



Welcome to Southern Exposure Revamped

Welcome to the first quarterly edition of *Southern Exposure*. We have a lot of changes in store for the newsletter that we are very excited about. In addition to the changes you will see in *Southern Exposure*, we recently launched the first edition of *NewsFlash*. *NewsFlash* will start out as a monthly news update with important information from within the southern region and across the nation. Once established, we hope to transition *NewsFlash* to a continuous release – i.e. news items are displayed as they are submitted and as long as they are timely.



With the shift to a quarterly publication and the introduction of *NewsFlash*, *Southern Exposure* will be able to focus more on in-depth success stories and feature articles from across the southern region. Please feel free to contact me at any time with story ideas and additional information.

In addition to the concentration on feature and success stories, we will continue profiling individuals and organizations that have made a positive impact in their communities and the region. There will also be Center updates and information on upcoming events.



Southern Exposure will remain an online publication, and we are implementing a listserv so that individuals may sign up to receive the newsletter, or unsubscribe if the need arises. To subscribe please send an e-mail to newsletter-subscribe@sripmc.org. Please note, if you received an e-mail about this newsletter you are already subscribed to the mailing list and do not need to sign up a second time. We are also looking into printing options for smaller runs available upon request. If you feel this would be a positive service please let me know.

As with any change to a publication we realize there will be some obstacles to overcome and problems to solve. Please let us know if there is anything we can do to make both *Southern Exposure* and *NewsFlash* the best possible news sources available.

I look forward to talking with many of you in the coming months regarding your work, and I am very excited about these improvements to *Southern Exposure*.

- Jennifer Hodorowicz (Jennifer@sripmc.org)



Director's Notes

By now, many of you may have heard the latest plans for IPM Centers in the president's draft budget. In recent years IPM Centers have been funded under section 406 of the USDA budget. This section also includes other IPM programs (CAR – Crops At Risk; RAMP – Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program; MBA – Methyl Bromide Alternatives) as well as Water Quality and other programs. Section 406 has been deleted in the president's latest budget plan for FY2006. The scuttlebutt is that some programs, including IPM Centers, may be moved to the National Research Initiative (NRI). What is still unclear is whether funding of NRI will be increased sufficiently to fund these IPM programs, whether the integrity of IPM Center funding will be maintained under NRI, and whether much higher indirect cost limits under NRI will affect IPM programming. We will be sure to keep you posted on any future developments.



In this issue:

1
Welcome to
Southern Exposure
Revamped

Director's Notes

2
IPM in Florida
Schools

3
Advisory Council
and Steering
Committee Meeting
Update

4
Advisory Council
and Steering
Committee Proposed
Membership

5
Pink Hibiscus
Mealybug Training

SRIPMC Staff
Receive New
E-mail Addresses

If you would like to be added to our monthly distribution list please send an e-mail to:
newsletter-subscribe@sripmc.org

Director's Notes Continued...

The other big news at the Center is in regard to our IPM Enhancement Grants Program. Each year the Center spends almost half of our total budget to support research, extension and development projects through this competitive grants program. This year we received 29 grant proposals. With the help of an expert review panel, we chose to fund 17 projects with more than \$456,000. Watch the *NewsFlash* (www.sripmc.org/news/newsflash.cfm) for a complete list of funded projects, to be released as soon as funding for all projects is approved.

- Director Jim VanKirk

IPM In Florida Schools



In 2003, the Florida School IPM Working Group shifted its emphasis from an informational model of delivering IPM to a demonstration model. With this shift in focus, the first order of business was to verify the level of IPM implementation occurring in the state. The group chose the Brevard School District as the pilot school system because it is well managed and has pest problems. The group worked with Brevard to develop a model for future School IPM implementation, where cooperative extension plays an integral role in training and implementation.

The project goal of the working group was to reduce risk from pests and pesticides by implementing verifiable IPM in Brevard County, starting with three pilot schools. The district has 81 schools and 73,000 students. Since the group also views IPM as "integrated people management," they began training teachers and administrators, custodians, and cafeteria staff on what they could do to prevent pests, and ways to monitor pests and pesticide use. They started the program last April with assistance from Marc Lame (Indiana University, Monroe School IPM model) and Dawn Gouge (University of Arizona).

At the mid-point review, the most successful school had a 65 percent reduction in number of pesticide applications, with an average of 32.2 percent across three schools. Pest problems either decreased or did not worsen according to occupants, even with the hurricanes of 2004. Custodians also

noted that cleaning became more efficient because significant amounts of clutter were taken away. School district personnel who were invaluable in reaching these accomplishments include Richard E. Smith, director of Environmental Health and Safety; Earl Lewellan, IPM Coordinator; and Mary Scattergood, Food Services.

The model followed by the IPM working group relies heavily on the "train-the-trainer" concept. The participants in the pilot program engaged in peer mentoring so that their counterparts in other school districts in the state can start IPM programs in their counties. To assist in the education about pest problems, the team publishes a monthly "Pest Press" that is distributed to each of the pilot schools and is available on the web at <http://schoolipm.ifas.ufl.edu/new.htm>.

In addition to the reduction in pesticides used, there are other positive benefits that have stemmed from the implementation of IPM programs. "There has always been a division between the cafeteria and custodial staff. Thanks to this school IPM program, there is a new spirit of cooperation between the two "departments" and they are helping each other. If the cafeteria staff are short-handed, the custodial staff pitches in, and vice versa where the kitchen is concerned. This is great progress!" said Richard Smith.

In early April, IPM Florida (Dean Joan Dusky and Dr. Norm Leppla, UF, IFAS, IPM Coordinator) and EPA presented certificates of appreciation to Dr. Faith Oi, Rebecca Baldwin and Richard E. Smith for their contributions to this successful IPM

program. Thus far, the focus of School IPM has been on interior pest problems, but the group wants to tackle landscape and fire ant issues as the program progresses. In addition, they have received requests from other school districts to work with them on their IPM programs in schools.

For 2005 the group is working toward the goal to expand to other schools, including high schools, with at least one high school with a daycare. The group hopes to have a total of 12 schools with IPM programs in place by the end of 2005.

For more information about Florida School IPM, please visit <http://schoolipm.ifas.ufl.edu>.

Article submitted by: Faith Oi, Norm Leppla, and Jennifer Gillett



Advisory Council and Steering Committee Update

The Southern Region IPM Center Advisory Council and Steering Committee held their semi-annual meeting April 20 and 21 in Raleigh, NC.

The Advisory Council met jointly with the Steering Committee on April 20 and covered a wide range of topics. These topics included a grants program update, with the IPM Enhancement Grants Program (formerly the Center Grants) deadline April 1, 2005 and the review panel meeting in May. In addition, S-RIPM received 47 proposals and funded eight spanning five states.

Mike Fitzner gave a brief update on the Federal Budget, and SERA003 gave background on their organization and updates from their past meeting including recommendations for the Center. Jennifer Gillett discussed the IPM Florida structure and Lane Price with NRCS discussed the Conservation Security Program. One of the most in-depth dis-

Steering Committee for final approval and adoption. These recommendations include:

- All qualities being equal, the Center will rank the IPM focus areas identified in the National IPM roadmap as:
 - 1 – agriculture
 - 2 – community and urban IPM
 - 3 – natural areas
- The Center will address the three risk issues identified in the National IPM roadmap (economic, environmental, and health) equally.
- The next RFA for RIPM needs to include a strong emphasis on the impact of IPM programs.
- The Center will continue to support “extension education” i.e. CEUs, distance learning etc. but will not expend significant resources on IPM education in the traditional, on-campus, degree-related sense. The Center will also downplay the academics section from the Web site.
- S-RIPM will maintain a strong multi-state focus, while IPM Enhancement Grants will allow single state issues. While IPM Enhancement Grants allow single state issues, we will still encourage a multi-state focus.
- When preparing RFAs, Center staff will not make particular distinctions regarding other sources of funding, crisis situations, major vs. minor crop, etc. If a factor, these criteria will be of low priority for RFAs.
- Center managed RFAs will not award bonus points under “addressing stakeholder identified needs” for specifically citing a PMSP. However, the grant writer needs to include evidence of stakeholder identified needs, and Center staff will provide

guidelines as to what are considered acceptable stakeholder identified needs.

Other topics discussed included the Advisory Council membership guidelines that were forwarded to the Steering Committee to review and discuss. Some recommendations include a 3-year rotation, having specific organizational seats that remain on the Council at all times, and the maximum capacity of the Advisory Council. The Steering Committee discussed these guidelines and will work with Center staff in the upcoming months to finalize the bylaws. The Steering Committee is also working to set guidelines and membership representation of their own.

The Steering Committee also voted on and made recommendations to Center staff regarding the publication strategy, foundation funds account, SERA003 recommendations, and a possible meeting with 1890 Universities in the southern region.

Both the Advisory Council and Steering Committee approved the publication strategy with changes to *Southern Exposure* and the implementation of *NewsFlash*.

The Advisory Council and Steering Committee approved the idea of pursuing less restrictive funds for the Center. These funds will help support items such as promotional items, guest speakers, receptions etc. The Steering Committee approved a working group comprised of Jim VanKirk, Larry Elworth, Jennifer Gillett or

Norm Leppa, Ron Stinner, and Pat O’Leary to establish a plan and set guidelines for use of these funds.



Advisory Council and Steering Committee Members

In concurrence with the recommendations of the Priorities Subcommittee, the Steering Committee approved the recommendations from the SERA003 as they coincided with the Center priorities.

Finally, the Committees recommended that Center staff plan an information meeting with 1890 Universities to cover and discuss Center activities and grant programs. Jim VanKirk, Jimo Ibrahim, Eric Young, Roy Bullock, Jennifer Hodorowicz, and Mike Fitzner will work together to plan this meeting and get the details in order.

The next Advisory Council meeting will be October 19, 2006, and the Steering Committee will set their next meeting date once the membership has been set.



Advisory Council and Steering Committee Members

cussions of the meetings surrounded the setting of priorities in the Southern Region and reviewing the work done by the Priorities Subcommittee the day before. The Priorities Subcommittee recommended the following priorities to the Advisory Council, who then passed on the recommendations to the

Advisory Council Composition:

The AC will include representatives from the stakeholder groups shown below. Individuals may represent more than one group.

- Research and extension personnel from 1862 and 1890 land grant universities
- Non-land grant universities
- Agricultural consultants
- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)
- Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program
- Other related agencies (e.g. NASS, Foundation for IPM Education)
- Natural Resource Conservation Service
- Southern Plant Diagnostic Network
- State lead agency (e.g. Dept. of Agriculture) for pesticide regulations
- Non-governmental environmental organization
- EPA – national
- EPA – regional
- Growers and grower organizations
- Extension IPM Coordinators, appointed by SERA003 committee
- IR-4 Project
- CSREES National IPM Program Leader
- Office of Pesticide Management Policy
- Association of Southern Region Extension Directors
- Southern Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors
- State Contact Project leaders
- Agricultural industry (agchem, biotech, etc)
- Southern IPM Center Director and Associate Directors



Steering Committee Composition:

The Steering Committee comprises representatives of organizations, programs, or perspectives that are important to the work of the SRIPMC. Its composition, described below, may be changed through an act of the Steering Committee itself.

Voting representatives:

- Advisory Council leadership (one of either the AC chairperson or AC co-chairperson)
- SERA-003 IPM (2)
- Grower or commodity organization
- Environment / Public Interest organization
- 1890s Land Grant institutions
- Pest Control Operator / Urban IPM provider
- Food Processors or similar "downstream" stakeholders
- EPA
- Southern Region Research and Extension Directors
- Pest Management materials companies (i.e., crop protection materials providers) (2, one of which has strong ties to a Resistance Action Committee)
- Agricultural IPM consultant or consultant organization
- Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) program
- State Contacts funded by the IPM enhancements Grants Program
- IR-4 southern region

Non-voting members:

- Office of Pest Management Policy (OPMP)
- USDA / CSREES

Pink Hibiscus Mealybug Training

In 2004, nursery stock infested with pink hibiscus mealybug was accidentally shipped to 36 states in the U.S. Of the 36 states that received potentially infested plant material, 13 of the states are considered climatically suitable for the establishment of pink hibiscus mealybug. Other states that are not climatically suitable may support pink hibiscus mealybug populations in greenhouse facilities. The 13 states that received infested plant materials that are climatically suitable for establishment of the pest are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana,



A healthy pink hibiscus (left) and one with severe damage caused by pink hibiscus mealybugs (right).

Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Some states are climatically suitable, but did not receive infested plant material. However, neighboring states may have received infested plant material near bordering states.

To address the distribution of the infested plant materials, USDA-CSREES, APHIS, the Plant Diagnostic Network and the IPM Centers are sponsoring two training teleconferences. The first training teleconference (June 1, 2005 at 2:00 p.m. EST) was designed for broad audiences including master gardeners, regulatory personnel, Extension and Land Grant personnel, commercial landscape and nursery personnel, and the general public. The second training teleconference (June 15, 2005 at 2:00 p.m. EST) is designed for regulatory, Extension and Land Grant personnel who will assist with survey efforts. Both train-



Female pink hibiscus mealybug.

ing teleconferences are approximately one hour in duration.

Each state will also have the opportunity to conduct a state-specific teleconference immediately following each of the national training sessions to discuss development of a state-based response plan for pink hibiscus mealybug. If you are planning a state-specific teleconference, please contact Susan Ratcliffe via email at sratclif@uiuc.edu.

Article information from the North Central's *Connection*.

Contact Us:

For more information, visit our Web site at www.sripmc.org

Director:

Jim VanKirk
919-513-8179
Jim@sripmc.org

Associate Director (Information Technology):

Ron Stinner
919-513-1648
Rstinner@cipm.info

Associate Director (Regulatory Issues):

Steve Toth
919-515-8879
Steve_Toth@ncsu.edu

Communication and Information Specialist::

Jennifer Hodorowicz
919-513-8182
Jennifer@sripmc.org

Programmer:

Jeanne Bacheler
919-513-8181
Jeanne_Bacheler@ncsu.edu

Administrative Assistant :

Jo-Anne Scoggins
919-513-1432
Joanne_Scoggins@ncsu.edu

SRIPMC Staff Have New E-mail Addresses

The Southern Region IPM Center recently implemented Outlook Exchange providing us with new mail server and scheduling capabilities. With the changes to the mail server, we are able to use e-mail addresses that more clearly match our regional roles. Please be sure to update your address books accordingly to reflect these changes.

Jim VanKirk - Jim@sripmc.org
Ron Stinner - Rstinner@cipm.info
Steve Toth - Steve_Toth@ncsu.edu

Jennifer Hodorowicz - Jennifer@sripmc.org
Jeanne Bacheler - Jeanne_Bacheler@ncsu.edu
Jo-Anne Scoggins - Joanne_Scoggins@ncsu.edu

