

## **Steering Committee Meeting Report December 5, 2006**

**Present:** Ples Bradley, Eric Young, John Anderson, Pat O'Leary, Jim VanKirk, Ames Herber, Carrie Harmon, Harold Coble, Steve Hopkins, Steve Toth, Rosemary Hallberg, Tammy Van Duyn, and Venkat Pedibhotla (by phone)

### **Update on projects**

- Advisory Council had some discussion about NC State's success with the RIPM grant, but that historical data proved that NC State had been successful even before the Center was at the university.
- S-RIPM included an evaluation type last year but did not fund any proposals of that type.
- SRIPMC Budget is continuing at a little under \$1 million per year.
- The RFA for the regional Centers will be coming out in February or March and we will be asking some of you for letters of support to include with our proposal.
- Jim is still heavily involved in the PIPE project; however, this year half of his salary is being paid from the PIPE, and we were able to hire Tammy Van Duyn as a projects coordinator with some of the savings.

### **PIPE Update**

- A steering committee has been formed
- This year there is the possibility of a Congressional appropriation that will allow the Risk Management Agency money to be used for other pests.
- Web site: [ipmpipe.org](http://ipmpipe.org)

### **Priorities**

Unresolved issues from the AC meeting:

PMSPs:

- Revise old PMSPs rather than write new ones. An inaccurate old one is more detrimental than not having one at all, since EPA uses them to make decisions. You may not need to gather stakeholders to revise a PMSP (S
- Suggest we contact primary authors of current PMSPs and survey them to see if they need to be redone, or if not the whole, what part needs to be redone
- Suggest if the Center receives feedback that a specific PMSP is needed (new), the Center should ask the Steering Committee for funding rather than writing it into an RFA.

## IPM Standards:

- There was considerable discussion about whether to develop IPM standards rather than PMSPs and whether to mention them as a specific priority in the IPM Enhancement RFA. Concern was that there was no template for IPM Standards, but others said that templates existed elsewhere.
- Action item: find an example template that would go out with the RFA
- Action item: mentioning this issue at the SERA03 meeting (although that meeting is after the RFA will be released).

## Glyphosate Stewardship Program

Sue Ratcliffe explained that the North Central region is sponsoring an event to bring weed scientists together who have been dealing with glyphosate-resistant weeds specifically in cotton. The event will be a forum that will be billed as being sponsored by the North Central region and possibly the Southern Region, if the Steering Committee agrees to it. The event will be multi-state, multi-regional and multi-crop. Details are still being worked out, including the length of the event. The main expense will be the speakers and the meals and snacks.

### Discussion:

- Need to see a proposal on paper before the Southern Region commits
- Need to know how this meeting will differ and be more effective than other weed science society meetings in other regions.
- The North Central region is holding the event whether or not the Southern region agrees to co-sponsor, but the invitation to sponsor was primarily because Southern region weed scientists will be invited to speak at the meeting.
- The committee wants to see a plan of deliverables and find out how it will involve and impact stakeholders.

## IPM in Schools

The Advisory Committee recommended that we do not put anything about IPM in Schools in an RFA, but that we hold a workshop. Steve Hopkins volunteered to put together a workshop and involve the Centers for Disease Control and other representatives from EPA.

### Discussion:

- Need to figure out what the deliverables would be
- Should this be a train the trainer model?
- Tentative spending limit is \$15,000, although the Steering Committee did not set a specific one; if significantly over that, the Center will ask the Steering Committee for a definite decision.

## **NRCS**

The Advisory Committee suggested that we hold a workshop about how this partnership would work in the second half of next year. A couple of people suggested that this topic really needed a work group. A proposal for a work group has never been submitted by any state in the Southern region.

### **Strategic and Communications Plans**

- Do we need to use logic models?
- Tie goals back to IPM Road Map and risk reduction.

### **Membership**

Several members have been inconsistent or delinquent in their attendance at these meetings. Jim asked the committee to discuss whether or not to rotate them off. Additional expertise that could be represented would be the environment, landscaping, and IPM in schools.

### **Project Reports**

There is a report template online. Jim and Ron are members of National IPM Evaluation Group (NIPMEG) including EPA, NRCS, CSREES and the Centers on how to collect impact data and report on it. The goal is to be able to click on a pest and find everything that has been reported on it.

### **Next Meeting**

July 9-10 in Raleigh