

Draft April 19, 2006

Meeting on School IPM National Implementation Led by the US EPA
Boardroom 23, 7:00-9:00 PM, Adam's Mark Hotel
St. Louis, Missouri
April 5, 2006

Introductions, Welcome:

Much is going on in school IPM Nationally.

People interested and implementing IPM in schools need to come together as a team.

Purpose of tonight's meeting is the following:

1. Allow school IPM implementers provide some updates of their programs;
2. Start to address EPA's need for the development of internal program measures of success for school IPM Nationally;
3. Obtain an update from the University of Florida on revisions to their School IPM Website;
4. Start discussions on the development of a National Strategic Plan for School IPM, identifying national goals and funding needs which can then be referenced in future grant funding proposals to the USDA;
5. Provide OPP updates on other urban IPM projects in which EPA is involved
6. Summarize possible funding opportunities for school IPM
7. Discussion of hold regular conference calls on the topic

Program Updates

Dawn Gouge started her report first on the status of school IPM in Arizona:

- Many workshops were held last year;
- Got some basic legislation through last year on child care IPM;
- Focused on child care IPM recently, and then stepped back a little and nothing collapsed;
- Partnered with Ecolab and;
- Experienced some staff losses through moves/retirements, but others stepped up to the plate.

Al Fournier reported as well on his work in Arizona:

- ◆ 6 school systems are on-board with IPM and;
- ◆ Worked with Department of Ag to develop a Pest Control Operator training program and State certification category for IPM.

Mike Merchant reported in Texas and for his Southwest School IPM Technical Resource Center:

- ➡ Completed a survey after 10 years of IPM implementation;
- ➡ Received 548 responses of 1,037 surveys distributed;
- ➡ 75% of schools reported less pesticide use and 75% thought that they were doing a better job of pest control;
- ➡ 55% believed that they had reduced their long-term costs via IPM;

- Many are now making use of “low-impact” chemicals;
- Janet plans to revisit 20 schools to verify the survey results and;
- Texas school IPM law is up for review this year and he wants to insert some fixes in the Law (as removal of the preferred pesticide list).

Clyde Ogg of Nebraska reported that they have created a video game (Pest Private Eye) and will pilot this to school libraries. The target audience are 4th graders and up.

Tom Green reported that his IPM Super Sleuth off the IPM Institute web site is very popular.

Norm Leppla of Florida reported:

- ✖ That they are updating their University of Florida web site which serves as the National School IPM site and;
- ✖ They are going to multi-County for IPM programs which is supported by the University and on this large scale has not been seen elsewhere.

Marc Lame reported:

- That his Newsletters are available now for anyone to put their letterhead on and use (accessible from the Arizona web site in word and pdf);
- Every school that he works with is required to be IPM Star certified;
- He concurs that the school IPM programs in AZ and AL are sustainable because of the coalitions that were put together, which hopefully will lead to Statewide expansion;
- Still trying with the Utah program;
- Washington State has been doing stuff for a long time under different drivers, with the Washington Toxics Coalition the driver for Seattle; and
- Ohio has a model for school IPM for the 30 districts in Northeast Ohio, but no State agent to help with the effort.

Tom Green reported on IPM Star:

- ✖ Recently certified another major child care center in Pittsburg;
- ✖ In Cornell, worked with 3 school systems;
- ✖ Will travel to Arizona in June for the Mesa Star and also evaluate 2 more schools;
- ✖ Working with the US Army child care centers in Florida;
- ✖ Currently adding an anti-microbial component to the IPM Star certification program.

Rich Muscarella from New York reported:

- ✓ That in New York public schools there have been no sprays in a year;
- ✓ The IPM Star program has been well accepted;

Lynn Braband from Cornell reported:

- ✓ They have been funded through the USDA Northeast IPM Center;
- ✓ Dan Dickerson has done an excellent job at schools – the IPM Star audit form is used to evaluate schools;
- ✓ Finishing-up with Maryland a alternative weed management program for schools;
- ✓ School Facility Managers often complain about classrooms and teachers as a source of the pest problems so they have partnered with teachers and facilities on 2 projects – one to foster custodian interactions with teachers and another science projects specific to the school.

Tom Green reported additionally:

- ✖ He has submitted an article to the Entomological Society of America's American Entomologist journal and;
- ✖ Dawn and Marc have submitted an article for publication on the Monroe Model.

Julie Wagner reported:

- Safer Pest Control Project has trained some 300-400 Chicago school engineers;
- Trained all 600 school Food Service Managers at schools in Chicago;
- Convinced Chicago Public Schools to provide pesticide notifications under the State Law and;
- They are eager for the University of Illinois to conduct the Statewide School IPKM survey that has been funded by EPA Region 5.

Mark Shour reported:

- ◆ Last year the State proposed legislation action on school IPM but it died;
- ◆ Just completed a PESP project for landscape IPM at schools, with maps of specific diseases/pests which were linked to solutions and another part of this work was with turf and athletic fields and;
- ◆ A student is working on alternatives for weed control and doing an economic study on turf IPM.

Sherry Glick encouraged people to register on the University of Florida Schools List Serve.

A person from Nebraska reported that they have been invited to EPA Region 7 to meet with tribes to implement IPM in schools and day care centers.

Kathy Murray reported:

- that they have had in place State regulations for school IPM for two years now;
- she is convinced that the State Law led to the successes now experienced;
- she works closely with the State Department of Education, through which they inserted school accreditation for IPM;
- Tom Green will come to Maine to help their program;
- Trying to incorporate into the school curriculum IPM principles and hope to add IPM into the "Agriculture in the Classroom" to reach teachers, but lacking the time and funding.

Jim Criswell reported that in Oklahoma they tried school IPM but the person responsible left.

Tom green closed the session expressing that we are all doing much more than IPM in schools, and we are really educating the next generation in IPM to carry over into all lives and environments.

Measuring Success Discussion:

Sherry opened up the discussion with an emphasis that EPA and other Federal agencies are now concerned with the development of measures of success. Sherry expressed that EPA is interested in agreeing on measures for National school IPM implementation. Donald Baumgartner clarified that these measures that EPA are interested in are not those for the Office and Management and Budget (OMB), but instead to satisfy needs internal to EPA and its Management.

The EPA has been concerned with measures of success for several years, without

agreement with States as to appropriate measures for various programs. The Government Performance and Review Act (GPRA) of 1993 aimed at increasing accountability by requiring measurement of program results and linking those to resource allocations. Within the last 4 years the OMB, with motivation from the current Presidential Administration, has begun evaluating the progress of environmental programs against GPRA, using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). In 2004, both EPA pesticides programs and enforcement were audited through PART, with poor results. EPA was provided the opportunity to develop PART measures of success and apply these to the major pesticide programs which receive Federal funding, and if EPA's PART ratings are not improved, OMB threatens funding reductions. EPA Management committed staff resources in 2005 to the development of these PART measures linked with Federal funds, as well as the agreement of other program measures to be used internally within EPA.

On behalf of EPA, Sherry is interested in starting discussions on the agreement of measures for the school IPM Program. Some possible scorecard activities to track include:

- ◆ Number of schools IPM Star certified;
- ◆ Percentage of schools with IPM plans;
- ◆ Percent of schools actually implementing IPM;
- ◆ Pest sightings;
- ◆ Comparison of pre- to post-IPM;
- ◆ Number of training classes and;
- ◆ Pesticides used as a function of IPM implementation. Sherry next opened up the discussion to questions and thoughts, with the admission that final agreement to accepted measures for school IPM will not be finalized at this meeting but require many more?

Dawn Gouge advocated using the number of IPM Star certified school IPM programs as a measure Nationally. Donald Baumgartner, however, quickly responded that this is not a good measure because many schools are not IPM Star certified, and many will not pay for the certification even though they may implement IPM.

Paul Cardosi concurred that we cannot use the IPM Star program as a measure of National success since only some 23 schools are represented by this, which is only a small part of the US. A problem too is that some schools may say that they practice IPM but do not in reality.

Kathy Seikel responded that the measures must be tied to health impacts.

Dawn agreed that we need to focus on health impacts and not just measure the pesticides used or pesticide reduction.

Marc Lame stated that we need to examine pest and pesticide use over a number of years.

Jim expressed that we need outputs of firm data and this is something which we do not have.

Mike Merchant mentioned that we need money to obtain survey data.

Sherry wants to focus on the number of children affected by IPM implementation.

Marc thinks that we need pesticide applicators certified in school IPM and that this will translate into children protection.

Kathy Murray suggested that we could link successes to asthma incidence. Julie Wagner

replied that asthma is a very complex topic and will be a challenge to control the variables.

A woman contributor responded that for numerical measurements we could just account for pesticide reduction over time to translate into risk reduction.

Donald Baumgartner stressed that first we as a group need to examine the USDA Road Map Schools Logic Model diagram which was presented as a poster presentation at this meeting. Although no one in the room was involved in the development of this schools Road Map, it seemed appropriate to start discussions from these results arrived at by others.

Mike mentioned that perhaps we could modify the IPM Star school assessments to capture data for school progress and measures.

Tom observed that schools really cannot self-assess because they are biased and may not meet the IPM standards. Marc agreed that self-disclosure does not work.

Norman Leppla reminded us that in some programs measures have been talked about for 30 years without agreement, and so they gave up and went to success stories.

Sherry recapped this discussion that these measures discussions cannot be resolved here and that this topic will certainly be a component of future Workgroup calls.

Update on Florida Website:

Rebecca explained that she is now updating the Florida School IPM web site, considered as the National web site for this topic. Web site was initially constructed in 1998-2001 using initially EPA funds, and has been maintained without funding since that time.

A newly revised Florida Univ. web page showing a color map of the United States containing State clickable links to other important school IPM web sites was distributed to all attendees for reference. In addition, an outline was distributed of the School IPM Box Table of Contents which will contain many other resources.

Rebecca explained that the map will link to each IPM Star certified school in the US, as evaluated by the IPM Institute.

Tom Green explained that the number of hits to the Florida web site in general are very large.

Anyone one currently on the school IPM List Serve was encouraged to join through the Florida web site.

Dawn Gouge clarified further that this revision of the FL web site started when EPA assembled a small group of IPM implementers in Las Vegas and discussed how to add Marc Lame's created School IPM Tool Box (funded by EPA OPP in FY 2004) to the web site. FL went over thousands of web pages and put together their favorite sites for this revision. Dawn explained that they have been real careful to evaluate stuff.

Marc Lame's continuing outlook is "not to reinvent the wheel", and advocated Florida web site as the best school IPM applicable web site.

Rebecca stated that they are not sure how long they can keep this web site alive though and updated. The most recent University of Florida web site updates are being performed w/o funding.

Strategic Plan for School IPM:

A conference call was held earlier this Winter 2006 on the need for USDA funding for school IPM, and how to leverage increased funding.

This former meeting resulted in the agreed need for a Strategy document (as already composed for some agricultural IPM areas) to cite as to the importance and needs to further support school IPM, as grants are provided to USDA.

Thus far, the Strategic Plans documents which have been composed have all been for an agricultural focus, except one for Right-of-Way.

There is interest to get people together and start the process to develop such a Strategic Plan for School IPM. Tom Green agreed to take the lead on this new endeavor.

Rick Melnicoe has met with all USDA IPM Centers and put in a proposal to the North Central IPM Center to fund the development of this School IPM Strategic Plan.

The advantages to develop a School IPM Strategic Plan include:

- Strategize/refine ideas for the next steps in school IPM National implementation;
- Prioritize directions for advance of the Program;
- Identify research needs to further promote the Program and;
- Cite one document agreed upon by several Federal agencies and leaders in the field which would carry weight in the selection of proposed grants for funding to USDA or other agencies.

Mike Merchant mentioned that there has been a couple Regional IPOM grant committees who utilize these Strategic Plans when grants are selected for funding.

Tom Green stated that in at least two USDA Request for Proposals, Strategy Plans are requested and the potential grantee is awarded extra evaluation points for grant activities which match the Strategy Plan.

It was proposed that each USDA IPM Center be solicited for a contribution of funding for a two-day meeting of some 30 people to develop this School IPM Strategic Plan.

Rick Melnicoe added that this Strategic Plan for School IPM would address:

- Ⓢ Identify what is important;
- Ⓢ Identify research needs;
- Ⓢ Identify education needs;
- Ⓢ Identify implementation needs and;
- Ⓢ Fulfill requests from all USDAD Centers for this Strategy document as part of focusing future grant funds.

Rick Melnicoe stated that he has already facilitated the development of 25 such Plans through meetings thus far, and that he is willing to assist a National workgroup to develop a similar Plan for School IPM. He would ask all the IPM Centers for input and send the draft document to a larger audience for review. Existing Plans for agricultural commodities are already posted on the USDA IPM Center web sites.

Urban IPM – Kathy Seikel, OPP/FEAD

Kathy's work has been mostly directed to urban, low-income housing and IPM.

On behalf of EPA, she is trying to partner with CDC to leverage funding.

CDC has decided that they will split internally and instead look at "placed-based" areas, such as healthy schools, healthy homes, and healthy communities.

Attended meeting of 60 participants hosted by CDC last 2005 which examined all angles around “Healthy Homes” – developing goals and strategies for CDC to follow for next 10 years.

CDC will next examine the topics of Healthy Communities and Healthy Schools in a similar way as done last year for Healthy Homes.

Funding Opportunities:

The School IPM Strategy Plan is one step, hopefully, towards increased funding for school IPM projects.

EPA Environmental Stewardship Branch been through lots of changes:

- Program has suffered because of problems securing a contract and;
- Pesticide Environmental Stewardship grants are ready to be solicited by EPA.

EPA grant to provide technical support assistance for risk reduction will be solicited by EPA, and school IPM/daycare could be included in this solicitation:

- ◆ Expect award in summer 2006;
- ◆ Solicitation via a contract and;
- ◆ Thus far, 3-4 organizations have showed an interest.

Regularly Scheduled Conference Calls:

Sherry advised the meeting attendees of her intent to start regularly scheduled conference calls monthly among all the participants present at this meeting. An email communication list will be established by Sherry and conference calls arranged to continue discussions on the topics addressed only briefly tonight.

Marc Lane closed the meeting by publicly acknowledging both Sherry Glick and Kath Seikel of EPA for all their hard work in sustaining IPM as a program, both at EPA and Nationally.

Tom Green additionally acknowledged Donald Baumgartner of EPA Region 5 for his efforts to also sustain school IPM, particularly within Region 5 (IL,IN,MI,MN,OH,WI), as well as Nationally.

Full Agenda for the 5th National IPM Symposium is at
<http://www.ipmcenters.org/ipmsymposiumv/>

Power Point Presentations of the sessions at the Symposium will be posted at
<http://www.ipmcenters.org/ipmsymposiumv/>

List of Attendees (38):

Rebecca Baldwin, University of Florida, Gainesville [baldwinr@ufl.edu]
Erin Bauer, University of Nebraska, Lincoln [ebauer2@unl.edu]
Donald Baumgartner, US EPA Region 5, Chicago [baumgartner.donald@epa.gov]
Paul Cardosi, Ecolab Pest Elimination Division, Scottsdale, AZ [paul.cardosi@ecolab.com]
Lynn Braband, New York State IPM Program of Cornell Univ., Rochester [Lab45@cornell.edu]
Jeanne Ciborowski, Minnesota Department of Agriculture [jeanne.ciborowski@state.mn.us]
Jim Criswell, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater [jim.t.criswell@okstate.edu]
Sharon Dobesh, Kansas State University, Manhattan [sdobesh@ksu.edu]
Terry Elichuk, Ecolab Pest Elimination Division, Eagan, MN [terry.elichuk@ecolab.com]
Carrie Foss, Washington State University, Puyallup [cfoss@wsu.edu]

Al Fournier, University of Arizona, Maricopa [fournier@ag.arizona.edu]
Tim Gibb, Purdue University, West Lafayette [gibbs@purdue.edu]
Sherry Glick, US EPA Office of Pesticide Programs, D.C. [glick.sherry@epa.gov]
Dawn Gouge, University of Arizona, Maricopa [dhgouge@ag.arizona.edu]
Lawrence Graham, Auburn University, AL [grahalc@auburn.edu]
Tom Green, IPM Institute of North America, Madison [ipmworks@ipminstitute.org]
Judy Grundler, Missouri Department of Agriculture, Jefferson City [judy.grundler@mda.mo.gov]
Janet Hurley, Texas A&M University, Dallas [ja-hurley@tamu.edu]
Jerry Jochim, Monroe County Community School Corp., Bloomington, IN [jjochim@mccsc.edu]
Marc Lame, Indiana University [mlame@indiana.edu]
Norman Leppa, University of Florida, Gainesville [ncleppa@ifas.ufl.edu]
Jack Marlowe, Eden Advanced Pest Technologies, Olympia [jackmarlowe@edenpest.com]
Patricia Matteson, CA Dept. of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento [pmatteson@cdpr.ca.gov]
Richard Melnicoe, Western IPM Center Director, Davis, CA [rsmelnicoe@ucdavis.edu]
Mike Merchant, Texas A&M University, Dallas [m-merchant@tamu.edu]
Kathy Murray, Maine Department of Agriculture, Augusta [Kathy.murray@maine.gov]
Rich Muscarella, Cornell IPM, Alden, NY [ipm@netzero.net]
Clyde Ogg, University of Nebraska, Lincoln [cogg@unl.edu]
Rachel Rosenberg, Safer Pest Control Project, Chicago [rrosenberg@spcpweb.org]
Kathy Seikel, US EPA Office of Pesticide Programs, D.C. [seikel.kathy@epa.gov]
Mark Shour, Iowa State University [mshour@iastate.edu]
Jennifer Snyder, University of Arizona, Maricopa [jsnyder@ag.arizona.edu]
Tim Stock, Oregon State University, Corvallis [stock@science.oregonstate.edu]
Dan Suomi, Washington State Department of Agriculture, Olympia [dsuomi@agr.wa.gov]
Julie Wagner, Safer Pest Control Project, Chicago [jwagner@spcpweb.org]
Belinda Messenger, CA Department of Pesticide Regulations, bmessenger@cdpr.ca.gov
Faith Oi, University of FL

Disclaimer: These School IPM Meeting notes were composed by Donald Baumgartner, EPA Region 5 (Chicago) (Baumgartner.donald@epa.gov ; tel. 312/886-7835), who accepts sole responsibility for the content and its accuracy. This Meeting summary is based on notes taken by Mr. Baumgartner while present during this meeting. He apologizes in advance for any inaccuracies recorded. These notes are provided only as a means to share information on this topic. Do not cite or quote this summary; to ensure the accuracy of any future published references to these notes and its content, please contact the respective originator of the presentation to verify the accuracy and opinions of any information herein provided. The views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the United States Environmental Protection Agency or other cited agencies/organizations who participated in this meeting.