SUMMARY | PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE GRANT REVIEW MEETING
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
May 8, 2014
Produced by the Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento

Table of Contents

1. Attendance 1
2. Background 2
3. Discussion of Alliance Grant Proposals 4
4. Revised Rankings and Additional Discussion 10
5. Closing Remarks 12

1. Attendance

Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) Members

1. Caroline Cox, Center for Environmental Health
2. David Bakke, US Forest Service
3. Janine Hasey, University of California Cooperative Extension
4. Juli Jensen, California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association
5. Kelsey Blagan, California Cattlemen's Association (for William Thomas)
6. Laura Brown, California Citrus Mutual
7. Nicole Quinonez, Randlett Nelson Madden
8. Rebecca Sisco, UC Davis, Western Region IR-4 Program
9. Terry Gage, California Agricultural Food and Agriculture Aircraft Association

Interested Parties

10. Aimee Brooks, Western Agricultural Processors Association
11. John Steggall, California Department of Food and Agriculture
12. Kyle Lawson, Lawson and Associates
13. Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health Association (via webcast)

California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

14. Brian Leahy, Director
15. Ann Schaffner
16. Christine Uhrik
17. Doug Downie
18. Kimberly Steinmann
19. Nan Gorder
20. Mark Robertson

Facilitation Support

21. Sam Magill, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
22. Orit Kalman, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS

2. Background

Introductions and Chair's opening comments

Brian Leahy, Director of the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), welcomed Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) members. Mr. Leahy began the meeting by paying tribute to Barry Wilson, a PMAC member for ten years, who had recently passed away. Mr. Leahy introduced a new PMAC member, Laura Brown of the California Citrus Mutual. Mr. Leahy led introductions around the room, noted that the meeting was being webcast, and reminded those who joining the meeting through the Webcast to send comments and questions via email.

Background on DPR's Pest Management Alliance Grant Program

Ms. Ann Schaffner, Environmental Scientist with the Pest Management and Licensing Branch provided an overview of the Pest Management Alliance Grant program and application process and gave summaries of the seven proposals.

Key grant program milestones are as follows:

- Concepts were received by February 7, 2014
- Proposals were received by April 4, 2014
- Grants will be awarded on June 30, 2014
- Projects will begin by September 1, 2014
- Grant projects will be presented to PMAC on November 10, 2016

Proposals were evaluated based on the Alliance Grant program's priority to promote adoption of proven integrated pest management (IPM) practices that reduce pesticide use in urban or agricultural settings.

In response to the grant solicitation, DPR received and reviewed thirteen concepts. Of the thirteen concepts, seven project sponsors were invited to submit full proposals, which were reviewed by the PMAC members. Four submitted projects were related to urban pesticide use and three were agricultural. The grant program has $400,000 annually to fund two proposals, which are typically 33 months in duration. Table 1 summarizes the seven proposals that were selected for PMAC review.

Table 1: Summary of submitted Pest Management Alliance Grant proposals

Proposal	Principle Investigator	Budget
Creating Future Urban IPM Proponents and Practitioners in California through Career Development for Low Income/ At-Risk Youth	**Fernando Soriano** San Jose Conservation Corps	$200,000
Developing an IPM Program to Reduce the Exposure to Pesticides for Young Children in Family Child Care Homes in California	**Abbey Alkon** The Regents of the University of California	$197,973
Arundo, Tamarisk and Ravenna Grass IPM Outreach Program	**Christopher Gardner** Cache Creek Conservancy	$165,971
Winegrapes and Almonds: Integrating BMP Valuation and Continuous Improvement Models to Expedite Pesticide Risk Reduction	**Joseph Browde** California Sustainable Winegrowing Alliance	$212,397
Promoting Insectary Habitat and Conservation Biological Control Practices in California Crops	**Jeanette Wrysinski** Yolo County Resource Conservation District	$215,418
Education and Incentives to Reduce Pesticide Risk in Coastal San Mateo County	**Chelsea Moller** San Mateo County Resource Conservation District	$137,866
IPM Focus on Multi-Unit Housing	**Geoff Brosseau** Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association	$199,927

PMAC members reviewed and scored the seven proposals using the State Water Board's Financial Assistance Application Submittal Tool (FAAST). The review included scores for six categories: overview, adoptability, pest management, scope of work, PI and team, and budget. The FAAST raw scores were used to create rankings and to identify members' preferences among the proposals. Prior to the meeting, twelve PMAC members reviewed and scored the seven proposals. The members' numeric scores were converted to ranks, where 1 was the most highly regarded proposal and 7 was the least, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of reviewer scores for Alliance Grant proposals

Project	Rank	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	Avg	High	Low	$
Alkon UCSF—Family Child Care	1	2	2	1.5	3	4	3	3	2.5	1	7	3	2	2.83	1	7	$ 179,973
Wrysinski Yolo County—Insectary Habitat	2	3	1	3.5	1	5	2	7	2.5	6	3	1.5	3	3.21	1	7	$ 215,418
Brosseau BASMAA—Multi-Unit Housing	3	1	4	1.5	6	2	5	4	6	2	2	1.5	6	3.42	1	6	$ 199,927
Soriano San Jose—IPM Jobs	4	7	3	3.5	2	6	7	1	4.5	7	1	4	1	3.92	1	7	$ 200,000
Gardner Cache Creek—Invasive Weeds	5	5	5	6	4	1	4	6	1	4	4	5	7	4.33	1	7	$ 165,971
Browde* CSWA—Winegrapes & Almonds	6	6	7	7		3	1	2	4.5	5	6	7	4	4.77	1	7	$ 212,397
Moller San Mateo County—IPM Education	7	4	6	5	5	7	6	5	7	3	5	6	5	5.33	3	7	$ 137,866

*The blank box associated with the Browde proposal indicates a member's recusal from scoring that project due to a conflict of interest. The member was not in attendance and did not participate in the proposal re-ranking (see Table 3) during the meeting.

The following PMAC members contributed initial review scores: Anne Katten (not in attendance), Caroline Cox, Cliff Ohmart (not in attendance), Dave Tamayo (not in attendance), David Bakke, Janine Hasey, Jenny Broome (not in attendance), Laura Brown, Nicole Quinonez, Rebecca Sisco, Terry Gage, and Kelsey Blagan (for William Thomas).

The goals for the PMAC meeting are:

- Identify proposals recommended for funding
- Rank proposals in order of preference
- Identify merits and concerns for all proposals and provide feedback to PIs who may want to submit proposals in the future

Ms. Schaffner reminded members that those who represent organizations submitting proposals need not recuse from proposal review, but members that are part of the project team must. She also noted that only members who provided initial score may vote on proposals during the meeting.

Mr. Sam Magill, a facilitator from the Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento, reviewed the meeting ground rules and facilitated the proposals review discussion.

3. Discussion of Alliance Grant Proposals

The initial discussion focused on the merits and concerns that PMAC members identified when scoring each proposal. Below is a summary of PMAC members' comments for each of the seven proposals. Comments reflect individual PMAC member observations, not consensus opinions. Thus, merits and concerns may occasionally appear to be contradictory.

I. Soriano: Creating Future Urban IPM Proponents and Practitioners in California through Career Development for Low Income/At-Risk Youth

Concerns

- This proposal does not directly address Alliance Grant objectives.
- The proposal provides for job training that may not necessarily result in pesticide use reduction. Success is being measured in terms of job placement rather than pesticide management.
- This type of vocational training program could be facilitated through other venues.
- The proposal did not demonstrate a strong alliance with companies that would be hiring trainees.
- The proposal needs more of a commitment from pest control companies.
- A clarification is needed for a certification process.

Merits

- Regardless of job placement, the proposal will increase the general public's understanding and knowledge of the use of IPM methods.
- The proposal combines job training and outreach.
- The proposal outlines clear measureable goals.

II. Alkon: Developing an IPM Program to Reduce the Exposure to Pesticides for Young Children in Family Child Care Homes in California

Concerns

- This proposal overlaps with a previously reviewed green cleaning toolkit proposal.
- There is concern about the proposed toolkit's content and possible consumer product issues that may need to be addressed.
- Many of the steps that are outlined in this proposal could have been eliminated by considering past related projects. The proposed survey to identify pest management concerns is not needed given previous work.
- Although the proposal provides training to 1,500 family child care centers, only 450 of these centers will receive toolkits.
- The proposal's statements regarding organophosphate exposure are inaccurate and unnecessary.

Merits

- The audience is important.
- The proposal outlines a good alliance effort. In some proposals, the concept of an alliance and reaching out to new audiences has been lost.

- This is building on investment in this arena and moving it forward; there is a good transition in an underserved market. There is redundancy, but the survey will show improvement in implementation.

Clarification/Suggestion:

- A meeting participant asked DPR to clarify how given concerns raised by the previous Green Cleaning toolkit would be addressed by this proposal and how DPR would approach this proposal differently.

  DPR Response: For clarification, the current proposal's focus is actually on IPM rather than green cleaning. The referenced concerns were regarding a project that focused on green cleaning and had a broader scope. Secondly, DPR has thoroughly reviewed the types of materials that come out of these different projects and will direct PIs to use a broader perspective rather than focus on specific products when developing outreach materials.

III. Gardner: Arundo, Tamarisk and Ravenna Grass IPM Outreach Program

Concerns

- The proposal does not clearly identify the groups that it intends to work with.
- The proposal's assertion that it will "try" to use surveys does not demonstrate confidence in, or commitment to, project outcomes.
- The budget does not reflect the participation goal.
- The proposal lacks information on currently used methods and suggests a limited pesticide reduction of 10 percent.
- The proposed methodology is not very much different than what is currently done in the field. This is nothing new for people to adopt.
- This proposal does not meet the Alliance Grant objectives.
- The proposal did not identify possible team partners.
- The proposal did not provide sufficient information on the content of proposed workshops.
- The proposal did not provide adequate details or demonstrate need.

Merits

- The proposal addresses an underserved area.
- This proposal addresses invasive species management.

Clarification/Suggestion:

- DPR should encourage proposals that address invasive species management.

IV. Browde: Winegrapes and Almonds: Integrating BMP Valuation and Continuous Improvement Models to Expedite Pesticide Risk Reduction

Concerns

- The proposal budget is high and does not demonstrate an opportunity for significant change in pesticide use. Not sure what would be accomplished.
- The proposed Alliance team is not clearly delineated and is very general.
- The program may not be sustainable without additional grant funding. The intent of the Alliance Grants is to provide seed funding for programs that could be sustainable long term.
- The project seeks to address harder to adopt IPM practices. In the long-term, adoption would likely be addressed through the UC Cooperative Extension.
- The project is only aiming for a 10 percent increase in adoption by 400 growers. They didn't list
- Targeted pesticides and quantitative goals for reducing pesticide use are not listed in the proposal.
- The proposal does not offer a good rational for not providing a cost comparison between IPM and conventional pest management methods.
- The grant funding should support projects that focus on crops other than almonds, a crop system that often receives funding.
- The project is a continuation of several other grants, and thus does not seem very sustainable. The measures of success are unclear.

Merits

- The proposal will improve the existing model and to add an economic component.

Clarification/Suggestion:

- The proposal was submitted by SureHarvest. A PMAC member commented that the agricultural and water coalitions feel assaulted by SureHarvest because of litigation threats. Given this history, the member suggested that providing funding to SureHarvest would be inappropriate.

  DPR Response: DPR's understanding is that this issue has been resolved. Further, it is not appropriate for PMAC members to weigh this issue when considering the proposal for funding.

V. Wrysinski: Promoting Insectary Habitat and Conservation Biological Control Practices in California Crops

Concerns

- The proposal raised questions regarding project logistics. The project will look at twenty sites in five counties, but it is unclear how the sites will be monitored for increased parasitism, which requires intensive fieldwork.
- The proposed time frame is insufficient to document project success in reducing pest pressures and pesticide use.
- The proposal engages only a small percentage of growers.
- The project includes the installation of irrigation systems, which seems inappropriate considering the water shortages districts already face.
- The proposal received only one letter of commitment.
- Proposed costs for preparing progress reports are high.
- Many orchards either do not have borders or do not have space for hedgerow plantings.
- Current adoption rates are low because of costs, loss of productive land, and grower unfamiliarity with conservation biocontrol. The proposal only addresses the unfamiliarity issue and would benefit from addressing the economics and loss of productivity concerns.
- Project activities may be more appropriate for row crops than orchard crops.
- This proposal needs to include research and field data.
- The Alliance team only includes a couple of farm advisors.

  DPR comment: DPR is looking for ways to encourage partnerships between conservation and agriculture, such as the collaboration between beekeepers and almond growers to encourage habitat.
- There are concerns with the science and implementation of this proposal. The Alliance Grant is directed to implementation proposals of known IPM practices.

Merits

- The proposed methods are not used because there is insufficient research to support their effectiveness. The majority of growers use alternate methods in response to research. This proposal may be more appropriate as a Research Grant rather than an Alliance Grant.
- The proposal creates an alliance among growers and conservationists.
- The Xerces Society—part of the Management Team—is highly regarded.
- This is a different type of proposal and is conservation oriented.
- This proposal is innovative and has an interesting combination of core team members.

- This proposal follows up on a pilot project in effort to do more extensive project for the growers in the area to witness. This seems to align with the Alliance Grant objectives.
- This proposal addresses interest and needs. The relatively small investment can lead to potentially widespread effect.

Clarification/Suggestion:

- DPR may use the comments from this proposal to help define next year's Research Grant Program objectives.

VI. Moller: Education and Incentives to Reduce Pesticide Risk in Coastal San Mateo County.

Concerns

- This proposal is similar to a previous proposal for developing hedgerows.
- The proposed budget of $7,000 per household is unrealistic for widespread adoption.
- The proposal is has very limited participation with only seven residential properties.
- The proposal was very unfocused.

VII. Brosseau: IPM Focus on Multi-Unit Housing

Concerns

- The proposal is vague and is not ready for implementation.
- The proposal appears to be intending to tailor its activities after the grant is funded; the team should have determined which practices to promote beforehand.
- Economic feasibility of the project is questionable.
- The target audience is too broad.
- The project's focus appears to be on attaining total maximum daily loads and meeting discharge permit requirements rather than IPM implementation.

Merits

- The broad audience is important for the proposal. It is important to consider diverse multi-family housing and a wide range of audiences is needed in order to see positive changes.
- The proposal demonstrates a good alliance project.
- This proposal outlines an Alliance team with diverse partners including storm water representatives, pest management professionals, tenants, and building managers.
- The focus on pesticide runoff from impermeable surfaces is a critical element in improving water quality in urban watersheds.

4. Revised Rankings and Additional Discussion

Based on the discussion of the proposals, PMAC members re-ranked the seven proposals in order of preference. Results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Results of proposal re-ranking by PMAC members

Project	Rank	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	Avg	High	Low	$
Brosseau BASMAA—Multi-Unit Housing	**1**	4	1	3	3	3	1	1	2	**2.25**	1	4	$ 199,927
Alkon UCSF—Family Child Care	**2**	2	3	1	1	1	7	3	3	**2.63**	1	7	$ 179,973
Wrysinski Yolo County—Insectary Habitat	**3**	1	2	2	4	7	2	2	7	**3.38**	1	7	$ 215,418
Soriano San Jose—IPM Jobs	**4**	3	4	7	6	2	3	4	1	**3.75**	1	7	$ 200,000
Gardner Cache Creek—Invasive Weeds	**5**	5	6	4	2	6	4	5	5	**4.63**	2	6	$ 165,971
Moller San Mateo County—IPM Education	**6**	6	5	6	5	5	5	6	6	**5.50**	5	6	$ 137,866
Browde CSWA—Winegrapes & Almonds	**7**	7	7	5	7	4	6	7	4	**5.88**	4	7	$ 212,397

Additional comments on the Brosseau Proposal:

- The proposal addresses Alliance Grant objective to reach a large group of stakeholders, but it is unclear how buy-in from various stakeholders will be achieved. If the project is funded there should be an understanding of how information will reach these various stakeholders.

  DPR comment: The stormwater management agencies will be able to help address this concern.

- The proposal does not sufficiently outline the outreach efforts to architects and developers. The idea of incorporating IPM to building design is intriguing, but additional information is needed.

  DPR comment: Materials have already been developed that address IPM in building design and target architects and developers. Landscaping and building designs have begun to identify and address problems related to pesticide runoff.

- It would be ideal to fund one urban project and one agricultural project. The agricultural industry has been implementing IPM for decades and is likely further along than the urban sector. However, it would still be nice to see continued support for agricultural IPM efforts.

Additional comments on the Alkon Proposal:

- Concerns regarding content and tem member overlap between the Green Cleaning project and the Alkon proposal were restated.

Additional comments on the Wrysinski Proposal:

- This proposal needs to involve more research before its activities are widely adopted.

DPR comment: PMAC members suggest that this project is innovative, but that research, including more monitoring, is needed.

- The project could benefit from additional partnering with the UC Cooperative Extension.
- Based on the grant priorities, this proposal would not have fit last year's Research Grant priorities. It seems reasonable that the PI submitted a proposal to the Alliance Grant program.

  DPR response: The legislature has directed DPR to focus the Research Grants on soil fumigant alternatives and other high-risk pesticides issues. It is unlikely that this issue will become a priority in the next research grant cycle. However, bee health concerns and wildlife concerns are important and will require consideration of habitat conservation. Last year's Alliance Grant proposal on hedgerows was funded and will provide important information in this area.

Mr. Leahy commented that this conversation helped DPR in reviewing the proposals. DPR will continue to review the grants with PMAC's input and make a final decision in selecting proposals for funding.

At the February meeting, PMAC members commented on the proposal review process using the FAAST system. One criticism of the system was that FAAST did not provide access to proposals once the review was submitted. This issue was remedied by allowing proposals to be saved or printed. FAAST also did not allow for comparison of scores. This issue could not be remedied for this round of proposal review, but it is being investigated.

PMAC members gave the following feedback on the review process and the use of FAAST:

Positive attributes

- Receiving the full proposals in pdf format was very helpful.
- It was helpful for the members to have their review scores and comments.
- The review process improves every year.
- The FAAST system was easy to use and the YouTube webinar was helpful.

Improvements needed

- It would be helpful to receive confirmation when proposal reviews are submitted.
- Members would find it helpful to know their reviewer number on the anonymous review summary table.
- It would be helpful to have consistent proposal references between the FAAST system and the meeting for identification; the use of last names was confusing.

  DPR response: Reviewers refer to proposals differently. DPR can provide a cheat sheet that includes the name of the PI and short proposal descriptions to aid reviewers. Another option is to provide few key words about the project subject matter and a number specifying the proposal order in FAAST.

- DPR received many good proposals and the Alliance Grant program should identify additional funds to support more projects.
- The required proposal format is redundant in some sections. It may be beneficial to streamline some of the questions.

  DPR response: It is difficult to avoid some redundancy due to the multiple phases of the application process. Further, DPR wants to ensure that PIs have ample opportunities to provide all the information needed to explain their project.
- It may be helpful to break out questions in the scoring rubric categories (e.g. questions about the strength of the team and likelihood of implementation and combined into the same category. Aggregation of categories makes it difficult to review.

5. Closing Remarks

Mr. Leahy concluded the proposal review discussion by thanking PMAC members for reviewing and commenting on the proposals. DPR will advise PMAC on its final decision regarding which proposals will receive funding.

DPR staff will send PMAC members an email to solicit topics for the upcoming August meeting.

DPR is shifting its focus to the urban environment to address pesticide-related exposures and lack of education about pesticide use. Education and having licensed professionals have made the greatest difference with regard to safer pesticide use practices.

Mr. Leahy reminded PMAC members of the upcoming Soil Biology Symposium on June 17, 2014. The symposium is a partnership between the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, University of California Davis, and DPR. The California Strawberry Commission is opening a new sustainability center for research and development in San Luis Obispo.