****

National IPM News Digest, October 2003

****

October 2003

Introduction

I participated in a meeting of the National IPM Committee in Washington DC on September 30th and October 1st, 2003. A key part of the meeting consisted of reports by program leaders for a large number of the federal programs that have a direct involvement in IPM. There was a significant amount of new and interesting information, which we will use within the state and region to assist in planning IPM coordination and support. I took detailed notes during the review sessions, and have edited these into the enclosed news digest. Given the range of programs that were represented, I thought it would be worth sharing these notes with the IPM community in Oregon. Please note however, these are notes taken by me during verbal reports by the individuals that I have listed. Where future funding opportunities are referred to, these are subject to adjustment during the budget process that is now in full swing in Washington.

Note the number of references that were made to the value and importance of Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSP's), as vehicles for determining priorities in pesticide regulation, pesticide registration, research, extension and education. Also, you might like to note the prospect of expanded funding for organic farming research and extension, and new opportunities for growers that may arise through the new NRCS Pest Management Guidelines, that are now a part of conservation planning.

Paul Jepson, IPM Coordinator, Oregon
jepsonp@science.oregonstate.edu

IPM News From USDA
USDA CSREES Plant Systems Group, IPM Program Update

- FY '04 IPM budgets are level, relative to '03, at about $65 million ($15 million in NRI, $5 million in SARE and $45 million in CSREES programs).
- Pesticide Safety Education Program funds are to be reduced (by 40%), for one year, in FY '04. This follows a complex set of discussions and negotiations between USDA and EPA (from whom the funding originates). Although the program is to be reinstated, it may be in a different form from FY '05 onwards.
- In FY '03, 185 grants in the area of IPM, were funded, at an approximate value of $57 million. Funding distributions are given in the Appendix at the end of this document. Note the proportion of funding that resides within special research grants (mainly geographically specific, congressionally designated projects).
- CSREES Integrated Programs in FY '04 will include *ONLY* CAR, RAMP and MBT (http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/programs/pest.htm). Announcements are likely in January. The ORG program will now have its own rfa (see below).
- Biosecurity is now a major theme within the agency, with an $8 million NRI program from the FY '03 budget currently under review (http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/funding/rfanri_integrated_program_03.htm).
- Invasive species fact sheets and pest alerts are now being published in a regular basis (e.g. *Ralstonia*, Emerald Ash Borer (e.g. http://www.na.fs.fed.us/spfo/pubs/pest_al/eab/eab.htm), Soy Bean Rust).
- The IR-4 external review was successful. The program is being encouraged to coordinate and collaborate with the IPM Centers and to use PMSP's in the IR-4 prioritization process (see below).
- A new Federal IPM Coordinating Committee, Chair Harold Coble (harold_coble@ncsu.edu), will focus on implementation of the National IPM Roadmap (Roadmap penultimate version available at: http://www.nepmc.org/national/roadmap/june172003.html).
- A searchable database of IPM expertise, including e-mail addresses and distribution lists) has been launched at (http://www.pmcenters.org/contacts/).
- CSREES has purchased 2000 access points to CABI Compendium products (e.g. the CABI Crop Protection Compendium includes information on 10,000 pests, diseases, weeds and natural enemy species worldwide, 1,850 with complete datasheets). This is to be made available to Land Grant University faculty and staff, free of charge.
- The Regional IPM (RIPM) grants program and the Pest Management Alternatives Program (PMAP), are to be administered by the Regional IPM Centers. PMAP (approx. $1.6 million p.a.) will be divided into five parts, the 5th portion being used for projects of national priority. IPM Centers may be asked to forward proposals to CSREES that fall into this latter category.
- There are opportunities for shared faculty positions and temporary appointments (IPA's) for individuals that are interested in participating in activities in Washington DC.
- The most recent staffing details for CSREES Plant Sciences, including e-mail addresses can be found in the Plant Sciences Update at: http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/whatnew/psupdate03/update803.pdf .
- IPM coordinators are being encouraged to play an active role in the Regional IPM Centers.
- IPM encompasses many areas beyond cropping systems (e.g. schools, rights of way, structural pest control, urban and landscape etc.) and programs are being encouraged to diversify more fully into these sectors.

From a verbal summary by Mike Fitzner (Section Leader, Plant Systems Group; MFitzner@CSREES.USDA.GOV)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency & U.S. Department of Agriculture Committee to Advise on Reassessment and Transition (CARAT)

CARAT (http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/carat/) provides advice to EPA and USDA on strategic approaches for pest management planning, transition, and tolerance reassessment for pesticides, as required by the FQPA. It advises on ways to ensure smooth implementation of FQPA. Their most recent draft report, for review October 1st-3rd, 2003 (http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/carat/2003/carat_trans_wkgroup_recomm_draft7-18-03.pdf), endorses Pest Management Strategic Plans (PMSP's)(http://www.pmcenters.org/CropProfiles/) as a basis prioritizing research, extension and education grant programs, and for setting registration priorities. It recommends that USDA should utilize Farm Bill Conservation Title resources to assist transition to IPM programs and urges NRCS and USDA to find ways of enhancing funds that go to minor crops. Finally, it argues that the role of the Regional IPM Centers (e.g. http://www.wrpmc.ucdavis.edu/) should be enhanced and follow the model for other programs (e.g. IR-4) in having extensive stakeholder involvement. CARAT has a very diverse committee composition, and is in a position to be influential in the shaping of future IPM policy.

From a verbal summary provided by Al Jennings (Director, USDA Office of Pest Management Policy; Allen.Jennings@usda.gov).

IPM Impact Assessment

Bill Coli is on a part-time appointment with USDA CSREES, to offer services to regional IPM Centers in impact assessment for IPM. Dr. Coli developed the IPM Guidelines in Massachusetts (http://www.umass.edu/umext/ipm/ipm_projects/education/ipm_guidelines.html). He has also undertaken one of the most detailed surveys of IPM adoption, within New England States (http://www.umass.edu/umext/ipm/ipm_projects/education/assessing_grower_adoption.html). The adoption measures enabled growers to document IPM practices, and to gain recognition for progress along the IPM continuum. The IPM guidelines provided check lists of IPM practices that could be used to enhance adoption. They also enabled NRCS funding ($15/acre) to support IPM crop consultants.

From a verbal summary by Bill Coli (wcoli@umext.umass.edu).

Federal IPM Coordinating Committee

This Committee will focus upon implementation of The National Roadmap for Integrated Pest Management (IPM) across all the federal agencies that could conceivably have an interest in this IPM (including EPA, NRCS, CSREES, DOD, NASS, OPMP, NPS, ARS, GSA, FS, APHIS, BLM, FWS, ERS). The latest draft of the Roadmap (dated Sept. 18th, 2003 has not yet been distributed nationally) adds further emphasis to non-agricultural IPM, and it outlines the PAMS approach (i.e. each site where IPM is practiced should have management strategies for **P**revention, **A**voidance, **M**onitoring and **S**uppression) as a guide to what IPM is for agencies that have not considered adopting these practices in the past. Some agencies are developing more formal IPM policies and procedures than they have held previously. The Committee requests input from the states and regions for its quarterly meetings.

From a verbal report by Harold Coble (committee Chair; Harold_Coble@ncsu.edu)

Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program

SARE is now in its 15th year and is recognized for its participatory approach, the availability of producer grants, and an emphasis on a whole systems approach (http://www.sare.org/). State SARE contacts and IPM coordinators are encouraged to work together. Producer grants can fund IPM projects, but in the context of soil management,

conservation practices, marketing etc. This is to draw a distinction between the USDA SARE and IPM programs. Professional development grants, that offer training programs, are under-utilized.

From a verbal report by Jill Auburn (Director, SARE; jauburn@reeusda.gov).

Organic Transitions Program and (new) Organic Research and Extension Initiative

There are now two legislative authorities to offer grants addressing organic agriculture. The first, the organic transitions program (ORG) (http://www.reeusda.gov/pestmgt/org/organic.htm) (part of the Section 406 Integrated Research, Education and Extension Competitive Grants Program). This program develops approaches, tactics and systems that help organic growers to meet certification standards. The second is the Organic Research and Extension Initiative (ORIE), funded for 5 years at $3 million per annum. This program aims to 1) facilitate organic production, 2) evaluate the economic benefits of organic agriculture, 3) explore international trade opportunities, 4) determine desirable traits for commodities, 5) define marketing and policy constraints to organic production and 6) conduct advanced on-farm research. The program provides opportunities for extension projects, including education programs, and projects that better equip county extension faculty to answer the questions that organic producers are asking. The ORG rfa, will no longer be part of the IPM program rfa, and there may be a joint ORG/ORIE rfa in early January.

Advice on making successful proposals to these programs:

- Read the rfa.
- Propose research and outreach to assist farmers with whole-farm planning and ecosystem integration.
- An outcome oriented plan for disseminating information MUST be part of the proposal.
- Producers MUST be consulted *prior to* application, and they must play a role in developing goals, implementation and evaluation.
- Farmer applicants with limited experience must consult with specialists.

From a verbal report by Tom Bewick (Program leader, organic agriculture; tbewick@reeusda.gov)

IR-4 Program

- PMSP's are being used to assign priorities within the IR-4 program. Five 'A' priorities have been assigned recently. Current priorities will be on the IR-4 web site by November (http://pestdata.ncsu.edu/ir-4/).
- A list of new products is updated annually and posted to the IR-4 web site (http://pestdata.ncsu.edu/ir-4/newchemistry.pdf).
- Of 503 crops listed by IR-4, 19 groups have been developed as being representative for residue studies. The program hopes to double both the number of crops represented and the number of groups, and to add ornamentals.
- The goals of the biopesticide research program (deadline November 15th) are to integrate biopestiocides within pesticide programs, and to examine their role in resistance management and residue management.
- Canada invests $US10-12 million per annum in minor crops, and 70 trials have been undertaken through collaboration between IR-4 and the Canadian PMRA in Ottawa, saving IR-4 $250,000.

From a verbal report by Robert Holm (Executive Director IR-4 Project; holm@aesop.rutgers.edu).

National Plant Diagnostic System (NPDN)

The NPDN (http://npdn.ppath.cornell.edu/default.htm), a new network that is designed to detect and respond to crop biosecurity threats, is divided into 5 regions (a Great Plains area has been inserted within the standard N,S,E,W USDA regional structure). Emphasis is upon detection and diagnosis, with response (i.e. management following detection), receiving less priority at present. A Diagnostic Information System is under development (http://www.pdis.org/information/contacts.aspx) and this will include a photographic database and digital diagnostics (see image search on the PDIS web site).

From a verbal report by Kitty Cardwell (National Program Leader Plant Pathology; kcardwell@CSREES.USDA.GOV).

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

The National Resources Inventory - Conservation Effects Assessment Project (CEAP) will be carried out over 5 years by NASS, at 10-11,000 sites nationally. The survey will be used to estimate the potential benefits of farm conservation programs. Annual reports will be published by NRCS from 2005. The CEAP contains, for the first time, 25 questions concerning Pest Management Practices. This opportunity for measuring IPM practice adoption, was developed by Eldon Ortman (eortman@CSREES.USDA.GOV).

The NRCS now has an updated Pest Management Standard (FOTG Practice Code 595) for use within the conservation planning process (http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/pestmgt/). The pest management procedure within conservation planning was developed to guide site-specific environmental risk analysis and selection of appropriate mitigation techniques. Pest Management requires the use of available IPM and is defined using the PAMS model (see Federal IPM Coordinating Committee, above). Pest Management techniques that specifically address resource concerns (associated with soil, air and water quality) will receive more attention in conservation planning and NRCS Programs.

The Pest Management standard requires environmental risk analysis and requires mitigation where risk to a resource is detected. Mitigation includes IPM (e.g., application based on scouting, reduced application rates, spot spraying) and NRCS Conservation Practices (e.g., Conservation Buffers, Residue Management, Irrigation Water Management).

Financial support for pest management is available in EQIP for new application of the practice for up to three years and in the Conservation Security Program (CSP) to enable those already applying the practice to reach a higher level of conservation.

New Conservation Innovation Grants (rule making in progress) will provide opportunities for speciality crops, with funding for governmental and non-governmental organizations. They will provide up to a 50% cost match for innovative projects (e.g. market systems for pollution reduction).

Significant EQIP and CSP payments may be warranted for speciality crops if environmental risks are high. Crop-specific IPM programs can help legitimize program payments.

The PAMS approach organizes efforts, but it is needed for all major pests. Program payments are only made where there is a demonstrated IPM benefit to soil, air or water resources.

From a verbal report by Joe Bagdon (Pest Management Specialist, NRCS) joseph.bagdon@ma.usda.gov

Invasive Species Management Plan

The national Invasive Species Management Plan can be found at http://www.invasivespecies.gov/ . There is a budget associated with the plan for research that leads to management action. A series of working groups are determining priorities, and requests are made periodically, for priorities or for committee membership. The Control and Management Working Group, is to meet April 2004 (contact Bob Nowierski, Co-Chair).

From a verbal report by Bob Nowierski (National Program Leader, Bio-Based Pest Management; rnowierski@csrees.usda.gov).

APPENDIX

USDA CSREES IPM Projects Funded in FY 2003 (Plant Systems Section)

(Table constructed by Paul Jepson from CSREES records). Smith-Lever, Hatch and formula fund allocations in addition to these.

Region (# States/ territories)	**Program** (Categories listed for CSREES Plant Sciences Section)	**Number of Projects** FY '03	**Level of funding** ($, *italics* not in total)
North Central (12)	Crops at Risk (CAR)		
	Pest Management Centers	1	1,068,930
	Tristeza (CTV)		
	Fed Administration	2	743,932
	Methyl Bromide Transitions (MBT)	3	956,320
	Special Projects (NSP)	3	65,000
	NI	2	165,000
	Organic Transitions (ORG)	2	975,919
	Pest Management Alternatives (PMAP)	4	649,416
	Risk Avoidance, Mitigation (RAMP)	3	2,453,963
	Regional IPM (RIPM)	12	914,311
	Special Research Grants (SRG)	18	6,987,977
	TOTAL	***50***	***14,980,768***
North East (12)	Crops at Risk (CAR)	3	727,000
	Pest Management Centers	1	1,068,900
	Tristeza (CTV)		
	Fed Administration	1	238,440
	Methyl Bromide Transitions (MBT)	1	398,875
	Special Projects (NSP)	2	50,000
	NI		
	Organic Transitions (ORG)	2	673,463
	Pest Management Alternatives (PMAP)	1	48,274
	Risk Avoidance, Mitigation (RAMP)		
	Regional IPM (RIPM)	7	1,068,144
	Special Research Grants (SRG)	9	3,669,002
	TOTAL	***20***	***6,527,783***
Southern (15)	Crops at Risk (CAR)	2	629,197
	Pest Management Centers	1	1,068,901
	Tristeza (CTV)	2	274,385
	Fed Administration	3	2,036,516
	Methyl Bromide Transitions (MBT)	2	699,803
	Special Projects (NSP)	3	70,785
	NI	2	59,900
	Organic Transitions (ORG)	1	346,420
	Pest Management Alternatives (PMAP)	3	414,968
	Risk Avoidance, Mitigation (RAMP)	1	2,000,000
	Regional IPM (RIPM)	16	928,629
	Special Research Grants (SRG)	26	11,454,064
	TOTAL	***62***	***19,983,568***

Region (# States/ territories)	**Program** (Categories listed for CSREES Plant Sciences Section)	**Number of Projects** FY '03	**Level of funding** ($, *italics* not in total)
Western (17)	Crops at Risk (CAR)	1	39,178
	Pest Management Centers	1	1,068,868
	Tristeza (CTV)	2	241,663
	Fed Administration	1	595,146
	Methyl Bromide Transitions (MBT)	3	998,726
	Special Projects (NSP)	1	25,000
	NI		
	Organic Transitions (ORG)		
	Pest Management Alternatives (PMAP)	2	366,000
	Risk Avoidance, Mitigation (RAMP)	1	178,512
	Regional IPM (RIPM)	10	759,321
	Special Research Grants (SRG)	24	10,154,635
	TOTAL	***46***	***14,427,049***
Oregon (included in Western, above)	*Crops at Risk (CAR)*	*1*	*39,178*
	Pest Management Centers		
	Tristeza (CTV)		
	Fed Administration		
	Methyl Bromide Transitions (MBT)		
	Special Projects (NSP)	*1*	*25,000*
	NI		
	Organic Transitions (ORG)		
	Pest Management Alternatives (PMAP)		
	Risk Avoidance, Mitigation (RAMP)		
	Regional IPM (RIPM)	*3*	*227,584*
	Special Research Grants (SRG)	*1*	*371,487*
	TOTAL	***7***	***663,249***