

**Advisory Council Meeting
June 20, 2011**

Present: Paul Smith, Caydee Savinelli, John Mayne, Howard Frank, Tom Royer, Doug Johnson, Carlos Bogran, Harold Coble, Conrad Lavender, Lora Lee Schroeder, Keith Douce, Steve Toth, Jim VanKirk, Michelle Samuel-Foo, Mike Weaver, Bob Bellinger, Carrie Harmon, Russell Duncan, Steve Muench, Fudd Graham, Charles Allen, Danesha Seth Carley, Ames Herbert, Anthony LeBude, Mike Fitzner, Pat O'Leary, Frank Louws, Ames Herbert, Clayton Hollier, Rosemary Hallberg

IPM Enhancement Grant 2011

As in previous years, Part 1 and 2 of the IPM Enhancement Grant were released in separate RFAs. The RFAs were released on December 6, 2010 with a deadline of January 31, 2011. We received 8 proposals each for Part 1 and 2; and Part 1 and 2 panels met on March 17 and 16, respectively. We funded 6 proposals under Part 1 and 5 under Part 2. The breakdown of funded projects is as follows:

Working groups include:

- Nursery crops
- Bugwood
- School IPM

IPM Documents include:

- Aquatic plants management
- IPM Documents for Virginia

Part 2 projects:

- RiceScout iPhone app
- Weed ID app
- GIS for wood boring beetles
- School IPM cost calculator
- Invasive plant pests in riparian areas

ipmPIPE Update

In the past we have had pretty big money:

- 2005 – \$2.3 M
- 2006 – \$3.5 M
- 2007 – \$4.5 M
- 2008 – \$75K
- 2009 – \$1.5 M
- 2010 – \$0

The ipmPIPE started with soybean rust. Other PIPEs included soybean aphid, legumes, onion, pecan, cucurbit downy mildew, western crops (light brown apple moth and spotted wing drosophila). In July we will be holding a PIPEfitters conference for all PIPEs and PIPE-like projects.

Regulatory Update

SRIPMC submitted a critical use exemption for methyl bromide through 2013. Several crop profiles were completed in 2010. EPA and USDA officials say that the crop profiles are very important to policy decisions. See the handout for more information.

The Regulatory Information Network is comprised this year of 4 project directors who cover their own states and contiguous states. There were no information requests in 2011, but we expect them to start up again by the end of the year.

RIPM Program

RIPM is a USDA program; the IPM Centers manage the competition. We made our funding recommendations at the end of January, but the federal budget issues have held up the contracts. USDA is just now beginning to complete the contracts.

This year, we had 35 submissions asking for about \$5 million. We recommended funding for 5 proposals totaling \$800,000. We recommended 3 research-only projects, 1 extension only and 1 research/extension.

Friends of IPM

The following were the awards given in 2011:

- Pulling Together: Mid-South Entomologist Working Group
- IPM Educator: Janet Hurley
- IPM Implementer: Patty Lucas
- Future Educator: Hannah Burrack
- Bright Idea: Okanola Project (wheat producers use canola as cover crop)

National Clean Plant Network

Rosemary Hallberg is working on this contract. The project is under USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). We have a cooperative agreement, led by Michigan State University, to help the 5 clean plant networks coordinate outreach materials. We are in the process of completing brochures for the national network and for each commodity. Although this project started out a little rocky, after a face-to-face meeting in February, everyone seems to be cooperating.

Organics Working Group

In Puerto Rico, the SERA-03 group went on a tour to a research station. Extension specialist Carlos Ortiz asked if there were any people in the group who knew about IPM and organics. Jim got Carlos together with Henry Fadamiro (AL) and Kelly Gilkerson (SC) and offered Carlos a plane ticket to the US to meet with Henry and Kelly. Unfortunately, Carlos has not returned calls since the meeting in Puerto Rico.

Doug Johnson suggested using the funding to give to someone who wants to take a sabbatical there. Lora Lee Schroeder suggested getting nonprofits involved, as they typically work with organic growers.

SERA-03 Priority Setting

The SERA-03 priorities were done a few years ago. After the group decided against squeezing priority setting in to the half-day SERA-3 meeting in March, they decided to use a separate meeting to set priorities. Paul Smith volunteered to lead the effort. The IPM Coordinators will meet for 2 days in Athens, Georgia on September 26-27. An extension evaluation person from Auburn will teach evaluation theory and practical evaluation for programs. The afternoon will include time to come up with a plan to develop evaluation protocols for the region. Currently they have a preliminary agenda. The second day will include the priority setting.

PMIDSS Grant

The current project includes a section on IPM working with eXtension. Jim VanKirk will run a one-day workshop in October to have a better relationship with eXtension.

NIFA Update

Staff changes: Roger Beachy left. NIFA is looking for a replacement. Herb Bolton will be handling the IPM Centers. Bill Hoffman is still working in Homeland Securities but is moving to administration.

IPM Centers have magically materialized back in Section 406 of the congressional budget. For 2011, the Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative (FADI) money, which includes the National Plant Diagnostic Network and Extension Disaster Education Network (EDEN) was cut 40%. All Congressional earmarks were zeroed out except for a couple (Potato and canola). Winners include Hatch money (up 23 M), AFRI (up 2M).

FY 2012 looks bad. The NIFA director has asked program leaders to consider what they might be able to do without. For RIPM Research, in 2012, in the House budget it's up to 14 M. The House funded IR-4, PMAP and the Expert IPM Decision Support

System, as well as IPM Centers at \$4 M. Almost everything else was cut 14-15 percent, including NIFA itself.

Keith Douce asked how one might find out who wrote letters to Congress.

Budget Update

Two grants expire after May 31 but we are going to try to change the end dates to May 31. We're hoping project directors spend all of their money; otherwise, we have to give it back to USDA.

In terms of the Center RFA, we're hoping for an RFA in July. We may have an 18 month project with the 2011 money, so there are 2 different scenarios.

As of this meeting, we have approximately \$48,688 left after DC travel last week, SERA priorities meeting and indirects.

Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative (FADI) funding: The 40% cut was distributed among the regions. Each region has to handle the cut different. The southern region did not touch the carry forward funds. The cut starts July 1. The states all were cut by 25%. Because of that, the main center has gotten a 60% cut. The Southern Plant Diagnostic Network can survive until April or May of next year. They are going to apply for another 5-year cooperative agreement.

The Plant Diagnostic Networks plan to do a 5-year review during the national meeting in November.

Success story: Nursery Crop PMSP Anthony LeBude

Nursery PMSP and Crop profile was funded by an Enhancement Grant. The documents are both over 200 pages. Part of the focus group was to determine the priority entomology pests. The group ranked pests by how difficult they were to control. The group also prioritized diseases and weeds.

After the meeting, Amy Fulcher created a listserv for nursery crops.

The group developed a 250-question survey based on a previous survey. Across 5 states, they had 124 nurseries. Growers had to have 40% wholesale container/field production. There were approximately 25 responses per state. They grouped respondents into 3 groups: IPM Savvy, IPM Part-Timer, and IPM Reluctant. Most respondents were in the IPM reluctant group. In terms of pest presence, group 2 did more IPM practices than group 1 or 3. Group 1 sends the sample to diagnostic clinic more than groups 2 and 3.

In terms of monitoring, group 1 used sticky cards, group 2 used phenology of host plants, and group 3 used visible symptoms. Control practices for insects or mites are

typically insecticides. Almost no one is using beneficial insects, nematodes or predatory mites to control pests.

The major limiting factor to IPM use was effectiveness of alternatives to chemical controls.

The Working Group is called SNIPM. They have created a website. Rosemary Hallberg wrote an article for NM Pro that highlighted the pest management strategic plan, and since then, Anthony has written an article for two nursery magazines.

The group received a 2011 IPM Enhancement grant to form a working group. They are considering submitting a proposal for an SCRI grant and are studying how beneficial insects can be used in the nursery industry.

Interesting tidbits:

- Growers who contacted Extension the most used IPM the least
- Sausage biscuits helped improve response rate for the survey
- Most growers wait until the damage occurs, so they have been having trouble controlling for borers.

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

What to do with the remaining funds:

Possibilities:

- Turf working group: would be setting priorities, sharing experiences, etc. Includes travel
- Friends of IPM (\$12,000)
- P.R. Organic working group (involves travel)
- Update crop profiles (OPMP has put together a list of which ones they need)
- SERA evaluation & priorities

Suggestions:

- Find alternatives for aldicarb
 - SERA-3 group will put it on priorities list
 - Ames Herbert is planning a project to look at aldicarb substitute
 - Put usage information in the crop profile for cotton, peanuts, soybeans
 - Look for research on integration
 - Develop a strategic plan
 - **Working groups could address issues like this and do crop profiles and strategic plans**
 - **Maybe Center could put it as a priority in the RFA**
- A couple of people suggested keeping Friends of IPM

Voting:

First priority:

- Turf working group 3
- **Friends of IPM (\$12,000) 10**
- P.R. Organic working group (involves travel)
- Update crop profiles (OPMP has put together a list of which ones they need)
4
- Temik response 4

Second priority

- Turf working group 4
- Friends of IPM (\$12,000) 4
- P.R. Organic working group (involves travel) 2
- Update crop profiles (OPMP has put together a list of which ones they need)
3
- **Temik response 6**

Three people recommended not doing the Puerto Rico project. Doug Johnson and Michelle Samuel-Foo recommended sending US specialists to Puerto Rico rather than inviting the Puerto Rico specialist to come here.

Success Story: Biocontrol of Mole Crickets

Mole crickets arrived from South America in 1899 in a ship ballast. There are 3 different species, invading from Florida to California. Chlordane was initially used but was banned in the 1970s. The experiment stations began a program in 1978 to find an alternative to chlordane. Scientists brought in parasitic wasps. The wasp causes about 70% mortality on mole crickets. If the wasps have a nectar source, the populations grow.

In 1997, after the program had implemented nematodes, specialists discovered that in three counties where the nematodes were, there were high levels of infected mole crickets, but low levels of healthy mole crickets.

To trap mole crickets, they have a sound synthesizer that plays a male song and it attracts the crickets to a trap. Tens of thousands of mole crickets were trapped annually from 1979-1988. However, the state funds that had been earmarked for mole cricket research went away. The nematode that had been controlling the crickets became unavailable in 1996.

Norm Leppla started research on mole crickets and discovered that although the biocontrol agents were working, ranchers were upset because they were still seeing damage. The university had not been doing training sessions, and the ranchers had no machines to apply the nematodes. So Leppla and Frank applied for and received

a 2010 IPM Enhancement grant to educate ranchers and purchase nematode-planting machines.

They had planning sessions, purchased two planting machines, and held training sessions with ranchers. They trained the ranchers on how to sample for nematodes. They also trained ranchers on how to apply the wasps. This project involved transferring the information from the lab to the field.

The discussion involved using the nematodes to control on golf courses. Economic studies are needed as well.

EPA Update

- The EPA has an RFA out on school IPM, closing July 15. Frank Ellis is the contact for that.
- PESP grants are being recast as agriculture grants. There is \$50,000 per region for this project. The announcement should be coming out the end of June. This will be strictly an agricultural focus.
- PRIA2 grants are in their second phase and the panel is looking at proposals.
- Results from the tick conference are online.
- Resistance Management committee is active. EPA has developed a definition of resistance and have posted it on their website.
- EPA put together a pollinator protection tour. It was a topical type tour put on by the regional office.

RIPM Program

IPM Centers are about to submit the RFA changes to USDA. A couple of issues have come up for which we need feedback.

- Split between technical and relevance panels: For the relevance panel, people are recruited from within the region. Criteria involve appropriate for the region, multiple IPM tactics, stakeholder involvement, and regional importance. Should the SRIPMC continue doing the relevance panel, and should we continue doing it separately?
 - The intent of the relevance panel is to determine the relevance of the proposals for the region. The only people who can determine that are people from the south.
 - The relevance panel is worth the cost
 - Perhaps you should do the technical panel first and then have the relevance panel look only at the ones that are technically sound. However, each proposal needs to receive a thorough review.
 - **The AC recommended continuing the relevance panel**
- Evaluation type: should we continue? If the proposal is technically sound, it's automatically relevant.

- Evaluation type shouldn't get any higher standing than any other proposal.
- Paul: since we're doing an evaluation workshop, we might be able to pull together a proposal.
- If a project is worth funding, it will pass relevancy panel.
- We need to find someone who has the expertise to put a group together to get the funds.
- Perhaps we should tweak the research RFA to say that we're looking for evaluation tools. Perhaps give extra points to evaluation component of a proposal, and explain what we're looking for.
- Make evaluation a requirement of the project.
- Perhaps make evaluation part of the evaluation workshop.
- Maybe put the evaluation type in extension. (It doesn't say where money comes from, so extension people can apply for it)
- It takes a lot of money to get a good evaluation for a project.
- Maybe create a working group that could get those numbers. The group could pick a project every year to find those numbers.
- We need the \$100,000 to hire an economist to get those numbers.

The 2012 IPM Center

Historically, the Center does

- the state networks, IPM documents and working groups for part 1,
- seed and capstone projects for part 2
- AC and SC
- Evaluation
- PIPE
- CEAP
- NC Coordination
- NCPN
- NPDRS

What should our priorities be? Should we pick a priority? The western IPM Center plans to have an annual theme. Should we do that?

Feedback

- By having a theme, you'll eliminate potential applicants. This funding is good to get seed and capstone funding, and there aren't many places to get that funding.
- What if you decide on a theme and get no applicants?
- Many other funding sources are becoming very targeted, and there aren't sources for funding for small projects. This is a place for regional action.
- This funding captures the diversity of the IPM program.
- The problem is that if you address everything, it's hard to appear that you're addressing anything.

- Utilize your priorities in the part 2.
- Maybe some of the money can be targeted toward a theme.
- The openness of the competition says that the Center is open to projects of merit.

Do the Information Networks add value?

The committee suggested that the networks needed to continue but could perhaps be more efficient.

Maybe in the next iteration of the Center, we could hire an economist to evaluate projects that have already been done.

- Maybe use a student?
- Really need an economist
- Maybe boll weevil economist group at NC State