

SERA 003 Minutes

The SERA 003 Committee met at 8:00 am Sunday March 3, 2013 in the Hilton Baton Rouge Hotel, Baton Rouge, LA. After technical delays, the meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Royer at 8:30 am.

Present were: Tom Royer OK Chairman, Charles Allen TX Secretary, Scott Stewart TN, Geoff Zehnder Clemson, Henry Fadamiro AL & SRIPMC, Blake Layton MS, Joe LaForest Center for Invasive Species & SRIPMC, Rosemary Hallberg SIPMC, Ric Bessin KY, Norm Lepler FL, and Clayton Hollier LA.

Participants informally introduced themselves.

NIFA Report:

The SERA 003 Committee was addressed by Dr. Marty Draper via webinar. Dr. Draper expressed his regrets for not being able to attend the SERA 003 meeting in person because funds for travel were short.

Dr. Draper discussed the federal funding process, disruptions and funding cuts due to sequestration. He discussed the annual funding process. The process begins with 2 budgets: an Executive Budget and the House Budget. The Office of Management and Budget provides its guidelines to Agencies in the fall with agency reports in early December. The President's budget is due the first Monday in February. Congress marks up the budget March through May. Conference committees meet in mid-August and the final budget is released in mid-September.

Dr. Draper reported that funds flow was disrupted by the 2012 budget process – when the Farm Bill was extended. He said there would be 3 options: a new Ag Budget bill, an omnibus spending bill or a new continuing resolution which would be reduced by sequestration. NIFA does not have a final budget number and cannot make grant awards without a final budget.

The Farm Bill was extended Jan. 1 after expiring Sept. 30, 2012. Funding for USDA NIFA decreased \$130 million (9-10% cut). There was no appropriation for SCRI, OREI for 2013.

Sequestration was delayed until March 1 and will be 7/9^{ths} of the originally planned sequestration – government-wide cuts of 8-9% (7/9^{ths} of which will be 6.5%). NIFA does not know what the cuts will look like – congress is not in agreement on where the cuts should be. The debt ceiling was raised through May 19th. A debt ceiling debate is scheduled for April and May.

Virtual panels will review USDA-NIFA proposals in 2013. NIFA has reduced staff and is experiencing tight travel, training, operating budgets.

The 2013 EIPM-CS RFA will have a Notice of Intent to Submit, due March 19th. It will include a project title, director, Co-PDs, type declaration (COORDINATION, SUPPORT or DEVELOPMENT) and suggestions for 3 reviewers.

Award obligations are expected Friday August 30, 2013.

There will be a webinar on proposal development on Monday March 4th, 2013 and the application deadline is April 16th.

Total funding is \$8.5 million with division as follows: Coordination \$8.2, Evaluation \$200k, Small Farms \$100k, extension issues IPM \$50k. Not all areas may be funded and \$400 to \$800k may be lost to sequestration. One coordination proposal is allowed per institution and a letter from the Director –

submitted with the institution's proposal will be required to designate proposals as the proposal from that institution.

COORDINATION Proposals:

EIPM CS Standard COORDINATION proposals will be written under emphasis areas to allow aggregation of results. All components will need an evaluation function (indicating change in clientele knowledge, behavior and condition). The 2013 RFA must have a 36 month budget capped at \$300k per year. Coordination will be imbedded in the budget. Primary Emphasis Areas are not limited (except they must come under the cap) Secondary Emphasis Areas are limited to \$50k.

Proposals will be evaluated in two phases: 1. Relevance –determination of merit and 2. Overall evaluation.

The Budget Narrative has been expanded with justification for equipment and travel and section breakdowns across Emphasis Areas.

Extension IPM is translational in nature and proposals should address the translational aspects of the work. They should explain how trials link back to clientele education.

Changes:

- 3-year budget
- Development \$50,000 over 2 years
- Notice of Intent
- No Coordination or Collaboration sections
- No guarantee of funding
- Previous compliance may trigger high risk status
- No cost extensions: first year triggered by University, 2nd year triggered by extreme situation , 3rd year none allowed.

By federal law, projects cannot be duplicated. Change titles of proposals. Review and renew objectives. Distinguish and differentiate your new proposal from previous proposals.

SUPPORT Proposals:

Should address critical needs. Funding is limited with only \$300k available. These are extension funds supporting extension programming but may include research work. Projects may include evaluation of EIPM-CS nationally, IPM working groups, critical issues, push-pull technologies, hand held devices, eXtension, and emerging needs.

USDA-NIFA can accept more than one SUPPORT proposal per institution.

Dr. Draper commented on PCAST Reports – the Presidents Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. He highlighted two recent reports:

1. US Research Enterprise
2. Agricultural Preparedness

These can be reviewed at www.whitehouse.gov/ostp/pcast

Dr. Draper commented on status of the Crop Protection budget consolidation effort. It proposes consolidation of IPM related programs into a single budget line – Crop Protection. The current budget lines for Methyl Bromide, Regional IPM Centers, RIPM/PMAP, EIPM-CS under the proposal would be consolidated under Crop Protection. IR-4 funding would remain as it is. The proposal was the subject of a favorable APLU white paper and was written into the recent Farm Bill which did not receive congressional approval.

Dr. Draper commented on agency conversion from the CRIS reporting system to the REEport system:

- The change will affect reports to: NIFA, ARS, ERS and NAAS.
- Changes in the report interface meet the Research Reform Mandate
- The system deploys April 1, 2013
- The system is:
 - More flexible – accommodates PDS and image imbedding
 - Navigation is easier
 - Clean screens
 - Archived Instructional Webinars
 - Ends AD forms
 - Uses names
 - Project Initiation
 - Project Progress
 - Project Termination
 - Financial Report

Dr. Draper's report was followed by a question and answer session which addressed:

- EIPM-CS RFA changes
 - Duplication of objectives from previous proposals
 - Selection of panelists in Notice of Intent
 - Imbedding of Coordination in other Emphasis Areas
 - Changing proposal title from previous titles
 - Evaluation component – Evaluation of EIPM-CS nationally
 - CRIS reporting gaps and aggregation of reports
 - Sustainability of programs
 - Collaboration no separate section

Southern Region IPM Center Update:

Dr. Henry Fadamiro provided an update on the Southern Region IPM Center. He discussed the center budget, new leadership, Steering/Advisory Councils, the Center Director's meetings, grants, and extension priorities.

Southern Region IPM Center Budget:

Dr. Fadamiro discussed the \$950,000 budget. He discussed the 4-year plan which will be implemented 1 year at a time. He discussed funding for the Regulatory Information Network.

Center Administration:

Dr. Fadamiro discussed changes at the Center and that with these changes, the center has a presence on 3 University Campuses. The leadership group is now Jim Van Kirk Director NCSU, Steve Toth Associate Director NCSU, Henry Fadamiro Associate Director AU (Small Farms, SERA 003, Friends of IPM and Enhancement Grants) and Joe LaForrest Assistant Director UGA (Bugwood, technology, electronic networking, Facilitation and Innovation Through Technology [FITT]).

Steering Committees:

- Smaller
- SERA 003 has one slot (need non-interim appointment)
- Advisory Council SERA 003 has two slots
- Also IPM Tech Committees, Grower Associations, IPM Practitioners

IPM Center Director Update:

RIPM Grant Opportunity discussed:

- RIPM RFA discussed
- RIPM RFA will be released in early March
- RIPM proposals due in 6 weeks
- Panels will be “virtual”

Social Network Analysis (SNA) discussed

PCAST Report discussed

- US Agriculture is not prepared
 - Low funding
 - Unbalanced portfolio
 - Corporate vs USDA funding – USDA the lion’s share
 - Industry funding - different priorities and emphasis
 - PCAST Report identified issues – report adopted by APLU
 - 6 innovative hubs for public/private partnerships identified \$150 million
 - \$150 million per grant – concerns about survival of small groups
 - Industry funding will go to innovation hubs
 - Function of hubs – new ideas, discovery
 - Regionally, top universities will be centers
 - Systems will support 6 universities – Regional Agriculture Institutions
 - Priorities will focus on strengths
 - Companies will want accountability
 - Expansion of competitive grants in USDA
 - Reduction of non-competitive funds for USDA-ARS

IPM Enhancement Grants were discussed:

- RFA is out - \$320k
 - April 1 proposal submission date
 - PMSPs \$24k
 - Seed, Capstone, Working Groups \$150k, \$30k each
 - Evaluation Criteria
 - Regional Importance
 - Potential for success
 - Resource Building/Leveraging
 - Impact evaluation
 - Contributions to knowledge base

SRIPM grants were discussed

- Administered by Southern Region Center
- 2013 RFA awaiting NIFA approval and release
- 6 week turn around

- Southern Region IPM Center Priorities
 - Herbicide resistant weeds
 - Kudzu bug
 - Stink bug
 - Spotted winged drosophila
 - Residential IPM: bed bugs, termites, fire ants, etc.

Regulatory Information Network was discussed

- Subgroups \$20k each .. Mossler, Matocha, Weaver, Hensley

Watermelon & Cilantro Pesticide Education was discussed

- Acephate on watermelon in NC and CA
- EPA alerted others to monitor
- USDA suggested education as a response versus punitive
- Western Region and Southern Region were asked to submit a proposal for Working Groups
- If you know someone who should be involved, let Jim VanKirk know ... CA, TX, NC, FL and NJ
- Possible sources – illegal applications, drift, other growers, international, etc.
- EPA and Extension emphasis

Signature Programs were discussed

- Small Farms Working Group – Extension Specialists and Research
- 1862 and 1890 universities understand the IPM challenges of small farmers
- Small farms and organic/alternative approaches
- 25-50 acre farms, most 5-10 acres
- 1890 and 1862 university opportunities
- Workshop – Clemson Geoff Zehnder
- Farm Tours
- Brainstorming
 - Communication with stakeholders
 - R&D for small farmers
 - Evaluation – feed back
- July 22-24, 2013 St Croix – Small Farms and SARE joint meeting – support grant

Friends of IPM Awards were discussed

- Grad. Student Awards
 - MS. Sandra Wheeler FAMU Entomology
 - Ph.D. Jacob Price Texas Tech U. and Texas A&M Plant Pathology
- Bright Idea – Southeast Entomologists Working Group – decision aid card
- IPM Implementor – Dan Lisenko – Bradenton, FL. School IPM Coordinator
- IPM Education - Tim Reed – soybean Auburn U.
- Future Leader – Steve Frank NCSU
- Pulling Together – Alabama A&M, Auburn, Tuskegee
- Lifetime Achievement - Harold Coble USDA OPMP

Lead 21 – Leadership for the 21st Century was discussed

- How to manage change
- Tell the dean to send you
- Upper level administrators – benefits for state program leaders
- <http://lead-21.org/current-class/>

- Promote/advocate an agenda

Joe LaForrest discussed Social Network Analysis

- How information flows – where it comes from – centrality

Joe LaForrest discussed FITT Facilitation of Information Through Technology

- Automate how images appear on other networks
- Ed Maps – early distribution of management information systems
- Brown Marmorated Stink Bug
 - dynamic maps
 - levels of infestation
 - Regulatory and areawide implications
- Spotted Wing Drosophila
 - County level maps
 - Regulatory and areawide implications
- Batch file
- Citizen Scientist upload
 - Lat and long with pictures
 - Verification of data – by confirmer
 - Regulatory has a private field
 - Delayed release until confirmed
- Smart Phone Apps.
- IPM Pipe Clayton Hollier
 - LA only one person – no verification
 - Bogus data
- Joe LaForrest
 - Can use data to create maps
 - Tx Invaders app
 - Can track who is using
 - Tracking - picture shown x times on x websites
 - Base Camp, Go To Meeting
 - IT advice
 - Basic syndication

SERA 003 Project Renewal was discussed – Tom Melton administrative liaison next 4 years

SERA 003 By-laws changes were discussed.

- SERA-003 officer structure was discussed. Charles Allen moved that the SERA-003 administrative structure be made up of a Chair and a Secretary. Clayton Holier seconded and the motion carried.
- The make-up of the Southern Region IPM Center Advisory and Steering Committee was discussed. Charles Allen moved that the SERA-003 Chair and Secretary serve on the Center Advisory Committee and the SERA-003 Past President serve on the Southern Region IPM Center Steering Committee and as an Ex Officio member of the Southern Region IPM Advisory Committee. Ric Besson seconded and the motion passed.
- The Secretary and President of SERA-003 are Delegates to the National IPM Meeting

Election of SERA-003 Secretary

- SERA-003 Committee discussed election of a Secretary. Geoff Zehnder nominated Scott Stewart. Tom Royer seconded. The motion passed.

Site Selection for the 2014 SERA-003 Meeting was discussed

- The committee consensus was the meeting would be held in Dallas, TX.

SERA-003 Issues were discussed

- The need for year-round Southern Region liaison with NIFA was discussed. The consensus was that this liaison would be best handled by the SERA-003 Chair
- Recruitment of SERA-003 membership within the research community was discussed.
- SERA-003 voting members are state IPM Coordinators for the region
 - Travel should be written into EIPM-CS for SERA-003
- Future funding was discussed
- Communicating Accomplishments was discussed. We must tell people what we do.
- The state of individual state IPM programs was discussed
 - Norm Leppla commented
 - Not growing –flat
 - IPM related issues were discussed
 - ✓ BMPs
 - ✓ Water Quality
 - ✓ Save Everglades
 - ✓ Organics
 - IPM programs should be steadily increasing
- NRCS support was brought up by Geoff Zehnder
- People working in IPM programs nationally was discussed. Programs were believed to have 50-60 fewer people.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.