Pest Management Alliance Grant Program 2015-2016 Solicitation

Steve Blecker
California Department of Pesticide Regulation
Pest Management and Licensing Branch
PMAC Meeting May 14, 2015

Outline

- Critical dates
- Alliance grant priorities and funding
- The proposals
- Scores and review logistics

Critical Dates

- 18 Concepts received: February 6, 2015
- 9 Proposals received: April 3, 2015

Review Period

- Grants awarded: June 30, 2015
- Project start date: September 1, 2015
- Report to PMAC 2018/19

Alliance Grant Priority

Promote the adoption of established IPM practices that reduce the use of pesticides of human health or environmental concern through the guidance of a collaborative team of knowledgeable participants known as an Alliance

The focus is outreach, research may be a minor component

Funding

$400,000 total

(grants may range from $50,000 to $400,000)

Review of Proposals

Reducing the Insecticide Runoff by Implementing the Lower Risk Urban IPM Strategies

Dong Hwan Choe

UC Riverside Department of Entomology

$171,738

Implementation of the IPM strategies to reduce the runoff of pesticides that are commonly applied for arthropod pests around structures

California Alliance for Tamarisk Biocontrol

Thomas Dudley
UC Santa Barbara
$135,185

Build a regulatory, managerial and scientific framework for the implementation of Tamarix biocontrol in California, with particular emphasis in the southern CA region

Urban Farming Pest Management Kits

Cora Garcia

City Slicker Farms

$200,000

Develop a best management practices model for IPM for urban farming in the eastern Bay Area

Completing the knowledge cycle: Deriving IPM knowledge directly from practitioners on working landscapes

Elise Gornish

UC Davis

$199,414

Conduct coordinated activities to mine knowledge from IPM practitioners on rangelands

Fresno County Pest Management Series to Educate Spanish-speaking farmers on Integrated Pest Management

Chelsi Johnston

Fresno Regional Workforce Investment Agency

$125,000

Bridge the language divide by offering a series of IPM workshops and field days in Spanish

Certification Program for California Native Landscape Professionals

Hei-ock Kim

California Native Plant Society

$261,000

Create a statewide training and certification program for maintenance gardeners and contractors that incorporates IPM

Reducing Pesticide Risk in Important California Crops

Clifford Ohmart

Collaborative Research & Designs for Agriculture dba Protected Harvest

$201,650

Increase awareness and application of the pesticide risk model Ipmprime.com

Area-wide integrated pest management program for Virginia creeper leafhoppers (*Erythroneura ziczac*) in North Coast vineyards

Houston Wilson

UC Berkeley

$191,038

Pair parasitoid introductions with an area-wide IPM program to reduce or even eliminate pesticide applications for *E. ziczac*

Promoting Insectary Habitat and Conservation Biological Control Practices in California Crops

Jeanette Wrysinski

Yolo County Resource Conservation District

$199,822

Support adoption of drought tolerant native forb and woody vegetation plantings within or adjacent to California crops to reduce dependence on insecticides

Scores

1. Overview
2. Scope of Work
3. Adoptability
4. PI and Team
5. Budget

FAA$T FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE APPLICATION SUMBITTAL TOOL

Welcome **Steve Blecker** of **Department of Pesticide Regulation**. If not your Account, please log out. Help | Logout

Questions Preview

This screen displays a **"Preview of Application/Survey Questions"** entered by the FAAST or RFP administrator. This Preview displays what the applicant /survey taker or reviewer would see while filling out the questionnaire or the review sheet.
To filter questions by funding program, please select a funding program from drop-down. The page will refresh and questions specific to the selected funding program will be displayed.

Filter by Funding Program: All

Questions Preview

Link to Solicitation: Pest Management Alliance Grant Program Solicitation NOTE: To prevent inadvertent sharing of review comments with applicants, please do NOT enter any information in the tab labeled "Review Notes." Only answer questions listed under the "Questions" Tab, where you are at present. Comments or notes may be added in the "Overall Review Comments" text box at the bottom. Be aware that all answers and comments can be viewed by all reviewers via the report options.

1. OVERVIEW

The reviewer's overall assessment of the project. Consider the following:

1.1. Is the project needed and will it provide significant benefits?
Maximum of 10 points, with 1 = poor and 10 = excellent.
Answer:
Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 1 and 10

1.2. Is the project likely to contribute to an IPM-based solution to reduce pesticide related risks?
Maximum of 10 points, with 1 = poor and 10 = excellent.
Answer:
Please do not use comma (,) and enter a number between 1 and 10

	R1	R2
Proposal 1	75	75
Proposal 2	70	77
Proposal 3	55	78
Proposal 4	40	80
Proposal 5	57	99
Proposal 6	65	90
Proposal 7	45	89

	R1	R2
Proposal 1	1	7
Proposal 2	5	6
Proposal 3	4	5
Proposal 4	7	4
Proposal 5	4	1
Proposal 6	3	2
Proposal 7	6	3

Overall Scores

RANKED SCORES

Project	Rank	R1	R2	R3	R4	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R14	R16	R17	R18	R19	Avg	High	Low	$
Wilson - vineyard	1	4	3	3	4.5	5	1	3.5	2	1	2	1.5	5	3.5	5	3	4	**3.19**	1	5	$191,038
Wrysinski - hedgerow	2	1	5	1.5	1	6.5	6	1	3	2	7	3	9	7	2.5	1	1	**3.59**	1	9	$199,822
Gorinsh - rangeland	3	5	1	7	4.5	4	2	3.5	6	3.5	4	4	1	9	1	5	3	**3.97**	1	9	$199,414
Kim - landscaper cert	4	3	6	8	2	2	3	6	4	3.5	8	7	4	1.5	6.5	8	6	**4.91**	2	8	$261,000
Johnston - Fresno ag	5	2	8.5	1.5	6.5	9	9	2	9	7	6	6	2.5	1.5	6.5	2	2	**5.06**	2	9	$125,000
Ohmart - Protected harvest	6	6	2	6	3	3	7	5	8	5	1	5	2.5	6	9	6	8	**5.16**	1	9	$201,650
Dudley - tamarisk	7	7	7	4	6.5	6.5	5	8	1	8	5	8	7	5	2.5	4	5	**5.59**	1	8	$135,185
Choe - urban ant	8	8.5	4	9	8	1	4	7	7	6	3	1.5	6	3.5	4	9	9	**5.66**	1	9	$171,738
Garcia - urban farm	9	8.5	8.5	5	9	8	8	9	5	9	9	9	8	8	8	7	7	**7.88**	5	9	$200,000

NAME: Individual Scores

(Column R7 in Aggregated Rank Table)

Questions

Projects	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	2.1	2.2	2.3	3.1	4.1	5.1	Total
Ohmart sureharvest	8.0	7.0	8.0	4.0	6.0	8.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	71.0
Gorinsh rangeland	8.0	8.0	7.0	4.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	6.0	70.0
Wrysinski hedgerow	6.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	7.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	4.0	56.0
Kim landscaper cert	8.0	8.0	7.0	3.0	8.0	8.0	7.0	10.0	8.0	6.0	73.0
Dudley tamarisk	6.0	6.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	8.0	3.0	56.0
Choe urban ant	10.0	9.0	9.0	5.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	14.0	10.0	8.0	91.0
Garcia urban farm	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	46.0
Johnston Fresno ag	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0		6.0	43.0
Wilson vineyard	7.0	5.0	7.0	3.0	6.0	7.0	5.0	8.0	6.0	4.0	58.0

Todays Goals:

- Identify the proposals PMAC feels are fundable.
- Rank those proposals in order of preference.
- Record strengths and concerns for all proposals.
- Grant Program feedback : https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1iWakoGWhU12alfijqmdznsQtuIEAhihkR2hVO2Dggb4/viewform

Recusal:

- PMAC members are not eligible to receive funds through a project unless they recuse themselves from the grant review process for that project.
- Organizations with which the committee members are associated are eligible for funding.

Folder Contents:

- Agenda
- Ground Rules
- PMAC Score totals
- Individual scores and comments
- Presentation
- Proposal Abstracts

Questions?

Thank You