

Recap of 2019 NIPMCC Meeting

October 22, 23 2019

APLU Building, 1307 New York Ave NW

Washington, DC

Reported by Ann Hazelrigg, 2019 Chair

The agenda and all files and PowerPoints from the meeting can be found at

<https://3.basecamp.com/3209262/buckets/5247593/vaults/2164489672>

Background and Context

The National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) is a committee of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP), and functions within the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) as a subcommittee of the ESCOP Science & Technology Committee. The responsibilities of the NIPMCC include:

- Recommendations to ECOP and ESCOP on programs, policies, reports, and other matters that affect pest management implementation
- Recommendations on budget matters relating to pest management
- Assist in development of reports and strategic plans on pest management issues
- Pursue activities that facilitate coordination and collaboration nationally among IPM research and extension at Land-grant Universities (LGUs) and Federal agencies involved in IPM

The NIPMCC membership is composed of IPM practitioners and representatives from LGU extension and experiment stations, Regional IPM Center members, federal agencies including USDA-NIFA and EPA, non-profit IPM organizations, professional societies and private industry. As such, the NIPMCC forms a strong nationwide network to fulfill its responsibilities. For more information, and to view reports and presentations from annual meetings, please visit: <http://escop.info/committee/national-integrated-pest-management-coordinating-committee-nipmcc/>

2019 Meeting Report

The 2019 meeting began with a recap of the 2018 meeting by Patrick Beauzay, previous NIPMCC Chair, followed by reports from each of the four Regional IPM Centers. Regional IPM Center reports included updates on staffing status, signature IPM programming efforts to address diverse regional IPM needs, communications and reporting efforts, grants programs, Center-funded Working Groups and activities, collaborations within and among regions, and evaluations and impacts. While each region serves diverse stakeholder bases with region-specific needs, commonalities across the four regions included successful stakeholder engagement, invasive species, pesticide resistance management, pollinator protection and conservation, communication of IPM success stories, and competitive grants programming for working groups and specific IPM programming areas.

Regional IPM Center reports were followed by updates with associated power points from each of the four regional technical committees (NEERA 1604, SERA 3, NCERA 222, and WERA 1017). Each regional technical committee reported on region-specific IPM priorities, programming efforts, progress, and successes. It is clear from the Regional IPM Center and technical committee reports there is extensive cooperation among states and regions resulting in the successful implementation of a broad diversity of IPM programming with tremendous positive impacts. Much of the funding for the Regional IPM Centers and state IPM programs comes from federal funding through USDA-NIFA dollars. The critical need for

continued ample federal funding to support national IPM programming through our state and regional infrastructures cannot be overemphasized.

Kristin Adams, Associate Director of Federal Relations at Cornell, presented on how to connect with Federal legislators by working with University Leadership; establishing/maintaining relationships with federal policymakers and their staff and working with coalitions – higher education associations, professional societies, industry groups – to promote items of mutual interest. The importance of effective communication was stressed-define your ask, write effective one pagers to list accomplishments, include pictures and be sure to tailor to your audience. She emphasized the importance of stories-people remember anecdotes as opposed to data in addition to relisting 3rd party advocates to vouch for your effectiveness. Kristin provided valuable information on navigating Capitol Hill and working with your campus federal relations office.

Steve Elliot, Western IPM Center, provided a National IPM Communicator Update indicating a process is still needed to aggregate, package, and discuss IPM stories. This topic was previously addressed in an earlier NIPMCC meeting. The centers are doing a good job communicating their regional accomplishments through newsletters but more could be done on a national scale. Funding remains a major challenge for the creation of a national IPM communicator position.

Bob Nowierski, USDA-NIFA national program leader, presented on agency organization, new leadership, future changes within NIFA: 25% of NIFA staff have relocated to Kansas City, there are new National Program Committee positions; final building location solicitation is still underway; NIFA has selected 6 national science liaisons that will remain behind in DC. Updates on grant awards were shared: Crop and Pest Management - 2019 4 regional continuation awards; Extension IPM Implementation - 45 awards; and ARDP - 16 new awards.

Marty Draper, AFRI, gave a Zoom update of Tactical Science Coordination Network, led by one PD and 4 Co-PDs with several programs involved- FADI, CPPM, IR-4, MUDRP, and FARAD. All programs are connected, related, responsive and aligned with the goals of efficiency, effectiveness, accountability, and relationships/trust (most important). Industry partners are important and are being recruited.

Tom Green of the IPM Institute of North America provided an update on the IPM institute, the IPM Voice and the Farming and Food Narrative. The IPM Institute of North America is a non-profit organization seeking to improve agricultural sustainability and community vitality through IPM, and is a dedicated partner of the NIPMCC. They have several impressive projects and initiatives in the works and more information about these endeavors and the IPM Institute of North America can be found at their website: <https://ipminstitute.org/>

Tom Smith and Dean Herzfeld of the National Pesticide Safety Education Center (NPSEC) presented information on the goals, function, and publicly available tools and educational materials available from the NPSEC. The NPSEC's mission is to support and serve extension Pesticide Safety Education Programs (PSEP), and promises to strengthen existing PSEP programs by fostering collaboration with a diverse group of stakeholders. For more information about the NPSEC, please consult their website at: <https://npsec.us/>

Day one of the annual meeting ended with the NIPMCC Business meeting. The election committee put forth three strong candidates and there was one open nomination from the floor. Jim Farrar, Director of the UC Statewide IPM Program, was elected Chair-elect, with full chair duties beginning at the close of the 2020 annual meeting. The 2020 meeting dates were set as October 20, 21, 2020 again at the APLU building.

The NIPMCC meeting continued on the morning of October 23th with Dr. Parag Chitnis, the NIFA Interim Associate Director for Programs on Zoom. He indicated NIFA is looking for National Program Leaders and Program Specialists, grants may be delayed by a few months, Congress has been supportive of the budget, CPPM funding should be at current levels but organic funding is increasing from 20 million to 50 million.

Jean-Jacques DuBois gave an update from iPiPE. iPiPe provides an infrastructure with internet tools, information products and expert commentary for detection and management of pests that threaten U.S. crops. iPiPE Crop-Pest Programs incentivize growers and consultants to submit observations on important pests by providing tools and information for timely management decision-making. iPiPE pest observations are housed in a national pest observation repository to enable future research using geographically extensive, multi-year databases. Many NIPMCC members participate in surveys that enter data directly into the iPiPE platform. For more information about iPiPE, please consult the website at: <http://www.ipipe.org/>

Joe LaForest, Southern IPM Center and Steven Mirsky, ARS provided insights on the successes and challenges of herbicide resistance management and tracking resistance.

Survey Results and IPM Priority Setting

Results of a survey sent out by the NIPMCC executive committee prior to the 2019 meeting were presented by Hazelrigg and discussed among attendees. The survey was sent to NIPMCC members and Regional IPM Center chairs asking about the general NIPMCC meeting format and three directed IPM priority setting questions.

The day and a half meeting met the needs of most of the attendees, the majority liked the Wildcard topics and the group was split on whether to include directed workshops within the meeting. Some of the comments from the survey question included:

- Would like more small group discussion time
- Too many updates and not enough follow up
- Wildcard-keep it up
- Directed workshop-some would be useful
- Not enough networking time
- Not enough follow up on wildcard topics
- Definitely need update from NIFA this year-who will be covering what areas, etc. Will RFAs be released at normal times, how will review panels be dealt with since there are fewer people at NIFA to do all of these things.
- Wildcard-As long as we are clear that these topics will be covered next year. May want to send out a survey in next summer to make sure these are still the most important topics to cover that fall.

- I always enjoy the conversation, and meeting folks here, but there is so little actual networking or discussion time (often).

The remainder of the meeting focused on IPM Priority Setting. There was a discussion of the various ways we set priorities in our organizations including the regional technical committees, the IPM Centers and Advisory Boards, Commodity groups, Working Groups, etc. The results of the three directed IPM priority setting questions, “What are your top 3 priorities, how are you addressing them and what resources do you need to accomplish them” are below. We received 12 responses, resulting in a total of 36 priorities from a mix of regional IPM Center Chairs and individual NIPMCC meeting attendees.

The 36 priorities were grouped into 6 major categories:

- Specific pests (spotted lantern fly, nematodes, Fusarium oxysporum Race 4, etc.) received 11 out of 36 responses.
- Stakeholder- 7/36
- **Resistance/Herbicide Management- 6/36**
- **Communication- 6/36**
- **Invasive Pests- 5/36**
- Pollinators- 2/36

The question, “What do you need for resources?” resulted in all responses basically voicing some variation of **“time and funding.”**

After the survey results were presented by Hazelrigg, the meeting attendees then selected three priorities (Resistance Management, Communication and Invasive Pests) to be developed into white papers by subcommittees to present back to the committee at large for further input and discussion prior to the 2020 meeting.

Robin Shepard, ESCOP and Brett Hess, ECOP provided a wrap up and next steps for the coming year.