PRONewEngland Pest Management Network

2008 Progress Report

December 12, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. GRANT DATA

Today's Date: **December 12, 2008**
Title: 2008 New England Pest Management Network
Grant #: UM-S704
Project Type: State Network Project, IPM Planning and Assessment Documents.
Project Directors:

University of Maine (UMaine)
Dr. James Dill
Statewide IPM Coordinator, Pesticide Applicator Training Program Coordinator
Pest Management Office
491 College Avenue
Orono, ME 04473-1295
Phone: 207-581-3879
Fax: 207-581-3881
Email: jdill@umext.maine.edu

Glen Koehler
Associate Scientist Integrated Pest Management
Pest Management Office
491 College Avenue
Orono, ME 04473-1295
Phone: 207-581-3882
Fax: 207-581-3881
Email: gkoehler@umext.maine.edu

Team Members:

University of Connecticut (UConn) – Candace Bartholomew, Pesticide Coordinator.
University of Massachusetts (UMass) – Natalia Clifton, Pesticide Education Program Specialist; Dr. Pat Vittum, Associate Professor of Entomology.
University of New Hampshire (UNH) – William Lord, Extension Professor.
University of Rhode Island (URI) – Margaret Siligato, Pesticide Applicator Training Program Coordinator; Dr. Steve Alm, Professor of Entomology.
University of Vermont (UVM) – Ann Hazelrigg, Pesticide Education and Safety Program Coordinator, Plant Diagnostic Clinic Director; Sarah Kingsley-Richards, Plant and Soil Science Department Assistant.

States Involved: Maine (lead state), Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont.

Funding Year: 2008.

Funding Amounts:

University of Maine – $ 49,063
$ 5,058 – PRONewEngland state liaison.
$ 12,063 – PRONewEngland.org web site.
$ 3,731 – Maple syrup producer survey data entry and summary.
$ 28,211 – Project coordination and contract for PRONewEngland and $85,294 of other attached contracts within the six New England.

University of Connecticut – $ 5,000
$ 5,000 – PRONewEngland state liaison.

University of Massachusetts – $ 90,294
$ 5,000 – PRONewEngland state liaison.
(Contracts from Northeastern IPM Center to University of Massachusetts totaling $85,294 were attached to PRONewEngland contract.)

University of New Hampshire– $ 5,000
$ 5,000 – PRONewEngland state liaison.

University of Rhode Island – $ 5,000
$ 5,000 – PRONewEngland state liaison.

University of Vermont – $ 23,567
$ 5,012 – PRONewEngland state liaison
$ 8,173 – Maple syrup producer survey questionnaire development and mailings.
$10,382 – Bramble (raspberry) pest management strategic plan.

B. SUMMARY

The PRONewEngland Pest Management Network is a coordinated effort among the Land Grant universities of the six New England states to promote the use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and increase public access to IPM information for New England citizens.

The PRONewEngland liaison in each state was available to respond to any EPA/USDA pesticide queries in 2008, but after a flurry of 2007 activity there few if any queries in 2008. State liaisons provided mailing lists and reviewed the Christmas tree pest management tactic survey questionnaire, recruited participants and participated themselves in the School IPM coordination meeting, and recruited growers to participate in the bramble pest management strategic plan (PMSP) meeting.

Work was completed on the New England pepper crop profile, and pepper PMSP. The School IPM survey was completed. Work is underway on the questionnaire form for a survey of maple syrup producer pest management concerns with mailings to begin in spring 2009, and data entry and response summary planned for completion in fall 2009. The bramble pest management strategic plan (PMSP) meeting is being held December 18-19, with the PMSP document scheduled to be routed to each state for draft review in February 2009.

The PRONewEngland.org website (PRO = Pest Resources Online) provides a portal to pest management information published by the Land Grant universities and state agencies in the six New England states. The web site also features original content, including New England pest management surveys, crop profiles, PMSPs, and pest timing models; and contact directories of university, state government, and private sector individuals and organizations for pest management topics in each New England state.

The project directors at the University of Maine provided oversight and coordination and for the above activities, handled budget and contract processing for two additional Northeastern IPM Center grants that were attached to the PRONewEngland award, and successfully completed closure of the 2004-2007 contract.

C, D, E. OBJECTIVES, RESULTS, IMPACTS

PRONEWENGLAND STATE NETWORK PROJECT

1. Enhance public access to regionally-specific research-based pest management information.

We continued to operate and update the PRONewEngland.org website. This consisted primarily of checking validity of links in the New England pest fact sheet database. All 1,099 documents in the database were checked, and links were reset to allow tracking of connections made to the documents through PRONewEngland.org, and to install a new Google site search engine in 2009. Updates were made to other content links and to the names and contact listings in the expert contact directories. PRONewEngland consists of 1,989 pages (not counting the 1,099 pages linked in the fact sheet database).

PRONewEngland continued providing twice-daily agricultural weather and apple pest updates for five sites (two in Maine, two in Rhode Island, one in New York) using weather data provided by other funds. The system to provide this service was developed with IPM Working Group Priorities funding in 2005 and 2006.

2. Enhance coordination among School IPM programs in New England.

We organized and hosted a meeting on May 19, 2008 in Concord NH. Natalia Clifton presented results of the PRONewEngland School IPM survey. Representatives from School IPM efforts in each of the New England states (Diane Jorsey – CT, Gary Fish – ME, Taryn LaScola – MA, Arife Ozkan – NH, Eugene Pepper – RI, Ann Hazelrigg – VT). Lynn Braband of Cornell University provided an overview of school IPM in New York. These presentations were followed by lunch and two hour discussion of topics raised during the morning presentations. The meeting provided opportunity for learning and networking across state lines, and served as a kick-off event for the Northeastern IPM Center School IPM working group.

3. Represent New England pest management needs in federal regulatory decisions.

State liaisons were available to respond to queries from EPA and USDA about pesticide registration needs and uses in their state. However, there were no queries received in 2008.

IPM PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT DOCUMENTS

4. Conduct a statistically valid survey of New England Christmas tree growers to document pest management needs and practices.

The survey mailings, response entry and summary were completed in 2008. The response summary is attached in Appendices.

5. Conduct a statistically valid survey of School IPM priorities in New England.

The survey mailings began in 2007, response entry and summary were completed in 2008. The response summary is attached in Appendices.

6. Conduct a statistically valid survey of New England maple syrup producers to identify their pest management concerns and priorities.

Work has begun developing the survey questionnaire which will be circulated in draft form for state comments in January 2009. Survey mailings are set to begin after maple syrup season in April 2009, with data entry and summary planned for September 2009.

7. Organize a pest management strategic (PMSP) plan meeting and create PMSP document for pepper production in New England.

The pepper PMSP meeting was held in March 2008. The document draft was circulated to each state in October 2008 and is undergoing final review for state approvals before submission to the Northeastern IPM Center for referral to the national PMSP database in January 2009. The draft document under review is attached in the Appendices.

8. Organize a pest management strategic (PMSP) plan meeting and create PMSP document for bramble (raspberry) production in New England.

The bramble PMSP meeting is set up for December 18-19 in Concord NH. The document draft is scheduled for delivery and review in February 2009. After receiving state approvals, the finalized PMSP will be submitted to the Northeastern IPM Center for referral to the national PMSP database.

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

9. Co-PDs James Dill and Glen Koehler spent approximately 47 days on PRONewEngland project administrative tasks in 2008. This included writing proposal and contract documents, monitoring and assisting subcontractor compliance, bringing the 2004-2007 budgets to closure, managing procedural standards and document templates, reviewing documents, filing progress reports, and attending meetings.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. PRONewEngland.org most requested pages

	Top 100 - Most Requested Pages	Views	% of Total Views	Visitor Sessions	Avg. Time Viewed
1	**Pest Management Resources Online (PRO) for New England** http://pronewengland.org/	25,528	12.59%	22,493	00:04:24
2	http://pronewengland.org/ robots.txt	23,978	11.83%	22,395	00:01:53
3	**New England Fact Sheet Finder Instructions** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROFactSheetFinderIntro.asp	2,728	1.34%	2,351	00:02:21
4	**Pest & Crop forecast models** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/DecisionModels.htm	2,423	1.19%	2,185	00:03:34
5	**Invasive and Natural Resource pest INFO** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoInvasiveNatRes.htm	2,460	1.21%	2,166	00:03:44
6	**Pesticide Info for New England** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoPesticide.htm	2,223	1.09%	1,986	00:03:55
7	**Crop and Livestock pest INFO** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoCropLivestock.htm	2,343	1.15%	1,982	00:03:46
8	**Maine pest information contacts** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/ME-Contacts.htm	2,198	1.08%	1,971	00:04:09
9	**Orchard Radar directory for Monmouth ME** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ RADARME-Monmouth.htm	2,092	1.03%	1,868	00:03:27
10	**Crop Profiles for New England** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoProfile.htm	2,065	1.01%	1,832	00:04:33
11	**Ornamental, Turf, & Greenhouse pest management INFO** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoOrnTurfGH.htm	2,223	1.09%	1,824	00:04:27
12	**HEALTH & INDOOR pest management INFO** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoHealthIndoor.htm	2,210	1.09%	1,819	00:03:38
13	**Integrated pest management INFO** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoIPM.htm	2,017	0.99%	1,756	00:02:57
14	**ABOUT PRO New England** http://pronewengland.org/ PROAbout.htm	2,151	1.06%	1,745	00:03:19
15	**Directory of PRONewEngland INFO pages** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfo.htm	1,940	0.95%	1,730	00:03:27
16	**New England Pest ID cards** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/PestIDcards/ PestIDcardList.htm	1,862	0.91%	1,728	00:05:30
17	**Massachusetts pest information contacts** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/MA-Contacts.htm	1,878	0.92%	1,700	00:03:59
18	**Organic pest management INFO** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoOrganic.htm	1,951	0.96%	1,697	00:03:53
19	**Connecticut pest information contacts** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/CT-Contacts.htm	1,730	0.85%	1,569	00:03:40
20	**People and Places for New England pest management**	1,710	0.84%	1,555	00:03:05

	http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/PROPeople.htm				
21	**Rhode Island pest information contacts** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/RI-Contacts.htm	1,692	0.83%	1,538	00:04:07
22	**Vermont pest information contacts** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/VT-Contacts.htm	1,647	0.81%	1,490	00:04:39
23	**Biotech pest management INFO** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoBioTech.htm	1,684	0.83%	1,453	00:03:32
24	**New Hampshire pest information contacts** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/NH-Contacts.htm	1,557	0.76%	1,421	00:03:55
25	**Pest management surveys for New England** http://pronewengland.org/info/ PROInfoSurvey.htm	1,589	0.78%	1,367	00:04:48
26	**Massachusetts pest management Interest Groups** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/PROPeopleMA.htm	1,474	0.72%	1,358	00:05:42
27	**What's New on PRO New England** http://pronewengland.org/ PROWhatsNew.htm	1,454	0.71%	1,311	00:04:23
28	**New England pest management Interest Groups** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/PROPeopleNewEngland.htm	1,353	0.66%	1,254	00:05:14
29	**PRO New England Feedback** http://pronewengland.org/ PROFeedback.asp	1,374	0.67%	1,249	00:04:16
30	**SITE MAP for PRONewEngland.org** http://pronewengland.org/ PROSiteMap.htm	1,390	0.68%	1,210	00:03:07
31	**PMSP - Pest mgmt Strategic Plans for New England** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoPMSP.htm	1,300	0.64%	1,178	00:05:14
32	**Orchard Radar directory for Greenville RI** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/RImodel/ RADARRI-Greenville.htm	1,166	0.57%	1,051	00:05:12
33	**Introduction to Orchard Radar apple pest forecasts** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/RadarIntro.htm	1,035	0.51%	971	00:06:23
34	**Maine EPA & USDA Pesticide Registration Queries** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PesticideQueries/ PesticideQueries-ME.htm	978	0.48%	906	00:07:43
35	**Maine Invasive Pest Threats** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/ MaineInvasivePests.htm	1,013	0.49%	900	00:04:38
36	**New Hampshire pest management Interest Groups** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/PROPeopleNH.htm	906	0.44%	824	00:06:12
37	http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-HourChart.htm	901	0.44%	813	00:02:38
38	**Maine pest management Interest Groups** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/PROPeopleME.htm	869	0.42%	804	00:06:19
39	**Orchard Radar directory for Middletown RI** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/RImodel/ RadarRI-Middletown.htm	849	0.41%	790	00:08:01
40	**Orchard Radar directory for Sanford ME** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ RADARME-Sanford.htm	834	0.41%	777	00:02:01
41	**Wild Blueberries in the United States Crop Profile** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/Profile/ BlueberryProfileMainPage.htm	813	0.4%	757	00:06:55
42	**Stakeholder input** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/Stakeholder/ StakeholderInput.htm	765	0.37%	727	00:06:35
43	**Integrated pest management definition** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/ PROINfoIPM-definition.htm	737	0.36%	703	00:06:47
44	**Rhode Island pest management Interest Groups** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/PROPeopleRI.htm	745	0.36%	698	00:05:08
45	**Vermont EPA & USDA Pesticide Registration Queries** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PesticideQueries/ PesticideQueries-VT.htm	733	0.36%	692	00:07:09
46	**Maine Univ. & State pest mgmt. programs** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/People-ME-UnivGov.htm	715	0.35%	674	00:05:57
47	**Connecticut pest management Interest Groups** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/PROPeopleCT.htm	711	0.35%	671	00:06:03
48	**Vermont pest management Interest Groups** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/PROPeopleVT.htm	707	0.34%	663	00:06:40
49	**Flyspeck model background - fungicide groups** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/FlyspeckBackground.htm	692	0.34%	646	00:07:39
50	**New Hampshire Univ. & State pest mgmt. programs** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/People-NH-UnivGov.htm	680	0.33%	641	00:05:12
51	**Vermont Univ. & State pest mgmt. programs**	673	0.33%	632	00:06:07

	http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/People-VT-UnivGov.htm				
52	**Massachusetts Univ. & State pest mgmt. programs** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/People-MA-UnivGov.htm	639	0.31%	608	00:05:02
53	**Rhode Island Univ. & State pest mgmt. programs** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/People-RI-UnivGov.htm	637	0.31%	595	00:05:39
54	**Connecticut Univ & State pest mgmt. programs** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/People-CT-UnivGov.htm	629	0.31%	593	00:06:41
55	http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-HourForecast.htm	593	0.29%	562	00:03:49
56	**New England regional pest management programs** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/ People-NewEngland-UnivGov.htm	581	0.28%	556	00:06:59
57	**PRONewEngland web traffic report** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/WebTraffic/ PROWebTraffic.htm	568	0.28%	547	00:05:45
58	**ME 1985-1994 Pesticide Surveys** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ ME-Info/ ME-Surveys1985-1994.htm	600	0.29%	538	00:07:11
59	**PRO display panel image** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/Stakeholder/ PRO-motion.htm	539	0.26%	522	00:07:07
60	**Protectant fungicide Respray Dates for Secondary Scab Suppression** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/MEmodel/ ME-Monmouth-SecondaryScabSpray.htm	572	0.28%	519	00:06:06
61	**Apple insect pest degree day models** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-InsectDates.htm	550	0.27%	514	00:06:01
62	**Maine Vertebrate Pest Contacts** http://pronewengland.org/ PEOPLE/ME-VertPestContacts.htm	540	0.26%	508	00:06:58
63	http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-RainChart.htm	568	0.28%	487	00:02:19
64	**Plum curculio protection period** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-PCTable.htm	525	0.25%	481	00:07:00
65	http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Sanford-HourChart.htm	512	0.25%	474	00:02:57
66	**New England Pest Mgmt. Conference** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/Stakeholder/ Conference2004Report.htm	491	0.24%	469	00:05:25
67	http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-ScabInfectionPeriodChart.htm	482	0.23%	439	00:02:51
68	**How Pest Management Strategic Plans Are Used** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/PMSP/PMSP-Uses.htm	458	0.22%	433	00:07:28
69	**'Surface fungicide' Respray Dates for Scab Suppression** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-ScabSprayContact.htm	458	0.22%	429	00:05:23
70	**EPA-USDA Crop Profile outline** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfo-ProfileOutline.htm	433	0.21%	421	00:07:12
71	**2002 New England Pest Mgmt. Stakeholder Feedback Report** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/Stakeholder/ StakeholderFeedbackReport.htm	433	0.21%	419	00:05:00
72	**Background for Apple scab models** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/ScabBackground.htm	431	0.21%	419	00:06:49
73	**Apple scab: Primary infection period ratings** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-ScabRatingsTable.htm	439	0.21%	414	00:03:56
74	http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-TempChart.htm	462	0.22%	405	00:03:02
75	**Orchard Radar directory for Monmouth ME** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ RADARME-MonmouthLate.htm	416	0.2%	400	00:04:52
76	**Apple insect pest degree day models** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/RImodel/ ri-Middletown-InsectDates.htm	429	0.21%	397	00:06:31
77	http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-ScabLesionChart.htm	436	0.21%	382	00:04:12
78	**Connecticut EPA & USDA Pesticide Registration Queries** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PesticideQueries/ PesticideQueries-CT.htm	410	0.2%	376	00:07:35
79	**Special Local Need and Emergency Pesticide Registrations** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROInfoPesticide- Section18-24c.htm	399	0.19%	376	00:08:13
80	**European red mite background and threshold values** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/ERMBackground.htm	400	0.19%	373	00:07:15
81	**Fire blight background** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/FireBlightBackground.htm	381	0.18%	358	00:06:28
82	**New Hampshire EPA & USDA Pesticide Registration Queries** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PesticideQueries/ PesticideQueries-NH.htm	379	0.18%	354	00:07:40
83	**McIntosh bud stages** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-Bud.htm	376	0.18%	342	00:05:38

84	**Apple scab: primary infection period details** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-ScabPrimaryInfPerDetail.htm	363	0.17%	339	00:03:29
85	**ME-Potato 1998 pesticide survey** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ ME-Info/ ME-PesticideSurvey-Potato98.htm	348	0.17%	338	00:06:37
86	**ME-Blueberry 1997 pesticide survey** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ ME-Info/ ME-PesticideSurvey-Blueberry1997.htm	352	0.17%	337	00:07:50
87	**Orchard Radar directory for Monmouth ME** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ RADARME-MonmouthEarly.htm	348	0.17%	333	00:05:09
88	**ME-Ag 1997 Pesticide Sales** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ ME-Info/ ME-AgPesticideSales1997.htm	366	0.18%	331	00:04:30
89	**First catch through July: Apple maggot fly - resuming trap counts toward thres** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-AMJuly.htm	347	0.17%	330	00:06:30
90	http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-ScabPotentialChart.htm	380	0.18%	328	00:02:30
91	**Orchard management: Synopsis of key early season dates** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/RImodel/ ri-Middletown-CalendarEarly.htm	364	0.17%	320	00:07:08
92	**Orchard Radar Acknowledgements** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/ RadarAcknowledgements.htm	337	0.16%	318	00:08:37
93	**Background for Codling moth model** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/ CodlingMothBackground.htm	381	0.18%	317	00:04:22
94	**Rhode Island EPA & USDA Pesticide Registration Queries** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PesticideQueries/ PesticideQueries-RI.htm	329	0.16%	313	00:06:39
95	**Strobilurin fungicide Respray Dates for Scab Suppression** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-ScabSprayStrobilurin.htm	323	0.15%	306	00:05:44
96	**2002 New Engalnd Stakeholder Participants** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ PROpubs/Stakeholder/ StakeholderFeedbackReport-AppdxB.htm	324	0.15%	304	00:05:27
97	**Background for PRONewEngland pest forecast model weather data** http://pronewengland.org/ allmodels/ WeatherDataBackground.htm	308	0.15%	303	00:08:54
98	**ME 1996 Pesticide Surveys** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ ME-Info/ MEPesticideSurveys96-98.htm	318	0.15%	302	00:05:33
99	**Petal Fall - June mite scouting frequency** http://pronewengland.org/ AllModels/MEmodel/ me-Monmouth-ERMScoutJune.htm	320	0.15%	301	00:05:41
100	**ME Surveys** http://pronewengland.org/INFO/ ME-Info/ MainePesticideSurveyIntro.htm	313	0.15%	299	00:06:29

Appendix 2.

New England Christmas Tree Pest Management Survey

Survey Conducted by Candace Bartholomew, University of Connecticut
Data management and report by Natalia P. Clifton,
University of Massachusetts December 2008

A 59-question survey was distributed by the University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension to New England growers in the spring of 2008. A Dillman survey methodology was used to design and conduct the survey. This is a preliminary report has a selection of questions and responses from the survey. The original survey and final report will be available in January 2009 at www.pronewengland.org.

Christmas Tree Pest Management Survey Returns

State	#Growers	# Acres
CT	45	640.9
MA	44	539.6
ME	47	1,258.5
NH	11	368.5
RI	12	242.7
VT	33	830.5
Total	192	3880.3

Question A3. What percentage of your Christmas trees are: **(*N=191)**

Variety	Percent of Growers	Percent of Acres
Balsam Fir	84	53
Fraser Fir	75	25
Blue Spruce	45	5
Concolor Fir	36	2
White Pine	31	2
Douglas Fir	28	3
White Spruce	23	4
Canaan Fir	19	4
Scotch Pine	13	<1
OTHER	19	3

*N is used throughout the entire document and refers to the number of growers who answered the question.

Question A4. **What percentage of your Christmas tree crop is sold through each of these markets?** (N=191)

Markets	Percent of Growers	Percent of Acres
Cut your own	**89**	**47**
Fresh market, wholesale	**31**	**43**
Fresh market, retail	**24**	**8**
*Other	**4**	**2**

Insects and Mites Section

Grower reported the insects and mites that required "routine annual management, require occasional management, or are never a problem on your farm?" The pests are ranked based on this information through a weighed number. **(N= 185)** The percent of acres treated for these pests are in the last column. Growers (107) made on average 2.4 insect/miticide applications for controlling these pests.

Rank	Insect/Mite	Weighed Number*	Percent of Treated Acres
1	Balsam Twig aphid	**356**	**12**
2	White Pine Weevil	**306**	**5**
3	Spruce Spider Mite	**260**	**9**
4	Spruce Gall Adelgid	**162**	**<1**
5	Balsam Gall Midge	**152**	**6**
6	Pales weevil	**126**	**3**
7	Crytomeria/hemlock scale	**96**	**4**
8	Sawfly Larvae	**72**	**3**
9	Pine Shoot borer	**78**	**2**
10	Pine Root Collar	**10**	**<1**

*****The weighed number was determined by multiplying routine annual management by 4, occasional management by 2, and never a problem by 0.

Disease Section

Grower reported the diseases that required "routine annual management, require occasional management, or are never a problem on your farm?" The diseases are ranked based on this information through a weighed number. **(N= 185)** The percent of acres treated for these diseases are in the last column. Twenty percent of the growers indicated that they applied fungicides/bactericides and made on average 2.2 treatments.

Rank	Disease	Weighed Number*	Percent of Acres Treated
1	Rhabdocline needlecast	**174**	**3**
2	Rhizosphaera needlecast	**116**	**1**
3	Phytophthora root rot	**106**	**<1**
4	Swiss needlecast	**56**	**1**
5	Repeating spruce needle rust	**54**	**1**

*****The weighed number was determined by multiplying routine annual management by 4, occasional management by 2, and never a problem by 0.

Weed Management Section

Grower reported the weeds that required "routine annual management, require occasional management, or are never a problem on your farm?" The weeds are ranked based on this information through a weighed number. **(N= 185)** Eighty-six percent of the growers used herbicides to control weeds. There were on average 2.7 herbicide applications per grower.

Rank	Weeds	*Weighed Number	
1	Perennial broadleaf weeds	**628**	
2	Annual broadleaf weeds	**626**	**302**
2	Annual grasses	**626**	
4	Perennial grasses	**616**	**160**

*****The weighed number was determined by multiplying routine annual management by 4, occasional management by 2, and never a problem by 0.

Pest Management Decision Making Section

Question H1. Please select the single option that best describes your use of monitoring for insect or mites pests.

%Growers	Pest Monitoring Practices
23	Treatments primarily made on calendar basis, with few decisions based on monitoring
48	Informal observations influence decisions, but formal sampling methods and thresholds not used.
13	Sampling according to standard procedures or traps, observations compared to pest threshold
6	Sampling or trapping with thresholds, plus use of pest models to determine need or timing for control

Question H2. Please select the single option that best describes your use of monitoring for disease management.

%Growers	Pest Monitoring Practices
20	Treatments primarily made on calendar basis, with few decisions based on monitoring
51	Decisions based on informal observations, but leaf/fruit sampling or infection period tracking not used.
8	Infection period duration or intensity estimated, leaf or fruit sampling for symptoms.
5	Detailed infection period tracking and sampling or use of disease models.

Question H3. Please select the single option that best describes your use of monitoring for weed management.

%Growers	Pest Monitoring Practices
34	Treatment made on calendar basis, with few decisions based on monitoring
47	Decisions based on informal observations, but no formal weed scouting or weed mapping
11	Decisions based on informal observations, but weed scouting or weed map used for a few special situations
5	Weed scouting records or weed map used for most plantings

Question H4. Who does insect trapping or field scouting on your farm (Please circle all that apply)

%Farms	Who monitors for pests?
67	Grower
11	Farm employee or family member
1	Private IPM scout/consultant
4	University/Extension scout
20	No one
3	Other

Question H8. How important are these sources of information in making your pest management decisions? **(**please circle your answers)

Information Sources	Rank	Score*
Other growers	**1**	**422**
Twilight meetings, field days	**2**	**416**
Extension newsletters and/or pest alerts	**3**	**396**
Off season educational meetings	**4**	**394**
University/Extension staff	**5**	**382**
Trade publications	**6**	**308**
Suppliers/dealers	**7**	**336**
Web sites	**8**	**164**
Private consultants	**9**	**74**

Question H7. How would you describe your crop production practices? (please circle your answer)

Crop Production	%Growers
Conventional	**57**
IPM	**27**
Organic	**7**

Other	**11**

Special thanks to the hundreds of growers who supported this project.

Also to the members of the New England Pest Management Network team including, Glen Koehler and James Dill-University of Maine, Candace Bartholomew-University of Connecticut, Alan Eaton-University of New Hampshire, Margaret Siligato and Steven Alm-University of Rhode Island, Ann Hazelrigg and Sarah Kingsley-Richards-University of Vermont, and William Coli and Patricia Vittum-University of Massachusetts.

Submitted by Natalia P. Clifton, Department of Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences and UMass Extension Pesticide Education Program, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, December 2008

Funding provided by the USDA Northeast Pest Management Center.

Appendix 3.

New England School Pest Management Survey
Summary of Results

Prepared by Natalia P. Clifton, Department of Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences University of Massachusetts December 2008

This survey was distributed to 1477 New England public and private schools in February-May 2008. A Dillman survey methodology was used to design and conduct the survey. The original survey and final report may be found at the website www.pronewengland.org.

New England School Pest Management Survey Returns

State	# Surveys Sent	# Surveys Returned	%Return
CT	**315**	**102**	**32**
MA	**591**	**274**	**46**
ME	**178**	**87**	**49**
NH	**172**	**75**	**44**
RI	**111**	**46**	**41**
VT	**110**	**46**	**42**
Total	**1477**	**630**	**43**

The following are results from the first introductory questions in the survey. Unless otherwise noted, all percentages are of the number of schools participating in the survey.

1. Which below describes your job title(s)? *Check all that apply.*

38% School Maintenance Supervisor/Facility Manager
28% Principal
22% Maintenance/Custodial Staff
14% Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Coordinator
6% Teacher
4% Director/Asst. Director
3% Owner
2% School Superintendent/School District Administrator
1% Food Service Director/Staff
10% *Other

*School nurse, business manager, administrative assistant, compliance manager, and others

2. What is the setting of your school? *Check one.*

43% Rural
43% Suburban
11% Metropolitan

3. How many students are enrolled in your school? *Fill in the blank.*

Number of children enrolled (*in all schools participating*): __448,697___

4. Which of these pests require routine management, require occasional management, or are never a problem **indoors** in your school?

Rank	Indoor Pests	Weighed Number*
1	Ants	**1350**
2	Bees/Wasps/Hornets	**1084**
3	Mice	**1042**
4	Head lice	**824**
5	Flies	**744**
6	Spiders	**576**
7	Mold/Mildew	**534**
8	Fruit flies	**522**
9	Cockroaches	**200**
10	Termites	**190**
10	Other stinging insects	**190**

***The weighted number was determined by multiplying routine annual management by 4, occasional management by 2, and never a problem and don't know by 0.

5. Which of these pests require routine annual management, require occasional management, or are never a problem **outdoors** of your school?

Rank	Outdoor Pests	Weighed Number*
1	Bees/Wasps/Hornets	**1298**
2	Ants	**774**
3	Grassy Weeds	**654**
4	Mosquitoes	**572**
5	Mice	**564**
6	Poison ivy	**484**
7	Broadleaf weeds	**478**
8	Ticks	**398**
9	Turf grubs	**318**
10	Birds	**306**

*****The weighed number was determined by multiplying routine annual management by 4, occasional management by 2, and never a problem and don't know by 0.

Information on Specific Pests and Management Strategies

Ants were the most reported pest problem by schools (66%) in the past two years. Sanitation was the most (45%) widely used management strategy. However, pesticides were also used by schools including, ant bait stations (31%), spraying on indoor baseboards (16%), and perimeter spraying for outdoors (15%).

Sixty-five percent of the schools reported **bees/wasps/hornets** problems in the past two years**.** Most schools (58%) inspected, removed, and/or destroyed the nests. Other strategies that were used included, sealing of openings in playground structures, fences and pipes, etc (27%), installation and/or maintenance of window/door screens (22%), use of outdoor trash containers with tight lids (21%), and use of fly swatters (8%). Aerosol sprays were used by twenty-three percent of the schools.

Head lice were a reported problem for forty-nine percent of the schools. The following were implemented by the schools: parental notification (49%), inspect children (49%), discourage children from sharing hats, combs, etc (47%), parental education (37%), and written head lice plan (35%).

Forty-seven percent of the schools reported **mouse** or **rat** problems in the past two years.

A significant amount of schools (45%) indicated that they monitored for the pest and/or droppings. The following practices were also reported: glue traps (35%), exclusion (31%), sanitation (28%), and snap traps (28%). Eleven percent of the schools reported using rodenticide baits.

A percentage of schools also reported that **flies** (25%), **mosquitoes** (17%), **ticks** (11%), and **cockroaches** (6%) had been problems in the past two years.

Forty percent of the schools do not have athletic fields. Those that do have athletic fields used the following practices to manage pests: frequent sharpening of mower blades (48%), frequent monitoring for pests (43%), aeration at least once a year (32%), over seeding (31%), and annual soil test for fertilizer needs, etc. (22%). Organic fertilizers (19%) and synthetic fertilizers (19%) were used by schools. Pesticides were used to manage broadleaf weeds (15%), turf grubs (15%), and grassy weeds (10%).

Administrative Pest Management and Pesticide Use Policies

School maintenance supervisors/facilities managers were responsible for making pest management decisions at the majority of schools (63%). Principals (37%), maintenance/custodial staff (37%), integrated pest management coordinators (25%), professional exterminating companies (25%) and food service directors/staff (12%) also made decisions about pest management.

Sixty-one percent of the schools have a written pesticide use policy and forty-two percent reported that pesticides were applied in/around schools. Professional exterminating companies were responsible for applying pesticides in/around thirty-five percent of schools, followed by school maintenance supervisors/facility managers (11%), professional lawn/landscape companies (10%), and maintenance/custodial staff (10%).

Written pre-notification for outdoor applications (30%) and indoor applications (28%) was provided for pesticide applications. In addition, sign posting was provided for outdoors applications (27%) and indoors applications (15%). Schools (39%) and pesticide applicators/companies (20%) were responsible for providing notification. Fifty-seven percent of the schools indicated that all pesticides were applied by state licensed/certified pesticide applicators.

Sixty percent of the schools indicated that integrated pest management (IPM) was practiced. However, ninety percent of schools implemented five or more of the IPM strategies listed for managing pests. Most schools (42%) indicated that they spent less than $1001 to implement/maintain their pest management program. Fifty-one percent were "very satisfied" and forty-two percent were "satisfied" with their program.

Educational Needs

School maintenance supervisors/facilities managers (38%) and maintenance/custodial staff (37%) need/want more information on pest management in schools. In addition, principals (30%), teachers (29%), food service directors/staff (26%), and integrated pest management coordinators (15%) need/want information. However, twenty-two percent of the schools indicated that "no one" wanted/needed this information. Pest fact sheets, websites, and pest management manuals were the "most" useful sources of information. The "least" useful sources of information were professional consultants, posters, and video/podcasts/webcasts. Reported as the most convenient time to hold workshops and/or seminars for school/town staff are the months of August (25%), July (22%), and March (21%). Schools indicated that they would like more information on the following pests: ants (16%), mice (11%), bees (9%), wasps (5%), hornets (4%), and ticks (3%).

Special thanks to the 630 school who participated in this survey.

Contributors to the survey design included William Coli, University of Massachusetts-Amherst; Kathy Murray, Maine Department of Agriculture; Diane Jorsey, Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection; Taryn LaScola, Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources.

Additional contributors are members of the New England Pest Management Network team including, Glen Koehler and James Dill-University of Maine, Candace Bartholomew-University of Connecticut, William Lord-University of New Hampshire, Margaret Siligato-University of Rhode Island, Ann Hazelrigg and Sarah Kingsley-Richards-University of Vermont, and Patricia Vittum-University of Massachusetts.

Submitted by Natalia P. Clifton, Department of Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences and UMass Extension Pesticide Education Program, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, December 2008.

Funding provided by the USDA Northeastern IPM Center.

Appendix 4.

2008 New England Pepper Pest Management Strategic Plan

DRAFT for REVIEW

Compiled for the PRONewEngland Pest Management Network

by Ann Hazelrigg and Sarah L. Kingsley-Richards

University of Vermont
105 Carrigan Drive, Burlington, VT 05405

Telephone: (802) 656-0493

Email: ann.hazelrigg@uvm.edu

Table of Contents

- Comments on Other Vertebrates

IV. Appendices

Crop, Worker, Pest and Pesticide Timing

New Pest Management Technologies for Insect Pests

New Pest Management Technologies for Diseases

Pesticide and Non-chemical Methods Efficacy for Weeds

New Pest Management Technologies for Weeds

V. Acknowledgements

Strategic Plan Meeting Participants

References

Other Key Contacts and Resources

Reviewers

Key Pest Name Abbreviations

Insects

ECB = European Corn Borer

Aph = Aphids

PM = Pepper Maggot

Diseases

BLS = Bacterial Leaf Spot

Phyt = *Phytophthora*

Weeds

PP = Pre-plant
Pre = Pre-emergent
Post = Post-emergent

Executive Summary

The list of key pests for pepper in New England consists of three insects, two diseases, and the weeds and vertebrates common to agricultural settings. These key pests are persistent problems that need to be managed every year when and where they occur.

Pepper growers in New England are aware of the need to protect food sources and provide for food security in the region today. Overlying specific pest management needs are concerns about climate change and its impacts on pest behavior and expanding geographical range of pests. In addition, increasing vertebrate wildlife management issues are a growing concern.

The distribution and numbers of farms in New England, in combination with a limited number of available extension agents and private consultants, make it difficult for growers to receive on-site pest management support. This is especially true among smaller and diversified farms that grow peppers and other vegetables. Research and extension being done at universities is helpful but more pest management research is needed and the information flow to growers can be expanded.

The following outlines the most critical research, regulatory, and educational issues as determined by a review group of strawberry growers, researchers, and industry stakeholders during the Pest Management Strategic Plan process.

Research Needs

- Develop more *Phytophthora* resistant varieties.
- Explore the uses of grafting in achieving *Phytophthora* resistance.
- Explore methods of notifying and alerting growers of new information.
- Determine thresholds for nematode damage.

Regulatory Needs

- Loss of carbamate pesticides (carbaryl, methomyl, etc.) would impact management of many other crops found on a diversified farm.
- Direct funds towards development and continuation of models, forecasts, & newsletters that are useful to growers.
- Provide incentives to increase the research and extension that is beneficial to commercial growers.
- Create grant funding opportunities for newer researchers who may not yet have the background to as effectively compete for other funding.
- Encourage the infrastructure (fertilizers, suppliers, consultants) to support small farms.

Education Needs

- Provide information on pest lifecycles, transportation and variations, such as race, that are critical to management.
- Promote awareness of critical periods when crop must be kept weed-free.
- Encourage proper identification of European Corn Borer and Pepper Maggot injury in comparison to diseases.
- Clarify the differences between systemic and topical material efficacy.
- Notify growers of models that are available for predicting and tracking pest activity.
- Spread awareness of pests that are likely to spread into and within New England due to climate change.
- Clarify chemical families of materials to avoid confusion when combining and discourage development of resistance.

I. Introduction

Background of Pepper in New England

The six New England states combine to comprise a total of 1404 acres of peppers according to the 2002 Census of Agriculture. (NASS 2002) A recent survey (ProNewEngland 2006) indicated that the crop is split between 90% sweet and 9% hot peppers. Most (99%) of these peppers are grown for the fresh market with the remainder sent for processing. 64% of the fresh market peppers are sold to wholesale distributors and 35% for retail markets. While only contributing 0.0019% to the national production of peppers (NASS 2002), the pepper field is an integral part of the New England economy both in direct value and in its attraction and appeal as part of the New England landscape.

Peppers are susceptible to many types of pests including insects, diseases, weeds, and vertebrates. It is critical that these pests be effectively managed to maintain adequate yields of quality fruit that is acceptable to consumers. New England pepper growers have adopted innovative integrated pest management (IPM) and other cultural practices designed to manage these pests while reducing pesticide use, improving worker and food safety, and protecting environmental quality. While these methods do allow pesticides to be used more efficiently, they neither eliminate the need for pesticides nor reduce the critical importance of pesticides in pepper production. The loss of important pesticide tools due to pest resistance, regulatory, and consumer-driven pressures is a concern for the entire pepper industry.

How this plan was created

A review group of Pepper growers, researchers, and industry stakeholders throughout New England met for two days in March of 2008 to develop this Strategic Plan based on the 2008 New England Pepper Crop Profile. Key pests driving pesticide use were suggested by the 2006 New England Pepper Survey which was used to generate the Crop Profile. The survey was sent to 456 growers throughout New England and had a 52% return rate. The list of key pests was edited/approved by the review group.

The review group discussed the efficacy and practicality of current pesticides and pest management methods, identified acceptable alternative pest management methods, and listed the necessary research, regulatory and education needed to transition toward the use of these new methods. The pros and cons of each available option, along with opportunities for new technologies, were considered and contingency plans were discussed to prepare for possible future regulatory changes.

Benefits to the New England Pepper Industry

The New England Pepper Pest Management Strategic Plan will identify at-risk pesticides and propose future research, regulatory, and education priorities necessary to establish alternative pest management methods in the event of loss. These priorities will be used to inform EPA and state agency decisions and outline a development path for pest management researchers and educators. This information will be of great value in the pursuit of funding to address research and education needs identified through the Strategic Plan. The research and education necessary to establish effective alternative pest management methods requires this funding to account for the diversity of pests and the variety of habitats in Pepper fields. The current pest management programs will be made more effective through implementation of actions proposed in this plan.

II. Summary

Key Pepper Pest Strategic Issues

Summaries adapted from the *2008 New England Pepper Crop Profile*.

http://PRONewEngland.org

Insects

European Corn Borer (*Ostrinia nubilalis* (Hubner))

is an annual pest that attacks more than 200 host plants, including many common weeds and crops. It over-winters in New England and may have up to two generations in a season. Young larvae feed for a brief period on foliage then migrate to fruit where they feed on the flesh and seed head. Larval entry holes become the entry site for infection with the soft rot bacteria. A single larva may spread the soft rot disease to several fruit. Management with protective sprays targeted at adults based on pheromone trap thresholds usually occur in mid-late summer. Destruction of alternate hosts, especially corn stubble, is also common practice.

Aphids (Numerous species)

Aphids are annual pests that have many generations per year. Aphids cause damage by sucking the sap from plants, making leaves appear stippled, chlorotic, distorted, and may reduce photosynthetic capacity. Additionally, aphids exude a clear sweet liquid on which a fungus called 'sooty mold' may grow. Peppers with sooty mold fungus are unmarketable. Aphids also spread viral diseases such as cucumber mosaic virus. Management with protective sprays based on monitoring thresholds may occur. Destruction of alternate hosts is also common practice.

Pepper Maggot (*Zonosemata electa* (Say))

Pepper Maggot is an annual pest where established. Infestations can be complete or sporadic even within a single field. Adults emerge in July and eggs are deposited under

the skin of the fruit. Often, the egg laying site heals over completely and is not noticeable. The maggots hatch a month later and migrate to the seed head to feed. Occasionally, maggots tunnel in the flesh, leaving an opaque scar which is visible from the exterior of the fruit. Larval exit wounds become the entry site for infection with the soft rot bacteria.

Maggots in green peppers may be visually unappealing in fresh fruit or may contaminate processed products. Management with protective sprays targeted at adults based on baited trap thresholds usually occur in mid-late summer. Perimeter trap cropping is also common practice.

Diseases

Bacterial Leaf Spot (*Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *Vesicatoria*)

Bacterial Leaf Spot is the most common disease of peppers in New England. When introduced into a field it will spread under warm humid conditions aided by rain and wind. Leaf spots are water-soaked initially, then turn brown and become irregularly shaped. Affected leaves tend to crinkle, turn yellow and drop. Defoliation reduces plant productivity and fruit becomes vulnerable to sunscald. Fruit may also develop raised, scab-like spots. Management with protective sprays may occur following detection. However, use of resistant varieties and certified disease-free seed or transplants, sanitation, and crop rotation are common practices. In the absence of host crops, the disease is presumed destroyed by normal soil flora and fauna after two years.

***Phytophthora* spp.**

The Phytophthora genus contains many destructive species and is nearly ubiquitous in New England soils. The disease often starts following heavy rain or in low areas that remain flooded. Prolonged soil saturation causes release of swimming spores (zoospores) that travel until they encounter host tissue. Stem or branch lesions appear water-soaked then rapidly girdle and kill the plant beyond the wound. Infected fruit produce a white fungal growth on the skin. Successive heavy rainfalls can spread secondary spores throughout a field and to nearby sites. Management with protective sprays may occur following detection. However, use of resistant varieties, crop rotation, and proper water management are most effective in management of this disease.

Weeds

Weeds reduce yields by competing with the crop for water, light, and nutrients. Weeds serve as habitat and alternate hosts for insects, diseases, nematodes, and small vertebrate pests. They can inhibit spray penetration, air circulation, and drying conditions. Fields must be kept weed-free after transplanting into bare-ground or plasticulture to maintain yields.

Weed infestations occur in mixed populations including annual grasses, annual broadleaf, perennial grasses, perennial broadleaf, woody perennial and vine weeds. Hairy galinsoga may build up in fields over time because this weed is not controlled by most herbicides registered for use in pepper and because it resists cultivation. Management with cultivation, crop rotation, and herbicides is common from pre-plant through post-plant pre-emergence and post-emergence applications.

Vertebrates

Whitetail Deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*)

Deer may occasionally trample crops, but the primary form of damage consists of feeding on plants. Damage levels may severely reduce crop yields on many sites especially those near woods. Management with various cultural control practices is common.

Strategic Issues of Specific Pest Management Tactics

Insecticides

acephate (Orthene) - Aph, ECB

- Inexpensive
- Less detrimental to beneficials (than pyrethrin)

- Longer residual effect
- Systemic (Aph only)
- Broad spectrum - harmful to beneficials
- Long PHI (7 days)
- Resistance developing
- More useful for late-harvest peppers that have longer time in field
- Only useful early in season for early-harvest peppers due to Long PHI
- Used to be standard use material

azadirachtin (Aza-Direct) - ECB

- Immediate plus residual effects in combination with Pyganic
- OMRI listed
- Expensive
- Commonly combined with Pyganic

***Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki* (Dipel) - ECB**

- Not detrimental to beneficials
- Not toxic to mammals
- OMRI listed
- Easily washed off by rain and photo-degrades
- Narrow window of efficacy (only newly-hatched larvae susceptible)
- Requires frequent application
- Can be effective if applied properly and repeatedly

- More effective when applied with certain “stickers”
- Used in rotation with spinosad in organic program
- Very important for organic growers

***Beauvaria bassiana* (BotaniGard, Mycotrol) - Aph**

- OMRI listed (Mycotrol only)
- Efficacy drops with age of material
- Foliage damage (phytotoxicity) possible with liquid formulation

borax (Prev-Am) - Aph

- Only registered for use in CT
- Should not apply during mid-day sun
- New material

carbaryl (Sevin) - ECB

- Labeled for multiple crops
- Low toxicity to mammals
- Relatively inexpensive
- Broad spectrum - harmful to beneficials - leads to increased aphid population
- Especially harmful to pollinators of other crops
- Long PHI (5-7 days)
- Poor efficacy
- Do not apply to wet plants

- Material more effective against beetles

chlorpyrifos (Warrior) – Aph, ECB

- Labeled for multiple crops
- Relatively inexpensive
- Harmful to beneficials
- Long PHI (5 days)
- Severe dermal reactions possible
- *The* material against ECB in sweet corn

cyflurin (Baythroid) – Aph, ECB

- Labeled for multiple crops
- Relatively inexpensive
- Harmful to beneficials
- Long PHI (5 days)
- Part of arsenal

dimethoate (Dimethoate) – Aph, PM

- Systemic
- Very effective (PM only)
- Broad spectrum - harmful to beneficials (PM only)
- Harmful to beneficials - leads to increased aphid population (Aph only)

dimethyl phosphorothioate (MSR) - Aph

- Systemic
- Very toxic to mammals when compared to other materials
- Old standby

endosulfan (Thiodan, Thiodex) - Aph, PM

- Highly toxic to mammals
- Poor efficacy (PM only)
- Unpleasant to use
- Labeled for use on eggplant (PM only)
- Not effective against green peach aphids (Aph only)

esfenvalerate (Asana) - ECB

- Labeled for multiple crops
- Relatively inexpensive
- Harmful to beneficials
- Long PHI (5 days)
- Severe dermal reactions possible
- No gain over other pyrethroids

horticultural oil (Trilogy, JMS, Golden, etc.) - Aph

- OMRI listed
- Fungicidal properties

- Phytotoxicity possible
- Requires very good spray coverage

imidacloprid (Admire, Provado) - Aph

- Systemic
- Other neonicotinoids: Safari -Greenhouse use only, Venom -Field use

insecticidal soap (M-Pede) -Aph

- OMRI listed
- Phytotoxicity possible

malathion (Malathion) – Aph, PM

- Relatively inexpensive
- Short PHI (1 day)
- Not particularly effective against multiple insect pests
- Offensive odor
- Requires frequent application
- May be harmful to beneficials (no data, Aph, PM)

methomyl (Lannate) – Aph, ECM

- Broad spectrum
- Only material available against melon aphid (but not always effective) (Aph only)

- Extreme protective equipment required (storage, loading, applying)
- Harmful to beneficials
- Highly toxic to mammals
- Phytotoxicity possible with certain varieties
- Requires frequent application (ECB only)
- Resistance developing (ECB only)
- Old material
- Identification of pest important prior to use (Aph only)
- One of only materials available for aphids in corn
- Restricted use

methoxyfenozide (Intrepid) - ECB

- Labeled for multiple crops
- Longer residual effect
- Low toxicity to mammals
- Not detrimental to beneficials
- Short PHI (1 day)
- Difficult to validate effect - no immediate kill
- Only effective against Lepidoptera
- Relatively expensive
- Insect growth regulator
- Used in rotation with spinosad

oxamyl (Vydate) - Aph

- May cause blossom drop
- Harmful to beneficials
- Toxic to mammals
- Not recommended

permethrin (Ambush, Pounce) - ECB

- Labeled for multiple crops
- Relatively inexpensive
- Harmful to beneficials
- Long PHI (5 days)

pymetrozine (Fulfil) -Aph

- Best material available
- Labeled for multiple crops
- Not detrimental to beneficials
- Not systemic
- Only labeled for aphids
- EPA designated reduced risk material
- Unique chemistry

pyrethrins (Pyganic) - ECB

- No PHI

- OMRI listed
- Expensive
- Requires frequent application

Pyriproxyfen (Knack) - Aph

- Systemic
- Not effective against adult stages
- Insect growth regulator
- New material

spinosad (Entrust, SpinTor) - ECB

- Not detrimental to beneficials
- OMRI listed (Entrust only, ECB)
- Relatively inexpensive
- Short PHI (1 day)
- Harmful to beneficial parasitic wasps
- Large volume packaging sometimes problematic for small acreage
- Used in rotation with Intrepid and B.t. materials

zeta-cypermethrin (Mustang) – Aph, ECB, PM

- Labeled for multiple crops
- Relatively inexpensive
- Short PHI (1 day)

- Harmful to beneficials

Fungicides, Bactericides

basic copper sufate (Basicop) - BLS

- Relatively inexpensive (compared to other copper materials)
- Probably not as effective as newer materials
- Older material
- The copper is the effective component

copper hydroxide (Champ, Kocide) - BLS

- New formulation (Kocide 3000) promising greater ease of use

cymoxanil + fumoxidone (Tanos) - Phyt

- One of the better materials available
- Poor efficacy
- Resistance development possible
- Foliar spray effective against secondary spread
- Must apply before symptoms appear

dimethomorph (Acrobat, Forum) - Phyt

- Some efficacy
- Systemic

- Resistance development possible
- Not as effective as Tanos
- Foliar spray effective against secondary spread
- Not widely used
- Different chemical family

fosetyl aluminum (Aliette) and others (Phostrol, PhosPhyte, ProPhyte) - Phyt

- Inexpensive
- Moderately effective
- Newer materials to market

hydrogen dioxide (Oxidate) – BLS, Phyt

- OMRI listed
- Expensive
- Requires frequent application
- Copper materials are more convenient to use (BLS only)
- Not widely used

maneb (Manex) - BLS, Phyt

- Some efficacy (Phyt only)
- Not as effective as Tanos (Phyt only)
- Not recommended (Phyt only)
- The old recommendation was to mix with copper –new copper materials work better alone (BLS only)

- Useful against downy mildew on cucurbits (Phyt only)

mefenoxam (Ridomil Gold) - Phyt

- Almost useless on newer mating types
- Expensive
- Apply prior to planting

mefenoxam + copper hydroxide (Ridomil Gold + copper) - Phyt

- Almost useless on newer mating types
- Expensive
- Added benefits of copper
- Foliar spray against secondary spread

sodium methyldithio-carbamate (Vapam) - Phyt

- Soil fumigant

streptomycin (Streptomycin) - BLS

- Must apply to transplants before planting
- Relatively expensive
- Keeps disease from entering field and spreading

Herbicides

clethodim (Select) - Post

- Better activity against perennial grasses than Poast
- Best selective material for quackgrass
- New material

clomazone (Command) - Pre

- Some effecacy against galinsoga

glyphosate (Roundup) – Post*

- Activity against annuals and perennial weeds
- Easy to use
- Inexpensive
- Safe for applicator
- Crop injury potential
- No residual activity
- Timing is critical to efficacy
- Critical for spot treatment
- Very widely used
- *Not labeled for use when crop present

halosulfuron (Sandea, Permit) - Pre

- Poor efficacy against galinsoga

metolachlor (Dual) - Pre

- Very effective against galinsoga
- Special local needs use only in some states

napropamide (Devrinol) - Pre

- Good activity against annual grasses and small seeded broadleaf weeds
- Safe on new growth
- Needs to be watered in to prevent breakdown
- Residual effects only good for 12 weeks
- Some important weeds not affected
- Root growth inhibitor but used on new plantings
- Widely used

paraquat (Gramoxone) – Pre, Post*

- Effective burn-down
- Fast acting
- More effective against tree seedlings than other materials
- Applicator safety is an issue
- Crop injury potential
- Expensive
- Not effective against perennials

- Offensive odor
- Restricted use is an issue
- Important niche material for management of tree seedlings (how does this apply to peppers)
- Must be used prior to crop emergence
- Nonionic surfactant recommended
- *Not labeled for use when crop present

pelargonic acid (Scythe) - Post

- Effective burn-down
- Fast acting
- No PHI
- Expensive
- Not effective against perennials
- Not very effective at killing growth point
- Very odorous

sethoxydim (Poast) - Post

- Good activity against annual grasses
- Safe on crop
- Crop injury potential due to required mix with crop oil
- Fair activity against perennial grasses with multiple applications
- Very long PHI (30 days)

- Generally used

-

Research priorities

New chemistries and options

- More organic management chemistries are needed that are safe to beneficial organisms. (PM)

- Develop more disease resistant varieties, particularly BLS resistant hot peppers and ‘frying’ peppers. (BLS, Phyt)
- Explore use of noncompetitive, fast-growing, permanent ground covers to reduce erosion during growing season. (Phyt)
- Explore the effects of groundcovers on soil drainage. (Phyt)
- Explore grass herbicide options (for between rows) that have shorter days to harvest and/or have a residual effect. (Weeds)

Specific materials and equipment

- More materials are needed that work against melon aphids. (Aphids)
- Determine the effects of fungicides, such as azadirachtin, on *Beauvaria bassiana* (Botanigard, Mycotrol) applications, particularly for any counterproductive activity. (Aphids)
- More information is needed on the use of harpin protein ‘yield promoters’ as relates to an increase of early blight in tomato in northern climates. (BLS)
- Alternatives to copper chemistries are needed to improve soil health and toxicity issues. (BLS)
- Explore the activity and application of other soil fungus to out-compete or consume Phytophthora. (Phyt)
- Explore the uses of grafting in achieving disease resistance. (Phyt)
- More materials are needed that work against galinsoga. (Weeds)
- Quantify the effect of flame weeding in galinsoga management. (Weeds)

Models

- Explore methods of notifying and alerting growers of new information.
- Develop monitoring models for coastal regions where seasonal development ranges ahead of other New England regions and insect population is heavier. (ECB)

- Clarify chemical families of materials to avoid confusion when combining and discourage development of resistance. (ECB)
- Explore monitoring, mapping and trapping to determine current geographical ranges of pests. (PM, Phyt)
- Determine thresholds for nematode damage.
- A firm threshold model for Armyworms and Corn Earworms would be useful to growers, especially if developed for southern New England areas where the pest population is more consistent.
- Research is needed into effects of *Sclerotinia* infection on yield.

Regulatory priorities

Packaging and labels

- Loss of carbamate pesticides (carbaryl, methomyl, etc.) would impact management of many other crops found on a diversified farm.
- Create incentives for pesticide packaging that is practical for small-acreage growers. Smaller quantities are needed for small-acreage application. (ECB)

Specific materials

- Fast-track registration of new materials, especially organic materials. (PM)
- Standardize and limit the frequency at which the OMRI Products List and local organic certifying agency product lists change. The current rate of change is too frequent to maintain inventory of acceptable materials and is a hindrance to timely application of acceptable materials. (BLS)
- Expand Dual registration to other New England states. (Weeds)

Desired revisions

- Direct funds towards development and continuation of models, forecasts, newsletters that are useful to growers.
- Provide incentives to increase the research and extension that is beneficial to commercial growers.
- Create grant funding opportunities for newer researchers who may not yet have the background to as effectively compete for other funding.
- Encourage the infrastructure (fertilizers, suppliers, consultants) to support small farms.
- Direct funds towards publications and guides that may be useful to growers. (ECB)

- Provide incentives to increase the number of applied weed specialists in practice. (Weeds)
- Foster and enforce consistency among the varied international, federal, state, and county regulations, interpretation and enforcement. (Deer)
- Streamline and speed local permitting processes for deer control action. (Deer)

Education priorities

Scouting and identification

- Provide information on pest lifecycles, transportation and variations, such as race, that are critical to management.
- Provide information on proper timing and placement of pest-monitoring traps. (ECB)
- Promote the efficacy of pest predator populations in aphid management strategies. (Aphids)
- Clarify the identification features of pest predators. (Aphids)
- Encourage proper identification of ECB and PM injury in comparison to diseases. (PM)

Timing

- Proper timing of sprays and alternating between materials (ECB)
- Promote awareness of critical periods when crop must be kept weed-free. (Weeds)

Methods

- Promote the uses and benefits of trap crops. (PM)
- Demonstrate the use of hot water seed treatment to illustrate the worth of the practice. (BLS)
- Encourage the separation of resistant and non-resistant varieties in the field to ease management and to minimize management to only non-resistant varieties. (BLS)
- Promote the management uses of a three-year crop rotation and removal of all pepper plant residues. (BLS)
- Continue to promote the criticalness of water management practices and the minimal efficacy of chemicals in disease management. (Phyt)
- Encourage that irrigation sources be checked for disease inoculum. (Phyt)
- Promote proper formation of beds to ease cultivation. (Weeds)

- Promote the management uses of crop rotation to reduce galinsoga. (Weeds)
- Encourage the cleaning of equipment to prevent the spread of weeds. (Weeds)

Awareness

- Clarify the differences between systemic and topical material efficacy.
- Notify growers of models that are available for predicting and tracking pest activity.
- Spread awareness of pests that are likely to spread into and within New England due to climate change.
- Clarify chemical families of materials to avoid confusion when combining and discourage development of resistance. (ECB)
- Raise awareness that use of insecticides in addition to fungicides exacerbates aphid populations and such pest problems are avoidable. (Aphids)
- Spread awareness of the likely spread of Pepper Maggot into areas of northern New England. (PM)
- Notify growers of the changes in disease populations that are becoming more virulent, pervasive and destructive. (Phyt)
- Foster and enforce consistency among the varied international, federal, state, and county regulations, interpretation and enforcement. (Deer)
- Raise awareness that federal government assistance for deer fence installation is available. (Deer)

III. Key Pests

Key Insect pests

European Corn Borer (*Ostrinia nubilalis* (Hubner))

% Acres Affected: 81%

- Year to year problem but impact can be variable.
- A late winter temperature drop below freezing can reduce pest population.
- Stem boring activity early in the season is not as common as fruit damage later in season.
- The critical period for monitoring and management when fruit is present in July and August
- Traps to monitor for pest can be used in both corn and pepper, saving time and money when both crops are present.
- Management materials for corn and pepper are generally the same, saving time and money when both crops are present.
- The primary consideration when choosing applied materials is the pre-harvest interval (PHI).

Currently Registered Pesticides

Pesticide	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
acephate Orthene (5% growers)	60% excellent 40% good	• Inexpensive • Less detrimental to beneficials (than pyrethrin) • Longer residual effect	• Broad spectrum - harmful to beneficials • Long PHI (7 days) • Resistance developing	• More useful for late-harvest peppers that have longer time in field • Only useful early in season for early-harvest peppers due to Long PHI • Used to be standard use material
azadirachtin Aza-Direct		• Immediate plus residual effects in combination with Pyganic • OMRI listed	• Expensive	• Becoming common to combine with Pyganic

Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki Dipel (11% growers)	30% excellent 70% good	• Not detrimental to beneficials • Not toxic to mammals • OMRI listed	• Easily washed off by rain and photo-degrades • Narrow window of efficacy (only newly-hatched larvae susceptible) • Requires frequent application	• Can be effective if applied properly and repeatedly • More effective when applied with certain “stickers” • Used in rotation with spinosad in organic program • Very important for organic growers
carbaryl Sevin (7% growers)	17% excellent 83% good	• Labeled for multiple crops • Low toxicity to mammals • Relatively inexpensive	• Broad spectrum - harmful to beneficials - leads to increased aphid population • Especially harmful to pollinators of other crops • Long PHI (5-7 days) • Poor efficacy	• Should not be applied to wet plants • Material more effective against beetles
chlorpyrifos Warrior (2% growers)	50% excellent 50% good	• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive	• Harmful to beneficials • Long PHI (5 days) • Severe dermal reactions possible	• *The* material against ECB in sweet corn
cyflurin Baythroid (2% growers)	100% good	• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive	• Harmful to beneficials • Long PHI (5 days)	• Part of arsenal
esfenvalerate Asana (9% growers)	63% excellent 38% good	• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive	• Harmful to beneficials • Long PHI (5 days) • Severe dermal reactions possible	• No advantage over other pyrethroids
malathion Malathion (1% growers)		•	•	• Not labeled for ECB

methomyl Lannate (15% growers)	43% excellent 57% good	• Broad spectrum	• Extreme protective equipment required (storage, loading, applying) • Harmful to beneficials • Highly toxic to mammals • Phytotoxicity possible with certain varieties • Requires frequent application • Resistance developing	• Old material • One of few materials available for aphids in corn • Restricted use
methoxyfenozide Intrepid (IGR) (2% growers)	100% good	• Labeled for multiple crops • Longer residual effect • Low toxicity to mammals • Not detrimental to beneficials • Short PHI (1 day)	• Difficult to validate effect - no immediate kill • Only effective against Lepidoptera • Relatively expensive	• Insect growth regulator • Used in rotation with spinosad
permethrin Ambush, Pounce (20% growers)	66% excellent 33% good	• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive	• Harmful to beneficials • Long PHI (5 days)	•
pyrethrins Pyganic		• No PHI • OMRI listed	• Expensive • Requires frequent application	•
spinosad Entrust, SpinTor (22% growers)	75% excellent 25% good	• Not detrimental to beneficials • OMRI listed (Entrust only) • Relatively inexpensive	• Harmful to beneficial parasitic wasps • Large volume packaging sometimes problematic for small acreage	• Used in rotation with Intrepid and B.t. materials

		• Short PHI (1 day)		
zeta-cypermethrin Mustang (1% growers)	100% excellent	• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive • Short PHI (1 day)	• Harmful to beneficials	•

Cultural and Biological Alternatives

Practices Reported	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
Row covers		• Effective barrier	• May cause blossom loss • Expensive • Must remove and cultivate (for weed control) after rain if organic	•
Remove nearby corn stubble		• Can affect pest population if done regionally	•	•
Eliminate alternative hosts (weeds, etc.)		•	• Difficult to remove all of the many alternative host plants	•
Traps to monitor		• Best way to time insecticide applications • No need to place specifically in pepper field	• Cloth traps don't last long	• Trap opening must be at weed height
Release predators /parasites		•	•	• Not common practice
Nitrogen application		•	•	• Balance between fruit production needs and attractive growth
Perimeter trap crop		•	• Not effective	•

Research Needs:

- Develop monitoring models for coastal regions where seasonal development ranges ahead of other New England regions and insect population is heavier.
- Clarify chemical families of materials to avoid confusion when combining and discourage development of resistance.

Regulatory Needs:

- Create incentives for pesticide packaging that is practical for small-acreage growers. Smaller quantities are needed for small-acreage application.
- Direct funds towards publications and guides that may be useful to growers.

Education Needs:

- Provide information on proper timing and placement of pest-monitoring traps.
- Proper timing of sprays and alternating between materials
- Clarify chemical families of materials to avoid confusion when combining and discourage development of resistance.

Aphids (Numerous species including: Green Peach Aphid *Myzus persicae*, Melon Aphid *Aphis gossypii*, Potato Aphid *Macrosiphum euphorbiae*)

% Acres Affected: 64%

- Usually not a problem or not specifically managed.
- Predators will usually control aphid populations, especially on small farms with multiple crops, provided there is no disruption of the predator population.
- Incidence increases with use of broad spectrum, weakly effective insecticides targeted at other insects because they affect the predator population.
- Use of fungicides targeted at other pests can destroy the entomopathic fungi that would kill aphids.
- Incidence more likely on plants that have come out of infested greenhouses, under row covers in the early season, and during hot and dry weather.
- Green peach aphid is the predominant species. Melon aphid outbreaks are rare and very difficult to manage when they occur. Other species are minor pests.
- Aphid 'honey dew' waste can make fruit sticky.

Currently Registered Pesticides

Pesticide	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
acephate Orthene (8% growers)	29% excellent 71% good	• Inexpensive • Less detrimental to beneficials (than pyrethrin) • Longer residual effect • Systemic	• Broad spectrum - harmful to beneficials • Long PHI (7 days) • Resistance developing	• More useful for late-harvest peppers that have longer time in field • Only useful early in season for early-harvest peppers due to Long PHI • Used to be standard use material
Beauvaria bassiana BotaniGard, Mycotrol (1% growers)	100% good	• OMRI listed (Mycotrol only)	• Efficacy drops with age of material • Foliage damage possible with liquid formulation	•

borax Prev-Am		•	• Only registered for use in CT • Should not apply during mid-day sun	• New material
chlorpyrifos Warrior		• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive	• Harmful to beneficials • Long PHI (5 days) • Severe dermal reactions possible	• *The* material against ECB in sweet corn
cyflurin Baythroid		• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive	• Harmful to beneficials • Long PHI (5 days)	• Rotation insecticide
dimethoate Dimethoate (1% growers)	100% good	• Systemic	• Harmful to beneficials - leads to increased aphid population	•
dimethyl phosphorothioate MSR		• Systemic	• Too toxic to mammals when compared to other materials	• Effective older material
endosulfan Thiodan, Thionex (8% growers)	29% excellent 57% good 14% poor	•	• Highly toxic to mammals • Unpleasant to use	• Not effective against green peach aphids
horticultural oil Trilogy, JMS, Golden, etc. (1% growers)	100% poor	• OMRI listed	• Fungicidal properties • Phytotoxicity possible • Requires very good spray coverage	•
imidacloprid Admire, Provado (11% growers)	80% excellent 20% good	• Systemic	•	• Other neonicotinoids: Safari – Greenhouse use only, Venom –Fiel use
insecticidal soap	100% good	• OMRI listed	• Phytotoxicity possible	•

M-Pede (1% growers)				
malathion Malathion (3% growers)	100% excellent	• Relatively inexpensive • Short PHI (1 day)	• Not particularly effective against multiple insect pests • Offensive odor • Requires frequent application	• May be harmful to beneficials (no data)
methomyl Lannate (8% growers)	57% excellent 43% good	• Broad spectrum • Only material available against melon aphid (but not always effective)	• Extreme protective equipment required (storage, loading, applying) • Harmful to beneficials • Highly toxic to mammals • Phytotoxicity possible with certain varieties	• Old material • Identification of pest important prior to use • One of only materials available for aphids in corn • Restricted use
oxamyl Vydate (1% growers)		•	• Causes blossom drop • Harmful to beneficials • Toxic to mammals	• Not recommended
pymetrozine Fulfil (2% growers)	50% excellent 50% good	• Best material available • Labeled for multiple crops • Not detrimental to beneficials	• Not systemic • Only labeled for aphids	• EPA designated reduced risk material • Unique chemistry
pyriproxyfen Knack (1% growers)	100% good	• Systemic	• Not effective against adult stages	• Insect growth regulator • New material
zeta-cypermethrin Mustang		• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive • Short PHI (1 day)	• Harmful to beneficials	•

Cultural and Biological Alternatives

Practices Reported*	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
Plastic mulches		• Reflective silver mulch repels insects • Black mulch reduces aphids and warms soil	• Reflective mulches do not allow soil to warm, stunts growth • Reflective mulches can oxidize and lose reflectivity later in season • Expensive	• May be more effective further south due to season/temp differences
Eliminate alternative hosts (weeds, etc)		•	• Difficult to remove all alternative hosts, particularly black cherry	• Especially critical in greenhouses
Scouting		• Identification of species present • Allows tracking of population growth • Can reduce frequency of management material application	•	•
Preserve/attract beneficials		• Cut flowers attract beneficials	• Seed is expensive for crops attractive to beneficials	• Not common practice in fields
Manage nitrogen		•	•	• High nitrogen levels encourage aphid populations

Research Needs:

- More materials are needed that work against melon aphids.
- Determine the effects of fungicides, such as azadirachtin, on *Beauvaria bassiana* (Botanigard, Mycotrol) applications, particularly for any counterproductive activity.

Regulatory Needs:

- None specified.

Education Needs:

- Promote the efficacy of pest predator populations in aphid management strategies.
- Clarify the identification features of pest predators.
- Raise awareness that use of insecticides in addition to fungicides exacerbates aphid populations and such pest problems are avoidable.

Pepper Maggot (*Zonosemata electa* (Say))

% Acres Affected: 63%

- This pest is currently present in Rhode Island and coastal New Hampshire but is not yet known to be in northern New Hampshire, Maine, or Vermont.
- Movement of population is likely to spread north along river valleys or through accidental transportation.
- Once present, the pest is endemic.
- Treatment is most effective when adults emerge in July although the maggots do not emerge until later in the summer.
- Systemic materials will be effective against maggots.
- Not all 'sting' damage done by adults result in eggs and/or maggots.
- There are no practical trapping methods but trap crops are very good to scout for first indication of pest presence.
- A perimeter trap crop of hot cherry peppers is very useful to attract pests away from other crops. Materials can sometimes be applied only to the trap crop to manage the pest population.

Currently Registered Pesticides

Pesticide	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
acephate Orthene (8% growers)	29% excellent 71% good	•	•	• Not labeled for PM
dimethoate Dimethoate (4% growers)	25% excellent 75% good	• Systemic • Very effective	• Broad spectrum - harmful to beneficials	•
endosulfan Thiodan, Thionex (11% growers)	30% excellent 70% good	•	• Highly toxic to mammals • Poor efficacy • Unpleasant to use	• Labeled for use on eggplant
esfenvalerate Asana (2% growers)	50% excellent 50% good	•	•	• Not labeled for PM

malathion Malathion (7% growers)	67% excellent 33% good	• Relatively inexpensive • Short PHI (1 day)	• Not particularly effective against multiple insect pests • Offensive odor • Requires frequent application	• May be harmful to beneficials (no data)
zeta-cypermethrin Mustang		• Labeled for multiple crops • Relatively inexpensive • Short PHI (1 day)	• Harmful to beneficials	•

Cultural and Biological Alternatives

Practices Reported*	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
Trap crop (1% growers)		• Increases ease of detecting damage • May only need to apply management material to trap crop	•	•

Research Needs:

- More organic management chemistries are needed that are safe to beneficial organisms.
- Explore monitoring, mapping and trapping to determine current geographical ranges of pests.

Regulatory Needs:

- Fast-track registration of new materials, especially organic materials.

Education Needs:

- Encourage proper identification of ECB and PM injury in comparison to diseases.
- Promote the uses and benefits of trap crops.
- Spread awareness of the likely spread of Pepper Maggot into areas of northern New England.

Comments on Other Insects and Slugs

These insects are not considered Key Pests but do warrant special note as emerging issues in New England.

Armyworms (Fall, Beet)

- Will infrequently affect peppers.
- Presence can be monitored.
- Spinosad (Entrust) is a better choice for management than acephate (Orthene) which will not affect armyworms.
- A firm threshold model would be useful to growers, especially if developed for southern New England areas where the pest population is more consistent.

Black Cutworms

- Migrate from the borders into every field in every year.
- The usual leaf damage is generally not a problem but sometimes stem damage occurs.
- Scout for leaf feeding.
- Can hand-dig out of soil.

Colorado Potato Beetle

- Can be a problem when eggplants are planted nearby or in rotation.
- Effective materials are available.

Corn Earworms

- Large populations occur along coastal New England.
- Spinosad (Entrust) is a better choice for management than acephate (Orthene) which will not affect armyworms.
- A firm threshold model would be useful to growers, especially if developed for southern New England areas where the pest population is more consistent.

Mites

- Broad mite outbreaks have been seen in New Hampshire.
- Relatively easy to manage.

Pepper Weevil

- Not present in New England.
- Could be imported on transplants grown outside New England.
- Avoid accidental introduction by growing or purchasing transplants locally.

Tarnished Plant Bugs

- Not present in New England.
- Severe infestations can cause blossom drop.

Thrips

- Incidence more likely on plants that have come out of infested greenhouses
- Predators will usually control pest populations.
- Fruit damage is possible.

Slugs

- Usually not a significant problem on pepper.

Other Insects not considered Key Pests

Common stalk borer
Caterpillars (general)**, Hornworms**
Flea beetles
Grasshoppers
Japanese/Asiatic Beetles
Leafminers

Stinkbugs

Whiteflies
Wireworms

Key Diseases

Bacterial Leaf Spot (*Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *Vesicatoria*)

% Acres Affected: 61%

- Incidence is higher during periods of high humidity and warm nighttime temperatures. These conditions are less likely to be found in more northern areas of New England.
- Incidence is more likely where higher acreage of the crop is grown.
- Water management and crop rotation are critical to management.
- A three year crop rotation allows time for any infected pepper residue to decompose, reducing inoculum.
- Many resistant varieties are available although none will completely prevent infection.
- Seed may be infected prior purchase.
- Tomato plants are also susceptible.

Currently Registered Pesticides

Pesticide	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
basic copper sufate Basicop (3% growers)	100% excellent	• Relatively inexpensive (compared to other copper materials)	• Probably not as effective as newer materials	• Older material • The copper is the effective ingredient
copper hydroxide Champ, Kocide (21% growers)	43% excellent 38% good 5% poor	•	•	• New formulation (Kocide 3000) promising greater ease of use
hydrogen dioxide Oxidate		• OMRI listed	• Expensive • Requires frequent application	• Copper materials are more convenient to use • Not widely used
maneb Manex (8% growers)	57% excellent 29% good 14% poor	•	•	• Not labeled for BLS • Old recommendation was to mix with

				copper –new copper materials work better alone
streptomycin Streptomycin		• Must apply to transplants before planting	• Relatively expensive	• Keeps disease from entering field and spreading

Cultural and Biological Alternatives

Practices Reported*	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
Resistant varieties (19% growers)	29% excellent 65% good	• Common practice	• Not completely effective • No variety is resistant to every strain of pathogen • Not every strain of pathogen has a resistant variety available	• Infection still occurs in resistant varieties but is prevented from spreading within the plant. Initial infection can look alarming.
Hot water treat seeds (2% growers)	100% good	• Effective • Some seed companies will treat prior to sale	• Can overheat/boil and destroy seed • Equipment necessary	• Seed companies discourage it – can destroy seed • Follow with fungicide to prevent damping off (normal procedure)
Bleach treat seeds		•	• Only removes pathogens on seed surface	•
Rotate crops/ Remove <u>all</u> plant residue		•	• Takes time to execute	• A three year rotation is preferred
Eliminate alternate hosts		•	•	• *Solonaceous* weeds such as nightshade, horsenettle, and jimsonweed
Inspect transplants and scout		•	•	• No comments
Maintain fertility, pH		•	•	• Drop in fertility or pH, especially nitrogen, encourages disease • High magnesium predisposes to bacterial diseases
Avoid planting in foggy areas		•	•	• Do not work field when plants wet

Research Needs:

- Develop more disease resistant varieties, particularly BLS resistant hot peppers and ‘frying’ peppers.
- More information is needed on the use of harpin protein ‘yield promoters’ as relates to an increase of early blight in tomato in northern climates.
- Alternatives to copper chemistries are needed to improve soil health and toxicity issues.

Regulatory Needs:

- Standardize and limit the frequency at which the OMRI Products List and local organic certifying agency product lists change. The current rate of change is too frequent to maintain inventory of acceptable materials and is a hindrance to timely application of acceptable materials.

Education Needs:

- Demonstrate the use of hot water seed treatment to illustrate the worth of the practice.
- Encourage the separation of resistant and non-resistant varieties in the field to ease management and to minimize management to only non-resistant varieties.
- Promote the management uses of a three-year crop rotation and removal of all pepper plant residues.

Phytophthora spp.

% Acres Affected: 50%

- Sudden and dramatic losses are possible, particularly in pos-harvest, when conditions favor disease development.
- Inoculum can never be eliminated from soils and will accumulate in the soil if crop is not rotated.
- Causal organism is an aggressive colonizer of soil, especially following fumigation.
- Water management, proper drainage, and crop rotation are ***absolutely critical*** to management.
- Cultural methods that avoid standing water and prevent movement of water between beds are advantageous.
- Washing soil from equipment between beds or fields will reduce the spread of inoculum.
- A three year crop rotation allows time for any infected pepper residue to decompose, reducing inoculum.
- Rotation is difficult on small acrage farms because many crops (*Solonaceous*, cucurbits, beans) are susceptible to the same species of *phytopthora*.
- Mapping of field locations where and when there is disease present is a valuable tool for planning management.

Currently Registered Pesticides

Pesticide	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
cymoxanil + fumoxidone Tanos (2% growers)	50% good 50% poor	• One of the better materials available	• Poor efficacy • Resistance development possible	• Foliar spray effective against secondary spread • Must apply before symptoms appear
dimethomorph Acrobat, Forum (1% growers)	100% good	• Some efficacy • Systemic	• Resistance development possible • Not as effective as Tanos	• Different chemical family • Foliar spray effective against secondary spread • Not widely used
fosetyl aluminum Aliette and others		• Inexpensive • Moderately effective	•	• Newer materials to market

(Phostrol, PhosPhyte, ProPhyte) (1% growers)				
hydrogen dioxide Oxidate (1% growers)	100% good	• OMRI listed	• Expensive • Requires frequent application	• Not widely used
maneb Manex (7% growers)	17% excellent 33% good 50% poor	• Some efficacy	• Not as effective as Tanos	• Not recommended • Useful against downy mildew on cucurbits
mefenoxam Ridomil Gold (10% growers)	22% excellent 67% good 11% poor	•	• Almost useless on newer mating types • Expensive	• Apply prior to planting
mefenoxam + copper hydroxide Ridomil Gold +Copper (8% growers)	14% excellent 43% good 43% poor	•	• Almost useless on newer mating types • Expensive	• Added benefits of copper • Foliar spray against secondary spread
sodium methyldithio-carbamate Vapam (1% growers)	100% good	•	•	• Soil fumigant

Cultural and Biological Alternatives

Practices Reported*	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
Resistant varieties (4% growers)	50% excellent 25% good 25% poor	• The resistant variety 'Palidin' provides good yield and fruit is marketable	• Only one variety available with strong resistance • Others varieties less resistant and have less marketable fruit	•

Raised Bed (1% growers)	100% good	•	•	• Shaping beds into domes to prevent runoff into planting holes
Rotate crops		•	• Takes time to execute	• A three year rotation is preferred

Research Needs:

- Develop more disease resistant varieties.
- Explore use of noncompetitive, fast-growing, permanent ground covers to reduce erosion during growing season.
- Explore the effects of groundcovers on soil drainage.
- Explore the activity and application of other soil fungus to out-compete or consume Phytophthora.
- Explore the uses of grafting in achieving disease resistance.
- Explore monitoring, mapping and trapping to determine current geographical ranges of pests.

Regulatory Needs:

- None specified.

Education Needs:

- Continue to promote the criticalness of water management practices and the minimal efficacy of chemicals in disease management.
- Encourage that irrigation sources be checked for disease inoculum.
- Notify growers of the changes in disease populations that are becoming more virulent, pervasive and destructive.

Comments on Other Diseases and Nematodes

These diseases are not considered Key Pests but do warrant special note as emerging issues in New England.

Anthracnose

- Incidence is increasing in New England.

Bacterial Soft Rot (*Erwinia carotovora*)

- Secondary infection to ECB or Pepper Maggot damage.

Blossom End Rot

- This physiological damage can be mistaken for a disease.
- Low pH exacerbates the condition.
- Regular watering allows a constant flow of calcium to reduce the manifestation of the condition.

Pythium

- Peppers are particularly susceptible when seedlings.
- Cold, wet soil during germination favors infection.
- Infection in a greenhouse can affect large numbers of seedlings.
- Older plants are a bit more resistant to effects of infection.
- Presence in all soils is managed through sanitation practices and moisture management.
- Fungicidal root and soil treatments can protect from infection.

Sclerotinia

- Inoculum presence is random in fields.

- Knowing presence is important to rotation with other crops because peppers tolerate presence better than other crops.
- Research is needed into effects of infection on yield.

Sun Scald

- This physiological damage can increase risk of *Alternaria* infection.
- Some varieties are more susceptible.

Viruses (Alfalfa, Cucumber, Potato, Tobacco, Tomato)

- Not usually persistent in the field from year to year.
- Some strains of virus are less damaging than others.
- Applied sprays are **not** a direct management option.
- Insecticides that induce increased aphid activity exacerbate the spread of virus.
- Resistant varieties are available.
- Avoid accidental introduction by growing or purchasing transplants locally.
- Avoid contact with thrips on ornamentals that may transmit the tomato spotted wilt virus.

Nematodes (Northern Root-knot, Lesion, Stubby Root)

- Tend to ignore in New England.
- Research would be useful to determine and map presence to determine thresholds for damage.

Other Diseases not considered Key Pests

Alternaria

Cercospora leaf spot

Rhizoctonia

Weeds

- Galinsoga and nightshade are the most problematic weeds.
- Presence between rows, under plants, and in holes in plastic can be problematic.
- Critical periods for weed control are different for mulched and bare ground.
- Days to harvest of applied materials are a limiting consideration during late season.

Currently Registered Pesticides for Pre-emergent Weeds

Pesticide	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
bensulide Prefar (2% growers)	50% good 50% poor	•	•	• No comments
clomazone Command (3% growers)	100% good	• Some effecacy against galinsoga	•	•
halosulfuron Sandea, Permit (3% growers)	67% excellent 33% good	•	• Poor efficacy against galinsoga	•
metolachlor Dual (1% growers)	100% excellent	• Very effective against galinsoga	•	• Special local needs use only in some states
napropamide: Devrinol (18% growers)	29% excellent 65% good 6% poor	• Good activity against annual grasses and small seeded broadleaf weeds • Safe on new growth	• Needs to be watered in to prevent breakdown • Residual effects only good for 12 weeks • Some important weeds not affected	• Root growth inhibitor but used on new plantings • Widely used
paraquat: Gramoxone (2% growers)	50% excellent 50% good	•	•	• Not labeled for pre-emergent use
trifluralin	10% excellent	•	•	• No comments

Treflan (11% growers)	80% good 10% poor			

Currently Registered Pesticides for Post-emergent Weeds

Pesticide	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
clethodim Select (1% growers)	100% good	• Better activity against perennial grasses than Poast	•	• Best selective material for quackgrass • New material
glyphosate Roundup (4% growers)	75% excellent 25% good	• Activity against annuals and perennial weeds • Easy to use • Inexpensive • Safe for applicator	• Crop injury potential • No residual activity • Timing is critical to efficacy	• Critical for spot treatment • Not labeled for use when crop present • Very widely used
metolachlor Dual (5% growers)	100% good	•	•	• Not labeled for post-emergent use
napropamide: Devrinol (1% growers)	100% good	•	•	• Not labeled for post-emergent use
paraquat: Gramoxone (1% growers)	100% excellent	• Effective burn-down • Fast acting • More effective against tree seedlings than other materials	• Applicator safety is an issue • Crop injury potential • Expensive • Not effective against perennials • Offensive odor • Restricted use is an issue	• • Must be used prior to crop emergence • Nonionic surfactant recommended • Not labeled for use when crop present
pelargonic acid:	100% excellent	• Effective burn-down • Fast acting	• Expensive • Not effective against	•

Scythe (1% growers)		• No PHI	perennials • Not very effective at killing growth point • Very odorous	
sethoxydim: Poast (1% growers)	100% excellent	• Good activity against annual grasses • Safe on crop	• Crop injury potential due to required mix with crop oil • Fair activity against perennial grasses with multiple applications • Very long PHI (30 days)	• Generally used

Cultural and Biological Alternatives

Practices Reported	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
Plastic mulching (72% growers)	79% excellent 20% good 2% poor	• The most effective option around plants • The first step in weed management • Can be supplemented with chemical options • Very effective • Organically acceptable if plastic not left on ground over winter	• Holes can allow weed growth • Application costs can be high • Can provide pine vole habitat when plastic left on ground over winter	• • Provides other benefits (soil moisture retention, etc) • Use in combination with bed shaping into domes to prevent runoff into planting holes • Must fertilize through drip irrigation
Other mulching (straw, hay, or other organic material) (10% growers)	56% excellent 33% good 11% poor	• The most effective option around plants • The first step in weed management • Can be supplemented with chemical options • Very effective • Organically	• Can provide slug habitat • Can prevent warming of soil • Application costs can be high	• Provides other benefits (soil moisture retention, etc)

		acceptable		
Mechanical cultivation (79% growers)	44% excellent 52% good 3% poor	• Fairly effective on emerged annual weeds	• Can be challenging when mulch present • Perennial weed growth quick to recover • Not effective on wet soil • Can damage crop roots	• Galinsoga is resistant to cultivation • Cultivation generally occurs between crop rows • More effective in sandier soils
Hoeing (66% growers) & Hand pulling (78% growers)	61% excellent 38% good	• The best mechanical option for persistent and noxious weeds	• Very labor intensive	•
No-till or zone-till (3% growers)	33% excellent 67% poor	• Provides benefits towards improving soils • Zone-till allows soil to warm in narrow bands	• Lowers overall soil temp	•
Mowing between rows (1% growers)	100% good	• The most effective option for between crop rows	• Requires multiple treatments • Can encourage weed seed dispersal	• Standard practice
Late season cover crop overseeding (1% growers)	100% good	• Useful for between crop rows	• Living mulches can compete with crop for nutrients and resources	• Dutch white clover and rye are commonly used
Crop rotation (1% growers)	100% good	•	•	• Standard practice

Research Needs:

- Explore grass herbicide options (for between rows) that have shorter days to harvest and/or have a residual effect.
- More materials are needed that work against galinsoga.

- Quantify the effect of flame weeding in galinsoga management.

Regulatory Needs:

- Expand Dual registration to other New England states.
- Provide incentives to increase the number of applied weed specialists in practice.

Education Needs:

- Promote awareness of critical periods when crop must be kept weed-free.
- Promote proper formation of beds to ease cultivation.
- Promote the management uses of crop rotation to reduce galinsoga.
- Encourage the cleaning of equipment to prevent the spread of weeds.

Key Vertebrates

Whitetail Deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*)

- Damage can be variable but dramatic
- There are wide variations in international, federal, state, and county regulations, interpretation and enforcement.
- Fencing is the most effective management tool when pest populations are high.

Currently Registered Pesticides – None specified

Cultural and Biological Alternatives

Practices Reported	Efficacy	Pros	Cons	Comments
Fence	50% excellent 50% good	• The most effective barrier	• Expensive to install	• Deer like to go under fences as well as over
Electric fence	17% excellent 83% good	• Effective temporarily • Double layer more confusing to deer	• Must be on all the time • No longer effective once deer learn to go over	• May need to bait fence to educate deer
Shooting	50% excellent 50% good	• Very effective on individuals	• Not as effective when pest pressure is high • Can be unsafe if neighbors are nearby • Noise can be irritating to neighbors • Deer are active at night	• Bow hunting is less disruptive to neighbors
Dogs	50% good	•	• Temporary effectiveness • Require upkeep • Fencing necessary to contain dogs	•
Reflectors	100% good	•	• Must move or change regularly • Limited range	•
Odors, etc		• Temporary effectiveness	• Cannot spray directly on crops	•

Research Needs:

- None specified.

Regulatory Needs:

- Foster and enforce consistency among the varied international, federal, state, and county regulations, interpretation and enforcement.
- Streamline and speed local permitting processes for deer control action.

Education Needs:

- Foster and enforce consistency among the varied international, federal, state, and county regulations, interpretation and enforcement.
- Raise awareness that federal government assistance for deer fence installation is available.

Comments on Other Vertebrates

These vertebrates are not considered Key Pests but do warrant special note as emerging issues in New England.

Woodchuck/Groundhog

- Not widespread
- Scattered occurrence is easy to manage

Turkeys

- pulling fruit off plants, peck fruit
- pull transplants
- eat beneficials

- remove straw mulch

Other Vertebrates not considered Key Pests

Birds

Coyote

Porcupine

Rabbit

Raccoons

Skunks

Voles, Chipmunks, Squirrels, Mice

IV. Appendices

Pepper Crop, Worker, Pest and Pesticide Timing

	Apr.				May				June				July				Aug.				Sep.				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1
Crop Stage																									
Greenhouse		X	X	X	X	X																			
Pre-Harvest							X	X	X	X	X														
Green fruit Harvest												X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
Green & Mature fruit Harvest																			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Worker activities																									
Land preparation and cultivation	X	X	X	X	X																				
Planting					X	X	X	X	X																
Harvest												X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fertilization							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
Irrigation							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Field Scouting for Integrated Pest Management (IPM)							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

ECB = European Corn Borer
Aph = Aphids
PM = Pepper Maggot
BLS = Bacterial Leaf Spot
Phyt = Phytophthora

	Apr.				May				June				July				Aug.				Sep.				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1
Insect & Disease Pest Key Activity & Monitoring Periods																									
ECB									X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Aph		X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PM											X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
BLS											X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Phyt							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Insecticide & Disease Application Timing																									
ECB									X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Aph												X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PM											X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
BLS					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Phyt							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nonchemical Insect & Disease Pest Control Timing																									
ECB							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Aph												X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PM							X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
BLS	X	X	X	X	X	X																	X	X	X
Phyt	X	X	X	X	X																				

	Apr.				May				June				July				Aug.				Sep.		
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Weed Key Activity & Monitoring Periods																							
Preplant	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																
Pre-emergent weeds								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Post-emergent weeds								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Herbicide Application Timing																							
Preplant	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																
Pre-emergent weeds								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Post-emergent weeds								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					
Nonchemical Weed Control Timing																							
Preplant	X	X	X	X	X	X	X																
Pre-emergent weeds								X	X	X	X	X											
Post-emergent weeds								X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					

	Apr.				May				June				July				Aug.				Sep.			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Vertebrate Pest Control Timing																								
Deer*							X	X	X	X	X	X												

* Deer browsing can happen anytime, but may be more prevalent and damaging in the spring.

New Pest Management Technologies for Insect and Mite Pests

Method	Source	Status	Pests Affected
Abamectin	Pipeline	Registration Approved (Insecticide) (Miticide) Tolerance Accepted (Insecticide) (Miticide)	MITES, LEAFMINERS, THRIPS
Abamectin	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Broad spectrum acaricide with activity on leafminers, Colorado potato beetle, and pear psylla. Weak against sucking insects and thrips. Good IPM tool with short re-entry interval. Translaminar activity providing long residual activity.
Acetamiprid	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Broad spectrum control with contact and systemic activity via foliar applications. Excellent on sucking pests like aphids and whitefly.
Azadirachtin	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Disrupts insect molting. Target pests include whitefly, leafminer, and Lepidoptera.
Bacillus thuringensis	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	New strains of Bt are being discovered that have activity against numerous pests.
Beauvaria bassiana	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Insecticide) (Miticide) Registration Approved (Miticide) (Insecticide) Tolerance Accepted (Miticide) (Insecticide)	SOWBUGS, MILIPEDES, MITES, LEAFROLLERS, THRIPS, BEETLES, WEEVILS, BILLBUGS, WHITE GRUBS, FLEAHOPPERS, WHITEFLIES, APHIDS, LEAFHOPPERS, MEALYBUGS, PEAR PSYLLA, ANTS, CORN BORERS, LOOPERS
Bifenazate	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Controls spider and European red mites, including eggs and motiles. Provides quick knockdown. Safe on predator mites.
Bifenthrin	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Broad spectrum activity on aphids, armyworms, cutworms, flea beetles, mites, and corn borers.
Bistrifluron	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Active against lepidopteran pests, whitefly. It acts by inhibiting chitin synthesis (Insect Growth Regulator).
Canola oil	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Insecticide) Registration Approved (Insecticide) Tolerance Accepted (Insecticide)	MITES, LEAFROLLERS, LEAFMINERS, BEETLES, PLANT BUGS, WHITEFLIES, APHIDS, LEAFHOPPERS, SOFT SCALES, ARMORED SCALES, MEALYBUGS, PSYLLIDS, ADELGIDS, CATERPILLARS, WEBWORMS, CANKERWORMS
Chromafenozide	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Specific to lepidopteran pests, novel ecodyosone agonist.
Chrysoperla carnea	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Controls aphids.

Cinnamaldehyde	IR4	Registered (Insecticide) (Fungicide)	Aphids, mites and the diseases downy mildew, powedery mildew, botrytis, and brown rots.
Clothianidin	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Contact and stomach activity. It controls plum curculio, aphids, leafhoppers, apple maggot, leafminers, leafrollers, codling moth, and pear psylla.
Cyfluthrin	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Manages cabbage looper, potato leafhopper, Colorado potato beetle, European corn borer, flea beetle, potato tuberworm, citrus thrips.
Cyromazine	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Leaf miners, maggots, fungal gnats.
Deltamethrin	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Beetles, bugs, Lepidoptera.
Diflubenzuron	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Wide range of leaf feeding insects.
Emamectin Benzoate	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Effective on larval Lepidoptera. (Beet/fall armyworms, cabbage webworms, corn earworms, imported cabbage worm, cabbage looper.) and leafminers
Esfenvalerate	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Broad-spectrum control on numerous insect pests.
Fenpropathrin	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Aphids, whitefly, various worms, mites, glassy winged sharpshooter, and stinkbugs.
Ferric phosphate	Pipeline	Registration Approved (mullusicide) Tolerance Accepted (mullusicide)	SLUGS AND SNAILS
Fipronil	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Controls Coleoptera, Lepidoptera, Diptera, Homoptera, Isoptera, and Thysanoptera. Systemic activity with long residual control.
Flonicamid	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Effective against aphids, thrips, leafhoppers, plant bug and other sucking pests. Provides rapid antifeeding activity. Non-toxic to beneficials.
Flufenzin	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Acaricide.
Imidacloprid	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Primarily effective against sucking insects (aphid, whitefly, scale, etc.) as well as beetles and grubs. Controls numerous pests which are resistant to insecticides.
Indoxacarb	Pipeline	Organophosphate (OP) Alternative (Insecticide) Reduced-Risk Pesticide (Insecticide) Registration Approved (Insecticide) Tolerance Accepted (Insecticide)	loopers, armyworms, fruitworms, pinworms
Indoxacarb	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Controls most major Lepidopteran pest species. Possibly controls plant bugs. Soft on beneficials so it is a good fit with IPM.

Iron phosphate	Pipeline	Biopesticide (mullusicide) Registration Approved (mullusicide) Tolerance Accepted (mullusicide)	SLUGS, SNAILS
Isomate BTW	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Mating disruption of Beet Armyworm.
Kaolin	Pipeline	Biopesticide (plant growth regulator) (Insecticide) (Miticide) Registration Approved (Miticide) (Insecticide) (plant growth regulator) Tolerance Accepted (Miticide) (plant growth regulator) (Insecticide)	mites, flea beetles, tarnished plant bugs, leafhoppers, Colorado potato beetle, lace bugs, stink bugs, tomato fruit worm, tomato pinworm
Kaolin	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Various insect and mite pests.
Lambda-Cyhalothrin	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Broad spectrum insect control.
Lufenuron	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Whitefly, thrips, Colorado potato beetle and lepidopterous insects.
Metarhizium anisopliae	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Controls whitefly, thrips, and mites.
Methoxyfenozide	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Similar to tebufenozide in that it only controls Lepidoptera larvae. Better on budworm/bollworm, leafminer and diamondback moth. Excellent fit with IPM programs.
Pymetrozine	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Controls sucking insects (aphids/whiteflies). The product has a rapid knockdown on aphids if they are contacted by direct sprays.
Pyridanil	IR4	Pending (Insecticide)	Good activity against lepidoptera. Effective against insecticide resistant insecticides. Safe on beneficials.
Pyriproxyfen	Pipeline	Reduced-Risk Pesticide (Insecticide) Registration Approved (Insecticide) Tolerance Accepted (Insecticide)	WHITEFLIES, APHIDS, CABBAGE LOOPER, TOBACCO HORNWORM
Pyriproxyfen	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Controls scales, whiteflies, thrips, pear psylla, codling moth, and ants. It is a juvenile hormone mimic that is slow acting with a long residual, safe to beneficial insects, non-toxic to man and wildlife. Effective on eggs and immature stages, not effe
Spinosad	Pipeline	Reduced-Risk Pesticide (Insecticide) Registration Approved (Insecticide) Tolerance Accepted (Insecticide)	LEAFMINERS, THRIPS, ARMYWORMS, LOOPERS, EUROPEAN CORN BORER, HORNWORMS
Tebufenozide	Section 18	issued	beet armyworm
Tetradecadienyl acetate + tetradecenol	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Insecticide) Registration Approved (Insecticide)	BEET ARMYWORM
Thiacloprid	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Broad spectrum systemic control of

			sucking and chewing pests; specifically, aphids, whiteflies, leaf hoppers, plant bugs, pear psylla, weevils, fruit flies, oriental fruit moth, leafminers, and codling moth. Very safe to bees.
Thiamethoxam	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Broad-spectrum activity against soil dwelling pests, sucking pests, and some chewing pests. Effective against aphids, whitefly, thrips, leafhopper and certain beetles. Being marketed for seed, soil, and foliar treatments.
Thiamethoxam	Section 18	withdrawn	pepper weevils
Thiocyclam	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	
Verticillium lecanii	IR4	Potential (Insecticide)	Effective against whitefly.
Zeta-cypermethrin	IR4	Registered (Insecticide)	Contols cutworms, thrips, armyworms, etc.

New Pest Management Technologies for Diseases

Method	Source	Status	Pests Affected
Acibenzolar	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Induces resistance to Blue mold, bacterial diseases, Downy Mildew, and Sclerotinia.
AE C638206	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Active against Phytophthora, Pythium, Plasmopora, Peronospora, Bremia and Pseudoperonospora.
AKD-3088	IR4	Potential (Nematicide)	
Ampelomyces quisqualis isolate M-10	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Hyperparasite of Powdery mildew.
Azoxystrobin	Pipeline	Reduced-Risk Pesticide (Fungicide) Registration Approved (Fungicide) Tolerance Accepted (Fungicide) issued ()	powdery mildew, anthracnose
Azoxystrobin	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Broad spectrum of pathogens of fungi: Cladosporium, Venturia, Botryosphaeria, Mycosphaerella, Pyrenophora, Puccinia, Pyricularia, Plasmopara, Guignardis, Pseudopeziza, Alternaria, Sphaerotheca, Erysiphe, Leveillula, Septoria, Pythium, Uncinula, Didymella
Bacillus firmus	IR4	Potential (Bacterial Nematicide)	Controls root knot and other nematodes including Heterodera avenae.
Bacillus pumilus strain 2808	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Botrytis, downy and powdery mildews, rusts, Sclerotinia blight, and rots.
Bacillus subtilis	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Disease suppression.
Bacillus subtilis QST 713	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Fungicide) Registration Approved (Fungicide) Tolerance Accepted (Fungicide)	gray mold, powdery mildew
Bacillus subtilis strain QST 713	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Protectant fungicide/bactericide with SAR activity. Broad spectrum, controls Botrytis, powdery and downy mildews, early blight, and bacterial spot.
Bacteriophages	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Manages bacteria spot and bacteria speck.
Benthiavalicarb	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Controls downy mildew
Chitosan	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Downy and powdery mildew, gray mold and Botrytis.
Copper Octanoate	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Downy mildew, powdery mildew, blue mold, white rust, anthracnose.
Copper octanoate	Pipeline	Registration Approved (Bactericide) (Fungicide) Tolerance Accepted (Fungicide) (Bactericide)	ANTHRACNOSE, BACTERIAL BLIGHT, EARLY BLIGHT, LATE BLIGHT, GRAY MOLD, LEAF SPOTS, BACTERIAL SPOT
Cyazofamid	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Effective against Oomycete and

			Plasmodiophoromycetes, fungi, especially late blight and downy mildew.
Dimethomorph	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Downy mildew, late blight, Phytophthora, Plasmopara, Pseudoperonospora Bremia, and Peronospora. Should be mixed with other fungicides for resistance management.
Ethaboxam	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Useful for grape downy mildew, potato and tomato late blight, pepper blight and cucumber downy mildew. Preventive and curative activity.
Famoxadone	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Broad spectrum fungicide, including Early blight, downy mildews, and other ascomycetes. Can be combined with Cymoxanil (marketed as Tanos) to pick up Late blight.
Fenamidone	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Foliar protectant and curative activity against Oomycete fungi. Also effective against ascomycete and Alternaria. Inhibits electronic transport.
Fenbuconazole	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Powdery mildew, rusts, apple scab, brown rot, cotton ball, mummy berry (Monolinia spp.), smuts, bunts, Cladosporium, Myclosphaerella, Cercospora, Septoria, Rhizoctonia, Pyrenophora, Helminthosporium & related genera, and a Colletotrichum sp. - in turf.
Fenhexamid	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Non-systemic protectant fungicide that is effective against Botrytis cinerea, Monolinia, Sclerotina sclerotiorum of lettuce.
Gliocladium catenulatum J1446	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Fungicide) Registration Approved (Fungicide)	damping-off, seed rot, root and stem rot, wilt diseases caused by Rhizoctonia, Pythium, Phytophthora, Fusarium, Didymella, Botrytis, Verticillium, etc. in greenhouse or indoors
Gliocladium catenulatum Strain J1446	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Recommended for control of Pythium and Rhizoctonia.
Glutamic Acid	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Controls brown rot and supresses shot hole.
Harpin protein	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Fungicide) (Bactericide) (virus resistance) (plant growth regulator) (Insecticide) Registration Approved (plant growth regulator) (Insecticide) (virus resistance) (Fungicide) (Bactericide) Tolerance Accepted (Fungicide)	PLANT DISEASES, IMPROVEMENT IN GROWTH AND YIELD, SUPPRESSION OF INSECTS AND OTHER PESTS

		(Bactericide) (Insecticide) (plant growth regulator) (virus resistance)	
Harpin Protein	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Bacterial leaf spot wilt, blight and fungal diseases such as botrytis, brunch rot, and powdery mildew.
Hydrogen peroxide	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Bactericide) (Fungicide) Registration Approved (Fungicide) (Bactericide) Tolerance Accepted (Bactericide) (Fungicide)	ANTHRACNOSE, POWDERY MILDEW, PHYTOPHTHORA BLIGHT
Hydrogen peroxide	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Broad spectrum bactericide and fungicide.
Mefenoxam	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Same spectrum as metalaxyl.
Milsana Bioprotectant	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Induces phytoalexins which infer resistance to powdery mildew and other diseases such as Botrytis.
Muscodor albus	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Fungus produces volatile compounds that are effective against plant pathogenic and bacteria.
Myclobutanil	Section 18	crisis issued	powdery mildew
Myclobutanil	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Powdery mildews, rusts, apple scab, brown rot (Monilinia spp.), shothole (Stimina spp.), cherry leaf spot (Coccomyces spp.) grape black rot (Guignardia spp.).
Nocobifen-BAS 510	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Manages powdery mildew, Alternaria, Botrytis, Sclerotinia and Monillia
Oxolinic Acid	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Controls gram-negative bacteria including rice grain rot, potato black leg, soft rot, and fire blight.
Paecilomyces lilacinus	IR4	Potential (Nematicide)	Controls root knot and cyst nematodes.
Peroxyacetic Acid	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Post-harvest decay and rot.
Phosphorous acid and its sodium, potassium, and ammonium salts	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Fungicide) Tolerance Accepted (Fungicide)	Phytophthora and Pythium diseases, downy mildew
Potassium dihydrogen phosphate	Pipeline	Biopesticide (Fungicide) Registration Approved (Fungicide)	POWDERY MILDEW
Potassium Dihydrogen Phosphate	IR4	Registred (Fungicide)	Powdery mildew.
Prochloraz	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Powdery mildew, Fusarium spp., leafblotch, Botrytis, Alternaria and others.
Propamocarb Hydrochloride	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Downy mildew, late blight, damping-off, Pythium, Phytophthora, and Aphanomyces. Should be mixed with other fungicides for resistance management.

Pyraclostrobin	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Broad spectrum activity on Anthracnose, Alternaria, downy mildew, Cercospora leaf spot, rust, powdery mildew, Septoria, Phytophthora, Pythium, Rhizoctonia.
Pyrimethanil	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Active against Botrytis spp., Venturia spp., Alternaria solani, Alternaria mali , Sphaerotheca macularis and Monilinia spp.
Quinoxyfen/DE795	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Has shown activity against powdery mildew in a wide range of crops.
Streptomyces lydicus WYEC 108	IR4	Pending (Fungicide)	Controls soil borne plant root rots and damping off fungi.
TM 416	IR4	Potential (Fungicide)	Bacterial speck and spot.
Trifloxystrobin	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Active against powdery mildew and leaf spot diseases. Also provides significant control of scab, rusts, downy mildew and other diseases.
Zoxamide	IR4	Registered (Fungicide)	Control of foliar phycamycetes and albugo. Also protectant against Oomycete fungi. Will be mixed with mancozeb for broader activity.

Pesticide and Non-chemical Methods for Weeds

Tables adapted from *New England Vegetable Management Guide 2008-2009*. http://www.nevegetable.org/.

Weed Group Name Abbreviations
PER **=** Perennial
AG = Annual Grass
AB = Annual broadleaf

Ratings:
E = 90% control or better

G = 70-70% control

F = 50-70% control or better

P = 5-50% control

N = less than 5% control

Active ingredient or Method	Brand name(s)	AG	AB	PER
bensulide	Prefar	E	N-P	N-P
clethodim	Select	E	N	N-E
clomazone	Command	G	N-E	N-F
glyphosate	Roundup	E	E	G-E
halosulfuron	Sandea, Permit	P	F-E	P-G
metolachlor	Dual	G-E	P-E	P-G
napropamide	Devrinol	G-E	P-E	P
paraquat	Gramoxone	E	G-E	P-G
pelargonic acid	Scythe	E	G-E	P-G
sethoxydim	Poast	E	N	N-E
trifluralin	Treflan	G-E	P-E	P-G

New Pest Management Technologies for Weeds

Method	Source	Status	Pests Affected
Alternaria destruens	IR4	Potential (Herbicide)	Controls dodder (swamp, largeseed, field, and smallseed).
Carfentrazone-ethyl	IR4	Pending (Herbicide)	Numerous broadleaf weeds, including cocklebur and water hemp.
Clethodim	IR4	Registered (Herbicide)	Strictly a grass herbicide.
Clomazone	IR4	Registered (Herbicide)	Material controls a broad spectrum of grasses and broadleaf weeds.
Colletotrichum gloeosporioides f. sp malvae	IR4	Pending (Herbicide)	It is pathogenic to round-leaved mallow, small flowered mallow, common mallow, and velvetleaf.
Flufenacet	IR4	Potential (Herbicide)	Soil applied for annual grasses and some broadleaf weeds.
Flumioxazin	IR4	Potential (Herbicide)	Low use rate pre-emergence broadleaf herbicide with contact activity and residual soil activity.
Glyphosate	IR4	Registered (Herbicide)	Controls most weeds.
Halosulfuron	IR4	Pending (Herbicide)	Nutsedge, velvetleaf, cocklebur, other broadleaf weeds.
Oxadiargyl	IR4	Potential (Herbicide)	Broad spectrum weed control, similar to oxidiazinon.
Pelargonic Acid	IR4	Registered (Herbicide)	Contact, non-selective broad spectrum foliar applied material
Pyrithiobac-sodium	IR4	Potential (Herbicide)	Controls a wide range of broadleaf weeds via pre- and post-emergence application.
S-metolachlor	IR4	Registered (Herbicide)	Same spectrum as metolachlor (Dual).
Sulfentrazone	IR4	Potential (Herbicide)	Controls broadleaf and grass species.
Trifloxysulfuron	IR4	Potential (Herbicide)	Broadleaf weeds.

V. Acknowledgements and Contacts

Strategic Plan Meeting Participants

Connecticut

Jude Boucher

University of Connecticut

Storrs, CT

(860) 875-3331

jude.boucher@uconn.edu

Maine

Rick Belanger

Lewiston, ME

(207) 576-5845

veggiefarmerinme@aol.com

Bill Spiller

85 Spiller Farm Lane

Wells, ME 04090

New Hampshire

George Hamilton

Hillsborough County

Cooperative Extension

329 Mast Road

Goffstown , NH 03045
(603) 641-6060
george.hamilton@unh.edu

William Lord

University of New Hampshire

Durham, NH 03824
(603) 862-1734
prunes@worldpath.net

Keith Marshal

Wilson Farm

144 Charles Bancroft Highway

Litchfield, NH 03051

(207) 985-2575

spillerfarm@juno.com

Gordon True

True Farms

305 Ridge Road

Charleston, ME 04422

(207) 286-3604

truefarming1@netzero.com

Massachusetts

A. Richard Bonanno

University of Massachusetts

Cooperative Extension

255 Merrimack St.

Methuen, MA 01844

(978) 682-9563

rbonanno@umext.umass.edu

(603) 882-9919

Rhode Island

Skip Paul

Wishing Stone Farm

25 Shaw Road

Little Compton, RI 02837

(401) 635-4274

skippaul@cox.net

Vermont

Ann Hazelrigg

University of Vermont

105 Carrigan Drive

Burlington, VT 05405
(802) 656-0493
ann.hazelrigg@uvm.edu

Sarah Kingsley-Richards

University of Vermont

106 Carrigan Drive

Burlington, VT 05406
(802) 656-0475
sarah.kingsley@uvm.edu

Pooh Sprague

Edgewater Farm

Plainfield, NH

(603) 298-8391

ps@edgewaterfarm.com

References

New England Pepper Pest Management Survey. Natalia Clifton, University of Massachusetts. 2006. PRONewEngland Pest Management Network, http://PRONewEngland.org/

New England Pepper Crop Profile. Candace Bartholomew, University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension. 2008. PRONewEngland Pest Management Network, http://PRONewEngland.org/

Northeast Pepper Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Manual. 2001.

T. Jude Boucher and Richard A. Ashley, Eds. University of Connecticut, Cooperative Extension System.136pp.

New England Vegetable Management Guide: 2008-2009. Cooperative

Project from University of Connecticut, University of New Hampshire,

University of Maine, University of Rhode Island, University of Massachusetts and University of Vermont. http://www.nevegetable.org/

New Pest Management Technologies. 2008. http://www.pestmanagement.info/NPMT/

Reviewers

****

If the New England Pest Management Network state liaison responds to the PMSP draft saying that it is OK, but doesn't provide any comments, then their name would be listed under this section but not under the Reviewer section.

****

Connecticut:

Candace Bartholomew

University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension

1800 Asylum Avenue

West Hartford, CT 06117

cbarthol@canr1.cag.uconn.edu

(860) 570-9067

Maine: Glen Koehler
University of Maine Cooperative Extension

Pest Management Office
491 College Avenue
Orono, ME 04473-1295
(207) 581-3882
gkoehler@umext.maine.edu

Maine: James Dill
University of Maine Cooperative Extension

Pest Management Office
491 College Avenue
Orono, ME 04473-1295
(207) 581-3879

New Hampshire: William Lord

University of New Hampshire

Department of Biological Sciences

Spaulding Hall, G-28

38 Academic Way

Durham, NH 03824
Phone: (603) 862-1734
Fax : (603) 862-1713
Email: prunes@worldpath.net

Rhode Island:

Peggy Siligato

University of Rhode Island Cooperative Extension

316 Woodward Hall

Kingston, RI 02881

(401) 874-5997

siligato@uriacc.uri.edu

Vermont: Ann Hazelrigg
Plant & Soil Science Department

jdill@umext.maine.edu

Massachusetts: Natalia Clifton
University of Massachusetts
Pesticide Education
212 Ag Engineering Bldg.
Amherst, MA 01003
(413) 545-1044
nclifton@ent.umass.edu

105 Carrigan Drive
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05405-0082
(802) 656-0493
ann.hazelrigg@uvm.edu

Vermont: Sarah Kingsley-Richards

Plant & Soil Science Dept.

105 Carrigan Drive

University of Vermont

Burlington, VT 05405-0082

(802) 656-0475
sarah.kingsley@uvm.edu