

Northeast Research, Extension, and Academic Program for IPM*
Newport, Rhode Island
February 27-8, 2007

*Acronyms listed at end

STATE UPDATES

Connecticut – Ana Legrand

[See Ana's report](http://northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/ctreport07.pdf) at northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/ctreport07.pdf

Funding: situation is fair, but can vary year to year

Personnel: Staff changes are minimal. Richard Kiyomoto will implement the wine grape IPM program

Highlights:

IPM school curriculum kits are available, schools are still requesting.

NRCS – this partnership is in its 4th year and is very successful training many growers.

CT has a new publicity brochure to be distributed to stakeholders. It will be updated every other year.

Delaware – Joanne Whalen

[See the Delaware state report](http://northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/DEreport07.pdf) at northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/DEreport07.pdf

Funding: Delaware has seen an increase of \$70K in funds for a total budget of \$170.

Personnel: Bill Cissel is a new extension IPM associate, Brian Kunkel is the new extension ornamental IPM specialist

Maine – Jim Dill and Frank Drummond

Highlights:

- Legislative- Jim is working to pass the Maine Pesticide Education Fund that will charge a fee on consumer purchased pesticides (ag uses are exempt) of 15¢ per container. Funds raised will primarily go to 1) the Board of Pesticides Control for education, licensing, and obsolete pesticide collection, and 2) the Maine Cooperative Extension Pest Management Program for pest management education primarily in community settings. This bill has the potential of raising several hundred thousand dollars and has wide support. They should know by June if this act will pass.
- Held a national certification and training meeting in Portland
- NRCS – Challenging but there is some progress especially in cucurbits.
- IPM Curriculum – IPM curriculum for grades K-12 was recommended by the state. The IPM program will develop the curriculum.
- Ant control – a small allotment of funds will go toward a graduate student who will study ant control. Maine also has a multistate grant with Delaware and New York to develop and ant IPM program.
- An IPM focus group working with organic wild blueberries have developed tactics for insect and weed control, but not diseases yet.
- Organic vegetable production in Maine is increasing and the IPM program is accommodating by launching variety trials.

Maryland. Sandy Sardanelli and Stefan Tubene

[See report](http://northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/mdreport07.pdf) at northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/mdreport07.pdf

Massachusetts – Bill Coli

[See report](http://northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/MAreport_07.pdf) at northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/MAreport_07.pdf

Funding: Federal 3(d) funds remain level and the IPM program has no state funding. Additional funding through the state legislature was anticipated for IPM, but the money, raised through a tax, went back into the general state funds at the Department of Agriculture. Because the funds were raised through a tax, they are prevented from being redirected to universities.

IPM in schools: not all schools have filed IPM plans therefore adoption of IPM is slow.

New crops in MA: immigrant populations are creating a demand for new crops. For those growers who are early marketers, this can be very profitable. Pest control presents challenges since few or no materials are registered for these extremely minor crops and the pest complexes are not well understood.

Personnel: There is a new turf plant pathology position in extension, but Ron Prokopy's position in apple IPM is not filled since the funds are not available. Bill Coli is partially retired.

Website: needs work, but there are no funds to do the work. IPM Guidelines are on the web.

Success story: Eco-apple is a project that involves setting IPM guidelines to qualify for marketing. In the past, marketing guidelines have been controversial, as growers had no economic reason to comply with a program that restricted use of certain pest control options. Now there is an economic incentive to comply with the guidelines since profits are higher for those selling under the Eco-apple label. There is potential to move this to other crops like lettuce.

New Jersey – no report

New Hampshire – no report

New York – Curt Petzoldt

[See report](#) (pdf)

The IPM program in NY has been state funded since 1986. There is a new report covering success over the last 20 years. See it on line at nysipm.cornell.edu/reports/ann_rpt/20yr/default.asp

IPM Adoption Survey: In 1989, the NY IPM Program surveyed residents to determine attitudes about IPM asking questions like, “have you heard of IPM”, “would you pay more for IPM grown produce”, “should stores carry these products”, etc. Once respondents understood the concept of IPM, they supported the idea. This survey was repeated in 1995 at which point more people had heard of IPM. Last year, in a telephone survey, 15% of respondents had heard of IPM, but ~70-80% supported the concepts. As a result, Curt feels there needs to be more effort to market the concept of IPM to consumers.

Pennsylvania

[PA IPM – Report of progress](#), February 2007 see at paipm.cas.psu.edu/pdf/AnnualReport2.pdf

[News releases from PA IPM](#) – see at <http://paipm.cas.psu.edu/10.htm>

- The program is increasing its emphasis on urban IPM with efforts in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. In Pittsburgh, they are working with the IPM Institute's STAR program.
- In Pennsylvania, each school is required to have an IPM plan, but enforcement of the law is weak. The IPM program is working to make the law stronger.

- PA is intensively working with NRCS to increase funding for IPM related activities in the field.
- IPM-PIPE (pest information platform for extension and education). This national pest modeling and prediction tool originally funded by the Risk Management Agency (RMA) began in response to the need to track soybean rust damage but is expanding to other legumes. RMA manages crop insurance payments so they are interested in using PIPE to record damage and connect damage with pest management practices.
- APHIS, the PA Department of Agriculture, and the IPM Program are working together on a new idea utilizing interested citizens to help identify invasives. The program is similar to the weather service using citizens to report weather events.
- Colony collapse – Ed has a graduate student addressing this mysterious issue.

Personnel:

Cathy Thomas is IPM Coordinator at the Department of Agriculture and is spending some of her time working with the IPM program to create basic pest management tactics for Christmas trees. Dennis Calvin has moved from field crop entomology to administration. Erik Wolf is no longer with the plant pathology department.

Rhode Island – no report

Vermont

See handout at northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/VTreport07.pdf

Personnel: Four people are funded through the IPM program for an equivalent of 1.5 FTE. Most of the funding is through 3(d) that is supplemented through grants.

West Virginia

See handout at northeastipm.org/nereap/2007/Wvreport07.pdf

NATIONAL – Mike Fitzner and Marty Draper

Marty Draper is the new program leader responsible for 3(d) funding and will represent CSREES to the regional technical committees. Mike Fitzner will remain involved in IPM efforts overall and the IPM Centers. Contact Marty at mdraper@csrees.usda.gov 202.401.1999

Reporting

Marty reminds IPM Coordinators that their annual reports are due by the end of March with a focus on success stories meaning indicators of measurable change as a result of IPM program work.

Questions and Answers:

- Q: Can new areas of emphasis be added to the reporting system? A: Marty will find out and report back to the group.
- Q: How can an IPM Coordinator report on an area that is not in his plan of work? A: add an amendment.
- Q: Are PPRS reports used in PART reviews? A: Yes. They are VERY helpful.
- Q: Access is limited. Can it be more accessible? A: Marty will check.

IPM-PIPE (Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education)

This computer program models the movement of soybean rust, but is planned to expand to other pests and crops in the future. John Ayers and Ed Rajotte are on the Steering Committee of this collaborative project involving the National Plant Diagnostic Network, IPM Centers, and others. Submit your ideas for expansion to Marty.

Questions:

Q: Can this modeling program track resistant weeds? A: Not sure, but Marty will suggest.

NRCS/IPM Task Force

An NRCS/IPM task force is under development with the purpose of increased cooperation between these agencies at the national level. It is led by Mike Brewer, IPM Coordinator from Michigan. Drafts of the new Farm Bill suggest additional funding for EQIP. Having a dialog between NRCS and CSREES at the national level might help us to provide direction for that funding.

Budget - Mike

All congressional earmarks, including many in IPM, will not be funded this year leaving large quantities of money shifted into Hatch formula funds. The 2007 budget seems level with 2006 with the big losers being organic transition and soybean rust funds (the \$2.4 million will not come through for soybean rust). Other programs that previously were not competitively funded must now compete including IR-4 and PMIDSS. The president's 2008 budget is available to view and includes a shift of 406 programs including IPM Centers, and granting programs such as CAR and RAMP into NRI with the logic that combining many individual lines of IPM funding into one bigger program area would be helpful in increasing IPM funding overall. The new program within NRI would have 3 functions: 1) IPM tactics, 2) Diversified IPM Systems (RAMP) and, 3) IPM Center coordination. All would remain competitive.

Questions:

Q: Would the 406 programs maintain their integrity in NRI? A: It's unknown, but the staff who handle the program now are likely to remain the same.

Q: would indirect allowables change? A: the current cap of 20% would increase to 27%.

Q: Since IPM earmark funds are redirected to Hatch rather than 3(d), is there a way encourage administrators to direct it to IPM? A: Since the funds need to be moved quickly it's unknown how they will be allocated but the requirement for Hatch funds to be multistate has increased from 25% to 60%, so multistate projects in IPM are in good shape.

NATIONAL IPM COMMITTEE – Ed Rajotte

Ed's goal is to increase awareness between NEREAP and the National IPM Committee. The NEREAP chair and chair elect are invited to the annual fall meeting in Washington in October 2007 along with the northeast representative of ECOP and ESCOP (Roger Adams and Mike Hoffman) and IPM Center representatives. Frank Zalom and Ed have notes from the meeting. Ed asks for input into the agenda.

Questions:

Q: Is there an official committee? A: no

Q: What is the purpose of the committee? A: to coordinate between government agencies and state IPM Coordinators. Usually the group will focus on a particular issue. This year it's NRCS.

Q: Where are the notes housed? Can NEREAP members have a copy? A: Ed is not sure if the notes are posted. A report goes to NASALGC.

EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS – Mike Hoffmann

About \$20 million in earmarks will be redistributed to states through Hatch funds. Those states with many earmarks stand to lose the most with smaller states possibly benefiting the most. CSREES will work this out by March 15th. How the funds are disbursed within each state is up to the college directors e.g. the three deans at the Cornell College of Agriculture and Life Sciences will decide how the money will be allocated. New requirements for Hatch funds state they be distributed competitively and a high percentage must be targeted to multistate projects. In 2008, special project funds may be back in the federal funds, but another 2008 scenario requires 60% of Hatch funds to be competitively disbursed, which causes problems in states where Hatch funds historically pay for faculty salaries.

Another large change is the switch of IR-4 funding to a competitive system. IR-4 holds little reserve funds and colleges do not have resources to pay the salaries of IR-4 personnel if their federal funding does not come through.

EXTENSION DIRECTORS – Roger Adams

Budget: Earmark or special projects have been cut from the 2007 budget and the savings from this will be redistributed to states through their Hatch funds and Smith Lever formula allocations. In some states, that money may be able to go back to the special project, but if the state doesn't receive as much funding as was taken away in special projects, then the work may be discontinued. Some states will have a net gain in funds and some a net loss. Those who manage the Hatch and Smith Lever funds will decide how the funds are distributed/used in each state.

Funding for Extension 3(d) programs is forecast to be flat while Extension 3(b) and 3(c) funds are set to increase.

Roger feels the 406 funds allocated to CAR, RAMP, IPM Centers and other programs would be better served in NRI since the many small line items for IPM are at risk of being cut. The President's budget reduces formula funds while increasing competitive funds. If more Hatch and Smith Lever funds become competitive, smaller states with smaller programs will be at a competitive disadvantage as faculty reach grant saturation sooner than large states with more faculty.. Including language in the Farm Bill may keep more stability in IPM budgets by combining IPM interests of multiple agencies into one. Extension's proposal for this consolidation is coined CREATE-21 or Creating Research, Extension, and Teaching Excellence for the 21st Century. The head of the CREATE-21 program would be politically appointed.

eXtension: eXtension provides websites, personalized by state, where the public can search for extension-based information available through peer reviewed communities of practice. Terry Meisenbach is the contact for eXtension questions.

Awards: Each year, the Northeast Extension Directors make up to three awards of Excellence in Extension but Roger doesn't see many submissions in the area of IPM. Contact Roger for the request for applications for this ~\$1000 award for program development.

UPDATE FROM THE CENTER

The IPM Centers went through a review of their program and progress in early 2006 resulting in specific recommendations for the Northeast of:

- In the future Northeast Community and Urban Workshop, consider including school IPM and other interest groups
- Provide advice on developing and implementing strategic plans to other regions
- As the region most heavily focused on urban IPM, consider adaptations to Northeast model that are applicable to urban areas in the other regions.

[See the whole review](http://ipmcenters.org/IPMCenterReview2-06.pdf) at ipmcenters.org/IPMCenterReview2-06.pdf and the [Center's response to the review](http://northeastipm.org/reviewresponse.pdf) at northeastipm.org/reviewresponse.pdf. As a result of the review, the NEIPMC strategic plan will be modified at the next advisory council meeting.

SYSCO

Carrie and Curt will both attend a food industry summit led by SYSCO to work on how the food industries can work with the land grant universities. The summit will be in Sacramento in March 2007. Questions they hope to answer are: How can processors better communicate their activities to State IPM Programs and IPM Centers? What support can states and IPM Centers offer? Are there success stories to tell? What can SYSCO do for IPM Programs?

Questions (Q) and Comments (C):

Q: is SYSCO educating chefs about IPM? A: SYSCO's interest is in responding to demands from its large buyers such as universities and schools.

C: make sure IPM is included in SYSCO's standards. Companies such as SYSCO and Wegmans are very interested in IPM guidelines (elements, protocols, etc) that have already been developed by IPM Programs. The IPM Center recently funded development of 2 new IPM Guidelines and review of 2 more as well as developing a guide to making IPM Guidelines. IPM Guidelines (elements, etc) in some states are a point-based system, but guidelines for SYSCO can be broader. A tiered system of high, medium and low level IPM adoption allows for flexibility.

IPM Working Groups:

The IPM Center increased the funding cap for IWGs to \$20,000. The vegetable IWG has distributed funds for an IPM exchange program to fund travel for those working in the area of IPM to go to meetings with the agreement that the funded person would later distribute knowledge gained to other audiences in the Northeast. [The RFA](http://northeastipm.org/iwg/veg/2007/EduExchangeOct07.pdf) is on the IPM Center's website at northeastipm.org/iwg/veg/2007/EduExchangeOct07.pdf.

The Community IWG received funds to hold a summit bringing those concerned with water quality and residential IPM together. The summit will be on July 17-18, 2007 outside Philadelphia.

The marketing IWG received funds to create a display and brochure addressing IPM marketing.

Communications:

Liz Myers completed an evaluation of the IPM Center's publications. The Center is considering initiating focus groups to help determine the most appropriate communication needs.

Housing and Urban Development – Healthy Homes Project

Carrie is working with HUD's Emily Williams to sketch out a memorandum of understanding between HUD and CSREES's IPM Centers to train public housing managers in IPM practices in 12 cities across the country. This will be a 3-year project with the objective of housing residents and managers having a better understanding of IPM techniques to reduce pests in public housing.

Comment: Rutgers has developed a training CD already. Contact George Hamilton for information on his project partnered with his neighboring state of Pennsylvania.

IPM – PIPE

This is a strong and successful project that visually tracks pests across the nation using sentinel plots. Originally funded by the Risk Management Agency, the funding pool has diversified. It first tracked soybean rust but has since expanded to soybean aphid and they are now looking at other legumes and pests.

PMAP panel review: Carrie and John are always interested in volunteers to be part of the relevancy panel.

IPM Center Grants programs:

RIPM – 37 proposals were submitted which is the highest number ever. Seven were funded.

Partnership: 34 proposals were submitted, but it's not determined how many have been funded yet.

Comments: Grants.gov process was discouragingly complicated. There must be a smoother way to electronically submit.

EPA UPDATES

Region 2 – Audrey Moore

[See handout](#)

PESP only received one proposal for funding. This may be due to the difficult requirements of the RFA and the 40% overhead requirement.

Region 1 – Andrea Szylvian

SAI submitted proposals are also down in region 1 for a program worth \$117,000. There were only 4 applicants.

Other news:

- Worker protection standards are being revised
- New pesticide containment regulations are now out and can be viewed on the EPA.gov website.

STRENGTHENING RELATIONSHIPS

How can IPM partnerships within the Northeast be strengthened?

- NEREAP could apply for funding to help sponsor a regional conference.
- The Center could develop a PowerPoint or a compelling story for states to use to train NRCS about the basics of IPM.
- Subcontracting Center funds is too slow of a process to encourage states to work together.
- Since state IPM budgets are tight, can states share IPM specialists? Response: this decision is at the level of the deans and directors and is not often popular when it comes to deciding how salaries are paid.
- Have the Centers consider whether funds spent on PMSPs are well spent since the EPA has finished its chemical review process.

PROPOSAL REVIEW

[See Proposal](#)

Lorraine reviewed the objectives of the proposal giving NEREAP the authority to continue to function. Reporting out of the meeting minutes is required. There was a discussion about incorporating outcomes from state IPM programs, but IPM Coordinators have many demands on their time and some feel putting more effort into reporting for NEREAP is not the most effective use of their time.

NEREAP membership is determined at the state level. States can nominate up to 3 people who represent extension, research, and academics but states are not required to have any representation. Membership has become less diverse with a heavy focus on extension. NEREAP is a coordinating committee only, not a formal regional project thus has fewer requirements and no funding. One IPM Coordinator expressed frustration at the increase in the amount of work required by the coordinator position while the funding remains level. In order to make NEREAP work more worthwhile, there needs to be some funding. Becoming a regional project would provide funds but would also require stricter reporting, more effort, and may be perceived as redundant to IPM Centers work. NEREAP had more focus when it was more involved in the Regional IPM Grants program

Discussion and Comments:

- While redundancy is negative, overlap can be synergistic, so working as a regional project might help the IPM Centers.
- Can NEREAP be more closely affiliated with the Centers? It would help if the Center paid for travel to the NEREAP meeting in exchange for NEREAP helping on a regional project that could be perceived as a collaborative effort between states and the IPM Center.
- If NEREAP were part of the advisory council, it would have more of a role in the Center.
- IPM Coordinators must pay their own travel expenses for the NEREAP meeting. Directors do not pay this cost in any of the northeast states. Since state IPM funds are so tight, this travel is becoming a burden.
- NEREAP could apply to become a working group as long as its goal is well outlined.
- It's important for IPM Coordinators to be officially recognized by gathering to talk about common issues.

BUSINESS

Curt Petzoldt is nominated to be incoming chair. The next meeting will be in Providence, Rhode Island on March 25-26, 2008.

A suggestion was made to have state reports focus on one or two key state projects augmented by a written report with details on the rest of the state activities.

EVALUATION – Bill Coli

Bill lead the group through a program planning process (or logic model) which helps to outline the steps to meet the IPM goals of improving human health, the environment, while maintaining or improving farm economics. Bill pointed out that activities are easier to document than long-term impacts. Two-year grants can hardly begin to provide enough data to determine outcomes projected into the future. Bill explained that some extrapolation is acceptable in projecting what the outcomes will be in the future even if not fully documented until much later. Extrapolate impacts and state the expectations of change over time. Speculation is sometimes the best we can do. Baseline evaluation work is needed to measure against in the future.

The National IPM Evaluation Group (NIPMEG) continues to work on filling out these logic models or program planning and assessment tools and will send to the IPM Coordinators for review and feedback. Part of NIPMEG's goal is to develop methods to measure impacts.

Discussion:

- John Butler pointed out that he has extended some of his project funding to more fully measure the impacts.
- Adding an evaluation component to a project can be expensive therefore granting agencies need to allow project directors to set aside funds to do evaluation 3 to 5 years from the initial project start date.
- New York invests in surveys every 5 years to provide baseline data but it's expensive.
- Other sources of baseline data include state departments of environmental protection.
- Maybe some of the unencumbered Hatch funds could be used for NEREAP to work on an evaluation survey of several crops in the region. A regional response would have merit. NEREAP could also apply for funding through the Center to do evaluation work.

Action item: There is a motion made for NEREAP to become a regional evaluation work group. All are in favor. Bill offered to be a co-leader for a working group proposal. NASS may be able to help. Curt offered to help with the survey aspect since NY has done some survey work with NASS already. Make sure the working group proposal includes travel funds for NEREAP or at the very least funding to cover food and the meeting room. The Center also has a minigrants program for projects up to \$8,000. For communications purposes, the listserv address NEREAP-L@cornell.edu goes to all NEREAP members and can be used by all NEREAP members.

IPM PRIORITIES USED FOR GRANT FUNDING DECISIONS

The IPM Center needs succinct IPM needs lists to help make funding decisions. A number of processes are used to narrow down the many IPM needs into what are the highest priorities. These lists are created by IPM programs, commodity groups, IPM Working Groups, and are an integral part of PMSPs. Methods for creating these lists are sometimes questionable and the Center asked for feedback on some of the issues it has with IPM priority lists.

Discussion:

What should the process be to gather priorities to distribute IPM funds and what is done in individual states?

- In Vermont, participants are asked for their input and then the Coordinator summarizes the responses.
- In NY, committees of IPM staff, faculty, extension, and outside stakeholders centered on particular areas of emphasis, meet to create lists of IPM priorities annually. Other stakeholder committees review and edit. They use meetings, email, and telephones to gather stakeholder input. The priority lists are sometimes ranked but not always.
- In MA they used to create IPM priority lists in a manner much like that used in NY but since funding for IPM has been cut so severely, the priority setting is more informal. Extension specialists and commodity groups meet to discuss priorities.
- In PA, Ed feels that IPM Centers should be gathering regional priorities as part of its regular tasks helping alleviate a burden on the states.

Should state lists be used when considering regional grant funding?

- VT feels that priorities from small states are lost when priority setting is done on a regional basis.
- PA feels that either someone should be hired to do the priority setting process or Centers should set regional priorities with the advise from groups like NEREAP on the process.

Discussion:

- The relevancy panel for RIPM should be given clear instructions to look at the regional priority lists. Panel members often miss this.
- Regional grant funding should cite regionally based priority lists that are broad, not just state specific lists or specific pests.
- Priority setting is an inexact science with some lists being very detailed and others very broad. Some NEREAP members feel that staying broad is better and some feel very specific priorities are needed.
- Don't include the actual votes given to individual priorities on the IPM Center's list but instead use the vote counts as a cutoff for what is included in the priority lists.
- Leave plenty of turn around time when requesting priority suggestions and voting in order for states to adequately respond.
- **Action item:** Carrie suggested a matrix of priorities combining the top 5 state priorities. Many of the Coordinators like this idea that allows for both specific and broad priorities. The broad categories of the current priority list (e.g. biocontrol) would be one axis of the matrix and the states could fill in the more specific crops or pests on the other axis with the input from their state extension specialists. Many Coordinators suggest we try this method as see how it works limiting states to 10 submitted items.
- NEREAP could apply for a minigrant to set regional priorities.

Action item: A committee is formed to work on next steps: Sandy, Ed, Rakesh, Ana, Mark, Liz, Carrie. The charge of this group is to develop the matrix idea and describe how information will be gathered to populate the matrix.

NRCS - Ed Rajotte – [See Ed's Power Point.](#)

Ed's program has developed a NRCS/IPM website: <http://Paipm.cas.psu.edu/nrcs.html>. Historically NRCS only dealt with soil-oriented activities at the county or state level and IPM did not always fit into that structure. To help speed the process of incorporating IPM into NRCS programs, a national task force formed at the October 2006 national IPM committee meeting consisting of Mike Fitzner, Ed Rajotte, Mike Brewer and others who were interested in working at national level cooperation between the programs. The head of NRCS agreed cooperate with this group.

In the ensuing discussion, it becomes clear that each state works with NRCS in its own individual way some more successfully than others.

Ana has been very successful in CT in acquiring funding from NRCS to train IPM techniques to growers on a weekly basis for 3 years. The Land Grant University in Connecticut is considered a technical service provider and can purchase items such as weather equipment since there are not many private consultants to help implement IPM. IPM Guidelines are helpful, but hands on training is key to understanding IPM methods. The NRCS contacts working with Ana were surprised at the intricacies of teaching IPM in the field.

PPRS – Program Planning and Reporting System
RAMP – Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program
RMA - Risk Management Agency