United States Department of Agriculture
NRCS Natural Resources Conservation Service

Integrated Pest Management (IPM)

Georgia

Conservation Practice Job Sheet – 595 (5/12)

Producer _____ County _____ Date_____

Farm # _____ Tract # _____ Assisted By _____

Definition
A site-specific combination of pest prevention, avoidance, monitoring and suppression strategies

Purposes The purposes of this practice only include mitigation and prevention even though IPM includes monitoring and suppression.

Identify one or more purpose listed below:

- **Prevent or mitigate** off-site pesticide risks to water quality from leaching, solution runoff and adsorbed runoff losses

- **Prevent or mitigate** off-site pesticide risks to soil, water, air, plants, animals and humans from drift and volatilization losses

- **Prevent or mitigate** on-site pesticide risks to pollinators and other beneficial species through direct contact
- **Prevent or mitigate** cultural, mechanical and biological pest suppression risks to soil, water, air, plants, animals and humans

Conditions where the practice applies
On all lands where pests will be managed

Conservation Management System
Normally, a single conservation practice does not successfully addresses a resource concern. Implement a conservation management system which is a combination of conservation practices and techniques that achieve the desired level of treatment for our soil, water, air, energy, plant and animal resources.

General Information
Conservation planners should be working with extension agents and other cooperators who develop IPM plans

Practice Lifespan 1 year

For More Information Contact your local NRCS Office and Soil and Water Conservation District

Prevention and mitigation of risks to water quality and other resource concerns

A. Procedure. As mentioned above, conservation planners evaluate potential risks and plan the application of mitigation practices with input from cooperators and producers.

1. The planning process. The potential risk for all resource concerns requires the conservation planner to evaluate the potential effect on the natural resource concern during the planning process. This is especially important for the risks addressed outside the WIN-PST analysis.

2. Mitigation of potential risks. Conservation planners have two options for documenting the implementation of this practice. First, evaluate the resource concerns by using the procedure outlined below and document the results in Table 1. Alternatively, independently acquire the capacity to use the 595 IPM Excel jobsheet. Instructions for use are provided in the software.

   Mitigate WIN-PST hazard rating values by selecting mitigation values from existing and planned IPM techniques (Agronomy Technical Note No. 5) for each active ingredient. Address a hazard value of 20 or more when humans or fish are threatened by any resource concern/pathway for a specific soil combination (WIN-PST interaction report).

   The potential of an active ingredient for drift, negative effect on pollinators and volatization can be obtained from the product label (http://www.greenbook.net/). Mitigation for drift, volatilization and direct contact to pollinators is not made with WIN-PST hazard ratings.

   - If drift is a concern, mitigate by applying relevant practices or techniques to obtain an index value score of at 20 or more from Tables 1 and 2, Agronomy Technical Note No. 5.

   - Address any level of potential hazard by volatilization and effect on pollinators by applying the at least one and two techniques listed on pg. 6 of Agronomy Technical Note No. 5, respectively. Mitigation values for these potential techniques can be obtained by using the information from the IPM (595) Practice Appendix 1 to look up the values for the techniques in the tables of the Technical Note No. 5. Many of these techniques involve replacing an active ingredient/pesticide (noted as currently not using). Document the change in the products in Table 2 and evaluate the potential hazards of using the replacement product.

Operation and Maintenance (Georgia IPM Standard October 2011)

The IPM plan shall include appropriate operation and maintenance items for the client. These may include:

- Review and update the plan periodically in order to incorporate new IPM strategies, respond to cropping system and pest complex changes, and avoid the development of pest resistance (Table 2)
- Maintain mitigation techniques identified in the plan in order to ensure continued effectiveness
- Calibrate application equipment according to Extension and/or manufacturer recommendations before each season of use and with each major chemical change

  http://www.caes.uga.edu/publications/pubDetail.cfm?pk_id=6348
- Maintain records of pest management for at least two years. Pesticide application records shall be in accordance with USDA Agricultural Marketing Service's Pesticide Recording Keeping Program and site specific requirements

  http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/ams.fetchTemplateData.do?template=TemplateQ&navID=PesticideRecordkeepingProgram&rightNav1=PesticideRecordkeepingProgram&topNav=&leftNav=ScienceandLaboratories&page=PesticideRecordkeepingProgram&resultType=

Table 1. Mitigate WIN-PST hazard rating values of 20 or more by selecting mitigation values from WIN-PST interaction Report for existing and planned IPM techniques (Agron. Tech. Note No. 5) for each active ingredient. Mitigation for drift, volatilization and direct contact to pollinators is made independent of the WIN-PST hazard ratings as described in the tables and footnotes.

Active ingredient _____

Resource Concern/Pathway WIN-PST	Hazard Rating Value	Mitigation Value for Existing/Planned IPM Techniques
Human – leaching (ILP)		
Human – solution runoff (ISRP)		
Fish - leaching (ILP)		
Fish - solution runoff (ISRP)		
Fish - adsorbed runoff (IARP)		
Pollinators - direct contact [1]	NA	Two techniques
Air quality-volatile organic compounds (VOC)[1]	NA	One technique
Any resource [2] – Drift	20	

[1] Mitigate with existing/planned techniques described in the Georgia IPM (595) Practice Appendix 1 and mitigation index values from Table 1 Agronomy Tech. Note No. 5

[2] If conservation planner identifies vulnerable crops, insects, humans, etc., note the resource concern and mitigate an index score of 20 with existing/planned techniques and practices in Tables 1 and 2 Agronomy Tech. Note No. 5

Table 1. Mitigate WIN-PST hazard rating values of 20 or more by selecting mitigation values from WIN-PST interaction Report for existing and planned IPM techniques (Agron. Tech. Note No. 5) for each active ingredient. Mitigation for drift, volatilization and direct contact to pollinators is made independent of the WIN-PST hazard ratings as described in the tables and footnotes.

Active ingredient _____

Resource Concern/Pathway WIN-PST	Hazard Rating Value	Mitigation Value for Existing/Planned IPM Techniques
Human – leaching (ILP)		
Human – solution runoff (ISRP)		
Fish - leaching (ILP)		
Fish - solution runoff (ISRP)		
Fish - adsorbed runoff (IARP)		
Pollinators - direct contact [1]	NA	Two techniques
Air quality-volatile organic compounds (VOC)[1]	NA	One technique
Any resource [2] – Drift	20	

[1] Mitigate with existing/planned techniques described in the Georgia IPM (595) Practice Appendix 1 and mitigation index values from Table 1 Agronomy Tech. Note No. 5

[2] If conservation planner identifies vulnerable crops, insects, humans, etc., note the resource concern and mitigate an index score of 20 with existing/planned techniques and practices in Tables 1 and 2 Agronomy Tech. Note No. 5

Jobsheet Certifications

Prepared by

_____**Title**_____**Date**_____

Approved by

_____**Title**_____**Date**_____

Installation Meets NRCS Standards and Specifications

Certified by

_____**Title**_____**Date**_____

Table 2. Review of IPM plan

Date	IPM Notes