

Vegetable IPM Working Group Meeting Report

Albany, New York—November 10–11, 2003

Attending

Iliana Rivas, Ruth Hazzard, Craig Hollingsworth, Dave Marchant, Henry DuBois, Luke McConnell, Shelby Fleisher, Kathy Murray, Liz Thomas

Update from the Northeastern IPM Center (NEIPMC)

Handouts at the meeting included:

- A flow chart diagram of the relationships within the NEIPMC.
- A description of working groups and set of goals.
- The Partnership Grant request for applications (RFA)

A main target for this meeting is to set IPM priorities as a group for the vegetable industry in the northeastern region since these priorities are used to justify the need for proposed research or extension projects and are also referred to by regulators to help in their decision-making. IPM working groups can create several different priority lists with one set focusing on specific pests and another on broader regional goals.

Vegetable IPM Working Group (IWG) Proposal

The NEIPMC steering committee recently approved funding for the proposal submitted by the vegetable IWG to develop a web-based database that includes all relevant resource materials for Vegetable ICM in the Northeast Region.

At the moment, 5 of the 6 IWGs are working to populate a resources database covering all 12 states and DC providing resources such as fact sheets, pest alerts, crop profiles and PMSPs, field manuals, IPM elements/protocols/guidelines, demonstrations, and other types of information. For a look at what has been done so far, go to:
http://216.7.10.218/alive/ipm/ipm_searchForm.cfm.

Discussion resulted in the following points:

- There is not an area related to marketing, but this will be added and activated as soon as there are marketing documents to show.
- Include crop management as a category (plowing techniques, cultural practices,...)
- A description of the document is not needed in the results page.
- Add pest identification photographs or somehow indicated which documents contain them.
- Commercially generated pest management information can be useful especially when unavailable in any non-commercial form, but these resources need to somehow be restricted for credibility reasons. Possibly for now, only publicly generated material should be on the site until specific issues about commercial information are resolved.

What does the IWG want to accomplish?

2004 work plan for the vegetable working group:

- Create a consolidated regional list of IPM vegetable contacts including grower organizations and vegetable researchers and extension specialists and agents. Craig and Liz will work on this and have it out to working group members by December 2003.
- Develop a process for gathering feedback on priorities list. Send a letter drafted by Iliana and Luke to regional list of grower organizations and extension specialists. Working group members will make direct contact with state contacts in support of this process. Feedback to members of the committee can be sent via mail, email, through the phone, or on the web.
- Write a proposal to develop a regional PMSP on sweet corn in time for the January 15 deadline. If funded, a leader needs to be identified (possibly Kerry Richards, Natalia Clifton, Iliana Rivas, or Lauchlin Titus) who will manage the project with the possibility of involving others in the writing and editing of the document. Jim VanKirk and John Ayers will facilitate the PMSP panel to review the final draft in late October or November 2004. Funding will flow through UMass except for travel expenses through the NEIPMC if possible. The method for determining sweet corn is in table 1 on page 2.

The PMSP panel will be selected through nominations from vegetable working group members paying attention to the required stakeholder representation. A subgroup of Luke McConnell and George Hamilton will review the nominations and make the final panel recommendations. (See more below and on page 3)

- Contribute to the regional IPM resources database. This work has been funded and Craig Hollingsworth will work with the NE IPMC to catalogue resources. (See more on page 1 above)
- Potential dates for the next meeting:
 - Week after Thanksgiving 2004 (November 29–December 3 or December 6–10)
 - Week before Thanksgiving (November 15–19)
 - In Albany
 - Start between 10 and noon
- Invite a weed scientist and a plant pathologist. Ask current grower members if they want to continue. Replace inactive grower members with others who can attend. (More on page 3)

Other Potential IWG projects:

Shelby Fleisher spoke about the geographic information system (GIS) he is working on and thinks this type of real time pest information is transferable to many pest problems in the region. He encourages the veg IWG to consider this as a focus for a future project possibly also incorporating the plant diagnostic centers. His present funding continues through 2005.

Prioritization method for choosing a PMSP to complete:

Members of the IWG worked together to create a grid to determine which crop to choose for a PMSP. Table 1:

	Sweet Corn	Pepper	Tomato	Pumpkin	Potato
Market visibility	++	+	+	+	+
Grown region-wide	+	+/0	+	+	+
Losing pesticides	+	+	+	-	+
Research needs	+	++	+	++	+
Fresh and processing	+	+	+	-	+
No PMSP done	+	+	+	+	+
Rising star	0	0	0	+	0
High acreage	+	-	0	+	+
High number of growers	+	0	+	+	0
Crop profile exists	+	+	+	+	+
High value	0	+	+	+	0
Total +	10	9	9	10	8
Total + minus -	10	8	9	8	8

The group unanimously chose to pursue completing a sweet corn PMSP. Members present at the meeting expressed interest in serving on the PMSP review panel. If successful, the funding for this PMSP would flow from Penn State through the state network project (SNP) of one of the states involved. Overhead is taken by the university managing the grant—i.e. if the grant goes through Massachusetts, only the University of Massachusetts takes overhead, not Penn State and not University of Maine (who manages the Massachusetts SNP). The entire amount needed for the PMSP completion including travel expenses for the review panel would be sent to the managing university. Average budgets for completing a PMSP run around \$8000, ranging from \$5000 to \$12,000 for a large national PMSP. The PMSP must follow the guidelines that can be found at:

<http://pestdata.ncsu.edu/pmsp/checklst.pdf>

Membership rotation and representation

For 2004, Ruth and Iliana will remain leaders, but this needs to be reviewed during the next meeting. A general guideline for membership asks members who want to resign to find their replacement from the group they are currently representing i.e. a consultant is replaced by another consultant, a grower by a grower. Members who do not attend meetings or participate in IWG work also need to be replaced.

Membership in the IWG needs to be expanded to include representation from weed scientists and plant pathologists. Also the states of CT, RI and WV are not represented.

Possible candidates include:

<i>Weeds</i>	<i>Pathology</i>
Erik Gallant - Maine, VERY busy	Kate Evert
Betty Marose - Maryland	Helene Dillard
Brad Majak	Tom Zitter
Mike Morsley (spelling?)	Bob Mulrooney
Mark VanGessel	Alan McNab - near retirement
Ed Beste - Salisbury Research Station	Greg McGraff
Rich Bonanno	Lauchlin Titus

Establishing IPM Priorities for Vegetables in the Northeast

Concern arose that the priorities created at this meeting are from too limited a group and that opinions from a wider range of experts need to be incorporated. Iliana and Luke will draft a document to be sent to extension experts and vegetable grower association representatives in each state describing what the veg IWG does, a bit about the Center goals, what priorities have been established, and why their input is important in making research and extension funding decisions and regulatory decisions. Compiling these incoming suggestions will be time consuming so Liz will look into providing an on-line method for gathering this information, which would also include a way to collect information on the person filling out the form.

Individual states have also created priority needs lists and these can be included at the IWG site. Shelby will send in priority lists and feedback from grower meetings for the Pennsylvania groups. A past survey done by Mike Hoffmann identifies what is grown in the NE by a diverse set of fresh market growers. Shelby will find this and send to IWG members.

The following are the two priority needs lists agreed upon by this group:

Vegetable IPM working group recommendations on priority needs within the Northeast region

- Expand web sites - especially pest ID and pest control information. Link this to commercial production guides. Over time make this relevant to the entire Northeast region, using models such as the Mid-Atlantic Fruit Production Guide.
- Improve and enhance existing monitoring and modeling infrastructure for determining insect, disease, weed and other pest conditions and forecasts. Include geospatial tools that result in real time regional maps of pest pressure and phenology made publicly available through the Internet and other media.
- Centralize vegetable IPM information through the Northeastern IPM Center database.
- Expand adoption of IPM through:
 - Promoting cooperatives or other organization structures to make it economically feasible for farmers to hire or create IPM services. We envision cooperative

- extension or other IPM professionals to be part of the board of the cooperative and providing training and support.
- Encouraging farmer-to-farmer educational exchanges about IPM practices.
 - Serving needs of small or isolated operations and highly diversified farms with the goal of growers being able to accomplish IPM. We are looking for creative ways to accomplish this. One possible way to accomplish this is through development of effective, systematic information gathering and management on the farm, whole-farm model IPM including record-keeping, scouting, and trapping techniques.
 - Encourage application of IPM methods to enhance the success of organic farming systems.
- Educate consumers and the public about the value and meaning of IPM
 - Include consumer information on the Veg WG website (place existing materials on our website)
 - Other methods for accomplishing this goal are to be developed and may include press outreach as a strategy for reaching the public more effectively.
 - K-12 education programs on IPM are an effective way to have a long term impact on the public
 - IPM marketing materials and issues should be explored for the Northeast region as a whole.
 - Identify and prioritize pest problems on a regional basis to enhance communication between states.
 - Support professional training and communication across the region for Extension and crop consultants in vegetable IPM. Using existing meetings as models (e.g. crop school for certified crop consultants (mid-Atlantic), mid Atlantic vegetable extension workers meeting; NY or New England in-service trainings) develop region-wide training programs.
 - Prioritize crop profiles and pest management strategic plans and encourage the completion of priority PMSPs.