Executive Summary
Draft

TO: Project Management Committee/Administrative Advisors/Meeting Attendees
FROM: Sherrilynn Novack & Van Starner
DATE: December 21, 2010
SUBJECT: Fall 2010 Project Management Committee (PMC) Meeting Minutes

Please find attached the Fall 2010 PMC meeting Executive Summary and minutes from discussions October 19-20 at the Hilton Marco Island Beach Hotel, Marco Island, FL

If you have any questions about this report, please feel free to contact the appropriate PMC or Headquarters Staff member listed by the agenda item, or us, for clarification.
October 2010 PMC Meeting - Executive Summary
The IR-4 Project Management Committee (PMC) held its Fall 2010 meeting on October 19-20, 2010, at the Hilton Marco Island Beach Hotel

**General Items**
- IR-4 Funding through the Ag Exp Stations was approved for another 5 years by a 44 to 1 vote.
- The expected date for the 2011 RFA to be published is 11/1/10; there could be a 3-week delay; funding can be expected to come out by the end of May 2011.
- The Analytical Chemistry Advisory Committee (ACAC) committee submitted a report that evaluated the equipment at each analytical lab and various purchase/lease options.
  - **MOTION:** To accept the ACAC report with each individual unit selecting the best option whether to purchase or lease equipment as they see viable. Seconded and Approved.
- IR-4 needs to do long term planning looking at budget and personnel issues.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** M. Marshall will send out a memo stating the request for Administrative Advisors attendance at the next PMC meeting to focus on long term planning for the program.
- 2011 Field Program – selected 16 weed science, 18 plant path and 16 entomology “A” priorities at FUW plus additional upgrades. Many have been suggesting selection of priorities by crop group rather than by discipline - this would be a major change to the FUW, and will require time to sort out.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Have a report of proposed changes to the FUW priority setting process by March PMC meeting.
- J. Baron submitted a draft template for the 2011 budget distribution:
  - **MOTION:** Agree to use J. Baron’s draft budget (revised and sent by email during the discussion) as a template to submit grants to NIFA. Seconded and Approved.
  - **ACTION ITEM:** Hold a PMC conference call after NRPM to discuss, as needed.
- The CLC will plan on holding two luncheons on The Hill during the March 2011 PMC meeting to brief new legislative personnel about IR-4.

**ARS/Regions/HQ Updates, Other items**
- ARS - B. Miller will remain at Maricopa, AZ, until June 2011. E. Pfeil will remain in the Beltsville lab thru Dec. 2010.
- Northeast Region – W. Borejsza-Wysocki has accepted the position of the SOR lab coordinator and will be in transition to that job while closing down the Cornell lab in the next few months. NER awards to S. Lincoln, T. Freiberger and B. Abbott were ratified by PMC.
- North Central Region – At the NCR annual meeting the following motion was approved to be presented to the PMC: Replicated efficacy and safety data must be critically evaluated for viability (acceptable yield, efficacy and crop safety) before a pesticide can be nominated to become a priority residue project.
- Southern Region – After W. Borejsza-Wysocki moves into the Univ. of FL lab, they will hire an additional chemist and a new QA auditor.
- Western Region – They have hired a new analytical QA person. The Hawaii lab is progressing better - understanding timeline priorities from HQ has helped them realize the importance of moving their samples along.
- HQ – Plans are underway for the next Global Minor Use Summit. There are a couple industry partners who are not adequately cooperating with IR-4’s needs for submission documentation in a timely manner. The lease for expanded HQ office space and rental extension to 2019 has been signed.
- Timelines reduction discussion: consistent themes throughout reports from all groups were the need for excellent and timely communication, conveying to researchers throughout the program their critical importance in the “Big Picture” of what IR-4 is doing, and that our passive approach to project management needs to change to a more active process if we are to positively impact current timelines. M. Marshall suggested that a subcommittee be organized at the NRPM to move the discussion toward recommendations for consideration at the March 2011 PMC meeting.
- Public Health Pesticides webpage/database are up and running, and a brochure was created.
- New brochures have been created to reflect the new IR-4 logo.
October 2010 PMC Meeting Minutes
Draft

The IR-4 Project Management Committee (PMC) held its Fall 2010 meeting on October 19-20, at The Hilton Marco Island Beach Hotel.

PMC Attendees:
- Jerry Baron - Executive Director
- Tammy Barkalow - QA Director (via teleconference - timeline discussion)
- Martin Beran - WSR QA Officer (via teleconference - timeline discussion)
- Michael Braverman - Biopesticide and Organic Support Program Manager (via teleconference)
- Debbie Carpenter - Assistant Director, Registrations
- Mary Duryea - Southern Region Administrative Advisor
- Matt Hengel - Western Region Laboratory Coordinator
- Tom Hendricks - USDA-ARS Southern Region Laboratory Coordinator
- Bob Hollingsworth - North Central Region Director
- Monte Johnson - NIFA National Program Leader
- Dan Kunkel - Associate Director, Food & International Programs
- Rocky Lundy - Commodity Liaison Committee Chair
- Marty Marshall - Southern Region Director and PMC Chair
- Karl Malamud-Roam - Public Health Pesticides Program Manager (via teleconference)
- Marion Miller - Western Region Director (via Teleconference)
- Sherrilynn Novack - Public Relations & Communications Manager
- Cristi Palmer - Ornamental Horticulture Program Manager
- Paul Schwartz - ARS Regional Director
- Brian Scully - USDA-ARS, Tifton, GA, Research Leader
- Becky Sisco - WSR Field Coordinator (via teleconference - timeline discussion)
- Dave Soderlund - Northeast Region Director
- Van Starner - Assistant Director, Research Planning & Outreach
- John Wise - Field Research Director (via teleconference - timeline discussion)
- Jim Yelton - USDA-ARS Tifton, GA, Facility Management Specialist
Tuesday, October 19, 2010

Approval of Minutes/new agenda items: Minutes of Summer PMC meeting held July 20-21, 2010 at The Wingate Inn, Bozeman, MT, were approved.

New Agenda Items: D. Soderlund - Awards for NE region and IR-4 long term tactical planning

Brief updates:

Administrative Advisors – M. Duryea reported the Experiment Station Directors voted 44 to 1 to continue funding the IR-4 Project for another 5 years. J. Baron reported Dan Rossi will replace Mark Robson as the Northeastern Region AA. Since Dan is the Executive Director of the Northeastern Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors he is in a good position to represent all the Northeast states, not just a single state.

NIFA – M. Johnson reported that Congress has voted on a continuing resolution until December 3rd for the 2011 budget, and he anticipates IR-4 funding will remain at the 2010 level. He expects the RFA will be released Nov. 1, with awards coming by the end of May. They have 3 new people who will be reviewing the grant proposals, George Shaal, Ashley Taylor and Megan O’Reilly.

The President’s budget has zeroed out the IPM centers. There is enough to fund them for just one more year, and beyond that is uncertain.

ARS - P. Schwartz reported B. Miller will remain at Maricopa until June 2011, but funds will continue to go there till Oct. ARS Beltsville lab technicians have been reassigned, and E. Pfeil will stay on until December 2010. The lab still has 56 sample sets to analyze, and ARS appreciates all help in finding homes for analysis of these samples. P. Schwartz and J. Baron will present Awards to R. Frank and E. Beste at the NEWSS meeting in January. P. Schwartz would like to consider providing an Outstanding Award to J. Ahrens for years of service.

HQ – J. Baron reported that the number in attendance at the 2010 Food Use Workshop was lower than in previous years. This workshop provided the forum for companies to, disclose several new active ingredients. Many good priorities were set, except in the Weed Science area where we are filling “A” slots with projects of questionable value to our stakeholders. J. Baron suggested the program revisit the priority setting process to look at commodities rather than each discipline receiving a specific number of “A” priorities.

Overall in the 2010 research year, there were some trials lost due to weather. There were some horticulture problems in the SOR, and the labs are not reducing the backlog as quickly as hoped. Kudos to B. Bowman the new QA in North Central Region (NCR) who has hit the ground running, and S. Erhardt, the NCR lab coordinator, who is making commendable progress in the lab.

J. Baron facilitating a pre-registration meeting with USDA and EPA on new RNAi technology. A Public Health Pesticide webpage has been created along with a brochure. K. Malamud-Roam is pursuing a Pest Management Strategic Plan working with T. Chin from the office of Pest Management Policy for mosquito. This is needed because two critical products have been cancelled (resmethrin and temephos) due to data call-in. The companies do not have the money needed for the data requirement.

In the global tomato residue study, crop samples from 21 of 27 sites have been secured and the other trials are being wrapped up. A second global residue study is being planned, and is targeted to be a full GLP study using a new compound BYI-02960 from Bayer CropSciences. This compound is particularly interesting because of its safety related to honey bees. The study will be conducted in US, Canada, Poland, UK, Australia, New Zealand and Chile/Argentina.
Industry partners, for the most part, are really supportive of IR-4’s mission; however, there are a few who are not as responsive as needed when IR-4 requests registration packages for submission (notice of filing, draft label with new uses, letter of authorization, various forms, etc.). Some companies also delay delivery of test substances and sometimes deliver wrong test substances. If companies continue a pattern of not cooperating, IR-4 should consider a moratorium on those companies. Often the problem is the individual assigned to IR-4, not the entire company.

EPA is a great supporter of IR-4 in most offices. However, there are still cases where IR-4 data is triggering requests for additional studies. There have been a couple cases where EPA has not honored the PRIA deadlines. One EPA group still takes issue with IR-4 being exempt from fees and this may be the reason they are not adhering to PRIA deadlines. In one case (Biopesticide - acetic acid herbicide for organic growers), a package was submitted requesting an exemption from tolerance in Sept. 2008 with a scheduled January 2009 decision. EPA-BPPD asked IR-4 for more information, IR-4 responded and was told a decision would be made by July 2010, yet as of the October 2010 PMC meeting, no decision was made. IR-4 has brought this to the attention of EPA management with no result. IR-4 may want to have a meeting with EPA to ask how to avoid this in the future.

The lease for expansion of HQ office space has been signed and will extend current lease to 2019.

Rutgers was recently audited by the State regarding Type-4 temporary employees (contract, hourly, etc.), and various departments, including IR-4, were found in violation of policy. Type-4 employees are only allowed to work for 2-years and after 9 months they must take a month off. This blindsided IR-4 and will affect 5 people at HQ. There are currently 27 FTE at HQ and J. Baron is reluctant to hire more FTE because of the uncertainties surrounding the IR-4 budget.

**North Central Region (NCR)** – B. Hollingworth reported, things are running smoothly in NCR. The lab productivity is up. The one concern is the facilities and B. Hollingworth foresees the lab subsidy from Michigan State being eliminated. It had been a subsidy of two thirds, now it is one third and in another year they will have to pay the full amount which will add an extra $125K a year to the NCR budget. They’re working on rental negotiations at the moment and hope to stay in the current facility. The NCR annual meeting went very well; there was a fair amount of discussion of herbicide residue studies without good supportive efficacy/crop safety data. This caused the group to approve the following Motion: Replicated efficacy and safety data must be critically evaluated (acceptable yield, efficacy and crop safety) before a project can be nominated to possibly become an “A” residue priority.

**Northeast Region (NER)** – D. Soderlund reported the NER lab still has to complete sample analyses for two residue studies. They are trying to determine a decent all-matrix method for etofenprox that could cover odd matrices like avocado and tree nut crops, as the method from the manufacturer was not workable. R. Fish is making progress on a new method that does seem to be working, and could be worthy of publication. The NER still has personnel in transition. R. Fish may pick up a 25-hour position that has become open as S. Lincoln has left for another position within the University. There is an attractive early retirement incentive in NY right now, and J. DeCann will retire at the end of the year. They expect to hire her back part time for 6 months. W. Borejsza-Wysocki has accepted the position of SOR lab coordinator which was opened when J. Yoh retired, so he will be in a time of transition over the next several months into 2011. D. Soderlund asked the PMC to ratify the NER presenting awards to S. Lincoln - Cornell, T. Freiberger-Cream Ridge, NJ and B. Abbott-Eastern Shore Maryland.

**MOTION**: that PMC ratify the NER awards - moved, seconded and approved.

**Southern Region (SOR)** – M. Marshall reported the SOR will hire an additional chemist once W. Borejsza-Wysocki has moved down (November). They will also hire a lab QA person. The summer was very hot and damaged many Citra trials - they will be redone within the year. Arkansas and Homestead are still having
issues with many findings in their FDB, and QC and this is being addressed. The laboratory is trying to work off the backlog which still exists.

**Western Region (WSR)** –M. Miller reported the field performed 206 trials, a good number of trials for the region. They terminated 9 trials due to late spring in the west. They have restarted 5 and will restart the remainder in the winter. The field centers are full and they are using some contractors. M. Hengel reported the lab is moving along, and the Hawaii lab is progressing better - understanding timeline priorities has helped them realize the importance of moving their samples along. There will be a major change in the lab building as soon as a new walk-in freezer is installed. Completion of freezer is expected in about a year.

M. Tolson is doing excellent work with ornamentals. She is very computer savvy, which is a great resource for the WSR, particularly working with the database. She is doing many site visits to come up to speed. They would like the Biopesticide database to be more user friendly in order to optimize its capabilities. QA is quiet right now with J. McFarland and M. Beran traveling ~ 50%. They have hired a new analytical QA auditor, Sherita Normington. She comes from Morse Labs and brings 20 years experience.

**CLC** – R. Lundy reported the CLC held an informal meeting at the FUW with J. Baron and S. Novack in attendance. Since there will most likely be heavy turnover in the House and Senate in November, the March meeting should include 2 luncheons on The Hill. A. Schreiber will approach the winner (Dino Rossi/ Patty Murray) to sponsor a Senate luncheon. R. Ratto will approach Congressman Cardoza’s office for a House luncheon. The rooms are very small so not everyone will be invited from PMC or CLC. Definitely those from FL and CA should plan on attending the luncheons.

Other areas of concern are related to the Budget and Congressional turnover because those running on the Tea Party platform are talking about less government spending. The CLC is also concerned with how the EPA is operating and the direction it is going with little government oversight; particularly the EPA proposal on rules pertaining to drift and waste water discharge. Ag was traditionally exempt from these rules. EPA is not consulting with stakeholders when making these proposals.

**EPA Registrations, Work Plans, FDB/ASR Completion Status, Timeline Status, EPA Update** (in meeting materials) - D. Kunkel reported 726 new uses with 16 AI. The number of submissions in 2010 (so far 12 AI’s) is down ~40% over previous years (much is due to waiting for data or registrant registration packages).

**Ornamental Horticulture Program** – C. Palmer reported twenty-one research summaries have been prepared so far for 2010 containing more than 4000 trials. Product label registrations are down from 2009 (only 4 so far) which is disappointing, but these 4 have a higher crop impact because three are related to efficacy, not crop safety. The 2010 program includes 28 protocols, 142 products, 54 researchers. C. Palmer submitted a $382K grant request to APHIS (farm bill funding) for chrysanthemum white rust, and the funding decision is past due.

**Canceled trials** - Last year C. Palmer started to include statistics on ornamental horticulture program timelines (completed, outstanding, canceled). The canceled category includes a variety of reasons a trial wasn't completed (pest populations not sufficient, researchers not completing trials, etc). USDA-ARS and WSR consistently provide 85-90% of their planned research. The NCR has two researchers that are presently in arrears. One has been cut off already, because requests were made for data from 2008 and 2009 by a specific deadline so that the information could be included in a summary package for the manufacturer to write use directions. The other one took himself out of the program. Each region has had some issues with non-performing researchers and typically the RFCs and C. Palmer work together to find a solution because some of these researchers are influential in the ornamental horticulture industry or are younger researchers trying to thrive.
There is a large discrepancy of percentage of trials canceled regardless of funding source versus those that receive industry funding. The NIFA funds cover A level priority trials in efficacy, and A - C level priority depending on regional needs for crop safety. Industry funds usually do not cover a whole experiment; they are inserted treatments either in NIFA-funded research or in an experiment funded with outside IR-4 sources. With this type of arrangement, there is an implicit promise to the manufacturer for what will be accomplished with donated funding. It is important to ferret out why there is a percentage discrepancy, whether it is due to researchers not including the extra treatments because of ignorance, lack of plant materials or other reason or because there is a communication or timing issue with inserting these treatments which are usually B or C level priority.

**ACTION ITEM** – C. Palmer to determine which of the cancelled trials are due to circumstances outside researchers' control.

**Public Health Pesticides (PHP)** – K. Malamud-Roam reported with the help of S. Novack, the PHP webpage has now been populated, the database is up and running and a PHP brochure has been created and produced, and is being distributed.

**Communication Update** - S. Novack reported on new brochures and Facebook posting. Also she was given work by the CLC to help provide them with Report Cards for Hill visits in March. R. Ratto will need her help for the Jan. 2011 CA Weed Science meeting.

**Biopesticide and Organic Support** – M. Braverman highlighted a number of 2010 successful biopesticide program registrations, as well as one Sept. 2008 submission for acetic acid (a higher concentrated vinegar [20% vs 4-5% for home food use]) which has been hung up in BPPD many months beyond the PRIA date for a decision. He attended the National Organic meeting in early August where they talked about Thymol use and its apparent injury to bees (a user expressed that he had no idea what rate of the product he was using in his hives that resulted in bee injury!); there was discussion about a safer registered product, but the responses were that the registered product was more expensive. The 2011 Biopesticide grant proposal deadline has been extended to November due to the low number of proposals received to-date. The annual lateness in disbursement of funds has been indicated as a serious hindrance to researcher proposal submissions. There was a suggestion that the RFP needs to state more clearly what is/isn’t expected in the proposed budget for proposals.

**Tifton Freezer Security System**- B. Scully gave a presentation about the new security system, which included a system overview, chronology of the events that preceded the freezer breakdown, the fix, and the administrative review or lessons learned.

**QAU**- No report given at meeting but T. White-Barkalow submitted a report after the meeting.

**Lab Update** – D. Carpenter reported that she is working with the lab directors to prioritize projects. The directors need to continue developing a mind-set of teamwork. The regular meetings are good but, there is still a year or more of backlog and it doesn’t seem to be getting much better. When one or two projects are caught up, another one or two are added to the pipeline with overdue completion dates. In July there were 47 late ASRs, as of this meeting there were 51, and there are another 17 that will be considered when November rolls around.

D. Soderlund has participated in a number of laboratory ACAC conference calls and commented that he’s sensing a fundamental change in IR-4 labs’ approach to this being a “National Program” – the labs are realizing that the IR-4 submission timeline to EPA needs to be the driver of a project, not individual lab efficiencies. This is a positive development for the program, but the backlog is still there, as well as equipment needs not yet addressed (the Wapato ARS lab still needs new instrumentation in order to run samples, but ARS $s are not being released pending a directive from the PMC).
IR-4 Timelines Reduction discussion: T. Barkalow/M. Beran (QA), R. Sisco (Regional Field Coordinators), J. Wise (Field Research Directors), Matt Hengel (Regional Lab Directors) and D. Carpenter (HQ Study Directors/Registration Team) discussed their reports on timelines/pinch points, etc. Consistent themes throughout all reports were the need for excellent and timely communication, conveying to researchers throughout the program their critical importance in the “Big Picture” of what IR-4 is doing, and that our passive approach to project management needs to change to a more active process if we are to positively impact current timelines. They each explained how their groups approached this topic and provided the following suggestions:

- Since resources are limited, having a set path and goal at the beginning of the process would be helpful
- Everyone needs to know which projects have what level of priority
- Shouldn’t put high priority projects at troubled sites
- Should have active study management such that someone owns the timeline
- Have protocols available earlier in the process
- Changed submission dates need to be highlighted in one specific area of website or database
- Have the lab instruments running 24/7
- Project management training for all
- Hold FUW earlier in year, but others felt that moving away from something that really works (FUW) would be going down the wrong path
- Incorporate active functions on database
- Don’t wait till end of trial to work on and submit books but work on them as you go

M. Marshall suggested that time be set aside at the Oct. 26-27 NRPM to discuss this with all groups again represented, and come up with consensus ideas, or establish a subcommittee to move the discussion toward recommendations for the March 2011 PMC to consider.

D. Soderlund commented that the old 30-month timeline concept for “A” priorities is essentially gone, replaced by the reality of individual timeline plans for each project, based on registrant submission timelines, EPA/PRIA issues, etc. – the timeline concept is really a thing of the past.

Training Committee- D. Carpenter reported that the training committee is exploring 5 possible venues for the 2012 National Education Conference, Feb 2012: San Antonio, San Diego, Orlando, Phoenix and New Orleans.

Wednesday, October 20, 2010

International Activities – D. Kunkel reported plans are underway for next Global Minor Use Summit. OECD offered the use of their offices in Paris for the 2012 Global Minor Use Summit, but there are concerns from EPA due to some OECD rules. USDA-Foreign Ag Service has set aside funding for this meeting - location still TBD.

NAFTA technical working group will meet in Nov. in Mexico.

FUW, E/CS 2011 Food Use Research Plan. – V. Starner gave a summary of the FUW survey results. P. Schwartz commented that the FUW went very smoothly and reflected the amount of homework done ahead of time. R. Lundy also provided positive FUW feedback. There was a suggestion for the 2011 FUW that priorities be set by crop grouping rather than by discipline, and that IR-4 focus on the needs of the commodity groups rather than an arbitrary commitment of “A” priorities to each discipline. This would be a major change in how the FUW is conducted and would take some time to sort out. Some felt “if it isn’t broken, don’t fix
it,” while another suggestion was to consider a “hybrid” approach to priority setting, with a set # of “A” priorities for each discipline and the rest to be allotted on a “crop group/commodity basis.”

**ACTION ITEM:** Have a report of proposed changes to the FUW priority setting process by March PMC meeting.

V. Starner reported “A” priorities assigned for 2011: weed science 16, pathology 18, entomology 16. “A” nominated projects requiring only efficacy/crop safety (E/CS) data were discussed separately from residue projects and each discipline assigned up to 10 “H” priorities (highest need for E/CS research should sufficient funding be available).

**Summary of All 2011 Residue Studies:**
- Total 72 residue studies + 21 “Red A” trials = 457-525 trials
- Total 53 different chemistries
- Includes 5 processing studies
- Includes 18 joint studies with Canada (~65-75 trials)
(Canada as SD proposed for 5 studies [10555 pyrifluquinazone/pepper (GH), 10634 tolfenpyrad/cucumber (GH), 10695 penthiopyrad/caneberry, 10369 metrafenone/peach, 09786 mesotrione/grape])

**Efficacy/Crop Safety (E/CS) Research Replacing “A” Residue Studies**
There are still quite a few projects left over from previous years that need additional E/CS data, and these will exhaust all of the $250K funding allotted by PMC in July for E/CS work in 2011. Five “Pest Problem Without Solution” projects (PPWS) were upgraded to replace “A” priority residue studies in 2011, due to lack of funding for E/CS work.

If the Biopesticide program receives fewer than anticipated proposals, the PMC will consider moving money from there to fund some upgraded pyrethrin residue projects which are primarily needed for organic growers. This can be decided through an email discussion or conf. call after completion of biopesticide grant proposals early 2011.

**IR-4 Budget for 2011** - J. Baron reminded all that at the July meeting PMC voted $250,000 for E/CS and $2.3 million for residue research in 2011. He put on the table for discussion a budget plan which included $350k for “difficult to analyze” chemistries by taking 2% of budgets from regions and HQ. Regional directors weighed-in on this proposed budget, suggesting that such a plan would leave them well below funding needed. P. Schwartz felt S. Schneider/ARS will do what’s possible to move funds to support analyses that would have been done at Beltsville. There was also general concern about a second budget proposal option, and R. Lundy thinks (depending on how the election goes), IR-4 could see a 5% cut, so it might be best to err on the conservative side at this time, agree on the distribution of funds, and wait for election result fall-out. If this happens the PMC will have to convene a meeting and revise the budget.

**MOTION:** Agree to use J. Baron’s draft budget (below) as a template to submit grants to NIFA (this is same core as in 2010, “difficult-to-analyze [“backlog”]” at ~$153k, and $40k to NER to pay for a tractor needed at the MD site. Seconded and Approved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East Core</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Core</td>
<td>$1,313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Core</td>
<td>$1,313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Core</td>
<td>$1,788,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headquarters Core</td>
<td>$2,836,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Residue</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Efficacy/Crop Safety</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopesticide</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backlog</td>
<td>$153,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,354,561</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was additional discussion about funding “centers at risk” (when a minimum # of trials to keep the doors open are not scheduled) and possibly adjusting per-trial costs to help out these centers, or to keep the funding at a stated cost per trial and use the difference (~$300k) to help out the centers at risk for one year. For now the per-trial funding remains at $5k.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Hold a PMC conference call after NRPM to discuss, as needed.

**ACAC Report** - The PMC thanks Emy Pfeil for her work compiling information and spearheading the project to analyze lab equipment needs throughout the Project.

- **MOTION:** To accept the ACAC report with each individual unit selecting the best option whether to purchase or lease equipment as they see viable. Seconded and Approved.

- **ACTION ITEM:** J. Baron will notify S. Schneider ASAP of the acceptance of the ACAC report clearing the way for the potential new equipment purchase in Wapato.

**Upcoming Meetings:**

NRPM  
October 26-27, 2010  
Princeton, NJ

Spring CLC/PMC  
Feb 28 - Mar 3, 2011  
Washington, DC

CLC meet Feb 28 for dinner; PMC/CLC meet a.m. of Mar 1; lunch on Hill;  
PMC meet 2-5 p.m. Mar 1; a.m. of Mar 2; lunch on Hill; PMC meet 2 p.m. Mar 2  
PMC meet a.m. of Mar 3

Summer PMC  
Week of July 18, 2011  
Madison, WI  
(tentative)

Jerry will check with Canadians to see if they want to host this meeting.

2011 Food Use Workshop  
Sept 13-14, 2011  
Embassy Suites  
Cary, NC
New Agenda Item

Long term planning - IR-4 needs to take a serious look at long term planning, with budget and personnel concerns (many retiring). IR-4 needs to look at 5-year plan for facing these issues. The PMC would like as many A/A’s as possible to attend the March 2011 PMC meeting to participate in this discussion. The next meeting will need to be 3 days in order to accommodate luncheons on The Hill.

ACTION ITEM: M. Marshall will send out a memo stating the request for Administrative Advisors attendance at the next PMC meeting to focus on long term planning for the program.