***Meeting summary for Southern IPM Center SERA3 Meeting (03/06/2024)***

Attendees List

In-person – Janet Hurley (TX), Ric Bessin (KY), Rebecca Melanson (MS), Heather Kelly (TN), Tegan Walker (SIPMC), Francis Reay Jones (SC), Kayla Watson (SIPMC), Joe LaForest (SIPMC), Roger Magarey (SIPMC), Norm Leppla (FL), Raj Singh (LA), Kiersten Wise(KY), Ashleigh Farris (OK)

Zoom – Ryan Adams (NC), Wanda Almodovar (PR), Daniel Frank (VA), Ash Sial (GA), Glen Studebaker (AR), David Kerns (TX), David Held (AL), Amy Dreves (VI), Lauren Quevillon (SIPMC), Lacey Belanger (SIPMC)

7:00 AM Joint Networking breakfast with NCERA222

8:30 am Welcome and Introductions

8:45pm Minutes: Read and Approve

 Updates from the Southern IPM Center (Joe LaForest et al.)

* SERA3 Pest prioritization process (Tegan)
	+ Discussion and improvements for next time
	+ Planning including dates for next year
* This is IPM (Kayla)
	+ Website
	+ Survey
	+ Podcast guests
* EIP PD workshops (Kayla)
	+ What has to happen for **THIS** cycle
	+ Format including selection of dates and topics
	+ What the plan is for next cycle
* NIPMCC update (Roger)
* Grants
	+ New IPM awards (Roger)
	+ IPM Ambassadors (Lauren)
	+ PMSP pending (Lacey)
* Connect - What is it - How to use it (Joe)

9:45am Discussion on items from Joint Meeting

* Infrastructure
* EPA & ESA
* Reporting & Evaluation
* Proposed surveys and information gathering

10:00am Break

10:15am Including 1890 & 1994 in SERA3 (Joe)

10:45am State updates - Other business to discuss

* 2025 meeting at International IPM Symposium

11:45pm Selection of the incoming Secretary

12:00pm Adjourn

Updates from the southern IPM Center by Joe LaForest

Joe highlighted the significance of entertainment and commitment in their work and the challenges encountered during a particular season. Updates from the Southern IPM Center were shared, including the departure of Robin Boudwin (9 years with the Center) and the redistribution of her work among Lacey Belanger, Brian Holderman, and Kayla Watson.

2024 Priority Document, SERA3 Pest Prioritization Process —Tegan Walker

SERA3 2024 priority document was finalized on January 22, 2024. In the document, only regional priorities are shown. In the database, SERA3 members can view data down to the state level. There is a need to normalize the top priority list document and track responses to pest categories in the state-level reports in Air Table in the future. With an established database, we will just need to update the document and lists each year. Tegan was happy with state-level responses. Suggestions were made for noting who in each state is responding for data calls, and how to get responses for areas that did not provide data. Data will be available via Airtable. Data can be saved as a print to PDF, or Excel format.

There was discussion on the process for data collection. People thought the survey was easy to complete and enjoyed that the data were compiled through the dashboard. Discussion of making sure there are opportunities for respondents to add in pests that should be included in future surveys or future discussions in SERA3. There was also discussion on if things are not voted on, should it be removed from the published list? Tegan proposed keeping unvoted items in the survey and publishing a "top 10" list based on priorities and disciplines. Unvoted items will potentially work itself out over time. It is also important to make sure that people are aware of and utilizing the list, because some participants expressed frustration about the limited list of pests to rank. She also highlighted the potential use and promotion of a list containing data on pest problems and the need to ensure the list is not broken down by state.

Tegan emphasized the importance of tracking responses to pest categories in the state-level reports in Air Table and suggested improvements to the data's readability. Tegan proposed a system allowing read-only account access to view data and interact with responses, and the potential use of this data at the state level. She also discussed the process of handling incoming emails and surveys, noting its effectiveness for first-time users.

Tegan suggested creating infographics on how to use this document that we could send to our groups. These ideas may increase utilization of the document. Potential uses include:

* Grant proposals
* Preparing for job applications/training
* Use in extension programming

IPM Ambassador Travel Grants Program Overview – Lauren Quevillon

Lauren discussed the IPM Ambassador Travel Grants program, which supports individuals to travel to conferences, meetings, or workshops to increase IPM awareness among new audiences. Funds can be received for up to $1,000. RFA is available and continuous. This can be for professionals and/or graduate students. SRIPMC has received eight proposals and funded two of them to date. The proposals are evaluated based on their clarity, relevance, and potential impact. Currently, the program is only open to those based in the Southern Region, but there is a consideration to open it up to international travel in the future. The goal is to fund at least five proposals per year.

“This is IPM” Campaign Survey Pilot, Honorarium System – Kayla Watson

Kayla discussed the challenges of paperwork and the possibility of transitioning to an honorarium system in the future. She also shared plans of a “This is IPM campaign” survey pilot for the IPM website and campaign, which will be launched at the International IPM Symposium in March 2025. The team was encouraged to participate in the survey pilot. Website will be live prior to that date and there will be resources added. Survey will go out to learn about what resources we are missing for IPM. Anticipate a dynamic interface with podcasts and videos, etc.

PD Workshops, Symposium Poster for SERA3 priorities – Kayla Watson

Kayla discussed the PD workshop requirement. NIFA wants a presentation about how the EIP money was spent. All funded priority areas need to be addressed. This is not just a program that discusses the overall IPM program in a state, but instead cover what the grant is, and what was funded. Regional IPM Centers will organize and conduct these project director workshops in each region. These may be held in conjunction with another conference or separately from any other meeting. NIFA is looking for outcomes and impacts more so than just what we do. They like stories about change and impact. Every PD should send a link to a recording of presentations by July. Zoom should be used to record, and presentations should be less than an hour. These will be uploaded to YouTube and put on a web page. Kayla will send more instructions as the date gets closer. Kayla will highlight and promote any specific parts of anyone’s presentation if they wish.

Kayla proposed an idea for the next PD workshop cycle as an EIP event called the “EIP Extravaganza”. This would be more collaborative, engaging and helpful and make sure other states are aware of what others are doing and have ways to partner. She emphasized the importance of collaboration between states and the need to avoid over-reporting. She also suggested the idea of having regular meetings focused on priority areas to facilitate collaboration and sharing of ideas.

Focus on priority areas with presentations available to watch live or available later. The idea is that the meeting will occur throughout the grant cycle and have meetings organized around priority areas. Graduate students and co-PIs could talk about work and the goal is to have a more conversational format with the goal of increasing collaboration. The idea was suggested to have a kick-off event at the IPM meeting. Furthermore, Kayla mentioned the need to improve the infrastructure and to work on a strategic planning initiative to document the needs of IPM and to advocate for more funding.

Suggestion to present a poster on the SERA3 priorities list to present at the International IPM Symposium.

Group Formation and Funding Projects–Lacey Belanger, Roger Magarey, Joe LaForest

Lacey discussed the formation of various groups and the funding of several projects, including one on termite diversity and another on poultry farms. Lacey provided an update on the progress of the Diamond Back Moth working group, the crepe myrtle team, the cotton workshop, the rice conference, sugar cane, strawberries, and a potential sugar beet project. There was interest in forming a greenhouse group on Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSP) and emphasized the importance of having up-to-date documents for every crop grown in the US. They also discussed the Office of Pest Management Policy at USDA, the importance of early career professionals establishing stakeholder contacts, and the limitations of the current contact database and networking tools. Joe also mentioned a new user system for Bugwood and a new system designed to facilitate better collaboration and resource sharing among members. Towards the end, she highlighted the importance of keeping data up-to-date.

Transitioning, Mailchimp, Privacy, Reporting, Partnerships, and IPM Understanding– Kayla Watson

Kayla discussed the challenges of transitioning an individual between universities, including the effects on email aliases and accounts. She also touched on the issues with universities removing the capacity to use Mailchimp and the forthcoming feature aimed to create an email similar to Mailchimp by end of April. She emphasized the importance of privacy and user opt-in to prevent spamming. She also addressed the need to improve reporting forms for DEBA and suggested linking it to the conflict of interest form. Kayla discussed potential partnerships with organizations like the Crop Protection network to pull in data. She also talked about a survey aimed at understanding road management practices, the importance of capturing behavioral changes, and the challenges of managing email lists. Kayla also discussed the development of a project for the CDC and a collaborative project with a college communication specialist to better understand the knowledge and perceptions of IPM among new and younger farmers.

Individual State Projects Changes and Challenges

Norm discussion department of nematology’s ongoing and planned projects, including the introduction of a new chair and plans to restructure the diagnostic system using AI and machine learning. Norm emphasized the importance of biodiversity and the impact of development on the environment, and mentioned a summer program at the Natural History Museum aimed at promoting IPM awareness. Issues of invasive grasses in pastures and the importance of focusing on biodiversity for promotion and tenure purposes. She discussed the leadership structure of their project and the involvement of more people in performance evaluations to increase authority and improve relationships. Janet Hurley brought up her involvement in mentoring committees and the success of their podcasts in Texas. She discussed various issues related to the organization's structure, funding, and staffing, including state mandates on employee salaries and the challenges of keeping extension and research personnel. She also highlighted the importance of balancing research and extension responsibilities and the increased number of female agents in their organization. Janet also stated that they received funding from the Texas Beekeeper Association to hire a new Beekeeping Specialist. Ryan in NC outlined the restructuring of their program based on a statewide needs assessment for IPM, with new objectives including increased program accessibility, incentives for IPM, and pollinator protection. Daniel mentioned changes in their EIP grant, including the addition of new members and outreach projects. Glenn discussed the need to train new county agents and the challenges of replacing retirees. Joe also discussed the need to approve the meeting minutes and reappoint the secretary, and proposed increasing the budget of the IPM program by 50 million dollars.

National IPM Coordinating Committee update – Roger Magarey

Roger presented on the charge--- to make recommendations to ESCOP and ECOP relating to pest management, assist in development of reports and strategic plans on pest management issues, and facilitate coordination. NIPMCC will meet September 4-5th with APLU, Washington DC for 30 people. Will do the NIPMCC recommendations, work on IPM Infrastructure and strategic planning. The group provided feedback that the group should focus more on outcomes and next steps and make the meeting less of a “report-out.” Need a forum for interacting—change purpose and intent for this meeting. Make the meeting more interactive and dynamic. Return to the goal of advancing IPM through agency capabilities. This could be one of the only chances to increase funding for IPM.

Connect - Joe LaForest

Connect group—start with an existing searchable database of state contacts for IPM, PSEP, IPMCs and IR-4. Charged by NIFA to Provide web-based networking tools for IPM research and extension. Can set up profiles in Connect/Bugwood, and this could be a good tool to connect and map groups and impact going forward.

Friends of IPM award recipients and funded grants were presented by Roger Magarey.

Post-Meeting Action Report

• Kayla will ask Vanessa about the possibility of converting travel awards into honorariums in the future.

• Team members will complete and send recordings of their PD workshops to Kayla.

• Consider having regular online meetings focused on EIP priority areas after August 2025.

• Potential for a kickoff event at the International IPM Symposium.

• Kayla and Tegan will work on the strategic planning initiative and present it at the IPM Symposium.

• Lacey will continue to work on the PMSPs and reach out to potential collaborators for future PMSPs.

• Update profiles with accurate information

• Add aliases for email addresses

• Set up alerts for new resources and content

• Consider integrating with 1890s and 1994s

• Kayla will send the survey to those who expressed interest and discuss the objectives with the team.

• Consider using the Connect platform to distribute surveys and find interested participants.

• Determine the best approach for survey distribution across different groups and stations.

• Kayla will write up a brief on the need for increased funding for EIP and the inclusion of 1890 S. In EIP.

***Tuesday, March 5 (Joint meeting with SERA3, SE IPM Center)***

Attendees List

In-person – Janet Hurley (TX), Ric Bessin (KY), Rebecca Melanson (MS), Heather Kelly (TN), Tegan Walker (SIPMC), Francis Reay Jones (SC), Kayla Watson (SIPMC), Joe LaForest (SIPMC), Roger Magarey (SIPMC), Norm Leppla (FL), Raj Singh (LA), Kiersten Wise(KY), Ashleigh Farris (OK)

3:00 PM Welcome, introductions, appoint meeting minutes recorder

3:30 PM Regional IPM Evaluation/Reporting Tool (Walker, Lane, SE IPM Center)

4:00 PM USDA-NIFA update

4:15 PM EPA Update - Pesticide registration and regulations to meet Endangered Species Act requirements (Dibblee, EPA Region 5)

4:45 PM NC Region IPM Topic Presentation (Invited Speaker, TBD)

5:15 PM S Region IPM Topic Presentation: Coordination with ALEC (Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communications) Departments - surveys and information gathering (Shelley Rampold and Francis Reay-Jones)

5:45 PM IPM Infrastructure Update (Mueller, Iles)

6:00 PM Social Activities with Extension Plant Pathology Groups

Regional IPM (-ERA) Reporting Tool (annual report) (David Lane and Tegan Walker)

Discussion on NIMSS (National Info Management & Support System) reporting and the inconsistency across regions for report, which makes it hard to compare – presentation is a solution to the problem.

Intro – Problem: Annual Report is Burdensome, IPM impact data is difficult to analyze, NIMSS – not user friendly = opportunity to create standardized reporting, makes easier for incoming Chairs. Tool will help create report, make visually appealing (more useful data) and then can submit.

Data collection process – state IPM coordinators send out link to collaborators to gather IPM data (annually). Contents include: demographics, outputs (publications, contacts, etc.), outcomes and impacts, leveraged funding, ERA benefits, pest rating, IPM drivers and barriers, impact of regional IPM centers, and feedback (using Qualtrics). Preview tool – went over example questions from the previous contents listed. Question about submitting multiple reports – if reporting on multiple IPM areas, short answer yes – limited to what Qualtrics can and can’t do. Question about where the data goes after submitted – idea is to go to centers first and then a report sent to state IPM coordinator. Another comment about most institutions having their own internal reporting system and if possible to ‘scrap’ it from those. Line up indicators from both institutional and NIMSS. Feedback was to keep it at the coordinator level (not going to IPM center). Questions were aligned, to cover all the CPPM areas. Suggestion to also include, whether or not the service/activity/etc. was funded that is being reported, this could be a case for additional funding needed for IPM. Question will be added if this was funded by EIP, CPPM, etc. How being part of the network benefits you/the group (IPM group). Proposed deliverables at state, regional, and national (a dashboard and reports at each level, but with the same format). Can see respondents, what they are reporting on (example, 3 from IPM in agr. Crops (3), specialty crops (2), pollinator health (1)), what is your expertise, products/outputs, etc. (based on the REEport that has to be submitted for EIP grants), etc.

* For reporting on the IPM region annual report - there are 4 review questions – describe …. To report back on the objective. Comment that it’s not as quantitative as what was being demo when it comes to the IPM group reporting.
* There is state reporting which is difference than the NCERA or SERA reporting. Statement made it is different between CPPM (EIP, etc.) versus SERA/NCERA reporting due to different objectives. Point of the reports are for/how are they used by administrators was discussed. Comment about never hearing back about the annual reports or the 5 year report.
* Timeline – Jan-Feb (survey development) Mar-Jul (pilot testing), Tegan and David to meet with NIFA reps/NIMSS admin advisors, and with WERA, -ERA chair feedback. Potential 2025 roll out. In 2025, all 4 IPM regional groups will / usual meet all together at International IPM symposium.

USDA-NIFA Update – Emmanuel Byamukama

Changes coming that will hopefully make REEporting smoother. Suggestions from the listen session on the CPPM/EIP grant will tried to be incorporated, although increased funding is not within their realm. Having discussions about coordination of meetings next year with IPM centers at the international symposium. Question – about who could make changes about funding, and if the comments still go up the chain of command. Short answer – yes it goes up the chain, and then feedback comes back down. Question about timeline when to expect to hear about proposals – there is a spot to track your proposal to see where it is in the process, may have decisions by the end of May/June and hear July/Aug (link to track proposal put in chat). Question about feedback on how reports are used – continuation reports are read and taking seriously and are summarized and send to their communications dept, used in social media and sent to congress when asked – each report read and signed off that it is read, # of publications, # etc. NIMSS managed by different group (E- and S-COP?), their main responsibility are those through REEports and continuation. Emmanuel said he could look into the contacts for E- and S-Cops and Roger Magery also mentioned he has contacts he can share with David.

EPA Update – Seth Dibblee and Jennifer Dobbs

There will be a handout with annotations and slides, and such on basecamp site. Overview:

2023 highlights

* IPM at EPA
	+ It’s housed at Dallas, TX. Have monthly webinars (9 a year, none in the summer), publications and provide technical assistance, and have IPM listserve. There are the pesticide environmental stewardship grants – 4 of them, example given for watermelon growers. There are 10 regional projects, region 5 works with OSU on spotted lantern fly, in region 7 works with health care sector, all regions have involvement in IPM centered project.
* Applicator Cert. and training – 2017 final rule to have plans submitted by last Nov. and were all approved and now going into implementation phase. Difference in Indian Country applicator certification then rest – if Tribe has opted out or has established a plan of its own. Applicators must have a certification from EPA to apply RUPs in Indian Country. Link provided for more information (). Required by PRIA5, portions of pesticide labels need to be in Spanish (such as emergency info). Standardized translations provided to registrants for use on labels. Does not provide directions for use, nor does it address dialect (link provided for more info ). Registration updates on Atrazine, proposed interim decision, June 2022, received 65,000 comments on it – panel last Aug and reported in Nov. 2023, decision planned for 2024. Rodenticides – proposed interim decision Nov. 2022, 11 ingredients, including anticoagulants – mitigations to mitigate ecological risk; 3 ESA species (how to reduce exposure to dead rodents that have rodenticide exposure). Sulfuryl Fluoride – structural fumigation (residential, not commodities), exposure reduction tactics, especially electronic clearance devices – these devices weren’t working properly (one reason for exposure). Chlorpyrifos – Nov. 2023 tolerance revocations were set aside by appellate court, Feb. 2024 EPA published corrections in the Federal register – they are going to submit to revoke it’s use, except on 11 specific food-feed crops. Tolerances are on raw products before processing (established at state level) and FDA enforces those. FDA published a guide on how long residues remain, tolerances not the same as uses. Example, Corteva took out all chlorpyrifos labels (use has been canceled that’s final and not affected by tolerances), depends on the product. Links on basecamp folder for what has been canceled and are in effect. Dicamba – foliar use on GM cotton and soybean has been vacated by the Appellate Court. Epa issued an Existing Stocks Order for the 3 products in the channels of commerce; see the order for state-specific use deadlines (enough in channel for this year, no decision for next year). All use must comply with previously accepted labels, all additional state requirements remain in effect (i.e. cut off dates, geographic, etc.) – Link provided in basecamp folder on this.
* Endangered Species Act Implementation (Jennifer) – FIFRA updates
	+ Background was given on the ESA passed in 1973, Section 7(a\_(1) charges federal agencies to aid in the conservation…under FIFRA “Action” subject to consultation and only 5% have been compliant. ESA consultation is complex – 4 to 15 years, FIFRA requires EPA to reevaluate every pesticide every 15 years, in addition to all new registrations that come in. 2011 mega suit was the largest – settlement reached in 2023, down to 35 active ingredients but covering 1,000s of products. Moving forward shifts towards programmatic approach – groups or types of pesticides – herbicide strategy, early mitigations, and a third. Actions and deadlines listed in table across herbicide (final in 2024), rodenticide (), insecticide (), vulnerable species pilot plan(), and fungicide (2025 draft expected) – lots of public comments. Looking to improve species maps – refine the PULAs, credit for using Voluntary USDA Conservation Practices – workshop, online mitigations menu – draft this year, use of offsets, developing outreach and education material. EPA wants to continue to hear from stakeholders and finds it very important. Strategy for implementation – final strategies may be applied through general label mitigations and/or ES protection bulletins. EPA bulletins detail geographically specific pesticide use limitations or mitigations for the protection listed species and their habitat (link provided in slide) – products with limitations, location of use limitations – PULAs, and details on the specific limitations or mitigations all are on bulletins. Bulletins are extensions of the label – when directed by the label to visit ‘bullets’ – that must be done (the label is law). Example Label language to go to Bulletins Live! Two (BLT) and gives link. Before you go to Bulletins Live! Two, need
1. Location of application
2. Application month – can be up to 6 months prior to application
3. EPA registration number for each pesticide that will be applied

Example of label and where to find all this information. Demo – BLT homepage, the first bullet is where to get ones ‘Bullet’, next page you fill in the information from the above 3 points. Then went through example of entering information. Not all pesticides that reference BLT on the label will have geographically specific ESA regulations. BLT resources slide with links.

Question about the use of applications/software and if the BLT could be integrated into the app. Coming from services, suggested this comment to be submitted; as of now it’s standing on it’s own and not integrated, but maybe in the future. Streamlining will cut down on griping. Question about how new ones come onboard, there has been some glitches in the system (one is printed out and says they can use it, but at later date when inspector looks, then it is not allowed) – answer – there is a time period involved and the date entered can produce different bulletins, and it would be possible that a habitat map was updated between those times (but in that case as long as within 6 months and applicator has pdf print out). Q – on now certified applicator education material – answer there are efforts, but nothing at this point, it is acknowledged as a need. Q – about the listserve, answer – not too much info on that yet, it’s still underdevelopment. Comment where member reached out to EPA to get list of products from their state and received back a csv file for products for their state. EPA just published source reduction and pollution RFA – granted to each region, will be put onto basecamp.

SE Region IPM Topic – Shelli Rampold – Surveys and information gathering – Surveying Success

Trying to touch on the ‘big things/strategies’ on what to ask next/to pursue. Hard science and social sciences pair together nicely to measure the land grant mission. Partner with your institutional ‘ALEC’ department – they are experts in social theory specialists, so they rely heavily on the other specialists in the discipline area. Developing objectives, suggests developing 2 sets – first - outcome objectives (big goals and want to see after/what to accomplish) and 2-research objectives (should be able to draw clear lines from research objectives back to outcome objectives). Build a team – input and expertise help the research objectives are achieved to inform the outcome objectives. Gave example of converting septic to sewer for homeowners. Strategic data collection – quotas, filters, and response scale should be considered. Reports – key elements are reported such as an executive summary, key findings, etc.

Francis Reay-Jones

Had recently done a corn insect IPM survey, took about 2 years to get enough data (why buying Bt corn, what insects are you trying to control), and now is putting together a cotton insect IPM survey – wanted to see if there is interest across states for regions to collaborate in surveys. Would be good collaboration in IPM groups, Francis using it to galvanize researchers at Clemson. Sample size varies. What do you think your response rate was – Francis hands out survey and provide link to Qualtrics at production meetings. Comment it would be better to coordinate surveys and Doug Farmer is good contact at NASS. Can also influence the questions they are asking at NASS to producers. Within chemical use survey, there are IPM questions, David Lane has been looking at some of it, can look up active ingredients, as well as IPM practices (like PAMs), under specific commodity and they survey the biggest producers. Comment on how to tell the story of how far IPM has come, would be great.

IPM infrastructure Update (Daren Mueller)

full 37 slides and recording is on the national basecamp. Received 52 of 52 surveys back, there is a publication in draft form now and will be sent out at some point (if you contributed, you will be author and will receive it). Lots of different highlights from it, it focused on the tools and strategies that were in place, highlights were while publications are cornerstones in academia, but #s dropped for video content for IPM as well as support and infrastructure for that. Challenges that were listed highlighted do we have the time, energy, resources, etc. to do our job well and IPM is still needed and that we do still have so many IPM programs and an IPM network should be celebrated.