

# **Best Management Practices for Pest Control in Vegetables**

Vegetable Entomologist Workshop  
Monterey, California, May 2008

## **Acknowledgements**

This report summarizes the discussion and subsequent general Best Management Practice (BMP) recommendations of research and Extension vegetable entomologists and crop consultants from primary vegetable-producing states. During a meeting held in May 2008 in Monterey, California, the group discussed pest-management issues, challenges and opportunities confronting the fresh and process vegetable industry today. Topics included shifts in pest spectrums; emergence of insect-vectored diseases as significant risks to profitable production; availability of advanced insecticide and acaricide technologies; the need for resistance management in pest control; the challenges of a shrinking agricultural infrastructure; and regulatory trends. The information-exchange format, featuring a facilitated discussion, allowed the group to identify key success factors and focus on BMPs in a non-commercial context.

## **Workshop Goals**

- Brainstorm issues, challenges and opportunities in the control of insects and mites in vegetable crops;
- Develop contemporary Best Management Practices (BMPs) that optimize the performance of new insecticide technologies for controlling insects and mites; and
- Discuss new insecticide technologies available to the vegetable industry and their fit in the BMPs.

# Best Practices for Successful Insect Management

1 Coordination and communication of management activities between growers and consultants are essential for safe, efficient crop production.

2 Adopt cultural practices that avoid or prevent the buildup of insect pests as a solid first line of defense. Cultural practices, such as crop rotation, sanitation, crop/residue destruction, host-free period and use of bed and row covers, are an important part of the planning process.

- Plan and implement crop management practices including variety selection, irrigation timing and fertilization for rapid emergence and growth, as related to historical pest trends - to assist in cost-efficient pest management.
- Area-wide crop consideration can help minimize insect pest pressure by maintaining a host-free environment at certain times of the year.
- Other cultural practices, such as timely crop destruction and weed or host plant management, will minimize or sometimes eliminate breeding sites for insects. Host plant resistance to herbicides may become more problematic for effective red aphid control in California lettuce and leafminer and *Lepidoptera* control in Florida.
- Cultural practices also can have a long-term impact on cost-effective pest control in the future. When making insecticide choices, pay particular attention to plant-back restrictions to avoid issues in successive seasons.

3 Monitor and sample for the presence of pests by crop stage and pest species.

4 Know the spectrum of pests, as well as trends of pests in the area and in the cropping system during the growing season.

5 Accurate identification of insect species is essential before making any pest management decisions.

- Correctly identify pests and species composition, and quantify populations, including presence of natural enemies.
- Sample fields regularly throughout the growing season.
- Build a historical database, geo-referenced by field and crop, as well as insect-flight timing by heat units, weather and crop stage.

6 Scouting in accordance with a scientifically validated sampling plan (if available) is required to quantify pest numbers, by species, to determine the need for control based on economic injury theory.

7 Select the correct pesticide for the need when pest populations reach an action threshold and control is necessary:

- Choose pesticides by value, efficacy, residual activity and spectrum of control.
- Consider eco-friendly pesticides whenever possible.
- Rotate modes of action and to reduce the risk of resistance.
- Employ insecticide use patterns and/or modes of action that are compatible with the activity of beneficial arthropods. Natural enemy conservation is critical to a cost-effective pest management program.
- Avoid broad-spectrum insecticides to conserve natural enemies.

8 A thorough understanding of the pesticide's biological activity and the biology/ecology of the target pest is essential for application timing and post-treatment evaluation.

9 Correct timing of pesticide applications according to thresholds published by each state's Cooperative Extension Service is critical, both for the cost-effectiveness of a treatment and to maintain the beneficial complex throughout the season. Three pest management models apply:

- **Preventive model.** This generally would be associated with systemic, at-planting applications, which would include the use of seed treatments or soil-applied products. These applications would conserve the beneficial complex and would minimize or delay the need for foliar applications of pesticides.
- **Preemptive model.** In specific situations, a cost-effective application of a selective insecticide may be warranted to treat expected pest trends based on historical data, while also maintaining beneficial populations. Application methods may include chemigation, as well as foliar treatments.
- **Reactive model.** Using proven scouting techniques to quantify pest and beneficial populations, treat on pest thresholds, based on crop stage or level of pest tolerance. Timeliness of this foliar application is critical.

Use weather patterns as a predictive model for insect pressure, population growth or insect stages by temperature/heat accumulation, and for choosing the correct insecticide. Rain-fastness and penetrability (translaminar or systemic) are important characteristics, particularly east of the Mississippi River, where rain can be a daily factor.

Temperature also is important when choosing which insecticides and adjuvants/surfactants to use. Forecasts for cooler temperatures can greatly slow the metabolism or breakdown of insecticides and effectively extend the

pre-harvest interval (PHI) beyond the point where growers can legally harvest and market their crops. Conversely, phytotoxicity can be a problem at high temperatures for certain insecticides and adjuvants, particularly with leafy vegetables.

Crop, contract or market trends will help quantify crop value in assessing the risks and benefits of insecticide applications. Vegetable growers must have a quality crop when prices are right or when locked in to a delivery contract.

## New Pesticide Technologies

New, more selective, pesticide technologies provide growers a range of benefits and advantages for cost-effective, season-long insect pest management. To better develop BMPs to exploit their value, it is important to understand their individual strengths and weaknesses. The following exercise addresses this need.

### MOVENTO™ (spirotetramat)

#### Strengths

- Whiteflies (early life stages), aphids, psyllids
- Systemic activity as a foliar spray
- Good residual control
- Application flexibility (volumes, methods, coverage)
- Tox profile/environmental fate package very good (short half-life)

#### Weaknesses

- Moderate control of adult whiteflies (requires an adulticide)
- Slow knockdown of aphids and whiteflies (5-7 days)
- Penetrating adjuvant required

#### Notes:

- *Leafy vegetables are an excellent fit for Movento, with Dyne-Amic® (methylated seed oil and silicone blends), particularly for red aphids in lettuce hearts. Aphids can not be allowed to build up in lettuce, because dead carcasses foul the lettuce, greatly reducing value.*
- *Reluctance of growers to use adjuvants may limit its application on some crops (i.e., spinach).*
- *A lower action threshold may be prudent because of long residual.*
- *Back-to-back applications (10-14 days) when plants are smaller may provide optimal systemic control.*
- *Up to 21 days of whitefly control on melons; 28 days of aphid control on lettuce.*
- *Same mode of action as Oberon® but has lower miticidal activity.*

### SYNAPSE™ (flubendiamide)

#### Strengths

- Broad *Lepidopteran* spectrum (pinworm, diamondback moth, armyworms, most Lep species)
- Good residual (10-11 days)
- Good rotation partner
- Easy on beneficials
- Does not leach; stays in soil profile
- Environmental profile (worker safety, mammalian toxicity)

#### Weaknesses

- Narrow pest spectrum (*Lepidopteran* only)
- Spray coverage is important

#### Notes:

- *Position Synapse™ early in stand establishment and later in the season when tolerance for pests in fresh produce is low.*
- *Stand establishment is especially important in Southern California, because of the need for Lepidopteran control.*
- *May require tank mixture with pyrethroid to control secondary pests, such as flea beetles.*
- *Similar environmental fate package as Coragen®.*
- *Same mode of action as Coragen®.*

## **CORAGEN® (chlorantraniliprole, rynaxypyr)**

### **Strengths**

- Broad spectrum of *Lepidopteran* control (including pinworm)
- Leafminer control
- Good in Integrated Pest Management (IPM) program as a rotational product
- Residual control
- Application flexibility (soil or foliar)
- Systemic - when soil-applied
- Translaminar - when applied as a foliar spray
- Environmental profile (worker safety, mammalian toxicity)

### **Weaknesses**

- Not consistent for whitefly control; suppression at best
- Residual too long for resistance management when applied to the soil
- Requires an adjuvant for some pests/crop situations
- Label does not allow for adjuvant use on some crops (cantaloupes, watermelons, spinach)

**Notes:**

- *Residual control of up to 40 days in drip irrigation system observed in Arizona.*
- *In Florida, controlled armyworm larvae up to 70 days on tomatoes when applied as a soil drench or drip application.*
- *Not comparable to Movento™, insect growth regulators (IGRs) or neonicotinoids for whitefly control.*
- *Long residual a concern in resistance management.*
- *Long residual can adversely affect plant-back to some non-labeled crops.*
- *Depending on pest species present, not a stand-alone product.*
- *Similar environmental fate package as Synapse™.*
- *Same mode of action as Synapse™.*

## **RADIANT™ (spinetoram)**

### **Strengths**

- Broad registrations in vegetable crops
- Excellent thrips control
- *Lepidopteran* control, including leaf miner
- Residual control
- Environmental profile (worker safety, mammalian toxicity)
- Low impact on predator mites
- Translaminar activity

### **Weaknesses**

- Resistance may develop rapidly if not used judiciously
- Photosensitive
- Effects on some natural enemies
- Needs adjuvant in some crops
- Acutely toxic to bees

**Notes:**

- *The best technology for thrips control.*
- *Thrips are now a primary pest. Saving it for thrips only may be prudent where they are a problem (i.e., peppers, lettuce).*
- *Performance for specific pests like leafminers is enhanced with adjuvants, not just by crop.*
- *pH sensitive; will break down in pH solutions < 6.*
- *Can be harmful to Syrphid fly adults.*

## **ALVERDE® (metaflumazone)**

### **Strengths**

- Quick Knockdown
- *Lepidopterans* and beetles

### **Weaknesses**

- Short residual (3-5 days)
- Needs adjuvant
- Hard on some beneficials
- High rates (16 oz. for Leps)
- Not translaminar; spray coverage is important

**Notes:**

- *A mid-season fit.*
- *Early-season fit in leafy vegetables at stand establishment when beet armyworm and flea beetles infest seedlings.*

## TESORO™ (pyridalyl)

### Strengths

- *Lepidopteran* (very good diamondback moth, armyworm control)
- Adult whitefly activity
- Leafminer activity

### Weaknesses

- Cabbage looper
- Environmental fate package

**Notes:**

- EPA registration in question because of ecotox issues.

## OBERON® (spiromesifen)

### Strengths

- Mites, whiteflies, psyllids
- Active against all mite development stages
- Wide spectrum of activity
- Translaminar activity
- High level of residual efficacy
- Adjuvant flexibility
- Minimal risk to beneficials
- Unique mode of action
- Good rotation partner
- Tox profile/environmental fate package very good (short half-life)

### Weaknesses

- Moderate adult knockdown (requires an adulticide)
- Slow knockdown of whitefly adults, it reduces oviposition and egg hatch from affected females.

**Notes:**

- Good fit in Florida, where both mites and whiteflies are a problem.
- Oberon does not require an adjuvant, although the use of an adjuvant can improve performance.
- Cross-resistance would be an issue where Oberon and Movento are used consecutively, in multiple applications.
- Current seven-day PHI is expected to be reduced to one day in late 2008.
- If mites are prevalent over whiteflies, apply Oberon.
- Residual activity against whitefly nymphs observed on tomatoes of up to 21 days.
- Up to 30 days of residual control of mites.
- Up to 21 days control of whiteflies on melons.
- Same mode of action as Movento.

## RIMON® (novaluron)

### Strengths

- *Lepidopteran* (fall and beet armyworm, diamondback moth)
- Can only be used on potatoes, sweet potatoes and brassicas
- Leaf beetle
- *Lygus*
- Sweet potato weevil
- Inexpensive
- Whitefly activity
- Long residual
- Rotational product

### Weaknesses

- Quick resistance can develop if not used judiciously
- IGR (Slow acting)
- pH sensitive
- Phytotoxicity problems in leafy greens

**Notes:**

- Do not use with products like Dyne-Amic; do not use surfactants.
- As an IGR, Rimon is an excellent rotation product.

# **Issues, Challenges and Opportunities in the Control of Insects in Vegetable Crops: A Changing Environment**

Agriculture is undergoing a rapid transformation in the United States and around the world, which is reflected in the fresh vegetable industry. Genetically modified (GMO) vegetable crops will likely expand in the future, but changing cropping patterns may have the greatest impact, especially in the West, where tree and vine acreage have rapidly expanded.

The U.S. agricultural industry also is facing competitive changes. Third World nations now control a range of crops, such as cotton and rice. Some of these nations are supplying an increasing volume of this country's fresh fruit and vegetable needs, as outsourcing of food production expands. A concern among many in the domestic vegetable industry is that food safety standards are lower in many other countries than they are in the United States.

In fact, changes in the vegetable industry may be more acute than in larger crop sectors because of industry concentration; fragmentation of fresh and process commodities; increasing regulatory issues; and other challenges, such as declining research and Extension staffing and overall budget reductions among Land-Grant institutions. Primary areas of discussion among workshop participants centered on challenges, issues and trends in the vegetable industry.

Following is a summary of these discussions:

---

## **Shifting pest spectrums.**

From east to west, pest spectrums have shifted because of widespread use or loss of specific pest-control chemistries, changes in cropping patterns and rotations, and cultural practices adopted by growers to reduce production costs. Whiteflies are the primary issue in Florida, for instance, while desert production areas of Arizona and California tend to deal with a broader spectrum of "primary" pests. One emerging insect across the country is thrips, particularly western flower thrips and onion thrips. Whiteflies, aphids and thrips are concerns for all because they vector an ever-increasing number of viruses that are becoming much harder to control. Because of a lack of effective disease-management alternatives, virus control falls to the effective use of insecticides to control insect vectors, thus avoiding infections.

The good news is that there are more insecticide alternatives than ever before. Many of these alternatives

are new, highly efficacious, selective chemistry technologies which are currently in the market or in the queue for EPA approval. Unfortunately, the knowledge required in the marketplace to most effectively implement these new insecticide tools is mediocre at best.

Other difficult pests common in all growing regions are a complex of lepidopteran larvae that annually require control to prevent economic damage. Diamondback moth may rank as the most difficult, because of its resistance to pyrethroids, *Bacillus thuringiensis kurstaki* and spinosin (in Georgia).

Wireworms are emerging as a significant problem across the United States, because a very limited number of effective insecticides are labeled for their control, particularly in vegetables. In fact, some vegetables have no effective wireworm control material labeled; growers must rely on cultivation practices and birds to control the pest. Phorate and ethoprop registrations and labels are under continuous review by EPA, with a goal of eliminating their use. In addition, with the reduction and elimination of methyl bromide use, the vegetable industry may be faced with no effective wireworm control products for a majority of the crops. Only sweet corn has an effective tool for the control of wireworms, a seed-applied insecticide.

**In the Southeast**, whitefly is the dominant insect problem, and its control goes hand in hand with virus management. In pockets such as South Georgia, the fall whitefly is problematic, and control is difficult at best. Western flower thrips also has emerged as a major pest over the last few years, vectoring TOSPO (impatiens necrotic spot and tomato spotted wilt) viruses and attacking a wider variety of vegetables.

Growers of sweet corn are experiencing problems controlling not only lepidopteran pests, such as fall armyworm, but also *Diptera* pests, such as an expanding complex of "corn silk flies." This latter pest complex encompasses four species that are not at all affected by Bt-enhanced cultivars and frequently require daily treatments to produce a marketable sweet corn crop. The range of corn silk flies is rapidly expanding north and west from Florida.

The diamondback moth is an annual problem, especially in Georgia, where resistance issues garner

greater attention. In addition to severe problems in Georgia, Florida also experiences serious problems with diamondback moth and other lesser known lepidopteran pests that, without control, would push damage beyond acceptable levels for harvest. Therefore, other notable pests in the southeastern United States also include fall, beet and southern armyworms, pepper weevil and many species of aphids.

At this time, control of pepper weevil requires the use of broad-spectrum insecticides, which also disrupt natural enemies that entomologists rely upon to control thrips in peppers. This forces growers fighting weevils to also have to fight thrips.

Other notable pests in the Southeast include russet, two-spotted spider and broad mites, which create a multifaceted control challenge for crop consultants and growers.

In addition, control of nematodes, wireworms, seed corn maggot and slugs were singled out as concerns, because of the loss of methyl bromide. Costs associated with the loss of methyl bromide and the use of alternatives has created other issues, including worker safety.

**The Rio Grande Valley** has seen a significant shift in pest spectrums. The most notable change is western flower thrips, which now comprises a significant portion of thrips pressure in the region. Onion thrips was the only species present in the recent past. Grower reluctance to rotate crops or pesticides has facilitated the shift to western flower thrips and emergence of potato psyllid and leafminers as serious pests. The Hawaiian beet webworm is another significant pest that has emerged in South Texas on spinach, Swiss chard and beets.

**In desert vegetable-production areas of the West,** the pest spectrum may not be increasing in breadth, but there is no single dominant pest. Primary pests include whiteflies, aphids, leafhoppers and thrips, all of which vector diseases. Beet armyworm and cabbage looper are particularly important pests in fall lettuce production. Secondary pests, such as seed corn maggot, flea beetles and slugs, also are having more impact on vegetable production.

Complicating the situation in the West is the emergence of naturally occurring microbial pathogens, such as *E. coli*, which indirectly affect pesticide applications because of the care required to avoid using contaminated water in the spray tank.

**Hawaii.** Vegetable production in the Aloha State is robust, but it also is difficult to maintain an acceptable service life for pesticides because of resistance problems. Diamondback moth is the most prevalent and difficult-to-control, but specific pests also include other lepidopterans, such as pickleworm. Excellent management programs have been developed for the *Tephritid* fruit fly, which has enhanced local production of cucurbits and melons. This could provide new opportunities for winter exports if an irradiation treatment facility is approved and constructed in Honolulu.

---

### **Trend toward selective pesticide technologies.**

Positive trends in the marketplace include the availability and use of selective pesticide technologies and maintenance of the beneficial, predator-insect complex as a means to cost-effectively control critical pests. Preservation of natural enemies is seen as a key part of an IPM program, although even beneficial insects must be “cleaned up” in the field before harvest because of low tolerances for insect contaminants (or “insect debris”) in vegetable produce crops (e.g., lady beetle larvae in lettuce). In addition, many new products are considered expensive and tend to increase grower costs as broad-spectrum pesticides are phased out. These new-technology pesticide products for the most part are being used in old management practices; thus, updating BMPs is necessary for growers to recognize the economic benefits of these technologies.

Concerns about development of resistance among specific insect pests continue, despite the proliferation of new insecticide technologies. For instance, an interesting over-the-counter trend now emerging is the use of pre-mixes, which effectively create broad-spectrum products. However, the use of pre-mixes risks accelerating selection for resistance by increasing exposure of pests to specific modes of action. It would be foolish to squander these new tools by using them to recreate broad-spectrum insecticides. Therefore, the continued availability of older, broad-spectrum chemistries is considered important. With up to 11 modes of action now available to vegetable growers, none should have to be relied upon excessively. Producers would be well-advised to use new pest management insecticide technologies and strategies efficiently and prudently to maintain efficacy as long as possible.

Another concern related to new, selective technologies involves the management practices within which they are used. Many growers, consultants, pest control advisers (PCAs) and crop protection retailers are using the new insecticide technologies as they would the older, broad-spectrum chemistries. Because of their greater

efficacy, increased persistence or longer residual, optimal use of new insecticide technologies requires continued education of the technical community and producers. A current challenge confronting the industry is integrating season-long pest management programs - keeping resistance management front and center - into a contemporary set of BMPs.

With selective insecticides, parameters of pest control need to be redefined, particularly between target and non-target pests. Thresholds and application timing also must be readdressed, as well as expectations after an application is made. For example, some new insecticides are slower to control pests; although the pest stops eating immediately, limiting injury or damage to the crop.

Ultimately, more education and training are needed for growers, consultants, pest control advisors (PCAs), crop protection retailers, field reps and others influencing crop protection decisions.

---

### **Shrinking Extension/ Applied Research Support.**

Complicating the need for more agronomic and technical education and training among a wide range of audiences is the general lack of funding and support for applied agriculture science at Land-Grant universities and within the Cooperative Extension Service. The greatest potential impact, and a real threat to the integrity of the agriculture infrastructure, is the sharply reduced number of personnel, which diminishes the services once provided to growers, consultants, retailers and others. It is a primary symptom of a festering problem that goes deeper, with a range of negative implications throughout the industry.

Less value or recognition is assigned to applied research at Land-Grant institutions across the United States. According to current perceptions among workshop participants, academic credit for research is based on the number of publications in prestigious journals and the acquisition of competitive research grants. In addition, a consolidation of Extension programs, because of reduced state and federal funding, has resulted in fewer specialists by discipline, particularly in the West. And where the infrastructure interfaces with production agriculture, a system of county agents has given way to regional agents. In many states, Extension specialists not only must conduct problem-solving, adaptive research but also design and conduct extensive outreach programs to keep growers, consultants and PCAs informed of new developments.

The downward trend for adequately trained human resources, including university research and Extension

personnel, crop protection retailers, PCAs, consultants and farm advisors, is expected to continue. The vegetable sector may be one of the least-supported of the commodity groups, and this problem is compounded by the number of vegetable crops produced.

On one hand, various audiences involved in vegetable production need to be trained. On the other hand, buy-in for changing production practices must be received from a wide range of downstream audiences, as well. With limited funds funneled to public programs and away from production agriculture, research and Extension staffs are shrinking, as well as the information and education programs they traditionally managed. The crop protection industry and commodity groups will need to adopt a more significant role in the development of data and information, as well as its delivery to a wide range of audiences.

In summary, the infrastructure of agriculture - the Land-Grant university and Cooperative Extension Service - is suffering from a severe reduction in support and resources that is compromising the development and delivery of empirical data and new information. This trend shows no signs of abating. Perhaps only a food crisis would force more recognition for agriculture.

---

### **Miscellaneous challenges, issues and trends.**

**Resistance management.** Although addressed in the "Trend toward selective pesticide technologies" section earlier, cross-resistance and resistance management among insects, diseases and weeds are major issues for everyone in agriculture, not just vegetable production. Because resistance management programs need to be developed for specific cropping systems, industry must take on greater responsibility in the development of BMPs, as well as education of growers, consultants, PCAs, crop protection retailers and others.

**Use of adjuvants with pesticides.** It is a common belief that adjuvant use with pesticide applications is "all over the board -- a can of worms," according to one participant. Another noted that "with adjuvants -- when in doubt, leave them out." The bottom line is that, in some situations, adjuvants are required to gain a higher level of performance and efficacy from specific pesticides. The risk of phytotoxicity on specific crops makes the use of adjuvants a serious management decision. More research is needed by pesticide formulation, by specific vegetable crop and by environmental conditions, although specific research with new pesticide technologies indicates that adjuvants have a place and are crop-safe if used correctly.

**Distribution channel.** Profit-driven recommendations are made at the retailer level, and, in many cases, the crop protection retailer is misinformed and lacks the training required for such consultation. An example of this is recommendations for pre-mixes in pest control programs, which are contrary to Cooperative Extension philosophy. But in an environment where input prices change daily, the crop protection retailer has a heavy influence on purchase decisions.

The industry should focus on training crop protection retailers to provide correct agronomic and technical information to growers and their advisors. All too often, they are misinformed. Although pest control recommendations should be in the hands of trained and licensed entomologists, the retailer often influences decisions on the farm. This underscores a bigger issue for the industry, which is the conflict of interest retailers face by selling a particular product based on their own bias or profit motive.

**Regulatory.** Increasing regulations are recognized at all levels of the vegetable industry, including public perception-driven issues. The result is inflated costs, which affect growers' ability to compete within the United States or with foreign producers.

Maximum residue limits are an issue; tolerances of some active ingredients are set too high by some foreign markets. With changing cultural practices over the past decade, labeling issues are becoming problematic, particularly where various crop mixes are planted side by side. This creates a planning issue for the use of pesticides. Identifying crop groups on labels would be helpful to growers and their advisors.

Regulatory timeliness to obtain labels is a critical issue for the vegetable industry. One participant suggested a "super-crop-group" concept to be identified on product labels. Two problems with any changes to the regulatory process are restructuring the guidelines, which may be an insurmountable obstacle, and inadequate funding to acquire the additional data required. Consequently, the IR-4 program may become increasingly important for registering insecticides on vegetable crops.

Water shortages and contamination also will need to be considered in the future, especially regarding potential drinking water and the environment.

**Consumer perceptions.** Downstream education is needed. On the public side of the vegetable sector is a general lack of confidence among consumers about production of fresh and processed food. The general

public perceives conventional management practices employing commercial fertilizers and pesticides as unhealthy; in extreme cases, some may see the grower as an enemy. In contrast, the public perceives U.S. food production to be the safest in the world.

The *E. coli* scare in spinach and the *Salmonella* issue in tomatoes, cilantro, and jalapeno and serrano peppers in 2008 have taken the spotlight for the time being, but the attention likely will rotate back to pesticides in the future. Microbial contaminants, such as *Salmonella* and *E. coli*, are aggressively monitored in vegetables, and for good reason; these "natural pathogens" can be deadly in fresh produce. The sources of the contaminants include frogs, mice, rats, wild pigs, birds and other wildlife. To date, food safety programs have increased grower costs; but, they have not been passed on to the consumer.

Further exacerbating this situation is urban encroachment into farming areas, which makes insect management a challenge. This situation has been, and will continue to be, problematic for pest management. The selection of pesticides often is limited by urban/public interface issues.

**Farm ownership.** More prime farmland is being lost to real estate developers every year. Growers close to urban areas find that selling land for development can be much more lucrative than farming. But another concern for agriculture in the future is that more and more farmland is owned by off-farm individuals. Today, farmland is viewed as more of a commodity, which encourages investors.

**Human resources.** The reservoir of human resources in agriculture, from scientist to farm labor, not only is dwindling in number; its impact is felt in a drain of expertise from the agriculture industry. There is a general lack of knowledge in the industry about the fundamentals of insect biology, ecology and toxicology. An example of the dearth of expertise is seen in the maintenance of accreditation; PCA licenses are difficult to maintain in the West because of a shortage of classes and training programs. At the same time, too many farm operations practice "haphazard or lazy IPM" instead of knowledge-driven IPM. The lack of focus on resistance management may be but one symptom.

Knowledge-driven decision-making is supported by scientifically validated methodologies that enable accurate assessment of pest and beneficial population densities, provide interpretation with respect to economic injury level and action thresholds, and provide expert guidance on the most appropriate and effective control measures. With lazy IPM, insufficient attention or respect is paid to

assessment and interpretation of pest densities in the context of economic injury theory. Control decisions are based more on perception than on rigorously collected and evaluated data, and choices of chemical treatment too often ignore a resistance management framework.

From a labor standpoint, access to qualified workers is becoming a greater concern than ever. Exacerbating the situation is an ever-increasing scrutiny of worker safety and protection, which increases costs to the producer and, ultimately, to the consumer.

**Economics.** Keeping growers profitable is a challenge throughout the U.S. vegetable production industry. Florida growers struggle to compete with Western growers in

production costs, although this may change as transportation costs skyrocket. Transporting a trailer load of lettuce from Salinas Valley to New York, as of May 2008, cost \$10,000. Increasing transportation costs may force a restructuring of fresh fruit and vegetable production markets, making the development of local or regional BMPs even more critical to the industry.

Furthermore, the availability of generic insecticide products is increasing, and growers are more willing to use them, as input costs for fuel and fertilizer continue to soar. The impact of this trend on industry development and innovation may limit pest management choices in the future.

---

## ***Actions to be Taken***

An integrated resistance management plan is needed for *Lepidopteran* chemistries, which can be managed through the IRAC MOA number system.

- A resistance management coordinator could establish a repository and monitor protocol.
- Standardized techniques and reports would be required for participants.
- A standard, pre-commercialization baseline for pests could be established.

---

In the absence of a formalized resistance management program, a simple set of guidelines should be communicated to growers and PCAs to help defend against resistance.

**Minimize insecticide use.** Avoid preventive or prophylactic treatments with insecticides. Implement cultural (sanitation, early planting and plow-down, etc.) and conservation bio-control (refuge strips, selective insecticides) to suppress pest populations.

**Diversify insecticide use.** Avoid using the same mode of action more than once per crop season. Develop a provisional insecticide use strategy that primarily anticipates the number of treatments that may be required in all crops throughout the year. Devise a deployment schedule that minimizes overlap in modes of action while maximizing effectiveness of each insecticide application.

**Refine insecticide use.** Obtaining an understanding of the modes of action of all chemistries in the repertoire of pest managers is essential to optimal performance of treatments against pests, with minimal impact on beneficial insects. Refinement of insecticide use is a process of identifying patterns of target pest infestations in crops requiring protection, and development of sampling plans and economic thresholds for application timing. The process also incorporates eco-toxicological information regarding impact on beneficial insects to minimize collateral damage from an insecticide treatment.

---

In-can pre-mixes are strongly discouraged by entomologists. Producers should be better educated in their selection of insect management systems and the consequences of using the broad spectrum pre-mixes.

- Entomologists are concerned about active ingredient levels in the mix.
- Pre-mixes should never be used unless all components are needed.
- Pre-mixes can exacerbate resistance issues.
- Pre-mixes are confusing to growers; name recognition will be an issue.
- Pre-mixes complicate tracking of modes of action for cost-effective pest control and resistance management.

---

Industry should take a more active role in development of IPM programs and BMPs.

- Partnerships among academia, industry and commodity groups to support students and research staffs should be actively promoted.
- Support will be needed by applied university researchers in the future for more than just collecting efficacy data, such as development of thresholds and determining cost-effective and environmentally friendly use patterns for new and existing active ingredients.

---

Industry should take a more active role in developing technologies for the control of emerging pests, such as wireworms, pepper weevil and other secondary pests.

The pest control sector of the vegetable industry must be prepared for the transfer of Bt and trait technology to the marketplace.

- General education of all audiences is required.
- New pest management regimes to cost-effectively exploit emerging technologies are critical.

## Steering Committee

**Ron Mau, Ph.D.**  
Extension Entomologist  
University of Hawaii

**John Palumbo, Ph.D.**  
Research and Extension Entomologist  
University of Arizona

**Phil Stansly, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
University of Florida

## Participants

**Mohammed Bari, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
USDA – ARS  
Salinas, California

**Nilima Prahbaker-Castle, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
University of California -  
Riverside

**Steve Castle, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
USDA - ARS  
Maricopa, Arizona

**Gordon DeCou**  
Agri-Tech Services  
Bradenton, Florida

**Toby Glik**  
Entomologist  
USDA – ARS  
Salinas, California

**Ricardo Hernandez**  
Wilbur-Ellis  
Edinburgh, Texas

**Tong-Xian Liu, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
Texas AgriLife Research -  
Weslaco

**Leon Lucas**  
Glades Crop Care  
Lehigh Acres, Florida

**Ron Mau, Ph.D.**  
Extension Entomologist  
University of Hawaii

**Gene McAvoy**  
Hendry County Extension  
Specialist  
University of Florida

**Eric Natwick, Ph.D.**  
County Director &  
Entomology Advisor  
Imperial County  
Cooperative Extension

**Gregg Nuessly, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
University of Florida -  
Belle Glade

**John Palumbo, Ph.D.**  
Research and Extension  
Entomologist  
University of Arizona

**Dave Schuster, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
University of Florida -  
Wimauma

**Dakshina Seal, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
University of Florida -  
Homestead

**Alton N. Sparks, Ph.D.**  
Extension Entomologist  
University of Georgia

**Phil Stansly, Ph.D.**  
Entomologist  
University of Florida -  
Immokalee

**Nick Toscano, Ph.D.**  
Extension Entomologist  
University of California –  
Riverside

Sponsored by



Bayer (reg'd), the Bayer Cross (reg'd), Movento™, Synapse™ and Oberon® are trademarks of Bayer.

Alverde is a registered trademark of BASF Aktiengesellschaft.

Coragen is a registered trademark of E.I. DuPont de Nemours and Company.

Durivo is a trademark of Syngenta Corporation.

Dyne-Amic is a registered trademark of Helena Chemical Company.

Radiant is a trademark of Dow AgroSciences.

Rimon is a registered trademark of Makhteshim Chemical Works Ltd.

Tesoro is a trademark of Valent BioSciences Corporation.

©2008 Bayer CropScience, 2 T.W. Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709.  
Always read and follow label instructions. For additional information on Bayer products  
call toll-free 1-866-99 BAYER (1-866-992-2937) or at [www.BayerCropScienceUS.com](http://www.BayerCropScienceUS.com).

D7701 8/2008 Q5M BCSDMUC126