

Advisory Council Meeting December 4-5, 2006 Meeting Report

Present: Clayton Hollier, Jennifer Gillett, Jim VanKirk, Henry Fadamiro, Pat O'Leary, VenKat Pedibhotla (phone), Harold Lambert, Harold Coble, Ron Stinner, Jonathan Edelson, Rosemary Hallberg, Tammy Van Duyn, Steve Hopkins, Steve Toth, Carol Somody, Carrie Harmon, Ames Herbert, Eric Young, Earl Tryon, Tom Fuchs, Mike Weaver (phone)

Thanks to Cotton, Inc. for paying for the snacks, reception and meals.

Budget / New Staff / Grant Update

- Introduced Tammy Van Duyn, the new projects coordinator
- Currently we receive about \$970,000 from CSREES. Next spring we will be submitting a proposal to keep the Southern IPM Center at NC State
- The Southern IPM Center is still heavily involved in the Soybean Rust project, but this year the project is paying for 50% of Jim's salary and some of Jo-Anne's salary. The salary savings is used in part for Tammy's position.
- IPM Enhancement grants:
 - Part 1: For State Contacts, we added two states—South Carolina and Louisiana. One project combined State Contact and Documents.
 - Part 2: These were startup and capstone projects. One of these project was for a PMSP that would lead to a RAMP grant. Typically PMSP's are funded in Part 1, See discussion below, "Priorities"..
 - S-RIPM: The Southern Region IPM Center manages this grants program for USDA including writes the RFA, with input from the Advisory Council and the SERA03 group on priorities. There was a question about why so many proposals from NC State were funded, and after looking at a chart of the history of the grant, it was discovered that NC State has historically done well with this grant,. In part to deal with the perception of fairness, SRIPMC sponsored a grantwriting workshop at Clemson and are offering the workshop to any institution interested in hosting..

IPM PIPE Update

History: This project began as the Soybean Rust project and has been managed since Oct. 2006 by SRIPMC. Last year there were 41 subcontracts, 35 to states to run sentinel plots and related items. The project addresses soybean rust, soybean aphid, and dry bean diseases. Some changes for 2007

- The amount that RMA is giving to the Center is increasing from \$2.3 million to \$3.18 million.
- Each house of Congress has passed an appropriations bill including \$2.277m for this project, but the bills have not been reconciled between houses as part of the Ag. Appropriations bill. The money from Congress will go strictly towards soybean rust. That will free up the RMA money to include other pests, including more legume pests. Other additions could include and including fusarium head blight and corn migratory Lepidoptera.
- A steering committee of the newly-named IPM PIPE has been formed and is active, and The steering committee includes representatives from industry, grower organizations, land grant universities, extension, regional centers, and federal agencies. The PIPE steering committee will make decisions for the PIPE and is developing bylaws.
- PDNs are all involved In the IPM PIPE, with a major role in diagnostics and data handling

Regulatory Issues

Steve Toth talked about some of the issues he and the state contacts have been working on this year:

- The Insecticide Resistance Management Fact Sheet for cotton was updated this year and distributed by Cotton, Inc.
- Applications for critical use exemptions for methyl bromide were submitted for 2009, and we should know the decision next year..
- Added two funded state contacts to the network: Louisiana and South Carolina.
- SRIPMC's website shows a record of all of the products EPA queries to State Contacts
(<http://www.sripmc.org/requests/index.cfm?strUSDARegion=Southern>)
- New crop profiles and PSMPs are scheduled for next year, and others will be revised.. Although PMSPs were originally something done only by the state contacts, recently other scientists have become involved in creating and revising them. Some of the PMSPs are even becoming non-traditional, such as the IPM in Schools PMSP.

Partnership for Saving Threatened Forests

Fred Hain from NC State gave a presentation on this project to coordinate IPM with invasive species threatening some of the southern east coast's national forests. Currently SRIPMC is giving publication and web site assistance to this project,.

CIPM Conversations

Ron Stinner explained that the CIPM Conversations are a way of getting diverse groups together to focus discussion on one issue of importance to IPM. No minutes are taken nor report produced; however, some of the speaker's talks are placed on CD. The first conversation was on risk management. CIPM is planning to hold three conversations next year and is looking for input from the AC on topics and participants.

Annual Report

Rosemary presented the draft annual report. Reaction was favorable. Comments included use only southern region photos and making the state pages flexible for states to be able to use them for their own purposes.

Strategic Plan Draft

Jim explained the purpose of the strategic plan and the goals. He asked for feedback about revisions, or if anything should be ranked differently. The strategic plan should be useful to help us measure progress and success.

Discussion focused on the last goal, support for IPM, especially when Jim mentioned that the Center might support communication with Sysco. The discussion entailed whether or not the region should be composing IPM standards for companies like Sysco and Wal-Mart, but it was not resolved.

Communications Plan

Jim presented the communications plan. Comments during this discussion included the need to have the Center better known in the region by organizing Center visits to state programs (at the states' request), requiring inclusion of SRIPMC logo on grant-supported products and report, or doing a brochure.

Tuesday, December 5

IPM Star Program

Tom Green, President of the IPM Institute, introduced the IPM Institute and explained what they have done, and then described the IPM Star program. He discussed issues surrounding pesticides in schools and talked about some of the progress being made in reducing pesticide use.

- The IPM Star program has evaluated 28 school systems and certified 20 nationally.
- The program evaluates 48 items and costs between \$2,500 and \$3,000 plus travel. Tom said they are looking for more schools to be certified.
- The program evaluates based on the state's regulations.

Discussion: Could the IPM Star program could be utilized as a single standard to aggregate school IPM programs across the region , it could handle the differences in each state?. Is this was something that we should include in future RFAs?

- While some felt that it would be valuable to tell schools about the program, the majority felt that the IPM in Schools programs in their own states were overburdened and could not handle more interested schools without more manpower.
- There was not a strong push to include IPM in schools in the RFA.
- There was, however, a recommendation that the Center could sponsor a workshop that would possibly be a “train the trainer” that would train more people to evaluate schools.

Partnering with NRCS

Because NRCS’s mission to conserve natural resources is close to IPM’s mission, IPM Centers have been interested in working with NRCS to add IPM to their contracts with states. However, there has been historical frustration over this because of a perceived “language” barrier. Larry Elworth described his partnership with NRCS and suggested that EQIP may be opening up opportunities to make NRCS more IPM friendly.

Discussion:

- Many NRCS staff are not well-versed in IPM.
- When NRCS gives a contract to a farmer, they look at resource management only, so any IPM technique does not get funded because it’s IPM, but rather because of the way it helps the natural resource (e.g., cover crops and erosion control)
- Larry is looking at ways to adapt NRCS’s programs to small farmers; however, most of these farmers do not know about NRCS, and NRCS does not have the manpower to try to reach them. Need the Center’s help to make this happen.
- This issue was further discussed in the Priorities discussion later.

Nominating a new Char-elect

Three people received nominations: Henry Fadamiro, Tom Fuchs, and Carol Somody. Henry was elected the new chair-elect.

Working with state partnerships

Jennifer Gillette proposed that coordinators and PIs who have completed a project should write a report and give it to the Center to share with others in the region. The Center could catalog the projects by commodity.

While most committee members felt it was worthwhile to share projects with each other, some felt that some projects may not be applicable to others in the region. Others said that they already put the information into the PPRS system and so did not want to send it twice. SRIPMC will investigate display of state PPRS success stories on our site.

Priorities

The following is the results of the priorities discussion:

- IPM Enhancement Part 1
 - PMSPs. A few people pointed out that several PMSPs are outdated and need to be revised.
 - Are PMSPs were valuable, and whether we should fund IPM standards? Consensus: EPA uses the information from the PMSPs, the group determined that they were valuable but needed to be up-to-date.
 - Conclusion was that the Center should send out a survey asking the State Contacts to identify PMSPs that should be updated and specify what part needed to be revised, if not the entire document.

- IPM Enhancement Part 2
 - Jim raised the question about whether PMSPs should be excluded from Part 2, as they are explicitly covered under Part 1. After discussion giving pros and cons, the group was reluctant to exclude them from this part but suggested that the two RFA's to this grant go out together instead of separately to encourage people to submit PMSPs to Part 1.
 - The AC decided against making IPM in Schools or working with NRCS a specific priority in this year's RFA until the IPM in Schools workshop was completed.

- Southern Region IPM grants
 - Setting IPM in Schools and/or work with NRCS as a priority: same decision as above.
 -

- SRIPMC Staff
 - Need to call people for reports where funding has been given. Final reports need to be made explicit in the RFA language next year.

Defining IPM Standards

There was some discussion about whether or not IPM Standards should replace PMSPs, but the conclusion was that the PMSPs should be revised as needed. We also discussed holding an IPM Standards workshop later next year in light of the partnership possibility with NRCS.

1890s Follow-up

Jimo Ibrahim has rotated off the Steering Committee, and Jim will be asking L. Washington Lyons to become a member.

Plant Diagnostic Networks

The PDN is having a national 5-year review during the January meeting. Carrie Harmon said that the Southern PDN has begun an Advisory Council modeled after the Center's. Clayton Hollier is the Chair of the PDN AC.

Next IPM Symposium

The next IPM Symposium will be March 24-26, 2009 in Portland, OR. The overarching theme is IPM transcending boundaries. Carrie asked AC members to propose sessions if they wanted.

Next Advisory Council Meeting (discussed during the Steering Committee meeting)

The Steering Committee decided that the next Advisory Council meeting is July 9-10, 2007 in Raleigh.