

Northeast Research, Education, & Academic Program for IPM (NEREAP)
Meeting Report
April 3, 2006
St. Louis, Missouri

Glossary at end

Attending:

Zane Helsel, John Ayers, Don Rutz, Michael Hoffmann, Carrie Koplinka-Loehr, Odie Swanegan, Richard Casagrande, Ana Legrand, Rakesh Chandran, Sandra Sardanelli, Betty Marose, Jim Dill, David Handley, Audrey Moore, George Hamilton, Rob Koethe, John Butler, Andrea Szylvian, Ed Rajotte, Sue Futrell, Mike Rozyne, Frank Drummond, Liz Thomas, Liz Myers

MEETING OF ALL TECHNICAL COMMITTEES

National Update – Mike Fitzner (all regional technical committees meet together for the national updates)

- **Putting IPM on the map:** The response to soybean rust is a good example of how to make IPM visible to the nation. This project provides the ability to document savings from not applying pesticides due to IPM. PIPE (Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education) is a valuable spin-off of this work involving mapping and modeling of pests.
- **IPM Centers' Review:** An outside panel reviewed the IPM Centers in mid-February. The final report is not out yet, but the panel was generally positive. They did ask for Centers to increase the level of participation of IPM Coordinators in Center work, to expand partnerships with other agencies, to develop strategic plans, and to move toward greater collaboration with IR-4. They liked the 2 regional conferences that have been organized by the Centers. They suggest that diversification of Center funding would be wise, and that the Centers need to work on metrics to measure their successes and those they work with.

- **National Budget Outlook:**

Hatch: [The President's budget for 2007](#) again suggests that Hatch funds be partially allocated by formula and part through the competitive process. CSREES and the Land Grant Universities are working on a plan to address this proposed change should it come to pass. Formula funding is less and less encouraged at the federal government level, although it is doubtful that Congress will vote in favor of this change.

406 Funds: These funds include programs such as CAR, RAMP, ORG, Water Quality, and IPM Centers and all are set to move to NRI in the proposed Presidential budget for 2007. The grants programs included in this line of funding will basically be impacted only at the government administrative levels, but IPM Centers would be impacted more than the other grants programs. This proposal has more of a chance of being passed by Congress.

Other Budget Changes: (estimates) IR-4 decreased by 8%, SARE decreased by 20%, Regional IPM Grants increased by 12%, PMAP increased by 12%, NRI increased by 37% (includes \$38 million migration of 406 funds to NRI). Smith-Lever 3d funds increased by 8% or ~\$790,000

which if broken down would be about \$12,000 per state. It might be more effective to use those funds as a lump sum to do a project of national scope that would benefit all states. Mike would like to hear ideas from IPM Coordinators as to how this money would best be spent.

- **IPM Coordinators:** In order for IPM to succeed, we need to have a common agenda. One way to do this is to form closer relationships between IPM Coordinators and the IPM Centers. It is important to include the CSREES logo on work funded through 3d, Hatch, 406 and all CSREES funded work to make sure grassroots stakeholders aware of the important role CSREES plays in research and extension.
- **PPRS – Performance Planning and Reporting System – Bill Hoffman**
 - [See Bill's Power Point presentation](#)
 - Due to feedback from IPM Coordinators the system is in the process of being improved to:
 - Let IPM Coordinators submit more than one success story each year.
 - Help document where the 3d money is spent at each university
 - Shorten the 5-year planning cycle
 - Help with the problem of coming up with measurement numbers, which is not always easy.

MEETING OF NEREAP-IPM

Red Tomato Marketing Ideas - Mike Rozyne and Sue Futrell

- A main objective for Red Tomato is to see growers using the most advanced ecological growing techniques. It's a cycle that builds upon itself with the theoretical final result of a price incentive to growers, but marketing is key. Just because products are grown using IPM techniques does not mean that the consumer understands what that means and is willing to pay a premium for those products.

To attract consumers, the marketing plan needs to be based on terms that are familiar to the consumer like “fresh”, “local”, “healthy”, “ecological”, and “fair trade”, terms that evoke thoughts of the family farm. Packaging and logistics are also critical.

Successes:

- Northeast strawberries sold for their flavor in the Northeast are capturing back market share from California where size is not an issue, but flavor is.
- Dr. Seuss heirloom tomatoes that have guaranteed *inconsistency*
- Eco-apples – the most earth friendly apples that can be grown in the Northeast.

Some of the trends that Sue Futrell expects to remain strong:

- The organic movement – driven by environmental and health concerns
 - Local – the desire to keep farms small and local is deepening. Local gives a sense of food security as transportation costs to bring food in from long distances rise.
- If the opportunity is now, what do we do?
 - Understand the consumer

- There are a lot of eco labels on the market now. We don't want to compete with organic, how do we fit together? Need to collaborate and unify.
- Evaluate and revise the IPM marketing plan – in the mean time, move ahead with current products and track how they are working.
- Marketing IPM Discussion Points:
 - Walmart recently became one of the biggest sellers of organic foods. Watch to see what this does to marketing organic.
 - Red Tomato identifies the farmers who are producing the products they are selling to drive home the “local” message.
 - The organic community is becoming more fearful of IPM as some growers feel the term has been co-opted by the chemical companies and that IPM is not synonymous with ecologically responsible. Sue Futrell feels there needs to be a dialog between the organic and IPM communities. Some parts of the organic community feel IPM uses the “eco” labeling unfairly.

NRCS and IPM Partnerships – the View from NRCS – Odie Swanegan

- [See powerpoint.](#)
- Suggestions on how to become more involved with NRCS pest management programs:
 - Focus on the primary goals of NRCS programs - reducing non-point source pollution to protect water, air and soil quality.
 - Growers need to know more about what IPM means and how they can qualify as an IPM grower. Educating growers about what NRCS can offer is important.
 - Offer to help NRCS with state-specific version of their conservation practice standards for Pest Management (595) including IPM (by commodity), and through “PAMS” IPM principles – Prevention, Avoidance, Monitoring, and Suppression.
 - Have strong IPM representation on NRCS State Technical Committees.

Successful NRCS/IPM Partnerships – View from the States

Connecticut – Ana Legrand

- [See PowerPoint of Ana's talk](#)
- Key points:
 - IPM Coordinators need to work with the NRCS staff.
 - Educate grower about NRCS programs.
 - In Connecticut, extension personnel qualify as technical service providers. The staff visits growers at regular intervals for up to 3 years.
 - EQIP funding supports development of educational tools such as IPM manuals.

Pennsylvania - Ed Rajotte

- Every state is different. Assistant state conservationist are doing the legwork and are good connections.
- Ed is part of the state tech committee and acts to connect Technical Service Providers with growers.
- In PA, the high value crops were not getting the attention that they deserved. The apple growers wrote the definitions of what qualified as IPM and submitted to NRCS. Following the

development of these IPM standards, fruit crops qualified for \$650,000 of NRCS funds. To succeed, growers and IPM Coordinators need to be personally involved in NRCS at the local level.

Regional Approach - Ruth Hazzard

- The Vegetable IPM Working Group, funded through the IPM Center, held a meeting in Harrisburg in December 2005 with people representing NRCS and IPM for a 1 ½ day discussion of how NRCS and IPM can be mutually beneficial. Although decisions within NRCS are made at the state level, gathering experts from across states was productive in highlighting what works best. The group will continue work and is now building a web page with information intended to be useful to promote more interaction between these two entities in the region.

STATE REPORTS

Connecticut – Ana Legrand

[See handout](#)

Handout highlights:

- Connecticut General Assembly is considering a bill that will provide funding to the IPM program. Federal 3d funds are spent on IPM coordinator salary and IPM school curriculum staff salary.
- In July 2005, the General Assembly approved an act that bans the use of pesticides in any building or grounds of any child day care facility.
- Connecticut *Curriculum for IPM* is progressing.
- Lorraine Los received the ‘Award of Distinction’.
- Funding from NRCS EQIP program continues to support IPM training for organic vegetable growers.
- With funding from USDA NRCS, wine grape IPM training programs were offered again in 2005.
- A 2005 revision to *The Pest Management Guide for Herb Bedding Plants grown in the Greenhouse* is available.

Delaware – Joanne Whalen

Unable to attend.

Maine

- Through a NEIPM Center grant, Maine developed a calibration guide that has been distributed to PESP contacts in all Northeastern states.
- Pro New England – put together a series of cards to market IPM. They have been well received and they now need to print additional copies beyond the original 40,000. The cards have helped to market the work of Pro New England
- The IPM Council in Maine is supporting state legislation to add a 15-cent “tax” on some pesticide products. Fifty percent goes to the Department of Ag. Jim feels that this measure is likely to pass and has the potential of increasing IPM funding by \$300,000 to \$500,000 annually.

- In March 2006, the governor of Maine made an executive order for all government offices to use IPM to manage any pests. Homeowner IPM was mentioned also, although not acted on.
- Maine has a mini-grants program with \$12K of which \$4300 went to support 2 graduate students studying IPM.
- Fire Ant survey – Maine’s Ellie Groden and Kathy Murray are working along with Cornell on a survey of fire ant management.

Maryland – Sandra Sardanelli

[See handout](#) presented at NEREAP and also [Maryland IPM’s annual report](#)

Massachusetts – Bill Coli

Unable to attend. [See handout](#)

New Hampshire – Alan Eaton

Unable to attend

New Jersey – George Hamilton

[See handout](#)

- Rutgers Cooperative Extension (RCE) continues to maintain programs in blueberries, field crops, greenhouses, nursery crops, tree fruit, and vegetables
- RCE provides state funding for IPM but due to budget cuts all programs were hit with a 15% cut.
- In 2004, legislation was passed making the use of IPM mandatory in all New Jersey schools. See progress in handout.
- RCE Vegetable IPM program is receiving funding via the USDA APHIS CAPS program to deal with this emerging invasive species.

New York – Don Rutz

- Don Rutz is the new Director of the New York State IPM Program. Curt Petzolt is the IPM Coordinator.
- NY is working on the spreading bed bug problem not only how they affect humans but also on poultry.

Pennsylvania – Ed Rajotte

See the [Pennsylvania Annual Report](#).

Rhode Island – Dick Casagrande

[See handout](#)

Highlights:

- 3d funding is at \$57K with no state or University of RI funding for IPM.
- A new program promotes weed biocontrol in pasture, ties to URI Water Quality
- Working on bio control for other species as well.

Vermont – Lorraine Berkett

[See handout](#) for more information on Vermont IPM Programs: Apples (including an initiative in organic apple IPM), Greenhouse Ornamentals, Field Corn, Vegetable & Berry, School, and Grape IPM

West Virginia - Rakesh Chandran

[See handout](#)

Highlights:

- Rakesh is working with NRCS to include IPM in tree fruits in the 595 standards.
- Tree fruits are still a main focus of the IPM Program
- Revised pest management publications for field crops, and tree fruits were distributed to extension agents
- Work is on-going to control invasive species and weeds, especially in pastureland
- The WV IPM program is extending its partnerships with other state agencies.

EPA Updates

Region 1 – Rob Koethe and Andrea Szylvian

- [Handout](#) concerning avian influenza
- [Handout](#) about pesticide container regulations
- [Handout](#) regarding changes to the Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) agreement between EPA and USDA that is scheduled to expire in 2006 and become a competitive program in the future. This announcement created a great deal of discussion among IPM Coordinators as it would be unclear who in each state would do this critical work. James Parochetti is the national leader of this program. SEE DISCUSSION AFTER EPA UPDATES

Region 2 – Audrey Moore

- [Handout](#) about children's health initiative
- [Announcement](#) of Strategic Ag Initiative award given to Rutgers to do an impact assessment of "Reduced-Risk" pest management strategies for cranberries in New Jersey
- [A summary](#) of a presentation given at the Pinelands Preservation Alliance's session on Agriculture and Water Resources held to educate non-profit organizations on what programs are available to farmers to protect water resources.
- [An explanation](#) of the SAI Transition Gradient used to evaluate the progress of projects funded through the Strategic Ag Initiative (SAI). Audrey needs feedback by May 5.
- [An announcement](#) that West Point earned the IPM Star Award from the IPM Institute.

Region 3 – John Butler

- [A description](#) of the Healthy Yards, Healthy Lawns, Healthy Environment (H3) Initiative
- [An update](#) on Region 3 grant activities
- [Opportunities](#) involving the SAI toolbox

Discussion of changes to PSEP:

- James Parochetti is the PSEP program leader. He needs to know that the IPM Coordinators are very opposed to changing PSEP from base to competitive funding and that this change will likely shut down many state pesticide education programs. The people who manage PSEP now are the contacts within each state who know and can answer questions about pesticide regulation and pesticide safety. If they are let go, this pool of knowledge will be difficult and

expensive to replace. Also growers are used to the current systems for being certified to work with pesticides.

- The RFA for this newly competitive money has not been written, but is set to be out by July 2006.
- Contact Rob Koethe for more information on this subject.
- One suggestion from the national EPA leaders is to have this money flow through the IPM Centers, but the overhead will be much higher this way and the same people in the states will end up doing the work anyway.
- If PSEP is to be done regionally, individual state issues will not be addressed properly.
- If PSEP money becomes competitive, who will be eligible to apply? Will the process go outside of land grant universities?

Northeastern IPM Center Update:

[See Handout.](#)

Discussion:

Where should the NEREAP web page be housed?

Right now it is on the IPM Center website at http://northeastipm.org/nereap_index.cfm, but some sort of NEREAP report needs to be at the NIMSS site:

[NIMSS: http://nimss.umd.edu/homepages/home.cfm?trackID=1737%20](http://nimss.umd.edu/homepages/home.cfm?trackID=1737%20). (National Information Management and Support System). It is agreed that information should be in both places.

IPM guidelines (standards, elements)

Who is currently working on them? What would it take to move this forward? Guidelines are increasingly important for SYSCO and NRCS and can help to increase funding for IPM being done at the field level. Tom Green and Curt Petzoldt are working on a guide for how to develop IPM guidelines in hopes that more can be written. There is some concern about guidelines that are regional and how they would account for geographic differences in one crop. It is important that these guidelines are created by a knowledgeable group. Carrie has secured money from Mike Fitzner to work on projects that will result in more guidelines being developed.

IPM Priorities

We need more IPM working groups or a different method to collect regional priorities. Should the Center try to organize a group to develop IPM priorities on a one-time basis? It is agreed that developing regional priorities is important and that up-to-date priorities are necessary.

Update from Extension Directors – Zane Helsel

- Smith Lever funds have been level for a long time but costs are increasing. Zane is part of a group working to appropriate more funding for IPM through an institute called Create 21. This proposal combines IPM interests of many agencies – NRI, NASS, National Ag Library, CSREES, ARS, ERS, etc. into an overall IPM management group. Instead of having IPM program leaders in all these agencies, and numerous budget lines, they would be consolidated with the one leader of this program reporting directly to the Secretary of Agriculture (i.e. much closer to the president). This person would be a political appointment. They are working to have this idea incorporated into the Farm Bill in 2011. The idea is to reduce the budget lines into one, far bigger, budget line. This

idea is fomenting from a frustration over a perceived lack of commitment from the USDA for the Land Grant Universities. The funding for each LGU would be similar to what it is now in the Create-21 plan. Zane says there is a team working to increase base funding for extension by 10%.

- eXtension's calls for proposals are out and the program has reasonably good support overall.
- Kevin Keeney's call for changes to the PSEP funding to become competitive is a serious issue.
- Sungrant – multistate, multiagency grants working on energy issues. For agriculture this is particularly important for biofuels.
- NASULG – Has an EPA task force. If NEREAP has issues or comments supporting EPA, let Zane know. Need to know which groups are being helped through EPA e.g. STAR, Water Quality, etc.

National Plant Diagnostic Network - Kitty Cardwell

There is a line item in the President's budget for soybean rust control and some of this money is headed toward the PIPE project which works on pest modeling and predictions. It's critical that this work be driven by the states working together and Centers can help organize these efforts. Kitty has a paper describing this project on the soybean rust site (www.sbrusa.net. Go to the *getting started* link).

Update from the Agricultural Experiment Station Directors – Mike Hoffmann

- Experiment Station Directors are opposed to the proposed changes in Hatch Funds that could result in combining state experiment stations. The Northeast AES Directors met in March to discuss options if this change does come to pass.
- A subcommittee of AES Directors voted to sanctify the renewal of NEREAP.
- The Sungrant funding for biofuels is small now, but NEREAP should be aware that this amount will probably grow in the future.

NEREAP – NEIPM Center Interface.

- This discussion began with a comparison of mission statements and some questions: Is the relationship sufficient? Does it need improvement? Is one day of meeting enough?
- In general, the NEREAP members who do not sit on the NEIPMC Advisory Committee (AC) do not feel well informed about Center activities. How can this be improved? NEREAP members who also sit of the AC have a responsibility to share information gleaned at the AC meetings with the rest of NEREAP. John points out that the AC minutes are on the web. The Center offers to send out the AC agendas to NEREAP in advance of the meeting in order to have time NEREAP to gather input that might be considered at the AC meetings. The Center will continue to post minutes of all AC meetings. When Jim VanKirk was part of the Center, he would help with the facilitation of NEREAP and it is unclear how the Center will fill that role. NEREAP members feel they have lost their group momentum without a point person to coordinate and keep NEREAP records. John confirms that it is the Center's job to help with the coordination of NEREAP, but that NEREAP should take on the leadership of the topics it will address. NEREAP decides that increased communication (bulletin board, conference calls) is important and will take up this topic on a conference call in April.
- For the next NEREAP meeting: Zane feels that a half day of the next NEREAP meeting should be set aside to talk about IPM programs. Time needs to be set aside for NEREAP to make recommendations regarding future IPM Center work. These recommendations can then be reviewed by the Center AC and SC. The agenda for the next meeting should be more technical, proactive, and outcome oriented.
- The group agreed that a one-day meeting is too short.

- The current, past, and present chairs of the NEREAP committee will be the executive committee for NEREAP business.
- NEREAP agrees to convene via conference call on April 24 to gather input for the RIPM RFA.

NEREAP Business:

Membership

- What is the mechanism for membership?
- Zane – during renewal, it came up that directors should look at the representation from their institutions upon the formal renewal this fall. There can be up to 3 representatives from each state: one for research, one extension, and one academic. Each state decides how many representatives and who, but each state only has one official vote in NEREAP business.

New chair: Sandy nominates Ana Legrand who is then approved by the membership

Next meeting: February/March 2007, Newport, Rhode Island.

Action items:

- Include the CSREES logo on all IPM Program communications to increase awareness of projects funded through CSREES.
- Audrey Moore needs feedback on the SAI Transition Gradient used to evaluate the progress of projects funded through the Strategic Ag Initiative (SAI) by May 5.
- Contact Rob Koethe with comments concerning potential changes in the funding of the PSEP programs.
- Submit to Zane: issues or comments supporting EPA for him to submit to the NASULGC’s EPA task force.
- In response to concern over the coordination of NEREAP, the Center agrees to continue to help NEREAP to organize their meetings and communications. To be more aware of the Center Advisory Council actions, NEREAP members are expected to read the AC meeting minutes available on the web.
- At the next NEREAP meeting: 1) set aside to talk about IPM programs. 2) make recommendations regarding future IPM Center work. These recommendations can be submitted for review by the Center AC and SC, 3) The agenda for the next meeting should be more technical, proactive, and outcome oriented.
- The current, past, and present chairs of the NEREAP committee will be the executive committee for NEREAP business for that year.
- Convene via conference call on April 24. Topics: recommendations for RIPM RFA, how to improve communications, date for the next meeting,
- Zane will help to resolve the official membership of NEREAP once the renewal is settled.
- New chair: Sandy nominates Ana Legrand who is then approved by the membership
- Next meeting: February 27 - March 1, 2007, Newport, Rhode Island

Glossary of Terms

AES – Agricultural Experiment Station.

APHIS – Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
ARS – Agricultural Research Service
CAR – Crops at Risk
ERS – Economic Research Service
IR-4 – Interregional Project Number 4
NASULGC – National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.
NASS- National Ag Statistics Service
NRI – National Research Institute
ORG – Organic Transition Program
PIPE - Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education
PMAP – Pest Management Alternative Program
PPRS Performance Planning and Reporting System
PSEP – Pesticide Safety Education Program
RAMP – Risk avoidance and mitigation program
RCE – Rutgers Cooperative Extension
SARE – Sustainable Agriculture Research and Extension.