

**SERA-IEG3 Annual Meeting
April 7, 2003
Indianapolis, IN**

Participants: David J. Boethel (LSU Ag Center), Pat Bolin (OK State Univ.), Clarence Collison (MS State Univ.), Jonathan Edelson (OK State Univ.), Mike Fitzner (USDA-CSREES), Dave Foster (OK State Univ.), Tom Fuchs (TX AandM), Shani File (Univ. of FL), Clayton A. Hollier (LSU Ag Center), Doug Johnson (Univ. of KY), Anthony Keinath (Clemson Univ.), Bill Hoffman (USDA-CSREES), Fred Knapp (Univ. of KY), Gary Lentz (Univ. of TN, WTES), Norm Leppla (Univ. of FL), Mike Linker (NC State Univ.), Gus Lorenz (Univ. of AR, CES), Patty Lucas (Univ. of KY), John R. McVay (Auburn Univ.), Russ Mizell (Univ. of FL), Norm Nesheim (Univ. of FL/IFAS), Eldon Ortman, Patrick Parkman (Univ. of TN), Lowell Sandell (Univ. of KY), Ples Spradley (Univ. of AR, CES), Ron Stinner (NC State Univ.), Geoff Zehnder (Clemson Univ.).

Introductions: Clayton Hollier. 2002 minutes reviewed with comments, approved.

Administrative Advisor Comments:

- Dave Boethel. Southern region pest mgmt center will need to be discussed today, get minutes posted within 60 days, Web site needs updated.
- Dave Foster. Ad hoc committee will review all the SERA-IEGs, how they function; this one stood out as effective, ensure everything up to date

Southern Region Pest Management Center – Florida Update (Mizell and Nesheim)

Role of Pest Management Centers: Agroecological regional planning and management, facilitation, address overarching issues, document progress, publicize successes. Steering committee (7), advisory committee (20), grants to 13 states + Puerto Rico for network and products. Directly work with PMAP, RMAP, CAR, IR4, and PAT; indirectly, with Organic, SARE, MBr, special USDA, EPA-PSEP, NRCS-EQIP, IFAFS, Rural Development, NRI, 3d Formula funds; overall FQPA.

Accomplishments of the Southern Region Pest Management Center

Established a network, developed the crop profiles and pest management strategic plans (see <http://www.pmcenter.org>); crop timelines for EPA; IPM policy roadmap; IPM measurement; regional IPM facilitator, Dr. Shani File (salary 50% IPM, 50% UFL IDC return, hired for 2 years).

Future Plans

“Southern Region Center for IPM (SRCIPM)” – proposed March 31, with both FL and NC submitting proposals. FL proposal discussed by Mizell and Nesheim.

Regional IPM Centers (Mike Fitzner)

- Change from PMC to IPM Center
- Vision: responsive to important pest problems and issues, e.g., soybean aphid; coordinate information on pest management needed for strategic plans, standards, crop profiles, organize expertise; facilitate identification of important needs and prioritize; bring together teams to address needs and garner resources; focus resources to get greatest impacts; anticipate future needs; be a communication vehicle; centers don't represent one program; centers go beyond PIAP; not meant to replace state-based efforts, but instead support, enhance, show outcomes, reporting; centers should be forward-looking, collaborative, inclusive. Biggest challenge is to overcome the baggage of the past.
- ? If PMAP, CAR, and RAMP become regionalized, there is a loss of the national picture of peer review programs and redundancies; what about grants that work between regions?

- Problem is competition with other RFPs; directors will not limit but guide what must be done.
- The same panel that reviews the regional IPM grants will also review PMAP proposals though may have to add an additional person. At present time, we're not sure about CAR and RAMP.
- ? Takes away flexibility in regionality, as each region is limited to 12 other states, what about states that border other regions.
 - Need better link to money, and defined by the roadmap. CSREES hadn't defined the goals of IPM.
- ? Where do roadmap definitions fit into the system?
 - A required part of the document, how you will advance IPM.
- ? Re: all this information collected from the states, such as areas of emphasis, etc.; is there some of that information that we could get back? What of this information is used with Congress?
 - Contracted to compile 4 fact sheets re: impacts.

Regional IPM Facilitator (Shani File)

Needs from the Southern Region:

- Organize terminal reports from IPM grants (2nd highest priority)
- Visit programs in states
- Visit other regional facilitators
- Advertising and marketing success stories (Highest priority)
- Web page for region SERA-IEG3 page (3rd highest priority)
 - Web page needs: Reports, contacts, successes, funding sources links
 - Uniform appearance among the regions; broken out by states
- RIPM panel management
- Serve as main information source for region
- Facilitate interstate cooperation, grant development

SRIPM Funded Projects Update (Fred Knapp)

This year, Letters of Intent (LOI) were requested instead of preproposals. A total of 92 LOIs and 67 proposals submitted. Two were in the Joint Research/Extension category, 7 in Extension, 58 in Research. Two more peer review panels and one ad hoc panel were added. Of the 67 submitted proposals, 12 Research and 3 Extension proposals were funded; no Joint proposals were funded (the 2 didn't rate significantly high enough, because of lack of coordination, appeared to be put together too rapidly, doesn't show they're working together in a common goal; PIs should start now rather than wait for the last minute)—that money went back into the other projects.

SRIPM RFP Discussion (Geoff Zehnder)

1. Do we continue to fund one project under Joint Research-Extension (RE) category? The RFP says 1 large-scale 3-year project. This year, two were submitted but didn't score high enough for funding. Or do we go back to the old way and fund several smaller projects under Joint RE category. Discussion: Leave it open as an option for 3-4 states to work together. Should show the impact of how IPM works together; multidiscipline, multi-state cooperation—should we remove the multistate requirement? Review panel does give extra points for “appropriate” multiple state / discipline / organization. Sometimes you have a good idea but no partner, or your idea doesn't overlap enough states; the paperwork is overwhelming when including other states. Could add that if you are only covering one state, you must write a justification as to what the regional impact will be; in that case,

- would need to decrease the amount. Include language as to the roles of the cooperators in the different states, to make that clearer to the review panel. Motion Geoff change the wording to not preclude the addition of single state proposals, motion seconded & passed.
2. Research emphasis for alternative pest management systems, with emphasis on pesticides, and emphasis on weeds—do we want to remove the weed emphasis?
Final decision: Keep the wording in.
 3. Submission, where and when (on Page 11); must be signed by PI, PD, and the department chair—does dept. chair need to sign these when not on the cover page?
Decision: cross off tentatively, pending further investigation
 4. Evaluation criteria for research projects, pg 13, 2nd criteria, IPM program assessment #2; must be an error as the sentence doesn't make sense. The gist of that section is that there has to be some kind of plan in the proposal to adequately define IPM for the area or commodity that is being evaluated, and describe a plan to measure IPM adoption. Motion: have Geoff submit a revision of that particular article to the directors for consideration; motion seconded; no discussion, motion passed.
 5. e in extension is capitalized, but the r in research isn't. Is that by design or an error? Knapp states Extension is a proper noun whereas research is a general term. In generalities, extension is lower case
 6. Should there be a formalized committee to focus on the RFP, and under purview of SRCIPM? SERA-IEG3 will have a representative on the steering committee for the SRCIPM (there is also SARE and Organic represented on this steering committee). We will still pass on the comments about the RFP to the directors. SRCIPM funds remain outside and perform a logistic service only with the regional IPM program. A formal RFP committee needs to have mechanism to review the RFP annually and evaluate priorities of the region, with input from the SR IPM Facilitator. Based on last year's minutes, there was a committee for the RFP defined, with a three-year term, but it wasn't clearly defined how the committee members will rotate—we need to determine who goes off and we need a new member. Motion: Geoff remain on the RFP committee, Tom Fuchs (also on the SRCIPM committee) replaces Jim Shrefler; motion seconded; no discussion, motion passed.
 7. The detailed annual report and final report that was previously to be submitted to grants manager (next to last page) will instead be sent to the SRCIPM facilitator.

Election of New Officers

Positions rotate: chair-elect to chair, secretary to chair-elect; we elect a new secretary. Jonathan Edelson nominated and elected.

2004 Meeting

The 2004 meeting will be February 26-27, in Raleigh, NC. The dates chosen to overlap by one day with the Center Directors' meeting, and the location is at the new Southern Region IPM Center.

NRCS 595 Standard (MikeLinker)

This standard requires a pest management plan for every farm, developed by outside consultants, called Technical Service Providers (TSP). A pest management plan has to be written for every field, not just for a farm. National NRCS will set the standard for who qualifies, and the standard will be low. This is a self-regulating system—TSP writes the plan, submits it, certifies it as a good plan, and turns it in; then a year or so later, NRCS certifies the plan and the TSP is gone. The farmer will go to their Extension office for a written plan. A TSP in one state is a TSP in any state. Certified Crop Advisors (CCA) are automatically TSPs; in many places, CCA are weak in pest management, most can't write a pest management plan. It is possible that even if you hold a pesticide license you could be a TSP. NRCS will be making a decision

within weeks. Conservation is voluntary, so it is not mandatory that every farmer get a pest management plan, unless the farmer is getting money from NRCS. WINPEST (a computer program) is used to determine for offsite movement of pesticides, particularly herbicides, based on soil type, herbicide, and category (severe, moderate, low chance of off-site movement). If the field gets a Severe rating, the field must have mediation, such as banding, no-till, don't use the herbicide, etc. In a high organic soil with high water table, every herbicide comes up as high risk. Monsanto requires every employee to be CCA, and CCAs are automatically TSPs. Extension agents could also be TSPs and work overtime to write these pest management plans. Would like growers to really look at their concerns and develop a pest management plan based on need. Fuchs reviewed the Texas plan, and critiqued that it was all pesticides; he participated in the state standards, specifying that the PAMS system is used to select practices, including scouting, use of economic thresholds, etc.; recommend plan updated annually and a professional IPM person develop the plan. NRCS has declared recently that they will set the standard, not the state. Percentage of farmers that participate can be big in some states, and will expand given NRCS expansion of money available. .

State Reports, by IPM Coordinators
AL, AR, FL, KY, LA, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX

Update from CSREES (Mike Fitzner and Bill Hoffman)

(Handouts: job announcement for program specialist, 4 fact sheets IPM, crop profiles, IR-4, southern region project for termites, weed decision support system, IPM Roadmap, and new reporting standards draft)

Web page will be redesigned soon, looking for feedback afterwards.

Staff building in IPM arena at the agency, on last page of Plant Sciences Update handout.

Dennis Kopp at a Brookings institution fellowship for 7 mos., working with Representative Kines from WI. Eldon Ortman on an IPA, working on roadmap; Jonathan Becker working with EPA Biologic economic analysis on priority matrix for crop profiles on which EPA needs data.

Budget: 2003 was passed; agency has grown a bit; priorities in homeland security, genomics. Government-wide rescission of 0.65%, including IPM.

Environmental stewardship: lots of money in the conservation arena in the Farm Bill EQIP, CSP. Most important thing we can help with is the impact measurement in the programs

IPM Roadmap (Mike Fitzner)

There will be presentations at this workshop, with availability to make comments. The roadmap will represent a broad outline for the federal direction in IPM over the next several years. Biggest theme is risk reduction, in terms of profitability, health, and the environment, as an outcome for IPM. GAO thought the goal of IPM was to reduce pesticides, but that isn't true in all cases. The roadmap also broadens the focus to go beyond agriculture, such as in residential and recreational areas.

Reporting and Plan of Work (Bill Hoffman)

In 543 days, the extension IPM program starts a new 5-year cycle, time to evaluate current system, and review the IPM roadmap to make sure those items are captured. Feedback is desired on the proposed reporting standards. Changes:

- Develop some kind of objective standard as to what constitutes a complete report, including 'good' and 'excellent' rating.
- Changing timing from fall to spring, to have on same schedule as Smith-Lever funding (b and c).
- Added approval feature for administrative advisor; first effort of gaining others' inputs into what we report.

- Number of areas of emphasis, depending on level of funding (Problem: given that some states didn't have that many areas of emphasis in the past, they would have to retrofit this new system on the current five-year plan).

Areas of Emphasis. A state may have one huge program in one or two areas of emphasis that is much more significant than 5 or 6 areas of emphasis. Currently can add areas of emphasis easily.

New Plan of Work: Starts Oct. 1, 2004. Request is to have the questions by March 1st next year, to start preparing the new 5-year plan of work.

Plant Diagnostic Centers (Bill Hoffman)

Designed to safeguard against intentional or unintentional introduction of a biological threat. For example, what would happen if a state detected a new virulent strain of a disease? The hub in Kansas would provide secondary confirmation, contact the other state land grant diagnostic centers (without identifying where the sample came from) about a presumptive diagnosis, and given diagnostic instructions and any precautions. Not to replace NAPIS or to put extension into the regulatory business, but to complement APHIS. Hubs will also provide diagnostic lab training for possible threats. Will provide CCA training on how to do quick field diagnosis, and include lower level training materials for pesticide applicators, like how and why to send a sample into a diagnostic lab. The map is for the animal side of things, and the plant side will have KS be the Great Plains Diagnosis Center. Emphasis on animals because of the potential of bioterrorism through animals, like BSE.