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In a general sense, integrated pest management (IPM) can be defined as a systematic approach to pest management that considers all factors affecting crop health, including plant nutrition, horticultural practices, and all suitable means of pest suppression. Pest management tactics may include biological, chemical, mechanical, and cultural methods, but different tactics are often required for different crops, pests and climatic situations. Given these broadly defined and variable characteristics, growers and extension specialists have been heard to state that the practice of IPM cannot be defined or measured. The Massachusetts IPM guidelines provides a means to measure the relative adoption of IPM.

The Massachusetts IPM Guidelines: Crop Specific Definitions are a series of research-based best management practices encompassing soil and nutrient management, cultural practices, pesticide application techniques, record-keeping, tactics for insect, disease and weed management and grower education. Specific practices are assigned points on the based on their importance to an IPM system. Bonus points are given for experimental techniques. Some advantages of the point system are: it allows flexibility to design site-specific systems; it encourages use of most desirable practices by weighting; and it allows partial credit for trying a practice on a portion of the farm.

The publication includes guidelines for apple, cole crops, cranberry, field and greenhouse tomato, blueberry, peppers, poinsettia, potato, pumpkin and winter squash, raspberry, strawberry, sweet corn and wine grape.

To assure practicality and relevance, the guidelines were developed with the cooperation of growers, university faculty and extension specialists, private IPM consultants, and commodity associations. Most crop guidelines were used, tested and adjusted through the USDA Farm Service Agency Integrated Crop Management cost-share program (SP-53) and through Massachusetts’ IPM certification program, Partners with Nature.

IPM guidelines can be used in a number of ways: 1) as an educational tool which describes the scope and complexity of IPM to farmers, government officials, community groups and the general public; 2) as a checklist for farmers to evaluate their on-farm pest management programs and identify areas where management can be improved; and 3) to verify and document that IPM is practiced on the farm.

The guidelines received extensive use as an objective tool to document IPM compliance in the Partners with Nature program, which certified over 600 crops on over 100 farms. A discussion of the PWN program is available at: http://www.umass.edu/umext/programs/agro/ipm/educert/pwn.htm

Another application of the Massachusetts IPM guidelines was the assessment of adoption of IPM by sweet corn growers in six northeastern states. The report for this study can be viewed at: http://www.umass.edu/umext/programs/agro/ipm/Reports/craig.html

Massachusetts IPM Guidelines: Crop Specific Definitions, UMass Extension publication IP-IPMA (66 pp.) can be ordered for $ 6.00 through the UMass Extension Bookstore, Draper Hall, UMass, Amherst MA 01003 and can be also be viewed at the UMass Extension website at: http://www.umass.edu/umext/programs/agro/ipm/ipm_guidelines/. 

Acknowledgements

The authors especially thank Vicki Van Zee for her important work during the early phases of this project.

Development of the Massachusetts IPM Guidelines was funded by University of Massachusetts Extension, Massachusetts Department of Food and Agriculture and USDA Extension Service under special project number 94-EPMP-1-0049.

Contact:

Craig Hollingsworth, Ph.D
Extension Educator
Department of Entomology
University of Massachusetts
Amherst MA 01003
Tel: 413-545-1055
Fax: 413-545-5858
chollingsworth@umext.umass.edu
IPM Assessment Tool Survey: Summary and Results

May 22, 2000

Summary and Results compiled by:

John Vickery, Environment and Agriculture Program
IATP, Minneapolis, MN

Stephanie Lundeen, Environment and Agriculture Program
IATP, Minneapolis, MN
Thanks to all of you that replied to our survey. Below is some background information and a summary of the results.

Cordially,

Stephanie Lundeen and John Vickery
IATP

IPM Survey Results

PURPOSE

To identify the Integrated Pest Management assessment instruments or tools available in each state. These include: survey instruments, farmer self-assessment tools, and criteria for environmental marketing. Sometimes the terms IPM "guidelines," "protocol," "elements," are used.

Whenever any of us needs an IPM self-assessment tool or survey instrument, we will want to customize them to meet specific needs, but it is a great help to be able to start with a tool or survey instrument that has already been developed. For example, with Tom Green (IPM Works and IPM Institute), IATP is developing an IPM assessment tool for field corn. We previously knew about efforts in Ohio and New York, but now know that we need to contact folks in Illinois, Oregon, and Wyoming so that we can learn from their efforts.

METHODOLOGY

The IPM assessment tool survey instrument was sent via email from IATP to every state IPM coordinator (or similar individual) on April 28, 2000. John Vickery, Tom Green, and Mike Fitzner (IPM Program, USDA-CSREES) were identified as the senders—or surveyors! A deadline was given and a reminder email was sent prior to the deadline. The results of this first attempt resulted in 20 completed surveys. In an attempt to gather surveys from the states that did not respond, the IPM survey was sent a second time to a different contact person in each of those states. As a result, another 14 states responded. The total number of states that responded to the survey was 34. Below is a brief summary of the results

RESPONDING STATES WITH EXTENSION ASSESSMENT TOOLS

state: respondent 23 total

AK: Fred Sorensen **
CT: Richard A. Ashley
GA: Paul Guillebeau
HI: Ronald F.L. Mau
FL: Russ Mizell
IA: Jerald DeWitt
ID: Edward John Bechinski
IL: Michael Gray
KY: Doug Johnson
LA: Clayton A. Hollier
MA: Bill Coli ***
ME: Jim Dill
NJ: George Hamilton
NM: Carol A. Sutherland **
NY: Curt Petzoldt ***
OH: Joe Kovach
OK: Gerrit W. Cuperus
OR: Leonard Coop
TN: Karen M. Vail
UT: Diane G. Alston
VT: Lorraine P. Berkett
WI: Bryan Jensen
WY: Tom Whitson

**Based on available information, the materials from these states do not appear to be assessment tools, per se.
***More information for MA & NY is provided in the conference proceedings "Adding Value Through Environmental Marketing". NY - presentation summary and MA - appendix IV. A.

**RESPONDING STATES LACKING ASSESSMENT TOOLS**

state: respondent 14 total

AS: Fred Brooks (American Samoa)
AZ: John C. Palumbo
CA: Peter Goodell
CO: Bill Brown
CNMI: A. Lee Eavy (Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands)
DE: Joanne Whalen
KS: Douglas J. Jardine
MN: Kenneth Ostlie
ND: Marcia McMullen
NE: Robert J. Wright
RI: Richard Casagrande
SD: Darrell Deneke
VA: Ames Herbert
VI: Jozef Keularts (Virgin Islands)

**NONRESPONDING STATES AND TERRITORIES**

18 total

AL, AR, DC, GU, IN, MD, MI, MS, MO, MT, NV, NH, NC, PA, SC, TX, WA, WV

**STATES THAT HAVE IPM ASSESSMENT TOOLS: a listing by crop**

(Agricultural Crops & Other):

Agricultural Crops:
agronomic crops: CT
alfalfa: IA, OH, OK, NY, WY
apples: ME, MA, NJ, OR, VT
asparagus: NY
banana: HI
beans: NY, OR
beets: NY
blueberries: MA, NJ, NY
broccoli: OR
cabbage: OH, NY
carrot: OH, NY
cauliflower: NY, OR
chile: NM
cole crops: MA
cucumber: OH, NY
cranberry: MA
cotton: GA, LA, NM, OK
donut: OH
fruit: KY
lettuce: OH, NY
macadamia: HI
melons: NY
onions: ID
peaches: NJ
peanuts: OK
pear: OR
peas: NY, WI
pecans: NM, OK
peppermint: OR
peppers: FL, MA, NY, OH
pineapple: HI
potato: AK, ID, ME, MA, OH
radish: OH
raspberry: MA, NY
rice: LA
small grains: WY
snap beans: OH, WI
soybean: IA, IL, LA, OH
squash/pumpkin: MA, OH, NY
stored grain: OK
strawberries: ME, MA  
sugar beets: ID, WY  
sugarcane: LA  
sweet corn: ME, MA, OH, WI, NY  
vegetables: CT  
wheat: ID, KY, OH, OK  
wine grapes: CA, MA

Other:  
beekeeping: TN  
greenhouse: CT, OK  
landscape: TN  
livestock: FL  
ornamentals: FL, GA  
poincettia: MA  
poultry houses: CA  
schools: GA, TN  
urban: OK

Summary of question #6. Purpose: those who ranked "incentives" as an important purpose and identified the type/s of incentive.

CT and OK: EQIP (USDA Environmental Quality Incentives Program)  
MA: - not identified [environmental marketing; formerly, federal cost sharing, state public recognition program--editors]  
NY: IPM Labeling

### BLANK SURVEY RESPONSE FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact info. for respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE—for format</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary responsibility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Crop(s) with assessment tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. multiple choice OR dichotomous/yes vs. no/checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. point system/quantitative OR qualitative ratings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Organizations involved, other than Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes sections or criteria on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Assumed: sections or criteria on management of insects, weeds, diseases and/or nematodes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Who is the audience—the intended user for the tool?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(<em>&quot;</em>&quot; denotes the primary audience)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Rank order, starting with &quot;1&quot; for the most important purpose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- educational and/or motivational tool for farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- identify crop production system weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- evaluate Extension programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- determine eligibility for incentive *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- identify research needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- federal or state reporting requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other, specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7. Primarily a survey instrument? |

| 8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent): |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Website URL for info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tools available online?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Publications, reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 11. Project description—narrative or other explanation |
## SURVEY RESULTS

### ALASKA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fred Sorensen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPM Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska—Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2221 E. Northern Lights Blvd #118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, AK 99508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907 786-6300 Fax 786-6312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dffes@uaa.alaska.edu">dffes@uaa.alaska.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Crops**
   - A. potato

2. **Status**
   - A. final version completed

3. **Format**
   - A.
   - B.
   - Includes sections or criteria on:
     - education

4. **Other organizations involved**
   - Woodbridge/Lodi - Cliff Omart
   - Central Coast Vineyard Alliance - Mary Bianchi
   - Sun Maid Raisins - Joe Kretsch
   - Poultry House IPM - Lesley Hinkle

5. **Audience**
   - farmers
   - publics sector ag.
   - professionals
   - other specify: general public

6. **Purpose (rank order)**
   - education and/or motivational tool for farmers
   - characterize adoption of IPM practices
   - identify crop production system weaknesses

7. **Primarily a survey instrument?**
   - No

8. **Primary contact person for the assessment tool** (if different from respondent):
   - None

9. **Website URL for info**
   - None

10. **Assessment tools available online?**
    - No

### CALIFORNIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peter B. Goodell, PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPM Extension Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Statewide IPM Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney Ag Center, 9240 So Riverbend, Parlier Ca 93648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559/646-6515 Fax: 559/646-6593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Crops**
   - A. Grapes
     - Lodi Woodbridge Central Coast
     - Sun Maid Raisin (?)
   - B. IPM in Poultry Houses

2. **Status**
   - Unanswered

3. **Format**
   - Unanswered

4. **Other organizations involved**
   - Woodbridge/Lodi - Cliff Omart
   - Central Coast Vineyard Alliance - Mary Bianchi
   - Sun Maid Raisins - Joe Kretsch
   - Poultry House IPM - Lesley Hinkle

5. **Audience**
   - Unanswered

6. **Purpose (rank order)**
   - Unanswered

7. **Primarily a survey instrument?**
   - Unanswered

8. **Primary contact person for the assessment tool** (if different from respondent):
   - See notes for contact info on the above organizations.

9. **Website URL for info**
   - Unanswered

10. **Assessment tools available online?**
    - Unanswered
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONNECTICUT</th>
<th>FLORIDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richard A. Ashley</strong>&lt;br&gt;IPM Coordinator&lt;br&gt;University of Connecticut&lt;br&gt;Dept. of Plant Science, U-67&lt;br&gt;Storrs, CT 06269-4067&lt;br&gt;860-486-3438, FAX 486-0682</td>
<td><strong>Russ Mizell</strong>&lt;br&gt;Professor and IPM coordinator&lt;br&gt;U of Florida&lt;br&gt;Rt. 4, Box 4092&lt;br&gt;Monticello, FL 32344&lt;br&gt;850-342-0990&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:rfm@gnv.ifas.ufl.edu">rfm@gnv.ifas.ufl.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Crops</strong>&lt;br&gt;A. vegetables&lt;br&gt;B. agronomic crops&lt;br&gt;C. greenhouse</td>
<td><strong>1. Crops</strong>&lt;br&gt;A. Tomato&lt;br&gt;B. Ornamentals&lt;br&gt;C. Livestock&lt;br&gt;D. Peppers and other vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status&lt;br&gt;C draft version available&lt;br&gt;A,B final version completed</td>
<td>2. Status&lt;br&gt;A-D Final version completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Format&lt;br&gt;A, B, C dichotomous/yes vs. no/checklist&lt;br&gt;B. A point system</td>
<td>3. Format&lt;br&gt;unanswered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes sections or criteria on:&lt;br&gt;A, B, C soil conservation or management&lt;br&gt;A, B, C nutrient and/or soil quality management&lt;br&gt;C water conservation or irrigation management</td>
<td>Includes sections or criteria on:&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other organizations involved&lt;br&gt;None</td>
<td>4. Other organizations involved&lt;br&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Audience&lt;br&gt;- farmers&lt;br&gt;- *** other specify: IPM Coordinator</td>
<td>5. Audience&lt;br&gt;- regulators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Purpose&lt;br&gt;- 1 evaluate Extension programs&lt;br&gt;- 2 federal or state reporting requirements&lt;br&gt;- 3 characterize adoption of IPM practices&lt;br&gt;- 4 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers&lt;br&gt;- 5 identify crop production system weaknesses&lt;br&gt;- 6 identify research needs&lt;br&gt;- 7 determine eligibility for incentive * EQIP</td>
<td>6. Purpose (rank order)&lt;br&gt;- 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices&lt;br&gt;- 2 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Primarily a survey instrument?&lt;br&gt;No</td>
<td>7. Primarily a survey instrument?&lt;br&gt;Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):&lt;br&gt;O. Norman Nesheim, Pesticide Information Coordinator</td>
<td>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):&lt;br&gt;O. Norman Nesheim, Pesticide Information Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Website URL for info&lt;br&gt;Unanswered</td>
<td>9. Website URL for info&lt;br&gt;Unanswered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tools available on line?&lt;br&gt;No</td>
<td>Assessment tools available on line?&lt;br&gt;Unanswered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Project description--narrative&lt;br&gt;Program leaders use pre- and post-training surveys to determine impacts on participating growers. IPM coordinator uses evaluation forms developed by program leaders to assess the level of adoption and use of IPM practices by a random sample of growers.</td>
<td>11. Project description--narrative&lt;br&gt;PIAP assessment and impact surveys with IPM questions; no other IPM tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GEORGIA

**Paul Guillebeau**  
IPM/Pesticide Coordinator  
University of Georgia  
Department of Entomology  
Athens GA 30602  
706-542-9031  
FAX 542-3872  
pguillebeau@bugs.ent.uga.edu

Coordinate/facilitate IPM and pesticide programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Crops</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. cotton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ornamentals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. final version completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. C draft version available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Format</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A-C, multiple choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A-C point system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes sections or criteria on:  
A - soil conservation or management  
A - nutrient and/or soil quality management  
A-C - education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Other organizations involved</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Audience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other, specify: school personnel, PCOs, and school administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Purpose (rank order)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 identify research needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 evaluate Extension programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 identify crop production system weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 determine eligibility for incentive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Not identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Website URL for info</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Publications, reports</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### HAWAII

**Ronald F.L. Mau**  
Assoc. Dean/ Assoc. Director for Cooperative Extension  
Univ of Hawaii College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources  
3050 Maile Way, Room 203B  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822-2271  
808-956-8397  
Fax: 956-9105  
Mobile 808-265-4554

Former Extension IPM Coordinator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Crops</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Pineapple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Banana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Macadamia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A,B,C final version completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Format</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. unanswered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. point system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes sections or criteria on:  
- nutrient and/or soil quality management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Other organizations involved</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Audience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- regulators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Purpose (rank order)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1 educational and/or - - motivational tool for farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. The instrument is used to verify level of adoption of IPM Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dr. Arnold Hara, Extension IPM Coordinator  
ardolf@hawaii.edu |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Website URL for info</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.extento.hawaii.edu/IPM/">http://www.extento.hawaii.edu/IPM/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Publications, reports</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Project description--narrative</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The pineapple IPM protocol were patterned after the New York and Mass. elements/guidelines. The macadamia and banana guidelines were modeled after the national potato IPM program. If further information is needed it might be available in our plan of work at the USDA IPM Website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IDAHO

**Edward John Bechinski**  
Extension IPM Coordinator  
University of Idaho  
236 Ag. Sci. Bldg  
Moscow, ID 83844  
208.885.5972 FAX 885.7760  
ed_bechinski@uidaho

1. **Crops**  
   - potatoes  
   - sugarbeets  
   - wheat  
   - onions

2. **Status**  
   - A-D final version completed

3. **Format**  
   - A-D_multiple choice  
   - Unanswered

4. **Other organizations involved**  
   - Financially co-sponsored by state commodity commissions

5. **Audience**  
   - farmers  
   - private sector ag. professionals  
   - publics sector ag. professionals

6. **Purpose**  
   - 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices  
   - 2 evaluate Extension programs  
   - 3 identify research needs  
   - 4 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers

7. **Primarily a survey instrument?**  
   - Yes

8. **Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):**

9. **Website URL for info**  
   - http://agweb.ag.uidaho.edu/ipm

10. **Publications, reports**

### ILLINOIS

**Michael E. Gray**  
Professor & Extension IPM Coordinator  
Institution University of Illinois  
Department of Crop Sciences  
Address 2 S-320 Turner Hall, 1102 S. Goodwin Avenue  
Urbana, IL 61801  
217-333-6652; FAX 333-5245  
m-gray4@uiuc.edu

1. **Crops**  
   - corn  
   - soybean

2. **Status**  
   - A-D final version completed

3. **Format**  
   - A-D multiple choice  
   - Unanswered

4. **Other organizations involved**  
   - Not aware of any others.

5. **Audience**  
   - farmers  
   - private sector ag. professionals (summaries in preparation)

6. **Purpose (rank order)**  
   - 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices  
   - 2 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers  
   - 3 identify research needs  
   - 4 identify crop production system weaknesses

7. **Primarily a survey instrument?**  
   - Yes

8. **Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):**

9. **Website URL for info**  
   - http://www.aces.uiuc.edu/ipm/field/com/imr/wcrscout/wcrscout.html

Assessment tools available on line?  
   - Yes

10. **Publications, reports**

In 1995 the following paper concerning the adoption of IPM practices on central Illinois farms was published.  

11. **Project description—narrative**  
   See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.
IOWA

Jerald DeWitt, Professor
Pest Management and the Environment Program
Coordinator
Iowa State University
Department of Entomology
Room 8 Insectary
Ames, IA  50011-3140
515-294-1101
FAX  515-294-8027
jdewitt@iastate.edu

Your primary responsibility:
Coordinator of the Pest Management and the Environment Program. This program includes Integrated Pest Management for field crops and urban settings; also pesticide applicator training and educational programs for private and commercial pesticide applicators.

1. Crops
A. corn
B. soybean
C. alfalfa

2. Status
A,B draft version available
A-C final version completed

We have just mailed the final version of the IPM survey to growers in Iowa for corn and soybean. The alfalfa survey is as separate survey instrument for alfalfa growers that was used earlier this year. In addition, we ask questions of producers for our pesticide applicator training programs.

3. Format
A. A-C multiple choice and A,B dichotomous/yes vs. no/checklist

Includes sections or criteria on:
- nutrient and/or soil quality management
- education

4. Other organizations involved
Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship, Natural Resources and Conservation Service, Certified Crop Advisors, Agribusiness Association of Iowa, National Foundation for IPM Education, Texas A&M University, Texas Pest Management Association

5. Audience
- farmers
- private sector ag. professionals
- publics sector ag. professionals

6. Purpose
- 3 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers (and/or other audience)
- 1 identify crop production system weaknesses
- 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices
- 4 evaluate Extension programs
- 7 determine eligibility for incentive *
- 6 identify research needs
- 5 federal or state reporting requirements

7. Primarily a survey instrument?
Yes

8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):
Carol Pilcher
325 N Union St
Good Hope, IL  61438
phone 309-456-3513
email csimmons@iastate.edu

9. Website URL for info
No

Assessment tools available on line?
No

10. Publications, reports
Contact Carol Pilcher
Reports will be generated when IPM survey is completed.

11. Project description--narrative
The primary objective of the IPM survey was to take an important step towards developing a standardized measurement tool for the adoption of IPM that can be utilized by multiple agencies across different commodities. This research evaluated existing measurement devices to develop an appropriate tool with field level applicability. We are currently in the process of demonstrating the use of this tool across state lines with corn, cotton, and soybean production.

The alfalfa survey was designed to reveal specific management techniques that are used in alfalfa production in Iowa. From these data, we can better estimate client needs and develop educational materials that answer producer needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Crops</th>
<th>A. Wheat</th>
<th>B. Fruit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Status</td>
<td>A, B revised/updated version will be available (date/year?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Format</td>
<td>A. Unanswered</td>
<td>B. A, B Point system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include(s) sections or criteria on:</td>
<td>A. soil conservation or management</td>
<td>B. nutrient and/or soil quality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A, B organic amendments</td>
<td>A, B education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other organizations involved</td>
<td>See 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Audience</td>
<td>farmers</td>
<td>private sector ag. professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publics sector ag. professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Purpose (rank order)</td>
<td>- 1 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 identify crop production system weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 evaluate Extension programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 identify research needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- NA determine eligibility for incentive *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Website URL for info</td>
<td>Not yet available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tools available on line?</td>
<td>No, but will be as time and support permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Project description--narrative</td>
<td>IPM programs utilize expertise and participation from:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entomology, Plant Pathology, Agronomy, Horticulture, Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Weather, and Agricultural Communications. Additionally, IPM will share personnel teaching materials, programs, and ideas with efforts in Pesticide Applicator Training (KY PAT), Pesticide Impact Assessment, and Food Safety, Water Quality, and Sustainable Agriculture Working Groups. See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton A. Hollier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Leader (Plant Science) &amp; Specialist (Plant Pathology)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O. Box 25100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, LA 70894-5100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225-388-2186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:chollier@agctr.lsu.edu">chollier@agctr.lsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sugarcane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Rice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Cotton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Soybeans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A – D final version completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. A – D dichotomous/yes vs. no/checklist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Quantitative/Population Density/Unit Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include(s) sections or criteria on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A soil conservation or management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A nutrient and/or soil quality management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A organic amendments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A – D water conservation or irrigation management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A – D education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other organizations involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity associations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private sector ag. professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publics sector ag. professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other, specify: Agricultural Extension Agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Purpose (rank order)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 evaluate Extension programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 identify research needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 identify crop production system weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Website URL for info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.agctr.lsu.edu/wwwac">http://www.agctr.lsu.edu/wwwac</a> (then go to Commodity Pages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tools available on line?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No, not yet, still in planning stage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Dill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Management Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMCE PMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491 College Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orono, ME 04473-1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207-581-3870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAX 581-3881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jdill@umext.maine.edu">jdill@umext.maine.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Potatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Sweet corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Apples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Strawberries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,B,C,D: final version completed (for program evaluation only)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unanswered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes sections or criteria on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other organizations involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Purpose (rank order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1 evaluate Extension programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 identify crop production system weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 identify research needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Website URL for info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tools available on line?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No, not yet, still in planning stage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are strictly program evaluation surveys— not a point system like National Potato Council's IPM Protocol
1. Crops
   A. Apple
   B. Cranberry
   C. Cole crops
   D. Field tomato
   E. Greenhouse tomato
   F. Highbush blueberry
   G. Peppers
   H. Poinsettia
   I. Potato
   J. Pumpkin and winter squash
   K. Raspberry
   L. Strawberry
   M. Sweet Corn
   N. Wine grapes

2. Status
   ALL CROPS final version completed

3. Format
   A. Unanswered
   B. ALL point system

4. Other organizations involved
   Various grower associations
   Private IPM Consultants
   Dept. of Food and Agriculture

5. Audience
   - farmers
   - private sector ag. professionals
   - publics sector ag. professionals
   - auditors, certifiers
   - regulators
   - other, specify: environmental advocacy groups & consumers

6. Purpose (rank order)
   - 1 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers
   - 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices
   - 2 identify research needs
   - 2 federal or state reporting requirements
   - 3 evaluate Extension programs
   - 4 determine eligibility for incentive *
   *not identified [environmental marketing; formerly, federal cost sharing--editor]

7. Primarily a survey instrument?
   No

8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):

9. Website URL for info
   http://www.umass.edu/umext/programs/agro/ipm/IPM_guidelines/

Assessment tools available online?
Yes

10. Publications, reports
    ~ Hollingsworth, Craig and the University of Massachusetts Extension IPM Program. Amherst, MA, USA for Integrated Pest Management, Massachusetts Guidelines: Commodity Specific Definitions for sweet corn and potatoes

11. Project description--narrative
    See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW JERSEY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dr. George Hamilton</strong>&lt;br&gt;Associate Specialist in Pest Management&lt;br&gt;Dept. of Entomology&lt;br&gt;Rutgers University&lt;br&gt;93 Lipman Drive&lt;br&gt;New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8525&lt;br&gt;732-932-9801 FAX 932-932-9801 <a href="mailto:hamilton@aesop.rutgers.edu">hamilton@aesop.rutgers.edu</a></td>
<td><strong>2. Status</strong>&lt;br&gt;Many more veggies: in planning ALL: final version completed&lt;br&gt;- Apples, peaches and blueberries: revised/updated version will be available: 7/00</td>
<td><strong>4. Other organizations involved</strong>&lt;br&gt;Wegman’s New Jersey Department of Agriculture</td>
<td><strong>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</strong> No</td>
<td><strong>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool</strong>&lt;br&gt;(if different from respondent):</td>
<td><strong>10. Publications, reports</strong>&lt;br&gt;See website</td>
<td><strong>11. Project description--narrative</strong>&lt;br&gt;See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPM, PAT, PIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>3. Format</strong>&lt;br&gt;A. Unanswered&lt;br&gt;B. point system AND qualitative ratings&lt;br&gt;Includes sections or criteria on:&lt;br&gt;- soil conservation or management&lt;br&gt;- nutrient and/or soil quality management&lt;br&gt;- organic amendments&lt;br&gt;- water conservation or irrigation management&lt;br&gt;- education</td>
<td><strong>5. Audience</strong>&lt;br&gt;- farmers</td>
<td><strong>9. Website URL for info</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://aesop.rutgers.edu/~hamilton/IPM.htm">http://aesop.rutgers.edu/~hamilton/IPM.htm</a></td>
<td><strong>Assessment tools available on line?</strong> Yes</td>
<td><strong>12. Project description--narrative</strong>&lt;br&gt;See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Crops</strong>&lt;br&gt;A. Unanswered&lt;br&gt;Includes sections or criteria on:&lt;br&gt;- soil conservation or management&lt;br&gt;- nutrient and/or soil quality management&lt;br&gt;- organic amendments&lt;br&gt;- water conservation or irrigation management&lt;br&gt;- education</td>
<td><strong>6. Purpose (rank order)</strong>&lt;br&gt;- 1 determine eligibility for incentive <em>&lt;br&gt;- 2 characterize adoption of IPM practices&lt;br&gt;- 3 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers&lt;br&gt;- 4 identify crop production system weaknesses&lt;br&gt;- 5 evaluate Extension programs&lt;br&gt;- 6 identify research needs&lt;br&gt;- 7 federal or state reporting requirements&lt;br&gt;</em> New marketing opportunity</td>
<td><strong>11. Project description--narrative</strong>&lt;br&gt;See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW MEXICO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carol A. Sutherland</strong>&lt;br&gt;Extension Entomologist, State Entomologist&lt;br&gt;New Mexico State University Extension Plant Sciences Dept. Box 30003, MSC 3AE&lt;br&gt;Las Cruces, NM 88003-8003&lt;br&gt;505-646-1132 FAX 646-8085 <a href="mailto:csutherl@nmda-bubba.nmsu.edu">csutherl@nmda-bubba.nmsu.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Crops</strong>&lt;br&gt;A. chile (in binder)&lt;br&gt;B. pecans (in binder)&lt;br&gt;C. cotton (components are not assembled into a 3-ring binder, however)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Status</strong>&lt;br&gt;A,B,C final version completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Format</strong>&lt;br&gt;A. Unanswered&lt;br&gt;B. Unanswered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: compendia of available publications on a crop</td>
<td><strong>4. Other organizations involved</strong>&lt;br&gt;None</td>
<td><strong>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</strong> No</td>
<td><strong>9. Website URL for info</strong>&lt;br&gt;No</td>
<td><strong>Assessment tools available on line?</strong> No</td>
<td><strong>10. Publications, reports</strong>&lt;br&gt;See website</td>
<td><strong>11. Project description--narrative</strong>&lt;br&gt;See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Include(s) sections or criteria on:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- soil conservation or management&lt;br&gt;- nutrient and/or soil quality management&lt;br&gt;- organic amendments (manures only)&lt;br&gt;- water conservation or irrigation management&lt;br&gt;- education</td>
<td><strong>5. Audience</strong>&lt;br&gt;- farmers*&lt;br&gt;- private sector ag. professionals*&lt;br&gt;- publics sector ag. professionals</td>
<td><strong>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool</strong>&lt;br&gt;(if different from respondent):&lt;br&gt;Chile: Dr. Natalie Goldberg, same address as above&lt;br&gt;Pecans: Dr. Esteban Herrera, ditto&lt;br&gt;Cotton: no real spokesman for that since the collection of publications is not assembled into one unit</td>
<td><strong>12. Project description--narrative</strong>&lt;br&gt;See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td><strong>12. Project description--narrative</strong>&lt;br&gt;See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td><strong>13. Project description--narrative</strong>&lt;br&gt;See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td><strong>14. Project description--narrative</strong>&lt;br&gt;See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Curt Petzoldt**, Director IPM  
Cornell University, NYSAES  
Geneva, NY 14456  
Phone, Fax 315787-2206  
sp13@cornell.edu |
| **Your primary responsibility:**  
IPM Programs |
| **1. Crops**  
A. Market Sweet corn  
B. Cabbage  
C. Beets  
D. Carrots  
E. Asparagus  
F. Blueberries  
G. Cauliflower  
H. Cucumbers, melons, squash  
I. Wintersquash, pumpkin  
J. Dry beans  
K. Lettuce  
L. Peas  
M. Raspberries  
N. Snap beans  
O. Strawberries  
P. Processing sweet corn  
Q. Market tomatoes  
R. Greenhouse tomatoe  
S. Alfalfa & field corn  
T. peppers |
| **2. Status**  
S, T draft version available  
A - R final version completed |
| **3. Format**  
A. Unanswered  
B. A - T point system  
Include(s) sections or criteria on:  
-all soil conservation or management  
-all nutrient and/or soil quality management  
-organic amendments  
-water conservation or irrigation management  
*education is required if the elements are used for IPM labeling. Not required as an element |
| **4. Other organizations involved**  
-growers  
-Agrilink Foods  
-Wegmans  
F. Blueberries  
G. Cauliflower  
H. Cucumbers, melons, squash  
I. Wintersquash, pumpkin  
J. Dry beans  
K. Lettuce  
L. Peas  
M. Raspberries  
N. Snap beans  
O. Strawberries  
P. Processing sweet corn  
Q. Market tomatoes  
R. Greenhouse tomatoe  
S. Alfalfa & field corn  
T. peppers |
| **5. Audience**  
-farmers  
-Private sector ag. professionals  
-Public sector ag. professionals  
-Auditors, certifiers  
-Other specify: consumers |
| **6. Purpose (rank order)**  
-1 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers (and/or other audience)  
-1 identify crop production system weaknesses  
-1 characterize adoption of IPM practices  
-1 evaluate Extension programs  
-1 determine eligibility for incentive * IPM labeling  
-1 identify research needs  
-2 federal or state reporting requirements |
| **7. Primarily a survey instrument?**  
-no |
| **8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool** (if different from respondent): |
| **9. Website URL for info**  
| **Assessment tools available online?**  
-Yes |
| **10. Publications, reports**  
| **11. Project description--narrative**  
See notes/clarification/comments section. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfalfa</td>
<td>A- D draft version available (need to assign points)</td>
<td>A. Unanswered</td>
<td>So far, we only have had OSU internal input (by design.)</td>
<td>- * farmers</td>
<td>- 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>(if different from respondent):</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~ipm/element/index.htm">http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~ipm/element/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Corn</td>
<td>B. Point system</td>
<td>B. Point system</td>
<td></td>
<td>- * public sector ag. professionals</td>
<td>- 2 determine eligibility for incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment tools available on line?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- private sector ag. professionals</td>
<td>- 2 identify research needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 2 identify crop production system weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabbage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 evaluate Extension programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 4 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cucumber (Pickles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettuce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proc. Tomato</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snap beans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squash &amp; Pumpkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet corn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OHIO**

Joe Kovach  
IPM Coordinator  
Ohio State University  
Selby Hall  
OARDC/OSU  
Wooster, OH, 44691  
330-263-3846  
FAX  263-3841  
kovach.49@osu.edu

2. **Status**

A- D draft version available (need to assign points)  
E - O final version completed

3. **Format**

A. Unanswered  
B. Point system  
All will be point system.  
Veggies already have point totals. For survey work we may go use binomial system

Includes sections or criteria on:  
- soil conservation or management  
- nutrient and/or soil quality management  
- water conservation or irrigation management  
- education

4. **Other organizations involved**

So far, we only have had OSU internal input (by design.)

5. **Audience**

- * farmers  
- * public sector ag. professionals  
- private sector ag. professionals

6. **Purpose (rank order)**

- 1 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers  
- 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices  
- 1 determine eligibility for incentives * public recognition  
- 2 identify research needs  
- 2 identify crop production system weaknesses  
- 3 evaluate Extension programs  
- 4 federal or state reporting requirements

7. **Primarily a survey instrument?**

yes

8. **Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):**

9. **Website URL for info**

http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~ipm/element/index.htm

Assessment tools available online?

Yes

10. **Publications, reports**

11. **Project description--narrative**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OKLAHOMA</th>
<th>OREGON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gerrit W. Cuperus</strong>&lt;br&gt;IPM Coordinator&lt;br&gt;Oklahoma State University&lt;br&gt;1 127 NRC&lt;br&gt;Stillwater, OK 74078&lt;br&gt;405-744-9419&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:bbugs1@okstate.edu">bbugs1@okstate.edu</a></td>
<td><strong>Leonard Coop</strong>&lt;br&gt;Research Associate&lt;br&gt;Oregon State Univ. Dept. IPPC&lt;br&gt;Cordley 2040&lt;br&gt;Corvallis, OR 97331&lt;br&gt;541-737-5523, FAX 737-3080&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:coopl@bcc.orst.edu">coopl@bcc.orst.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status&lt;br&gt; A-G final version completed&lt;br&gt; H?</td>
<td>2. Status&lt;br&gt; A. B draft version available&lt;br&gt; C final version completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Format&lt;br&gt; A. multiple choice&lt;br&gt; B. qualitative&lt;br&gt; Includes sections or criteria on:&lt;br&gt; A – G soil conservation or management&lt;br&gt; A – G nutrient and/or soil quality management&lt;br&gt; A – G water conservation or irrigation management&lt;br&gt; A - G education</td>
<td>3. Format&lt;br&gt; Unanswered&lt;br&gt; Includes sections or criteria on:&lt;br&gt; B - soil conservation or management&lt;br&gt; B - nutrient and/or soil quality management&lt;br&gt; A, B - water conservation or irrigation management&lt;br&gt; A, B - education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other organizations involved&lt;br&gt; Ag Experiment Station, growers, independent groups</td>
<td>4. Other organizations involved&lt;br&gt; A,B - IPPC, OSU Stats Survey Center&lt;br&gt; C - Mint Industry Research Council, OSU Stats Survey Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Audience&lt;br&gt; tool? GENERAL PUBLIC&lt;br&gt; - farmers&lt;br&gt; - private sector ag. professionals&lt;br&gt; - other, specify: public housing authority residents &amp; general public</td>
<td>5. Audience&lt;br&gt; * other specify: general use is to indicate IPM status, especially for research prioritization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Purpose&lt;br&gt; - 1 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers&lt;br&gt; - 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices&lt;br&gt; - 1 evaluate Extension programs&lt;br&gt; - 2 identify crop production system weaknesses&lt;br&gt; - 2 Identify research needs&lt;br&gt; - 3 determine eligibility for incentive *EQIP&lt;br&gt; - 4 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
<td>6. Purpose (rank order)&lt;br&gt; - 1 characterize adoption of IPM practices&lt;br&gt; - 2 identify crop production system weaknesses&lt;br&gt; - 3 identify research needs&lt;br&gt; - 4 federal or state reporting requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Primarily a survey instrument? Yes</td>
<td>7. Primarily a survey instrument? Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent): Christine Johnson, Gerrit Cuperus</td>
<td>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent): A - Len Coop, <a href="mailto:coopl@bcc.orst.edu">coopl@bcc.orst.edu</a>&lt;br&gt; B - Dan McGrath, <a href="mailto:Daniel.McGrath@orst.edu">Daniel.McGrath@orst.edu</a>&lt;br&gt; C - ? Ralph Berry, <a href="mailto:berryr@bcc.orst.edu">berryr@bcc.orst.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Website URL for info&lt;br&gt; Assessment tools available online? Unanswered</td>
<td>9. Website URL for info&lt;br&gt; Assessment tools available online? Unanswered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Publications, reports&lt;br&gt; - stored grain management, E-912&lt;br&gt; - cotton evaluation (see evaluation stuff), E-930</td>
<td>10. Publications, reports&lt;br&gt; A - none other than website&lt;br&gt; B,C - contact persons listed above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>VERMONT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karen M. Vail</strong> Assistant Professor Entomology and Plant Pathology P.O. Box 1071 University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN 37901-1071 865 974-7135 FAX 974-8868 <a href="mailto:kvail@utk.edu">kvail@utk.edu</a></td>
<td><strong>Lorraine P. Berkett, Ph.D.</strong> Plant Pathologist &amp; IPM Specialist Department of Plant &amp; Soil Science Hills Building University of Vermont Burlington, VT 05405 802-656-0972 FAX: 656-4656 <a href="mailto:lorraine.berkett@uvm.edu">lorraine.berkett@uvm.edu</a> <a href="http://orchard.uvm.edu/">http://orchard.uvm.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Crops</strong> A. Beekeeping B. School IPM C. Landscape IPM</td>
<td><strong>1. Crops</strong> A. Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Status</strong> A – C final version completed</td>
<td><strong>2. Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Format</strong> A. A - C multiple choice B. A - C qualitative ratings</td>
<td><strong>3. Format</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes sections or criteria on:</td>
<td><strong>Include(s) sections or criteria on:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - nutrient and/or soil quality management</td>
<td><strong>4. Other organizations involved</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - organic amendments</td>
<td><strong>5. Audience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - water conservation or irrigation management</td>
<td>other, specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A - C education</td>
<td>A Beekeepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B School Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Other organizations involved</strong></td>
<td><strong>5. Audience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Audience</strong></td>
<td>other, specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Beekeepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B School Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Purpose (rank order)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6. Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1, B1, C1 characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
<td>A1, B1, C1 characterize adoption of IPM practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4, B2, C2 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers</td>
<td>A4, B2, C2 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 evaluate Extension programs</td>
<td>A3 evaluate Extension programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2, B3, C3 identify research needs</td>
<td>A2, B3, C3 identify research needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</strong></td>
<td><strong>7. Primarily a survey instrument?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A – C Yes</td>
<td>A – C Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool</strong>(if different from respondent): A. John Skinner/Pat Parkman B&amp;C. Karen Vail 9. Website URL for info No, but soon will be for B</td>
<td><strong>8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool</strong>(if different from respondent): A. John Skinner/Pat Parkman B&amp;C. Karen Vail 9. Website URL for info No, but soon will be for B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tools available on line?</td>
<td>Assessment tools available on line?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but B will be soon</td>
<td>No, but B will be soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Project description--narrative</strong></td>
<td><strong>11. Project description--narrative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See notes section for more info. on B and C.</td>
<td>See notes section for more info. on B and C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Publications, reports

*Project description--narrative*
### Wisconsin

**Bryan Jensen**  
Outreach Program Manager  
Univ of Wisconsin  
Dept. of Entomology  
1630 Linden Dr.  
Madison, WI 53706  
608-263-4073  
FAX: 262-332  
bmjense1@facstaff.wisc.edu

1. **Crops**  
   - A. Sweet corn  
   - B. Peas  
   - C. Snap beans

2. **Status**  
   - A – C in development/on hold

3. **Format**  
   - A. Unanswered  
   - B. Unanswered

4. **Other organizations involved**
   - - Commercial applicators  
   - - Farmers

5. **Audience**  
   - - Farmers  
   - - private sector ag. professionals

6. **Purpose (rank order)**  
   - 1 other, specify: labeling program

7. **Primarily a survey instrument?**  
   - No

8. **Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):**
   - Mark Ferrell

9. **Website URL for info**  
   - No  
   - Assessment tools available on line?

10. **Publications, reports**  
    - None

11. **Project description--narrative**  
    - We began development of IPM Elements for Sweet Corn, Peas and Snap Beans. However, industry wanted to put it's development and their involvement on hold until there was more demand. It may not take a lot of work to finish this project.

### Wyoming

**Tom Whitson**  
State IPM Coordinator and Extension Weed Specialist  
University of Wyoming  
PO Box 3354  
Laramie, WY 82071  
307-766-3113  
twhitson@uwyo.edu

1. **Crops**  
   - A. Corn  
   - B. Sugarbeets  
   - C. Alfalfa  
   - D. small grains

2. **Status**  
   - A - D in planning  
   - A - D in development  
   - A - D final version completed

3. **Format**  
   - A. Unanswered  
   - B. Point system

4. **Other organizations involved**  
   - - Commercial applicators  
   - - Farmers

5. **Audience**  
   - - Farmers  
   - - private sector ag. professionals

6. **Purpose (rank order)**  
   - 1 educational and/or motivational tool for farmers  
   - 2 identify crop production system weaknesses  
   - 3 characterize adoption of IPM practices  
   - 4 identify research needs  
   - 5 evaluate Extension programs

7. **Primarily a survey instrument?**  
   - Yes

8. **Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):**  
   - Mark Ferrell

9. **Website URL for info**  
   - Yes  
   - Assessment tools available on line?

10. **Publications, reports**  
    - ~ CAST IPM Report: IPM on Rangeland in the Western US, 2000 (in progress)  
    - ~ CAST IPM Report: Applications of Pesticides, 2000 (in progress)

11. **Project description--narrative**  
    - We began development of IPM Elements for Sweet Corn, Peas and Snap Beans. However, industry wanted to put it's development and their involvement on hold until there was more demand. It may not take a lot of work to finish this project.  
    - See notes/clarification/comments section for more information.
NOTES/CLARIFICATION/COMMENTS NOT INCLUDED IN SUMMARY TABLES

From states and territories with assessment tools

ILLINOIS

Over the last several years, Dr. Susan Ratcliffe, Department of Crop Sciences, University of Illinois, has created and coordinated the collection of data via a website that producers can directly report the results of their scouting efforts for western corn rootworms in soybeans. Since 1995, western corn rootworms have adapted to crop rotation across east-central Illinois and northern Indiana and now routinely lay eggs in the soil of soybean fields. By monitoring western corn rootworm adult densities in soybeans with yellow sticky traps (Pherocon AM traps) producers can make more informed management decisions regarding the need for a soil insecticide when planting corn the following spring. Since Dr. Ratcliffe established this web site, hundreds of producers directly report the results of their scouting efforts. The information is summarized and reported back to all producers in Illinois via the Pest Management and Crop Development Bulletin.

OHIO

In 1999, the Ohio State Integrated Pest Management Program initiated an effort to define and consolidate current crop specific Ohio information on integrated approaches to pest management. Working with Ohio State faculty and Extension personnel, the IPM elements for 15 commodities (4 field crops and 11 vegetables) have been defined and placed on the Ohio State IPM Program web site. Apple and strawberry elements are near completion. These IPM elements were modeled after similar efforts done in New York and Massachusetts and included insect, disease, and weed management techniques, and soil, nutrient and water management methods. Intended outcomes of this effort are: 1) to form crop specific working definitions (practices) of IPM in Ohio; 2) to develop a system of assessing how far along the IPM continuum growers are; and 3) to provide pests in order to detect them at low population levels which is a better alternative than the scheduled spraying of pesticides. Information about the life cycle of the pest and its interactions with the environment are used to make a control decision. Most pests need access to food, water and shelter. By removing the basic survival elements or by blocking access into a structure, pest populations can be lowered or prevented from establishing. Pesticides may be necessary in an IPM program, but they should be used in a manner to minimize the risk of exposure to the occupants.

In 1997, a mail survey was distributed to the 149 public school systems to determine the baseline adoption of IPM. Surveys were returned from 74% of the school systems. Sixty-five percent of the school systems indicated they were concerned about pesticide exposure, yet only 30% of the school systems indicated they used IPM. Many of the school systems indicated on the survey that they had adopted IPM. Our estimates of IPM adoption were lower. If, according to the survey, schools indicated they used IPM, but also sprayed pesticides on a monthly basis, then they were classified as NOT using IPM. This lowered the percentage of schools using IPM to 11.7%. Based on the Department of Education’s 1995/1996 annual statistical report on enrollment, schools using IPM account for about 34% of the children in Tennessee’s school system. We can assume a reduced risk of pesticide exposure to these.

NEW MEXICO

NOTE: These tools don't rank one IPM practice over another and they don't promote "environmental marketing." They present information or give directions on how to do something. They are not associated with additional surveys and they don't administer any surveys or keys to direct a grower's reading to a particular chapter. They were assembled because of grower interest.

There is no "environmental marketing" angle to our publications. There is a New Mexico Organic Commodities Commission, separate from the University and the NM Dept of Agriculture that has set some standards and limits and specifies needed documentation (for growers anticipating an organic marketing label)

TENNESSEE

B. School IPM
Pest management programs in schools need to balance the risk of unnecessary exposure to pest control products with the health risk associated with the pests. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) can help accomplish this goal. IPM emphasizes regular inspecting and monitoring of their scouting efforts. The information is summarized and reported back to all producers in Illinois via the Pest Management and Crop Development Bulletin.
C. Landscape IPM
The public is concerned about exposure to pesticides. Integrated pest management (IPM) can reduce reliance on pesticides and protect the balance that exists between the pest, its natural enemies and the environment. An urban IPM program was developed to address this need. In urban landscapes, the IPM program promotes preventing pests problems by choosing proper plant and site selection, and optimizing growing conditions. Pests are identified before intervention by regular monitoring and inspecting for pests, pest damage, indicator species and other problems. Action thresholds are used where feasible. Intervention, when necessary, is based on a combination of feasible techniques such as cultural, mechanical, biological and chemical control. If pesticides are deemed necessary, those that reduce the risk of unnecessary exposure to people, property and the environment are chosen.

Results from the Homeowner Landscape Management Survey conducted at the state fair by Davidson County Master Gardeners in 1996 established a benchmark to measure future impacts. Twelve questions were selected to represent the use of IPM in the landscape. These 12 questions referred to using cultural practices to prevent a pest outbreak; planting flowers for beneficials; planting resistant varieties; inspecting for pest problems; identifying pests before control practices are used; inspecting for beneficials; purchasing beneficials; changing cultural practices that affect the problem; tolerating slight damage; choosing a product with least impact on ground water; using biorationals (soaps, oils, microbials, etc.); and spot-treating infested areas. To be classified as using IPM a respondent would have used 8 out of 12 (67%) of these practices. Only 11.8% of the respondents could be classified as using IPM. Although the audience was biased and may not represent the average homeowner in the state, results of the survey indicate that more education is needed to increase the adoption of landscape IPM.

WYOMING

The project was an assessment of pesticides use in Wyoming conducted in cooperation with the Applicator Training Program. Ten percent of the farm and ranch population of Wyoming were surveyed with a 60 percent response rate. The survey was conducted on various crops to determine the pounds of pesticide that are used. Use rate declined from 1986 to 1993 indicating that pesticides are being used more judiciously. The purpose of the IPM portion of the survey was to determine if pesticide use was changing. It was determined that the decline in pesticides was due to crop rotations, pesticide rotations, and changes in pesticide formulations that resulted in lower amounts of chemical needed per acre.

From states and territories lacking assessment tools

AMERICAN SAMOA

To my limited knowledge, the only survey mechanism we have is the field visit. Though we had a big agricultural census last year, the scope of the questioning was limited and only superficially address crop management strategies.

Traditionally a verbal society, growers in American Samoa do not, as a rule, keep records. If you ask if they use anything against a particular pest, they may show you a container, the label of which they cannot or do not read. If you ask how much they apply, they may answer, “One tuna can per plant.” or “One corned beef can (for all plants).” Produce is not weighed at harvest or before sale. Baseline measurements and projected outcomes are a challenge, as are effects of (IPM) interventions.

Fred Brooks, Plant Pathologist, IPM Coordinator, American Samoa

CALIFORNIA

Before I fill in the survey, your real question isn’t about IPM programs but about activities in which the growers assess their progress or seek additional value to their produce. As such, the Statewide IPM Project does not have any specific activities in this area but does maintain a large library of IPM information from which such self-assessment tools could be developed. Such information is available in written, video, and web-based formats.

The Statewide IPM is engaged in an extensive IPM assessment program whose goals are to:
* develop generalized characteristics of IPM systems capable of contrasting different cropping systems
* formalize the IPM continuum concept
* establish benchmarks to measure IPM adoption and progress.
Again, these activities are not designed to measure individual growers but to establish the current state of IPM in some commodity, identify constraints in preventing implementation of increasingly biological reliant practices, and measure changes in practices.

We want to make the assessments 'grower-driven' e.g., if the growers want such assessments we can help them to formulate the guidelines. If they do not see a value in this for them, we are not going to force the issue. I am providing contacts for several organizations that have developed the assessment tools who might be contacted directed if this suits your needs. I cannot speak for them, thus I have not answered any of the survey questions.

Respondent contact info:
Peter B. Goodell, PhD
IPM Extension Coordinator
University of California Statewide IPM Project
Kearney Ag Center,
9240 So Riverbend
Parlier, CA 93648
559 646-6515; FAX 559/646-6593

Some IPM assessment tools have been produced in my state but not by Statewide IPM Project

Crop/s - with assessment tools (organizations involved)
A. Grapes
   (Lodi Woodbridge)
   (Central Coast)
   (Sun Maid Raisin) (?)
B. IPM in Poultry Houses (?)

Organizations involved, contact info.
Woodbridge/Lodi - Cliff Omart

Central Coast Vineyard
Mary Bianchi, Farm Advisor
Cooperative Extension San Luis Obispo County, 2156 Sierra Way, Suite C
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

mlbianchi@ucdavis.edu
805 781-5949; FAX: 805 781-4316
Specialty: Viticulture, pomology, nutrition, irrigation.
Grapes in Santa Barbara County

Sun Maid Raisins - Joe Kretsch
13525 S Bethel Ave
Selma, CA
559 896-8000

Poultry House IPM - Lesley Hinkle

COLORADO

I was on the original GPRA Task Force for impact assessment as an IPM rep from Colorado. Unless we can actually quantify things like improved profit margin (IPM), pesticide use down, or % low risk to traditional, I do not know what to do. All our assessments are qualitative and not very good.

We just completed an external 5-year review of Colorado IPM last summer and the major criticism was lack of effective impact assessment tools.

Sorry, I do not have anything to add that is really attainable.

Bill Brown, Colorado

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANAS ISLANDS

I am not aware of any IPM tools in my state. Since there is no IPM program here yet, it is hard to imagine an impact assessment tool existing. I have only recently taken this job, and am faced with creating this whole program from the ground up. I would much appreciate receiving copies of any pre-existing protocols which would help us design our IPM implementation program with an eye to being able to assess our successes in the future. We are assuming that we can document improved water quality through reduced use of insecticides and we plan to document residue levels on fresh produce arriving at the markets.
We have conducted a wide-ranging set of interviews with farmers on our three islands, to ascertain their Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP). These results will set the stage for technician training programs, which will then transfer information and IPM skills out to our client farmers. That is our IPM program in a nutshell. I will also attempt to answer subsequent questions, but this is the caveat under which I am working.

Dr. A. Lee Eavy  
IPM and Crop Protection Team Leader  
CNMI/CREES  
Northern Marianas College  
P.O. Box 501250  
Saipan, MP 96950  
Ph.: 670 234 5498 Fax: 670 234 0054

Design, develop, and deliver an IPM program for vegetable producers in the CNMI (Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands)

NORTH DAKOTA

We have explored the possibility for wheat but have not gone beyond the planning stage. We use NASS survey instruments to assess adoption of IPM practices, but we don't have guidelines with points or quantitative values.

Marcia McMullen  
Extension Plant Pathologist/IPM Coordinator  
North Dakota State University  
Dept. of Plant Pathology  
Walster Hall  
Fargo, ND 58105  
701-231-7627; Fax: 701-231-7851  
mmcmulle@ndsuext.nodak.edu

primary responsibility: Plant Pathologist for cereals, IPM Coordinator

VIRGINIA

I can make this very simple. In Virginia, the only way we can assess the IPM effort is via the VCE IPM Educational Program annual report. All Extension agents and faculty that 'buy-in' to the IPM Educational Program must report activities, annually. That pool of information is summarized and used to complete both state and federal (3d) reports. We have no other assessment process EXCEPT: a pilot project that is being tested in one Extension District that is a adoption/satisfaction/impact survey that can be conducted by individual agents and passed to a central location for summary, etc. It is only a pilot at this time, but if successful, could become standard throughout the system.

Ames Herbert  
Extension Entomologist  
Tidewater AREC  
6321 Holland Road  
Suffolk, VA 23437  
757-657-6450 ext 122  
FAX: 757-657-9333
ACTUAL LETTER AND SURVEY THAT WAS SENT OUT TO STATE IPM COORDINATORS VIA EMAIL

To:  State Extension IPM Coordinators and other Extension IPM leaders
Fr:  Mike Fitzner, IPM Program, USDA-CSREES, Wash., DC,
     John Vickery, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy, Minneapolis, MN, and Tom Green, IPM Institute, Madison, WI

Re:  crop specific IPM assessment instruments--surveys, guidelines
Enclosure: survey

Greetings

We request your assistance in helping us to identify the Integrated Pest Management assessment instruments or tools available in your state. These include: survey instruments, farmer self-assessment tools, and criteria for environmental marketing. Sometimes the terms IPM "guidelines," "protocol," "elements," are used.

Perhaps the best known are the Cornell University IPM "Elements," the UMass Extension IPM Guidelines, and the National Potato Council's IPM Protocol. Both Cornell and UMass have assessments for a number of crops.

After reading this cover letter, kindly hit the "reply" button, fill out the survey below and send it to us in the body of the email message. We will compile the information and make it available at a website. The survey summary will appear in the appendix of a conference proceedings. The conference, Adding Value through Environmental Marketing: Opportunities for Food Producers, Processors and Retailers took place in Madison, Wisconsin last December. Some of you were there with us. Tom and John were co-organizers. The conference website is http://www.iatp.org/labels/envcommodities/index.htm

We hope to have the proceedings finished in May and the hard copy version the following month.

Please send your completed surveys to Stephanie Lundeen at slundeen@iatp.org. If you have questions contact Stephanie at 612-870-3471 or John at 612-870-3430.

We would appreciate a response even if you are not aware of any IPM assessment tools--or plans for them--in your state.

Note: you are welcome to submit a narrative description of your IPM assessment program or tool for the proceedings. We will, for example, include information on the Massachusetts "IPM Guidelines" in the appendix. The Cornell University/Wegmans Food Markets "Elements" will be in the main body of the proceedings under presentations.

Finally, the survey is primarily designed for you to provide info. on Extension products/activities. If you are aware of any industry/grower efforts, kindly let us know!

Thank you

Cordially,

Mike      John       Tom

Dr. Michael Fitzner - IPM Program, USDA-CSREES
Ag Box 2220
1400 Independence Ave., SW
Washington DC 20250-2220
202-401-4939; FAX -401-5077 (pause) 0021 Email mfitzner@reeusda.gov

Thomas A. Green - IPM Institute of North America
1914 Rowley Ave
Madison WI 53705
608-232-1528; FAX -232-1530 Email tagreen@compuserve.com

John Vickery - Environment and Agriculture Program
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
2105 First Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55404-2505
612-870-3430; FAX –870-4846 Email jvickery@iatp.org
SURVEY
State Extension IPM guidelines/assessment tools

Respondent contact info
(fill in or paste your email signature file below)

name
title
institution
address 1
address 2
city, state, zip
phone, fax
email

Your primary responsibility:

Place an "X" in one of the following blanks:

_____ I am not aware of any IPM tools in my state.
>>>STOP HERE and return survey

_____ Some IPM assessment tools have been produced in my state
>>>PROCEED and complete questionnaire

1. Crops and Status

crop/s with assessment tools (Insert additional letters if needed)

A.  B.
C.  D.

2. Status

If you have an IPM assessment tool for more than one crop, then just use a letter code from above (A, B, C, D) and insert that letter in the appropriate blank. >>> approx. date or year it is expected to be available (again, use code, e.g., A-fall, 2000):

_____ in planning  _____ in development

_____ draft version available  _____ final version completed

_____ revised/updated version will be available  date/year ______

3. Format

place "X" in the blank for all that apply

_____ multiple choice  OR  _____ dichotomous/yes vs. no/checklist

_____ point system  OR  _____ qualitative ratings

Comment or clarification re. format:

Includes sections or criteria on: (place an "X" in blanks for all that apply*)

_____ soil conservation or management

_____ nutrient and/or soil quality management

_____ organic amendments

_____ water conservation or irrigation management

_____ education (attends training, receives newsletters, etc.)

* We assume that there sections or criteria on management of insects, weeds, diseases and/or nematodes.

Comments or clarification (con't from question 3.):

4. Organizations involved, other than Extension:
5. Who is the audience—the intended user—for the tool?
(Check all that apply, but circle the group or groups that are the primary audience)

_____ farmers
_____ private sector ag. professionals
_____ public sector ag. professionals
_____ auditors, certifiers, or regulators
_____ other specify:

6. Purpose

Rank order the following, starting with "1" for the most important purpose. Give the same rank order number for two or more that are of equal importance.

_____ educational and/or motivational tool for farmers (and/or other audience)
_____ identify crop production system weaknesses
_____ characterize adoption of IPM practices
_____ evaluate Extension programs
_____ determine eligibility for incentive *
_____ identify research needs
_____ federal or state reporting requirements
_____ other 1 specify:
_____ other 2 specify:

*Please identify type of incentive (e.g., public recognition program, EQIP or other incentive program, state or federal cost-sharing program, environmental marketing, etc.)

7. Is this primarily a survey instrument? _____ yes _____ no

8. Primary contact person for the assessment tool (if different from respondent):

9. Website

Is information about the IPM assessment tool available at a website?
_____ yes _____ no
If yes, URL:
Are the assessment tools themselves available on line?
_____ yes _____ no

10. Publications, reports (kindly provide citations below)

11. Project description - narrative—
We would appreciate it if you could provide a short overview, description, etc., of the project or program and IPM assessment instrument (one paragraph, half-page--perhaps longer if this is of interest or you already have something suitable). You can send this separately or attach the description with your reply. Kindly contact Stephanie Lundeen at slundeen@iatp.org for more details and deadline for longer contributions. The project description is optional and you are welcome to write a brief description here if time does not permit you to submit a short summary:

THANKS – appreciate your help!

_____ Place an "X" in this blank if you would like to receive the results to this survey.