

NEERA-1604 IPM Regional Meeting Agenda

May 1, 2019 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM

University of Maryland College Park

Stamp Student Union Grand Ballroom Lounge 1209

9:00 AM Welcome and introductions

In person attendees: Kelly Hamby, Ed Rajotte, Herb Bolton, Deb Graham, Betsy Lamb, David Lane, Mark VanGessel, David Owens, Rakesh Chandran, Cesar Rodriguez, Glen Koehler, Jennifer Grant, Hilary Sandler, Anna Wallingford, Lisa Tewksbury, Simon Zebelo, Stanton Gill, Rose Ogutu, Tesfa Mengistu, Dennis vanEngelsdorp, Karen Rane (NPDN), Northeastern IPM Center staff

Online attendees: Ann Hazelrigg, George Hamilton, Mary Concklin, Audrey Moore

9:15 AM Updates from NIFA Crop Protection and Pest Management, Herb Bolton

See Herb's slides for details.

- USDA Org chart; introduced current NIFA leadership REE Undersecretary Scott Hutchins and NIFA Director Scott Angle. Over last 2 years long process of leadership transition that is still not complete.
- 2019 Budget – late again, but slight increases to Hatch, Smith Lever, and Capacity funds; President's 2020 budget DOA (Congress says), all NIFA lines zeroed out again.
- 2018 Farm Bill has 3 new provisions: Beginning Farmer and Rancher program gets an additional \$15M; citrus disease research to combat citrus greening gets \$25M annually for 5 years; and a new Urban Ag Program gets \$10M to fund research, education, and extension on urban, indoor, and other emerging ag production. This should have quite a bit of interest for the Northeast.
- The 2018 farm bill erased language that was in the 2014 farm bill, which requires 100% matching for all NIFA grants. So 100% match is back in and required. There is a table on the NIFA website that shows the match requirement on each grant. This is complicating everything, and that is going to be the way it is until congress changes it.
 - *Matching requirements* for CPPM:*
 - *100% match required if a grant provides a particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity,*
 - *NIFA may waive the matching funds requirement for a grant if we determine that:*
 - *(a) the results of the project, while of particular benefit to a specific agricultural commodity, are likely to be applicable to agricultural commodities generally; or*

- *(b) the project involves a minor commodity, the project deals with scientifically important research, and the grant recipient is unable to satisfy the matching funds requirement.*
 - Other NIFA funding opportunities had different changes to matching requirements from the Farm Bill. Refer to each RFA.
- The second thing is that the Farm Bill maintains that no IDC will be charged to EIP awards (Extension), and indirect cost language is being enforced. I have included Herb's exact language from his slides on this topic.
 - *"Indirect Costs. Section 1462(a) and (c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (NARETPA) limits indirect costs for the overall award to 30 percent of Total Federal Funds Awarded (TFFA) under a research, education, or extension grant. The maximum indirect cost rate allowed under the award is determined by calculating the amount of indirect costs using: the sum of an institution's negotiated indirect cost rate and the indirect cost rate charged by sub-awardees, if any; or 2) 30 percent of TFFA.*
 - *"Indirect Costs. The maximum allowable indirect cost rate under the award, including the indirect costs charged by the sub-awardee(s), if any, is the lesser of the two rates.*
 - *If the results of number one, is the lesser of the two rates, the grant recipient is allowed to charge the negotiated indirect cost rate on the prime award and the sub-award(s), if any. Any sub-awards would be subject to the sub-awardee's negotiated indirect cost rate. The sub-awardee may charge its negotiated indirect cost rate on its portion of the award, provided the sum of the indirect cost rate charged under the award by the prime awardee and the sub-awardee(s) does not exceed 30 percent of the TFFA.*
 - *If the result of number two, is the lesser of the two rates, then the maximum indirect cost rate allowed for the overall award, including any sub-award(s), is limited to 30 percent of the TFFA. That is, the indirect costs of the prime awardee plus the sum of the indirect costs charged by the sub-awardee(s), if any, may not exceed 30 percent of the TFFA.*
 - These rules make collaborations less attractive. This has always been the rule, and now it is being enforced.
- NIFA move: They are supposed to hear the final location by the middle of May, or maybe just a short list of locations. All staff will get a letter of assignment and are supposed to show up there in 120 days. There is an enormous outreach of professional societies to Sec Purdue that this is a bad idea. Staff in limbo, and those not comfortable with the uncertainty seeking other employment.

- Plan of Work reporting for 1890s and Hatch & Smith Lever will have to start using REEport. Never happened before on Extension side. How is Extension going to do this? Lots of conversation around this.
- ARDP RFA just closed and they are working on the cycle, awarding in September. Most projects coming in are research or research-lead. Couple of extension projects. 25% of projects are Entomology topics; 35% plant pathology; 10-15% weeds etc.
 - Continuation award emails from Kathy Kimble-Day have gone out with REEport requests. REEports are due in early June. Tried to clarify what they want put into REEport. Narrative is much reduced, more like an executive summary.
- Continuation awards all go out, and award EIP awards. There are a few more slides on resources, etc.

9:50 AM Updates from National IPM Coordinating Committee, Ann Hazelrigg (online). Ann is current chair for NIPMCC and provided an overview of its mission and meetings.

- NIPMCC is a committee of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) and Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESOP). They meet 1x a year in person, and have quarterly conference calls. They make recommendations on programs, policy and report. Made up of IPM Coordinators, IPM Institute, industry, directors of Experiment stations and Extension are all involved.
- They meet annually in DC in October, with reports from all and then a general discussion on a topic such as IPM challenges, STEM education in IPM, what STEM disciplines are needed, etc. Usually good discussion. Minutes and agendas are all posted at the ESOP page and available for all. National IPM communicator issue is an annual topic, but who is going to fund it and how will it happen? This discussion will continue this year. She has been chair since Oct so still new to it.

10:15 AM Updates from National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN), Karen Rane, Director of UMD Diagnostic Clinic. Update on NPDN national meeting (see slides).

- There are 5 NPDN regions nationally and the Northeast regional hub is located at Cornell, but there is one lab in each state, and the Maryland one is at UMD. Established after 9/11 and NIFA-funded.
- NPDN is a surveillance biosecurity network to quickly detect and identify pests and pathogens of concern. NPDN partners with land-grant universities and Extension. They have many accomplishments to date. The national plant pest repository was established at Purdue University in 2002. They hold over 1.6M records on 12,633 pests and 3,600 hosts. <https://npdn.ceris.purdue.edu/> Data is available upon request to researchers but not to the general public. Current NPDN focus is on diagnostics after federal budget

cuts. They currently have 6 planning working groups – IT, communications, lab structure, professional development, lab proficiency development, and accreditation.

Discussion:

- You currently have a plant disease focus – will you expand to insects? Yes, they are already doing that. There are currently 89 labs adding information into the repository. There seems to be a barrier to adding info. They are working on herbicide resistance and adding that data, working with entomologists to expand this. State entomologists can submit data to the Repository.
- Do states charge for this? Yes, most of them do. But she doesn't because she cannot manage collecting the fees. Easier to charge when you have infrastructure to support it.

10:40 AM Sentinel Apiary Program, Dennis vanEngelsdorp

Summarized program, discussed the Bee Informed Partnership (non-profit) and efforts in pollinator protection. beeinformed.org

- Bee Informed Partnership 10 years old and established as a result of high levels of pollinator mortality. Developed several tools, management and loss annual survey and more. The Sentinel Apiary was established more for smaller beekeepers. They do lots of varroa mite sampling, but other tests as well. Beekeepers pay for the kits, do the tests, and add send their information in for analysis. Program sends the results back to the beekeeper within 2 weeks. They had 70 participants last year, and it will be closer to 100 this year. Results have been very informative to them.
- The number one cause of bee mortality is varroa mites or the viruses they transmit. This program has given them insights on why this is. Huge mites compared to bee size. Varroa mites feed on fat of the bees – vital organs to the bees. Big segment of bee community who does not want to treat for varroa. They want bees to exist on their own with no human input and are willing to take the losses caused by the mites. But these untreated colonies are spreading mites across the landscape. Much re-infestation after treatment due to these spreading mites. Bees from collapsing colonies are moving as far as 3 kilometers to other colonies and spreading mites more. They can no longer have control populations at their lab as these bees just keep spreading mites. Three mites per/100 bees is the current colony health threshold. They are just about to update that to “No detectable mites up until June” for bee colonies if you want your colonies to survive the winter. If you have more than 5 mites/100 you will need to treat in fall. MiteCheck mobile app available in the app store. Mite-a-thon nationally in September. Sugar vs. alcohol wash? Backyard beekeepers more comfortable with sugar since it doesn't kill the bees.
- Pesticide analysis on collected pollen 40% have no detectable pesticides. 36% insecticides, 32% fungicide. Fungicides need to be watched. DEET is found whenever it is checked for, but neonics not so much – only 4%. How much hazard do these products

pose? Neonics hazard is very high 84%, as compared to other products. Neonic ban in Maryland for homeowners does not affect professional beekeepers. At certain times of the year, they get spikes of neonic exposure well over levels you would expect. Why is this happening? Needs more research.

1:15 PM Updates from the Northeastern IPM Center, Deb Grantham

The Center is fully staffed as of 9/2018. StopPests is quite busy and active. StopBMSB is also quite active. Spotted lanternfly effort is ramping up with SCRI proposal due May 3. Center communication still active with *IPM Insights* newsletter, accessibility issues, weekly IPM News and Events Roundup. Partnership Grants program – 2020 RFA will be out in September. Funded 5 this year. Evaluation - assessing the Center's impacts via different avenues.

1:30 PM State reports (see [NEERA meetings and reports web page](#) for state reports)

3:10 PM Discuss Northeast crop profiles and pest management strategy plans, Deb Grantham
We will be releasing an RFA to fund PMSPs, we have some limited funds available.

- Cranberry (5 states), hemp production. Weather needs – would a PMSP approach be acceptable for this? Or for entomology pests? What are growers doing for certain pest problems and also what can we do? Multi-state approaches help.

Discussion:

- Ed doesn't like pesticide driven PMSP model and doesn't understand why the Center should be funding them. Glen finds the PMSP approach helpful – sitting in a room for a day and a half, discussing pest by pest what works and what doesn't and hearing directly from growers. Do the crop profile first to get the landscape and then go on to the PMSP. Grape, strawberry, and blueberry have been the ones done in the last 5 years. Others find them useful, use them a lot and get requests for them. In the end it seemed like the majority felt they were useful and should be continued.
- Climate smart solutions website tools are very useful to growers and IPM practitioners.

4:00 PM Spotted lanternfly (SLF) update, Julie Urban and Heather Leach (online). Invasive pest of concern in the Northeast.

- Finishing up the \$8M SCRI proposal due on May 3, seven universities, USDA and APHIS, StopSLF.org website. From the time to the pre-proposal and full proposal the match changed and they had to come up with the match funds. In-kind match funds (using Tracy Leskey's BMSB model) they have been able to get the match. \$5M in in-kind grower land. Other match came from salary and such. UMD had to drop out due to the match requirement issues.

- Most significant economic damage is in vineyards and tree fruit orchards. Vineyard owners are spraying every 3–5 days close to harvest. Killing vines in 2 years. Cost of spraying due to SLF is up 271% to \$147.85/acre. Christmas tree debacle over egg masses on trees in homes. Lots of media around this and keeps Heather busy full time. Lorsban is the most effective in killing egg masses (Chlorpyrifos which is going to be de-listed by EPA soon).

4:30 PM IPM “hot” topics, pollinator protection, ticks, pesticide issues – how are they impacting your programs?

- David Owen has been doing trials for when neonics are no longer available. Document with an agronomist that you have a problem that a neonic can affect, document it and apply for an exemption.
- NEEM oil products – any documentation on that? No. There are no restrictions or regulations on the efficacy or quality of these natural products. This is an ongoing issue. People replacing regulated pesticides with “natural” pesticides like vinegar, salt, and soap combinations.