

June 2, 2010

Dear Friend of IPM,

We at IPM Voice, an organization that advocates for integrated pest management nationally, are writing to ask for your assistance on behalf of the future of IPM in the United States (<http://ipmvoice.org>).

IPM needs you, now

For decades, public funding for IPM research and education has generated major economic, environmental, and health benefits for the United States. Specific examples are at the end of this letter. This public support for IPM is about to be severely curtailed unless you and others like you act now.

The situation

President Obama's proposed FY2011 budget has omitted funding for the USDA's Integrated Research, Education, and Extension Competitive Grants Program, often called "Section 406." This funding is slated to move to the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI). So far, the USDA has indicated that these funds will not be reserved within AFRI for IPM projects. As a result, most of the funding will likely be used to support other topic areas.

Affected Section 406 programs include the following:

- Regional IPM Centers (\$3.9 million/year)
- Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program (RAMP; \$4.2 million/year)
- Crops at Risk (CAR; \$1.3 million/year)
- Methyl Bromide Transitions (\$2.95 million/year)
- Other important programs:
 - Organic Transitions
 - National Integrated Water Quality program
 - National Integrated Food Safety Initiative
 - NRCS's Conservation Effects Assessment Program

What can you do?

We ask that you support restoring Integrated Research, Education, and Extension Section 406 funding through the legislative process that will culminate in the final 2011 federal budget. Your efforts will help assure that these productive agricultural and environmental programs can continue to increase farm profitability, preserve natural resources, and protect human health:

- Contact members of Congress and ask that Section 406 programs be restored to the USDA NIFA budget. Mention specifically the IPM programs: Regional IPM Centers, CAR, RAMP and Methyl Bromide Transitions. **The most involved legislators are those on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittees of the House and Senate, who are on the list at the end of this letter.**

- Contact your own Senators and Representative, or copy them on letters sent to the Agriculture Appropriations members. Find contact information at <http://www.votesmart.org/>.
- Spread the word to others at your institution and in your professional organizations about the situation and encourage them to address it now. Those of us employed by public agencies and universities may be constrained in how we can communicate with elected officials, but all are free to educate our peers about the situation.
- Join with IPM Voice (<http://ipmvoice.org>) in this and other efforts to advocate for IPM.

We thank you for your immediate action to support restoration of the Section 406 funding. If the Section 406 integrated pest management programs are terminated, their invaluable benefits to farmers, ranchers, and society will be lost.

Sincerely,

The IPM Voice Steering Committee including:

*Lori Berger, California Specialty Crops Council
Hasan Bolkan, Campbell's Soup Company
Tom Green, IPM Institute of North America
Scott Hutchins, Dow AgroSciences
Carrie Koplinka-Loehr, Northeastern IPM Center
Norm Leppla, Florida IPM Program
Kim Leval, Northwest Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides
Duane Maatz, Wisconsin Potato & Vegetable Growers Association
Pam Marrone, Marrone Bio Innovations, Inc.
Bob Rosenberg, National Pest Management Association
Michael Rozyne, Red Tomato/Eco-Apple
Jim VanKirk, Southern Region IPM Center
Blaine Viator, National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants*

U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies

Democratic Members

- [Senator Herb Kohl \(Chairman\) \(WI\)](#)
- [Senator Tom Harkin \(IA\)](#)
- [Senator Byron Dorgan \(ND\)](#)
- [Senator Dianne Feinstein \(CA\)](#)
- [Senator Richard Durbin \(IL\)](#)
- [Senator Tim Johnson \(SD\)](#)
- [Senator Ben Nelson \(NE\)](#)
- [Senator Jack Reed \(RI\)](#)
- [Senator Mark Pryor \(AR\)](#)
- [Senator Arlen Specter \(PA\)](#)

Republican Members

- [Senator Sam Brownback \(Ranking Member\) \(KS\)](#)
- [Senator Robert Bennett \(UT\)](#)
- [Senator Thad Cochran \(MS\)](#)
- [Senator Christopher Bond \(MO\)](#)
- [Senator Mitch McConnell \(KY\)](#)
- [Senator Susan Collins \(ME\)](#)

U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies

Majority

- Chair: [Rosa DeLauro \(CT\)](#)
- [Sam Farr \(CA\)](#)
- [Allen Boyd \(FL\)](#)
- [Sanford D. Bishop, Jr. \(GA\)](#)
- [Lincoln Davis \(TN\)](#)
- [Marcy Kaptur \(OH\)](#)
- [Chet Edwards \(TX\)](#)
- [Maurice D. Hinchey \(NY\)](#)
- [David R. Obey \(WI\)](#), Ex Officio

Minority

- Ranking Member: [Jack Kingston \(GA\)](#)
- [Tom Latham \(IA\)](#)
- [Jo Ann Emerson \(MO\)](#)
- [Rodney Alexander \(LA\)](#)
- [Jerry Lewis \(CA\)](#), Ex Officio

TALKING POINTS ABOUT 406 IPM PROGRAMS

All 406 IPM Programs:

Protect food supplies and communities. Section 406 IPM programs are the source of most of the USDA's support for research and educational programs to improve pest management so that risk is better managed, profitability is protected, environmental stewardship is enhanced, and human health is improved.

Regional IPM Centers: Small Investment, Big Impacts

<http://www.ipmcenters.org>

o **Involve stakeholders and find productive common ground:** Regional IPM Centers actively involve the people who will be affected by public decisions in a way that no central federal program ever could. They bring together people from different perspectives—for instance, agribusiness and environmentalists—to find common ground and solve problems.

o **Assist regulatory agencies to make practical decisions:** EPA and state regulatory agencies depend on IPM Centers to develop and manage information about the impact of pesticide regulations (existing, new, and proposed), helping ensure those regulations are practical for use in the field.

o **Respond quickly to critical issues:** Efficient staff and small but flexible pools of funding provide a stable infrastructure that scientists, farmers, and others use to respond quickly to important issues as they arise. This function provides a key complement to large, annual-cycle competitions managed by USDA.

o **Make the most of public resources:** IPM Centers help organizations to build on each other's successes. The Western IPM Center, for instance, has documented a 2 for 1 gain in leveraged resources. In 2006, an independent review found that IPM Centers show an *impressive use of limited resources to maximize output* of projects, and advised USDA to use IPM Centers as a model for future programs.

Crops at Risk (CAR)

<http://www.csrees.usda.gov/fo/cropsatrisk.cfm>

o **Purpose:** The Crops at Risk (CAR) program was developed to support IPM research and implementation programs for crops that were dependent upon certain pesticides scheduled for phase-out as a result of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA). The focus of the CAR Program is on integrated activities for individual crops and was designed to support multidisciplinary research and extension efforts within a single crop.

o **Example impact:** One project doubled the number of pest management tools available to cherry growers for plum curculio control. Instead of relying solely on organophosphate insecticides, cherry growers can now confidently integrate reduced-risk pesticides and insect growth regulators into their IPM programs, saving up to 2-3 cover sprays per season. The post-harvest research results have also created grower-level interest for developing a commercial automatic sorting technology for the purpose of eliminating pests and/or insect-infested products from the intact products.

Risk Avoidance and Mitigation Program (RAMP)

<http://www.nifa.usda.gov/fo/riskavoidancemitigationicgp.cfm>

o **Purpose:** RAMP was designed to support integrated research and implementation activities for multiple crop systems within a region. The focus is on cropping systems with elevated pest risk resulting from FQPA regulatory activities. Emphasis is on multi-pest, multi-crop, and multi-state programs.

o **Example impact:** A fruit IPM project in Pennsylvania identified replacement chemicals for those lost to registration and pest resistance. Scientists implemented mating disruption, resulting in decreased fruit damage and use of broad-spectrum pesticides. By using beneficial mite predators, each year participating growers reduced miticide active ingredients by one ton and avoided 45,000 gallons of insecticidal oil, saving \$700,000 and lowering the Environmental Impact Quotient 10- to 15-fold.

Methyl Bromide Transitions (MBT)

<http://www.csrees.usda.gov/fo/methylbromidetransitions.cfm>

o **Purpose:** The goal of this program is to minimize methyl bromide emissions in situations of critical use exemptions or to support alternatives.

o **Example impact:** A single project in California reported that methyl bromide was the basis for control of soil-borne diseases, nematodes, and weeds in the \$1.3 billion strawberry and \$316 million flower industries. They recently controlled these pests with steam and solarization technology, eliminating fumigant emissions into the atmosphere and the need for buffer zones.