

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Pesticides Program Dialogue Committee
Integrated Pest Management Workgroup Meeting Notes
May 2, 2012

Attendees:

Workgroup Members

Cindy Baker Smith, Gowan Group
Geoffrey Calvert, US Public Health Service
Joseph Conlon, American Mosquito Control Association
Caroline Cox, Center for Environmental Health
Tom Delaney, Professional Landcare Network
Tom Green, IPM Institute of North America
Robyn Gilden, University of Maryland School of Nursing
Dawn Gouge, University of Arizona (*via webinar*)
Maria Herrero, Valent BioSciences Corp.
Aaron Hobbs, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
Louis Jackai, NC A&T State University
Susan Kegley, Pesticide Research Institute
Marc Lane, Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs
Mary Roy, NY State Dept. of Environmental Conservation (*via webinar*)
Bill Coli, University of Massachusetts (*via webinar*)
Dave Tamayo, Sacramento County

EPA (OPP/BPPD)

Keith Matthews
Frank Ellis
Brian Davidson
Lee Tanner
Raderrio Wilkins
Cara Dzubow
Ed Brandt
Sherry Glick (*via webinar*)

Welcome and Introductions

Notes were reviewed for the October 2011 meeting and the April 2 2012 meeting.

Recap of 2012 Symposium in Memphis

- Tom Green, Keith Matthews, Dawn Gouge, Marc Lane, and Frank Ellis shared their thoughts on the 2012 Symposium in Memphis.
- 635 attendees were there and 36 countries were represented.
- No location has been determined for the next Symposium (in 3 years).
- Tom Green called for volunteers to help put on the next Symposium - 40-60 are needed to organize and plan the next Symposium. Planning for 2015 begins in July 2012
- Attendees were extremely impressed with the representation of EPA Headquarters and Regional staff.
- For many it was the first time to meet up in person. A significant increase in networking has followed as a result.

Recap of the statutory definition of IPM

- Keith Matthews delivered the official definition of "Integrated Pest Management" from FQPA.
- A question was raised to see if the phrase "chemicals used as a last resort" was in the definition. It was answered that this was not in the statutory definition.

- The Workgroup agreed to use the FQPA Sect 303 definition of IPM going forward.

“State of IPM” in the EPA

- Keith Matthews delivered the EPA’s substantial commitment to IPM, especially in schools. He said he believed it was positive and had a strong future. Most recently six grants were awarded over \$1 million for IPM projects.
- EPA is going to add 3 new employees to staff a Center of Expertise for School IPM housed in Region 6 (Dallas, TX). The Center will report to BPPD’s Environmental Stewardship Branch.
- There is now a draft Strategic and Implementation Plans for School IPM which was passed out to the group. The Agency hopes to finalize it in June.
- Keith Matthews addressed the need for EPA’s role to be at a wholesale level. This would involve the collaboration with many entities. It was asked that EPA send the draft strategic plan out via e-mail.
- Keith Matthews let the group know that certain decisions were delayed due to change in management in the Environment Stewardship Branch.
- Concerns were expressed from Marc Lame about doing things now, what is going on with training, people’s roles, and the dissemination and time line of the Agency’s Strategic Plan etc.
- Frank Ellis informed the group that the Strategic Plan is being disseminating to the IPM Workgroup and full PPDC and will be accepting comments through May 31, 2012. Frank Ellis and Keith Matthews instructed the committee to address any gaps they identified in the Strategic Plan that would assist EPA with implementation.
- Implementation of the Strategic Plan is projected to occur around June 2012.

Subgroup 1- Finalizing the development of metrics to assess the effectiveness of the new School IPM initiatives- Discussion and consensus building

- Tom Green started the discussion talking about the process and the benefits of IPM. It was mentioned that we would need to be able to document the practice of IPM in schools.
- Mary Roy mentioned that we would need to identify who would be conducting IPM and its documentation.
- Bill Coli and Tom Green talked about the logic models in www.ipm.gov/logicmodels.
- Marc Lame discussed the need for measures of sustainability when practicing IPM as well as the measures of accountability for the change agents. He further discussed the need to educate all change agents including the school boards.
- A question was asked how many schools do we believe are practicing “verifiable IPM”? Tom Green gave an estimated guess of 5%. How do we make progress in getting a larger number?
- Dawn Gouge (*online comment*): One more reason why schools believe they are already doing IPM is because their service providers affirm they are using IPM when, in fact, the IPM elements in their contracts are less than rigorous.
- Discussion continued on the levels of training and how IPM can be implemented as well as the number of interactions we have had discussing IPM with schools.

Subgroup 2- Appropriate ways to assess quantitatively the benefits of IPM in agriculture, public health settings, and school- Discussion and consensus

- Concerns were expressed that sustainability should be reinforced and not separated between the two groups. In addition, the committee should address agriculture issues related to water quality impacts.
- Joe Conlon started the discussion letting the group know about the annual reports from the American Mosquito Control Association. He mentioned that those entities that have practiced IPM experience fewer issues with resistance.

- Dawn Gouge (*online comment*): Risk reduction in mosquito management systems can be reduced dramatically due to changes in the products used as well as education efforts.
- Dave Tomayo mentioned there is quite the range of commitment to those who practice IPM and he finds it is driven by resources.
- Other resources were known to draw information from in this field such as the American Medical College Association and its 1600 members.
- Tom Green says that several published studies show those who has practiced IPM in buildings can achieve 70 to 90% reductions in pest complaints and pesticide use
- Mr. Jackai says we need to show the benefits such as avoiding resistance. It had also been said where there is most resistance is where IPM needs to be pushed.
- Susan Kegley said we need to measure benefits and its service it does to the ecosystems. The National Academy of Sciences posted an article on this last week discussing the issue.
- Marc Lane mentioned the different benefits by first quantifying the pest problems, then looking at quantifying the applicators.
- Public health entities have a recorded number of bed bug incidents in a number of states. We can look at that number and see where IPM is practiced. We can also see where IPM is used with respects to rodent management.
- Bob McNally (EPA/OPP) entered and introduced himself.
- Robyn Gilden mentioned a pilot project that was in full affect with the Maryland Pesticide Network that looks at Health Care Facilities. The project is with 18 different facilities.
- Marc Lane also mentioned that the benefits can be transferrable in indoor air quality, lead reduction and tick control where we can reduce lime disease. He mentioned a Tick Workshop the CDC presented in Arizona. One other number that was discussed was the number of workshops an Agency is sponsoring.
- Cindy Baker discussed the need for a starting point. We need to see what is working and why it is working and how it can fit to other cases.
- Caroline Cox mentioned that one problem we are seeing is that people say they are doing it (IPM) when they actually aren't.
- Maria Herrero discussed the need for us to have a conversation linking this to sustainability
- Marc Lane also mentioned that physicians and physician groups such as health care providers and the Academy of Pediatrics are good partners to have.
- EPA could train staff on the value of tools for IPM and give preference to grantees using the tools.
- Mary Roy recommended a central clearinghouse of school IPM information and measures be established and that a PREP course be held on school IPM addressing measures.
- Mike Page mentioned State Lead Agencies and Pest Management Professionals should also be included among IPM partners.
- One additional comment from Mike Page made related to training needs for EPA staff and other stakeholders that will be working in assisting IPM implementation. Concerted efforts are undertaken by ASPCRO to provided specific topic training. ASPCRO has done this with termite issues, fumigation issues and recently, school IPM. I want to offer those resources to the agency for their consideration.

NRCS EQIP 595 IPM practice standards and IPM Conservation Activity Plan

- Tom Green discussed the NRCS plan they give to communities practicing IPM who voluntarily undergo a self audit to ensure they are practicing IPM the appropriate way. He suggested the EPA could enter into a similar program with stakeholders.

Workgroup report to the PPDC

- It was decided that Tom Green would present the Subgroup #1 report-out and that Marc Lane would present the Subgroup #2 report Thursday afternoon.
- They would meet at the lobby of the hotel on the May 3rd to discuss what they are presenting.

Follow-up Items

1. Workgroup
 - a. Members should submit comments on the draft Strategic and Implementation Plan for School IPM by May 31st. EPA hopes to finalize the plan by early/mid-summer.
 - b. Members should make an effort to share other studies on the knowledge of IPM with the group.
 - c. Provide input into how frequently Workgroup conference calls should be held.
2. Subgroup 1
 - a. By the next Workgroup meeting, have a list of proposed school IPM metrics.
 - b. Identify potential partners in IPM to assist in metrics.
3. Subgroup 2
 - a. Provide written proposal on ways to assess quantitatively the benefits of IPM.
4. EPA
 - a. Prepare the agenda for the next Workgroup conference call.
 - b. Inform the Workgroup on the progress of the Center of Expertise.