

Advisory Committee Meeting, 7/17/06

Attending: Ames Herbert (Virginia Tech), Josh Spencer (NRCS), Carrie Harmon (SPDN), Pat O'Leary (Cotton, Inc.), Pat Parkman (U Tenn), Clayton Hollier (LSU), Debbie Hamrick (NC Farm Bureau), Jonathan Edelson (OK State), Fitzroy Bullock (Tenn State), Amber Davis (EPA Reg 4), Mike Weaver (Virginia Tech), Bob Bellinger (Clemson), Steve Hopkins (EPA), Steve Muench (American Soybean Assoc.), Norm Leppla (UFL), Venkat Pedibhotia, (IRAC, BASF), John Aselage (Gerber), John Anderson (Monsanto), Harold Coble (USDA-OPMP), Steve Toth, Jim VanKirk, Ron Stinner, Rosemary Hallberg (SRIPMC)

SRIPMC Developments overview – Jim VanKirk

- Communications position: Jen Hodorowicz left at the end of 2005; Rosemary Hallberg's first day is today.
- IPM Centers review: review of all four regional IPM Centers was held in February.
- Soybean rust / IPM PIPE project
- Training of EPA's OPP/BEAD staff on IPM for specialty vegetables and herbs in May by Steve Toth
- IPM Symposium in early April

Member Updates

University of Florida, Norm Leppla

The University of Florida has created a new DVD featuring 20 short segments describing IPM, and they are working on the tomato and pepper grant and the 1890 and 1862 proposals.

EPA Region 4, Amber Davis

Region 4 is reviewing RFPs. Expect the new Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program (PESP) RFA to be released very soon. Encouraging the 1890s schools to come aboard IPM programs but say that are usually not aware of the resources.

Oklahoma State University, Jonathan Edelson

The Southern Region technical committee (SERA 03 IPM) has rewritten the guiding document and is working on advice to IPM Centers. The biggest challenge is to attract research scientists, who don't often go to the meetings.

Tennessee State University, Fitzroy Bullock

Tennessee State University is continuing to work on the collaboration between the 1890s and 1862s.

NC Farm Bureau, Debbie Hamrick

The Farm Bureau is continuing their conservation efforts and lobbying government for various programs. They are trying to educate people on chemical safety and have been successful at getting money for pesticide programs put back in the federal budget.

Louisiana State University, Clayton Hollier

Soybean rust is taking a large amount of time and was recently found on kudzu (alternate host) in 3 sites.

University of Tennessee, Pat Parkman

Smith-Lever 3(d) IPM funds do not directly support the IPM Coordinator position. They are currently used on projects including fire ant management, grape borer management, and school IPM.

Cotton, Inc., Pat O'Leary

A priority IPM issue is the stinkbugs on cotton; they are addressing issues including thresholds and control.

Southern Plant Diagnostic Network, University of Florida, Carrie Harmon

Carrie talked about the legume pipe and said she is also dealing a lot with soybean rust. Florida needs help with it, and she has been helping to push funding to other states so they can identify pests, but they need someone to do data entry.

NC Natural Resources Conservation Society, Josh Spencer (substituting for Lane Price)

The NC Natural Resources Conservation Society funded a conservation innovation grant to research use of beneficial insects in small farms.

Virginia Tech

IPM Program, Ames Herbert

Considerable effort has gone into developing a new 5-year plan of work. Monitoring was going well for soybean rust and soybean aphid.

State Contact, Mike Weaver

His group has put together a pamphlet, of which he left samples, targeting IPM in sensitive areas. They have complete new crop profiles and are considering undertaking a PMSP with honeybees.

US Environmental Protection Agency, Headquarters, Steve Hopkins

The EPA is looking at pesticide labels rates of that far exceed the recommended rates, concerned about endangered species. Currently they are trying to determine how the products are being used. The IPM Institute has assisted Sysco in developing a certification program and is trying to involve people at all levels.

BASF, Venkat Pedibhotia

IRAC (Insecticide Resistance Action Committee) is trying to expand and update the mode of action bulletin for insecticides and encouraging partner groups HRAC (herbicide) and FRAC (fungicide) to consider similar efforts.

USDA/OPMP, Harold Coble

A recent survey shows that IPM adoption has dropped from 70% to 50%, but this finding is affected by what measures are used to define "IPM adoption." A lot has to do with survey scouting, which has gone down. But new IPM methods (e.g. Roundup-ready soy) have eliminated the need for scouting. We need to look at what is measured and how we interpret the data.

CIPM, Ron Stinner

NSF CIPM is initiating a series of invitation-only IPM "conversations." Each will be focused on a particular issue, and will provide interested parties with the opportunity for frank exchange on the issues. Anyone interested in an invitation to the meetings should contact Ron for details and availability of space.

Grants Programs

IPM Enhancement Grants Part 1:

The competition for State Contacts and IPM Documents projects has recently been completed, with panel recommendations to fund approximately \$300,000. We expect to have state contacts covering every state and territory in the region except Mississippi as a result. One funded PMSP is for greenhouse tomatoes – we are encouraging the PI on this to consider making it national, and will work with other IPM Centers for support of participants from other regions.

IPM Enhancement Grants 2:

The funding is \$100,000 total and includes the fiscal year from July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007. Money is for either seed or capstone projects. There are 12 proposals. The panel will meet August 24, with decisions announced soon thereafter.

S-RIPM:

The Southern Regional IPM Grants Program deadline for FY2006 proposals was in early December, 2005. Two panel (relevance and technical) met in January and as a result 10 projects were recommended for funding. We will announce the results as soon as all contracts between USDA and host institutions are released.

Critical issues grants include the methyl bromide transition, fire ant publications, soybean rust, IPM symposium, and the Soybean Rust Symposium 2006.

IPM PIPE

PIPE = “Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education.” This year we sometimes also call it “the soybean rust project,” but in fact soybean rust is only the first component of a system we envision covering many pest/crop combinations.

This year’s budget of \$2.31 million comes to SRIPMC. Most of the in turn is sent via subcontracts to other institutions. Approximate budget breakdown: \$1m for sentinel plots in 35 states; \$750,000 to NPDN for diagnostics; ~ \$75,000 for soybean aphid scouting; \$125,000 for IT tools and website development; \$125,000 for modeling; \$60,000 for mobile scouting teams; \$130,000 for education and outreach.

Next year’s budget is still unknown. We expect the USDA Risk Management Agency to increase funding to approximately \$3.2 million. In addition, a new line item for soybean rust currently is in both House and Senate versions of the Federal budget. If passed this would add \$2.227 million. Jim has just completed a “concept note” to be used by USDA/CSREES and RMA which outlines 2 budgets, depending on the outcome of the Federal budget. In either scenario the core objective of managing soybean rust monitoring and data management would be met. The system may expand to other pest/crop combos depending on funding.

We expect the IPM PIPE project to run entirely through SRIPMC for the coming year. Starting the following year (Sept. 2007-Sept. 2008) the project will most likely use up to 4 major grants, as many as 1 per IPM Regional Center. Thus our national responsibility for managing this project will decrease.

In either case, we will budget half of Jim VanKirk’s salary to be paid out of the IPM PIPE project. The savings to the core SRIPMC project will be used in part to hire an assistant, enabling us to continue to get both jobs done well. Management of the IPM PIPE project fits conceptually within the realm of the SRIPMC Director job description, and Jim will continue to provide leadership on all aspects of SRIPMC activities.

IPM Centers Review

All IPM Centers underwent a mid-term review that culminated in a review panel in February. AC and SC members were provided with copies of the review document submitted by SRIPMC and the review panel report, also available online at <http://www.sripmc.org/ac/July2006.cfm>. Discussion focused on two of the panel recommendations.

- The AC strongly favors the recommendation that SRIPMC staff produce a user-friendly and attractive “annual report.”
- The recommendation that NCSU consider partnering with another institution in our next proposal was not viewed as favorably by the AC. Although this was not rejected, AC consensus seemed to lean toward “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.”

Planning:

Conference call with Liz Thomas and Liz Meyers of Northeastern IPM Center about strategic plan and communications plan.

- Discussed how the Northeastern center created both documents
- AC recommended that SRIPMC staff develop working strategic plan that includes a communications plan.

Regional Priorities

- List is online but is not all-inclusive and is hard to find.
- AC agreed to ask that SERA 03 IPM, as probably the single stakeholder group with broadest knowledge of IPM, promulgate annual regional priorities for research, extension and regulatory changes. This would not be viewed by SRIPMC as the only list, but would certainly carry a lot of weight.