

PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED BY PARTICIPANTS AT NOV 2006 MEETING

- a. Education Priorities (and votes received during ranking):
 - a. Raise IPM on NRCS radar - continuing education modules for NRCS planners in IPM basics, how IPM meets resource conservation needs, and commodity-specific detail and; how TSPs can better meet NRCS needs re pest management plans; success stories. (15)
 - b. Extension education about NRCS mission, programs, opportunities for grower clientele how to engage NRCS effectively including using terms NRCS relates to (common language, see Mike Brewer's slides for translating IPM concerns in to terms understood by NRCS); success stories; distinguishing NRCS policy, program, standards and levers for improving each. (13)
 - c. Education for growers re NRCS program options, qualifications, requirements and proper scouting procedures to meet requirements. (12)
 - d. Develop and circulate more information on where current NRCS pest management dollars are directed, e.g., IN is in the top ten states for these dollars but uses are currently unknown. (3)
 - e. Develop best practices guide for including conservation approaches and practices in Extension publications, e.g., recommends, manuals. (1)
 - f. Fact sheet on strategies to optimize IPM and pest management-related impacts on resources within current NRCS programs.
 - g. Develop fact sheet on vehicles for IPM/NRCS collaboration, e.g., Cooperative Ecosystem Study Units (CESUs), contracts, grant programs.
 - h. Increase awareness of organic transition options.
 - i. Figure out how to channel resources to Extension for education, e.g., channeling dollars through state lead agencies might reduce overhead.
 - j. Secure funding for demonstration.
- b. Research Priorities:
 - a. Measurement/evaluation of ecosystem health, functional ecology to move beyond soil/water resource emphasis; sustainability of practice adoption once incentives go away; practice adoption vs. permanent installation; soil and aquatic life as indicators and relationship to IPM. (14)
 - b. Toxicity modeling, look at WinPST and other models for potential to create comprehensive tool, resolve conflicts among existing approaches, create a standard for selecting least hazardous options. (13)
 - c. Identify high impact IPM issues/practices for field crops (10)

- d. Vegetable production systems that score well on Soil Conditioning Index so that growers can get CSP incentives (5)
 - e. Endangered species-specific research, big upcoming issue for some cropping systems (3)
 - f. What are already identified NRCS/ID gaps in IPM? Are they really gaps and how do we repackage info to meet NRCS needs? (1)
 - g. How do management practices impact eco-system health (functional ecology)? (1)
 - h. What is best mix of investment in livestock, field crops, specialty crops to max economic/enviro/health and resource improvement returns? (1)
 - i. Comparative policy analysis state by state, what's different, what works best. (0)
3. Program/Policy Priorities:
- a. More IPM participation on state technical committees and sub-groups, e.g., EQIP subgroups, county workgroups. (12)
 - b. More IPM input into next farm bill re NRCS programs. (12)
 - c. Educate NRCS policy/program decision makers a national level about IPM (12)
 - d. Evaluate NRCS performance on pest management issues. (5)
 - e. Change farm bill to reflect resource needs, e.g., is 60% of EQIP to livestock justified by resource need? (2)
 - f. Make pest management incentives available in every county nationwide. (1)
 - g. Longer term, permanent annual green payments. (0)
 - h. More IPM specialists in state/regional/national NRCS offices.
 - i. Move incentive dollars now used for pest management to address higher priority IPM needs.
 - j. Change name of Pest Management Standard to IPM Standard, IPM is the way we do pest management.
 - k. More vehicles to move NRCS resources to IPM-based opportunities to improve resources.
4. Additional Priority (Mike Brewer to communicate to National Task Force):
- a. Widen technical assistance funnel to producers, e.g., NRCS staff are stretched thin with additional responsibilities and budget since 2002 Farm Bill; Extension and other resources could be brought to bear to increase technical assistance available to producers.