CABI Pest Compendiums have 2,000 access points that any land grant person can access for free. Can access from the National IPM Center website.
- E-extension – Extension Directors voted to tax themselves to help fund and design the E-extension system. The funds are from Smith-Lever funds and Extension Directors are using ½ - 1 percent of their state's budget.
- CSREES Grants Projects – 316 grants in all of plant sciences were funded in FY 2004 (\$82 million).
- Budget – FY 2004 had a 10 percent cut, but the President proposed in FY 2005 to restore these cuts. For FY 2005 the House came back with good marks, but the Senate shows us going back to the '04 level and maintaining the 10 percent cut. IR-4 is maintaining at the '03 level, but the majority is at the '04 level. The House and Senate are going to

conference and they could possibly split the difference with us gaining 5 percent back. SARE could come out at the '04 level. Special Grants may be down from '04. Homeland Security is down to \$15 million – higher than '04 but less than we wanted (\$30 million to \$18 million to \$15 million).

- Plant Production had their portfolio review process in June, and the process has worked well thus far. Plant Protection's portfolio review is slated for February '05 and preparation is underway. Looking for suggestions of people to serve on the panel with a 2-3 day commitment. Dr. Mike Fitzner is current section leader.
- PESP – the past couple of years funding for the program has been cut. From 1998-2002, PESP was funded \$1.88 million by EPA. In 2003 this amount dropped to \$700,000 with USDA contributing to boost it up to \$1.2 million. For FY 2004, funding is at the \$1.2 million level. EPA established review panel which held two meetings, one in July and one in September. A final report will be issued this fall.

Office of Pest Management Programs Update – Al Jennings

- Soybean rust – continues to be main effort. Working to secure Section 18s before the arrival. 3 triazoles approved through Section 18 Emergency Exemptions but they are not legal to use yet. Currently have chlorothalonil and azoxystrobin registered in addition to the 3 triazoles.
- NPDN is working on a recovery system for the protection of food and agriculture. Focuses on two things – that the U.S. is vulnerable to biological attack on crops and that we need tools to fight introduced pests. Plan a system/program to have tools including germ plasma and resistant chemistries. ARS is chairing this currently unfunded program and working with the select agents list from APHIS.
- Methyl Bromide – After December 31, 2004, Methyl Bromide is illegal except for three existing exemptions which include quarantine, critical Ag use exemptions and emergency issues. Exemptions are granted on a 1-year basis.
- Endangered Species – Counterpart regulations approved include four pesticides for EPA, but they have to do more to address endangered species. During a 17-year process EPA will go through pesticides and observe impact on environment. EPA does not need to consult with NOAA or Fish and Wildlife during this process.
- Food Quality Protection Act – Still has a few more years, cumulative risk assessments need to be done for carbamates and pyrethroids.
- Human Testing – being handled on a case by case basis. Not likely that we will see a published policy
- CARAT – Last meeting of the advisory council was almost a year ago and not much has happened since then. Committee has been rechartered, but they have not scheduled a meeting. Most of the recommendations indicated a lack of understanding of CSREES and ARS, want to produce a quick overview for committee members for the next meeting. There are rumors that there maybe a meeting in November.
- Jerry DeWitt recommends USDA work with APHIS, Centers, and Extension on how to communicate soybean rust information.

EPA Update – Jonathan Becker and Nikhil Mallampalli

- At the end of the fiscal year Jonathan established a website allowing individuals to comment on items such as re-registration of ziram, re-registration of methyl bromide, and global harmonization on labeling (i.e. symbols and key words standardization across countries)
- Methyl-bromide – just received next round of critical use exemption requests (55 from grower and commodity groups) for review.

- Risk Assessments on 7 fumigants – risks of all singly and combined.
- Rodenticide baits – comment period open to reduce ecological risks – anticoagulant consumed by rodent then eaten by predator. What are the risks up the food chain?
- Human testing – EPA looks on a case-by-case basis because the amount of human data is small (i.e. number of people exposed)
- Preparing a new Federal rule called Registration Review – EPA looks at pesticides to see if they are still eligible for use – the current program ends 2006-2008, then the new rule will go into effect in 2008
- EPA hired 110 new staff over the past 3 or 4 months in response to fee for service.
- Methyl iodide – not registered in the U.S. – decision may be made at the end of 2005 after evaluation of risks
- BEAD (Biological and Economic Analysis Division) training program – division responsible for collecting benefit information about pesticides and the economic value of commodities. Estimates impact of risk mitigation proposals before agency decides on a course of action. Former director thought about ways to keep staff current on more obscure commodities for which profiles or PMSPs not available. Arranged training with IPM Center directors. NC and Western regions held workshops on production of ornamentals with five BEAD staff members attending week long training in Michigan and California. Other commodities that BEAD would like to have additional training on include livestock production, specialty vegetable crops, parsley, dandelion, Swiss chard, specialty fruit crops, residential pest control, seed crops. One training session by each Center next year would be desirable, budget allowing. Dennis suggests inviting one or two key EPA administrators on tours.

IPM Regional Research and Extension Committee and Regional IPM Research Grants Program Updates: Priorities for the Coming Year – Regional Research Committee Chairs and RIPM Grants Managers

- West – Paul Jepson (Chair of WCC-69). The committee meets annually with a semi-formal structure and elects new offices each meeting. The western Region covers 1/8 of the world’s surface, making it very diverse. The meetings have presentations and reports from Regional IPM Coordinators, and the meetings always have a theme with this past year’s theme “Water Quality.” They have a grant to meet with groups to discuss the IPM continuum and vote on the evaluation process. This year they need a formal review process, which is a 2-day process.
 - Funded Western grants – received 34 proposals with 21 in research, 5 in Extension, 8 in Research-Extension. Funded 5 research, 2 Extension and 2 Extension-Research. They still lack some multi-discipline and regional approach to some of these programs.
- South – The Southern Region has completed 5 year review of IEG, and approved if for a 1 year extension. The group questions their purpose now that the SRIPMC manages RIPM grants, but they are looking at ways to work with the Centers on the RFP by maybe spreading meetings throughout the region or working with Ron Stinner to hold meetings in Raleigh, NC. They are well represented by IPM coordinators but need to look at how to keep research scientists involved.
 - Changing RFA a bit and it is now with CSREES for review. Proposing a relevance panel for RIPM grants and relevancy score will go into the final scores. Working with 3 southern states that have historically never submitted proposals.
- North Central – Committee meets annually in April. This year is a year of transition and they are looking for input on the NC201. Want to work multi-state and work closely with the Center. Will use state IPM coordinator as the primary contact for IPM Centers. Want

to strengthen the research component of program and the partnership between research and extension.

- This year they funded approximately 14 percent of proposals submitted. Moving to an electronic submission process with a hard copy sent in if funded. Reviews done electronically and submitted ahead of review panel meeting.
- Northeast – Met in February with IPM coordinators, SARE and EPA. Discussed role of NEREAP on the relationship with the Center
 - RIPM received nearly 40 proposals and funded 10. Required a letter of intent. NEREAP requested a pre-proposal, but CSREES denied the request because it would require the same level of scrutiny from a panel that would need to be brought together again. RFA was submitted in July and posted September 13.
- Joe Kovach’s question – Is it a conflict of interest for IPM coordinators to apply for IPM grants? Mike Fitzner does not believe so; avoiding conflict of interest was the reason to move the RIPM grants to the IPM Centers. Problem Joe is running into is that Ohio is moving from entitlement to performance, so if they get money they have to pay money back because of indirect costs.

Transition to IPM Centers: Mike Fitzner’s View of Center Progress – Mike Fitzner

- Mike talked to numerous people to get their views and they are very pleased with the Centers’ progress. Despite some rough spots at the start, he feels the Centers are a good thing and are successful thus far. Centers created a regional infrastructure that did not previously exist.
- Goal – to respond to pest management challenges. Fulfilling this goal with great success from projects such as soybean rust collaboration with NPDN.
- The relationships with IPM coordinators are still evolving and the Centers have regional differences on how to operate with them. Need to have that flexibility.
- Connection to NPDN is still evolving, but relationship is growing.
- Have not yet, and hope will not, take state IPM funding. Do not intend to replace state based IPM efforts.
- Al Jennings feels the Centers are working and is pleased.
- Harold Coble – happy with the evolution of the Centers and happy with progress
- Nikil and Jonathan – Centers are great device for focusing training. Can connect with land grants’ expertise, and the Centers are a great source for information.

Regional IPM Center Updates – Center Directors

- North Central - announced the release of their NC-RIPM Grants RFA on September 2. This year both the Letter of Intent (due October 4) and the fully developed proposal (due October 22) will be submitted electronically. The RFA and all forms are located at www.ncipmc.org/ncrim/. Other successful events include pairing with the National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN) to conduct a regional teleconference training session on June 29 to address soybean rust issues. The NCIPM Center Connection, the Center’s monthly electronic newsletter, has three successful editions released which are available at www.ncipmc.org. Future events include an upcoming Steering Committee meeting on November 4-5 in Indianapolis, IN. [The full report is available here.](#)
- West - announced the recent release of two RFAs. The Critical Issues RFA was released on June 11 with proposals due on August 19, and the Information Networks and Workgroups RFA was released on July 15 with proposals due on September 3. Twenty-eight proposals for Critical Issues, four proposals for Workgroups and eight proposals for Information Networks were received. Other activities the WIPMC has sponsored include a nursery issues training for five USEPA/BEAD staff on August 23-27. Upcoming events include a WIPMC Steering Committee meeting October 12-13 with the Steering

Committee meeting jointly with the National Foundation for IPM Education, and participating in a tour of AgraQuest, a local biopesticide company, on the second day,. Also, the FY2005 WIPMC conference will be held in Portland, OR on August 31 and September 1, 2005 with the general theme of Water Issues and Land Use. [The full report is available here.](#)

- Southern - recently hired Jim VanKirk as director of the Center with Ron Stinner taking on the role of Associate Director of Information Technology. The Center is working on updating and revamping their current website to match the design the Northeast Center recently implemented. The website will be tailored to serve individuals and groups in the Southern region and will include a web-hosted priorities system to allow individuals to provide feedback on issues of concern in their area. On May 11 and 12 the SRIPMC partnered with the Southern Plant Diagnostic Network (SPDN) to host an informational workshop on soybean rust. Upcoming events include an Advisory Council and Steering Committee meeting on December 8-9, and a move to new office space on NC State's Centennial Campus during the first weeks of October. [The full report is available here.](#)
- Northeast - has numerous meetings coming up including the Advisory Council meeting on October 26-27, State Network Project leaders meeting on October 14, the Center's first Northeast Region IPM Conference on March 15-16, 2005, the Northeast Research, Extension, and Academic Program-IPM on March 14, 2005, and the Northeastern IPM Center meeting on March 17, 2005. The Northeast Regional Community and Urban IPM Conference will be held March 15-16, 2005, in Manchester, NH. There will be a total of 11 conference sessions covering a wide range of topics, as well as poster displays and a limited trade show. For more information about the conference visit: http://northeastipm.org/conference2005_index.cfm. The Northeast Center is also conducting a search to hire a new Cornell-based Co-Director of the Center. Deadline for applications was September 10. [The full report is available here.](#)

PMAP Transition – Monte Johnson [Click here for the full handout.](#)

- Trying to transition the PMAP to Centers for years. Eldon had some success with the transitions with the Regions participating in the RFA by including a relevancy statement.
- Questions to consider –
 - Border States – should relevancy be based nationally?
 - Relevancy - a certain percentage or ranked outstanding?
- Possible 2-tiered panel – uncomfortable about each region having relevancy panel vote on other regions.
- The RFA must be issued simultaneously from each of the 4 regions with all applications submitted to CSREES
- RFA will require an abstract and a relevancy statement for RIPM center review
- RFA must be clear that both relevancy and technical merit are important
- RIPM Center relevancy reviews would be accomplished by a 'panel' identified by the Centers and conducted by the Center Directors. The National panel needs to be instructed that the RIPM Center relevancy panel reviews only the relevance and that they only review the technical merits
- No guarantee of any specific distribution of funded projects between regions
- A successful application would need to score well in both the relevancy assessment and technical merit.
- Ranking scale for relevancy will be the same as for tech merit: outstanding, high priority, medium priority, low priority, some merit, do not fund.

IPM Roadmap and Implementation Progress – Harold Coble

- IPM Roadmap – things are improving.

- After the group met they took to the roadmap to the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee Meeting. Some members felt they were not accommodated. Modifications were made to the Roadmap to address their concerns.
- Final version is available on site: <http://www.ipmcenters.org/IPMRoadMap.pdf>.
- Implementation was never meant to be prescriptive, only meant as a guide to help us organize. The roadmap is also included in RFAs, which is what it was meant for.
- Feels we are making excellent progress at getting it understood.
- Next step – putting money in, but what is outcome? Are we accomplishing our goals, is it working? Answering so what questions. Need to be able to say, we were right and here's why.
- Will be updated as needed. Having positive impact across agencies and departments.

Federal IPM Coordinating Committee – What is it? Is there a need/opportunity for Regional/State input? – Harold Coble

- In GAO report, USDA was criticized for not having appropriate coordination of IPM program. They feel no one is in charge. They wanted one person in control of it all, but can't happen because there are too many agencies and departments involved. Best approach would be a coordinating committee. Representatives of federal agencies and departments with pest control and/or pesticide interests make up committee.
- Objective – get people talking to each other and learning what's out there and available. Need input from Centers and States. Regional reps may be a good thing.
- Major focus is to make sure federal reps are involved and all interact. Centers are always welcome to meetings. May add Center Directors part of committee that meets quarterly. Could be connections to field? May add agency contact to field.
- CEAP (Conservation Effects Assessment Project) – survey program. Have IPM questions as part of it, can get 10,000 survey points per year. Recent survey indicates that IPM adoption is down 25-35 percent (especially in corn and soybeans). Scouting has gone down significantly.

IR-4 Program Update: How might IR-4 priority setting process relate to Regional IPM Research RFAs? – Bob Holm [Click here for the full handout.](#)

- IR-4 has new logo and new newsletter. Let Bob know if you are not on the newsletter mailing list so that he can add you (holm@aesop.rutgers.edu).
- Rick Melnicoe forwards the bimonthly report to the IPM Centers.
- IR-4 conference will be held February 2005 in DC with stakeholders to look at involvement over the next five years.
- FQPA (Food Quality Protection Act) drove program, but issues are a lot less now. IR-4 may possibly try to get into aquatic herbicides.
- Only nine products in the pipeline, but they have 13 for the coming year. Good news is only two are herbicides.
- Working with companies with new technologies in very early stages (commercial development stages). DuPont used an IR-4 meeting to introduce a new product, a first.
- Pesticide registration act – new process = submit petition with waiver, notice of filing, label, requires more coordination between IR-4 and registrant (slower process but good).
- California EPA, doing joint work share, because they are able to get technology registration quicker than others in the US. Efficacy data not required anymore. Work share has expanded from 20-25 petitions to 50-75 a year.
- Biopesticide program expanded to demo program (\$100K program) nine projects funded.
- Methyl Bromide Alternative program – focus on strawberry and tomatoes and changed focus on past years to include underserved products.

- Aquatic herbicide program - focused on the eight products with only one new in the past ten years. Need to develop new aquatic herbicides but industry is so small they are trying to develop a program.

IPM in NRCS Personnel/Discussion: How Can State IPM Programs, Regional Centers and NRCS Programs Collaborate to Insure that IPM is included in NRCS offerings? - Joe Bagdon [Click here for the full PowerPoint presentation.](#)

- NRCS does not evaluate pesticides in IPM programs but looks at potential risks of pesticides in NRCS programs (i.e. buffer strips between fields and streams to prevent herbicide runoff).
- The indirect impacts of pesticides are on soil quality, air quality and water quality (drinking water and fish habitats).
- Mitigation involves a number of IPM techniques including scouting, formulations, application, parameters, reduce quantities applied, use of less risky products, etc.
- NRCS areas are based on watersheds with 18 areas across the country.
- Suggestions – have strong IPM representation on NRCS State Technical Committees. Offer to help NRCS with state-specific projects.
- We the Centers can get involved - help growers and in turn get recognition and money. Need to become part of meetings and need to work with state conservationists to get attention.

National IPM Symposium- Sue Radcliffe

The 5th symposium will be held in St. Louis on April 4 to 6, 2006 with the theme “*Delivering on the Promise*”.

Future Opportunities and Challenges for IPM - Harold Coble

- Harold noted that the current IPM expertise is mature and the infrastructure is graying. Many state IPM Coordinators indicated that it is unlikely that their positions would be replaced when they retire.
- He also indicated the challenge of changing crop problems with major row crops (i.e. biotechnology impacts) and specialty crop (shifts in emphasis with new crops being introduced).
- Other challenges mentioned by the group were bioterrorism, invasive species, overhead on grants, shift of IPM focus from rural to urban situations, connect specialty crop protection to health benefits of fruits and vegetables to consumers, include organic production practices and biologicals in IPM programs, etc.
- Some people indicated that it would take a food crisis to spark significant new funding for IPM programs.
- Opportunities – look at this group and changes. Partnering opportunities, need to keep money and resources flowing. Need to work with other entities. Need to find new ways to demonstrate relevance and keep proving it.
- Need to look at Biosecurity and invasive species and how we can be a part of it.
- Need to talk about IPM as a health related goal. They help produce foods that are healthy for consumers. We help horticulturalists.
- Should look at research and extension, how do they bring their needs to us?
- Ag is part of community, talk about IPM as part of a cultural community. Let urban people know how big a part of the community it really is.

Day 2 – Thursday, September 16

IPM Roadmap Impact Indicators/Measuring Risk Reductions: What We Have

Found So Far? - Bill Coli [Click here for the full handout.](#)

- Bill has been working on measuring IPM adoption based on the GAO report that asked for metrics to measure risk reduction.
- Bill has attended IPM Center Meetings and introduced a concept of outcomes rather than outputs in a tiered approach (i.e. rather than 10 meetings with 1,000 attendees, what did the meeting accomplish?).
- There may be sources of third party information that can be utilized.
- The Dillman Survey Method was mentioned as a survey technique. SARE focuses on program outcomes.
- Bill used the Dillman Survey Method to survey wine grape growers in New England about IPM adoption.
- Bill mentioned a worker exposure study conducted in matched apple blocks (“Standard IPM” and “Reduced Risk IPM”) comparing IPM practices vs. a traditional spray program. The project was funded by the Northeast IPM Center. Costs for the analytical work are \$10,000.
- Handout – possible ways to measure outcome (look at handout). Focused evaluation projects – support roadmap goals (health) – proposed on NEIPMC. Measurement of water risk in standard and reduced risk crops. If a scout goes into standard IPM block, what is their risk of exposure vs. reduced risk block? Studies to show reduced risk are costly. Growers need reasons other than financial ones to adopt a reduced risk approach, need to show less risk. Can take random success stories, need a bigger effort. Need some sort of success to prove our worth. Should this be a standard part of RFA? Think we need a funded effort on a national basis. PESP helped design questions (win-win for both).

Update from Pest Management Strategic Plan (PMSP) Guidelines Subcommittee -

Rick Melnicoe [Click here for the full handout.](#)

- Rick and a subcommittee have developed a document entitled “Guidance in Developing a PMSP” updated on 9/14/04. The document is a comprehensive 11 page guideline with the goals of a PMSP, the benefits from conducting the PMSP and 15 steps to follow when implementing a PMSP. The updated guidance document can be found on the National IPM Centers website at <http://www.ipmcenters.org>.
- Introduction part of document, who we are, what PMSPs are.
- Goal – need to evaluate and get consistency across region to get minimum requirements. What questions do we need to ask to ensure IPM adoption in the future? (keep this in mind).

CSREES Organic Programs Update: Projects Funded and IPM Involvement - Tom

Bewick [Click here for the full PowerPoint presentation.](#)

- Tom is the National Program Leader for the Integrated Organic Program which is new in CSREES for FY 2004.
- The Organic Transition Program was initiated in 1998 as a 406 program while the Organic Research and Extension Initiative is a mandatory program funded at \$3 million/year for 5 years.
- The Integrated Organic Program combined the two programs allowing for grant submission and review efficiencies.
- In 2004, there were 104 proposals asking for \$47 million out of an available 4.7 million. Seven proposals were recommended for funding in the following areas: crops (7 projects at \$3.3 million), animals (2 projects at \$800K), economics (1 project at \$300K) and standards (1 project at \$200K). In the crops area, 5 projects (\$2.4 million) were for agronomic crops and 2 projects (\$900K) were for horticultural crops.

- There were 5 projects funded from the NE region, 4 from the Western region and 1 each from the Southern and NC regions.
- Tom indicated that he felt FY 2005 funding would be near this year's \$4.7 million appropriations level.

CSREES biotechnology programs - Ann Marie Thro [Click here for the full PowerPoint presentation.](#)

- Ann Marie highlighted a workshop CSREES and ARS are sponsoring this fall entitled "What Can Public Research Agencies Do to Facilitate Regulatory Consideration of Small Market Biotechnologies – Derived Crops."
- Ann Marie indicated that the IR-4 model was being considered to do the regulatory science needed for registration of specialty biotech crops. She reported on the results of her Embassy Science Fellowship in Agricultural Biotechnology with FAS/USDA in Europe in 2003.
- Work with IR-4. Desired outcome – more diverse products reach CSREES and growers/public. Gain acceptance. Want to provide a fresh and new option. Many feel biotechnology is only Monsanto – scared they won't get their money back on their investment.
- Important – Submit good proposals, Special grants and hatch programs

Invasive Species: Potential Role of State IPM Programs and Regional IPM Center - Bob Nowierski

- In 1999 the Invasive Species Executive order was issued and led to the formation of the National Invasive Species Council (NISC). The USDA Senior Invasive Species Coordinator is Hilda Dia-Soltero.
- The National Invasive Species Management Plan was published in 1991 and listed 57 action plans. The NISC website <http://www.invasivespecies.gov/> contains the information on the Plan.
- The National IPM Centers could become involved in the issue through potential agricultural bioterrorism threats and coordination with the National Plant Diagnostic Network.
- The key priorities are brown tree snake, saltcedar, Emerald ash borer, leafy spurge, yellow starthistle, ballast water, aquatic area monitoring, early detection and rapid response, innovative control methodologies and prevention through education.

Opportunities for State IPM Programs and Regional IPM Centers to Collaborate with APHIS Programs - Coanne O'Hearn [Click here for the full PowerPoint presentation.](#)

- A significant part of the APHIS staff was lost to the Homeland Security Department and APHIS is coping with how to reorganize under this situation.
- The Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) is a cooperative effort between Federal and state organizations to survey for plant pests, biocontrol organisms and weeds. The program involves field surveys, lab ID, state and project databases, a national database (NAPIS), electronic information exchange and strong interagency relationships. Surveys are prioritized by national, regional and state lists.
- Funding jumped from \$6 million in FY 2003 to \$24 million in FY 2004 due to Homeland Security Act support. The goal is \$100 million to establish core funding for states.
- They have started working with the National Invasive Species Council. The goal is to increase exotic pest detection surveys, develop an offshore pest information system, and utilize survey tools such as Risk Mapping, GIS/GPS systems and partnering with other agencies/groups.

- The National Agricultural Pest Information System (NAPIS) houses the CAPS database at Purdue University and can be located at <http://ceris.purdue.edu/napis>.
- Coanne suggested the following areas for further collaboration with the IPM Centers and state IPM programs:
 - National Plant Diagnostic Network, training, outreach materials, emergency response, state CAPS committees, eyes and ears for pest detection, listen to what each other has to offer, compare notes on cooperators and collaborators and explore connections to IPM Centers.
- It was mentioned that the Homeland Security Department plans to hire 700 staff eventually to support these programs on the national and state levels. Dennis Kopp suggested that APHIS consider funding the IPM Centers to hire a CAPS Coordinator for each region. The idea was strongly endorsed by Center Directors. It was recommended that the Center Directors get together and work with Coanne to submit a proposal.

Can a Joint Subcommittee of IPM Centers/National IPM Committee Be Used to Address Specific Issues? - Linda Herbst

- The revised PMSP Guidelines were a joint effort between these two IPM programs. Other possible collaboration areas/issues include NRCS, IR-4 priorities with PMSP's, the APHIS CAPS opportunity, etc.
- There was positive reaction to this idea.

Future meetings

National IPM Center Directors Meeting - February 1-3, 2005 in Washington, DC

Glossary of Acronyms That May Have Been Used

APHIS – Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
 ARS – Agriculture Research Service (USDA)
 BEAD – Biological and Economic Analysis Division
 CABI – Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International
 CAPS – Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey
 CARAT – Committee to Advise on Reassessment and Transition
 CEAP – Conservation Effects Assessment Project
 CSREES – Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service
 EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
 FQPA – Food Quality Protection Act
 GAO – Government Accountability Office
 GIS – Geographic Information System
 IPM – Integrated Pest Management
 IR-4 – Interregional Research Project 4
 NAPIS – National Agricultural Pest Information System
 NASULGC – National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
 NISC – National Invasive Species Council
 NOAA – National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 NPDN – National Plant Diagnostic Network
 NRCS – Natural Resource Conservation Service
 OPMP – Office of Pest Management Policy
 PESP – Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program
 PMAP – Pest Managements Alternative Project
 PMSP – Pest Management Strategic Plans

PPRS – Performance Planning and Reporting System
RAMP – Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program
RFA – Request For Applications
RIPM – Regional Integrated Pest Management
SARE – Sustainable Agricultural Research Education
USDA – United States Department of Agriculture