

**PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

MAY 13, 2010

9:00 AM to 12:00 PM

1001 I Street, Sacramento

Sierra Hearing Room, Second Floor

**PMAC members in attendance:**

Caroline Cox, Center for Environmental Health

Robert Ehn, Western Plant Health Association

Terry Gage, CA Agricultural Aircraft Assn.

Preeti Ghuman, Calif. Assn. of Sanitation Agencies

Janine Hasey, UC Cooperative Extension

Anne Katten, CA Rural Legal Assistance Foundation

Pam Marrone, Marrone Bio Innovations, Inc.

Cliff Ohmart, SureHarvest

Rebecca Sisco, UC Davis, Western Region IR4 Program

Darren Van Steenwyk, Clark Pest Control

Mary Grisier for Cindy Wire, USEPA, Region IX

**Interested parties also in attendance:**

Charles Goodman, CA Department of Food and Agriculture

Billy Gaither, Pest Control Operators of California

DPR staff (Marshall Lee, Nita Davidson & Mark Robertson) presented background information on the Alliance grant program in general and the following summary information on the five grant applications being considered for funding.

## Alliance Grants

SUBMITTED PROPOSALS FOR 2010–11 CYCLE	
1	IPM for Subterranean Termites
	UC Berkeley
2	Bay-Friendly Approach for Urban Landscapes
	Bay-Friendly Landscaping & Gardening Coalition
3	IPM for Yard & Garden
	Tehama County Resource Conservation District
4	Pesticide-Free Park & Demo Gardens
	City of San José
5	IPM Advocates for Retail Stores
	Bay Area Stormwater Mgmt. Agencies Association

### 1. IPM FOR SUBTERRANEAN TERMITES

PI: Vernard Lewis, UC Berkeley

\$199.7K | 2 years, 3 months

Where? Northern & Southern California

#### Goals & Objectives

- Compare two termiticides:
  - ⦿ Conventional liquid applications of fipronil (Termidor®), and
  - ⦿ In-ground baiting using the Sentricon® System with noviflumuron (Recruit® IV) bait.
- Show how using baits (novafalumuron) instead of spraying (fipronil) will reduce pesticide use by at least 50%.

- Determine whether baits or sprays leach into soil around homes where they're used.
- Implement termite IPM through outreach to the public and PMP industry.
- Reduce pesticide use by  $\geq 50\%$
- Measure amounts of pesticide used for 12 houses.
- Collect & analyze water samples to detect leaching
- Outreach: surveys, workshops & curriculum for PMPs; surveys, web site, pamphlet, UC IPM Pest Note for consumers | Other products: journal articles

#### **Management Team & Partners**

Pest control company collaborators from Sacramento, Lodi, Newport Beach, Anaheim; SoCal Coastal Water Research Project | pest control companies: additional staff; SCCWRP: additional staff; UC IPM

## **2. BAY-FRIENDLY APPROACH FOR LANDSCAPES**

PI: Debi Tidd, Bay-Friendly Coalition

\$123.3K | 2 years, 8 months

Where? SF Bay Area (9 counties)

#### **Goals & Objectives**

- Expand the already piloted Bay-Friendly Landscape (BFL) program regionally:
- Reduce pesticide use by promoting a least-toxic approach toward pest management.
- Focus on weed management in urban landscapes and gardens.
- Increase demand and adoption of BFL among consumers, property managers & public agencies.
- Train landscape professionals and consumers in BFL principles.
- Track use among landscapers of herbicides + permethrin
- Get buy-in from public agencies
- Reduce herbicide use by  $\geq 50\%$
- Outreach and partnerships: Increase demand and adoption of BFL

#### **Management Team & Partners**

Bay-Friendly Coalition; IPM technical experts (county agencies); landscapers; opinion leaders | city & county agencies; water districts

### **3. TEHAMA COUNTY RCD—IPM FOR THE YARD & GARDEN**

PI: Jas O’Growney

\$130.3K | 1 year, 6 months

Where? Tehama County

#### **Goals & Objectives**

- Reduce in-home use of pesticides in Tehama County by 10% over 2 years
- Study the success of outreach efforts to inform new programs in nearby counties
- Reduce in-home use of pesticides by 10% (Encourage adoption of IPM)
- Home garden assessments
- Workshops
- Outreach—IPM displays, field guide
- Study the success of each outreach type to expand to neighboring counties

#### **Management Team & Partners**

Tehama Co. RCD; UCCE—Master Gardeners; NRCS soil conservationist; professional landscaper, public garden center | Tehama Co. RCD staff; UCCE; local garden club

### **4. CITY OF SAN JOSÉ: PESTICIDE-FREE PARK ® GUADALUPE RIVER PARK**

PI: James Downing, Sanhita Ghosal & Michele Young—City of San José

\$200K | 2 years, 9 months

Where? San José

#### **Goals & Objectives**

- Pesticide-free park:
- Focus on weed prevention & squirrel management
- Teach consumers, commercial & city landscapers IPM practices—demo & workshops
- Provide demo gardens for consumers
- Provide training for City & residential landscapers
- Publicize the project for other municipal agencies
- Train landscapers; get buy-in from public agencies

- Reduce herbicide use by  $\geq 50\%$

#### **Management Team & Partners**

City & County of San José; Guadalupe River Park Conservancy

### **5. IPM ADVOCATES FOR RETAIL STORES**

PI: Geoff Brosseau, Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA)

\$170K | 2 years, 3 months

Where? SF Bay Area

#### **Goals & Objectives**

- Improve delivery of IPM information at retail stores by educating employees & consumers
- Train & certify IPM Advocates to assist stores with product selection, displays & mentoring
- Create web page for store employees & managers, IPM Advocates
- Invent a new vocation—the IPM Advocate
- Develop a formal training curriculum & exam.
- Recruit & train Advocates
- Create an IPM Advocate program—match Advocates with stores.
- Advocates will help retailers provide IPM info to consumers—inventory selection & in-store displays
- Continue the Advocate program after the grant (Continuing Ed program)

#### **Management Team & Partners**

BASMAA and member stormwater agencies; UC IPM; retail consultant | stormwater agencies

(> 16); retail garden centers & hardware stores; pesticide distributors, California Association of Nurseries & Garden Centers

#### **PMAC deliberations:**

Before specific proposals were discussed, DPR Director Warmerdam pointed out that no agricultural proposals had been received. Committee member noted grant amounts might not be enough; \$100K/yr minimum usually needed to make it worthwhile for larger organizations. Another member noted that small grants can be useful but smaller groups lack the resources to put the proposals together. DPR staff responded that they plan to streamline the proposal process to make it easier for applicants and reviewers;

Committee recommendations regarding improvements are welcomed. Staff also noted that it might be possible to have a smaller grant program in combination with larger grants.

A general question was asked of DPR staff regarding the review and scoring process: How much weight given to how realistic expectations are? For instance, if reviewers feel a specific task item doesn't have enough budget resources dedicated to it, does that invalidate the entire proposal? DPR staff replied that this is the most difficult assessment for the reviewers. It is an assessment that's part of the scoring criteria and not just in the one category focused on achievability. In addition, it was pointed out that the scoring criteria are guidelines and the committee has the authority to analyze and weigh proposal attributes as it sees fit. However, the Committee was asked not to attempt to adjust budgets outlined in the proposals. This had not worked in past deliberations as Committee members have no way of knowing the impact of budget reductions on project goals..DPR staff will address budget issues during negotiations with project personnel. PMAC suggestions regarding inadequacies of budget elements are valuable and will be included in staff considerations.

Joseph McIntyre of Ag Innovations Network was introduced as the facilitator of the Committee's deliberation process. Director Warmerdam noted that a facilitator was being used instead of having DPR staff lead the discussion to ensure that any biases that may have emerged in DPR staff analysis would not influence the Committee's process.

PMAC member noted that the amount of funding available limited selection to two projects because even the three projects with the lowest budgets were more than total available.

DPR staff stressed that there is some flexibility. If the Committee's recommendation is that three projects are worthwhile and need consideration, DPR can be flexible in addressing projects' needs and offering partial funding to one or more projects, if the reduced funding is reasonable to assume success of the project.

One Committee member (Cliff Ohmart) noted that because he had not reviewed the proposals sufficiently, he did not feel it fair to participate in the actual voting but he would participate in the discussion.

The Committee reviewed the results of the nine PMAC members who had submitted reviewer scoring sheets, as presented here:

2010/2011 Alliance Grant Review Summary by Reviewer															
Reviewer															
Project	Grantee	Average	Rank	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	Average	Rank	\$ Requested
Implementation of Urban Subterranean Termite IPM in California	The Regents of the University of California Berkeley, Dr. Vernard Lewis	86.2	1	86	76	74	93	93	89	72	98	95	86.2	1	\$199,728
Pesticide use Reduction in California's Urban Landscapes Through Bay-Friendly Approach	Bay-Friendly Landscaping & Gardening Coalition, Debi Tidd	80.3	2	90	98	68	68	79	74	93	80	73	80.3	2	\$123,264
Integrated Pest Management for the Yard and Garden	Tehama County Resource Conservation District, Vicky Dawley	76.7	5	66	74	74	85	86	81	82	53	89	76.7	5	\$130,341
Pesticide Free Park and Demonstration Gardens at Guadalupe River Park	City of San Jose, James Downing, Sanhita Ghosal	80.3	2	88	80	75	72	75	71	85	96	81	80.3	2	\$200,000
IPM Advocates for Retail Stores	Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association, Geoff Brosseau	80.1	4	70	100	71	73	93	79	83	95	57	80.1	4	\$170,000

Facilitator and Committee decided to discuss briefly the attributes of each proposal before doing a relative ranking poll.

**PMAC comments on first proposal (Termites):**

- It doesn't seem they did sufficient outreach to producers. May be good research but not very practical.
- More of a research proposal than an Alliance proposal. Seems to substitute one chemical for another – that's not IPM.

- It is primary research, but its focus is on demonstrating effective use of reduced-risk chemicals. While it may be chemical substitution it starts from an IPM approach (monitoring and risk reduction).
- Termiticide runoff is a big problem. Great buy-in from pest management professionals (PMPs). Has potential to prove a valuable IPM approach.
- Great potential to reduce pesticide use in CA.
- Darren Van Steenwyk noted that he is involved in this project so he would recuse himself, but pointed out that business implications are real and need to be considered. Dow controls Sentricon so PMPs have to deal with Dow, which will affect extent of industry adoption after project.
- Does that mean that if bait shows equal or better results than liquid, there may be resistance from industry to adopt increased use of bait because of cost or impact on profitability?
- We need to be aware that if we demonstrate something that isn't economically practical, we may not have the results we desire.
- Like the project but without broader industry buy-in it doesn't have much chance of impact.
- Fipronil runoff a growing problem and we need to know more about alternatives (i.e., the research is needed).

Public comment:

Bill Gaither, Pest Control Operators of California (PCOC): No successful treatment for subterranean termites – chemical control needed.

Summary:

Pros:

- ✓ Strong team
- ✓ Strong research design
- ✓ Potential for pesticide reduction

Cons:

- ✓ Unknown or unpredictable economic impact on post-project adoption
- ✓ Too much of a research project

**PMAC comments on second proposal (Bay Friendly):**

- Good proposal. Embraces IPM spirit of Alliance grant. Project may get done without Alliance funding, but it's valuable and reasonable. Didn't address barriers.
- Doesn't seem to do anything new.
- Concerned that methodology for monitoring effectiveness doesn't seem realistic.
- Concerned about depth of research that went into proposal preparation. Some blanket statements made in proposal regarding risks are questionable.
- Concerned that it feels like funding for their ongoing project. Doesn't seem to have adequate resources for outreach to have the desired effect of reduction.
- If they can actually have 400 new trainees, then they could have an impact but that seems like an unrealistic jump in numbers of trainees.
- Big change in scope could lead to big jump in trainees

Summary:

Pros:

- ✓ IPM spirit
- ✓ Potential impact

Cons:

- ✓ New project or not
- ✓ Can team do it?
- ✓ Realistic?

**PMAC comments on third proposal (Tehama County RCD):**

- Not impressed with project – increase of only 10% seems low
- Enthusiastic proposal but not technically proficient. It is an underserved and under-resourced area so there is a great need there.
- 
- Well-written and partnering with Master Gardeners is a positive
- In Sacramento River watershed, which is very impacted and an important area that needs attention

Summary:

Pros:

- ✓ Location (need)
- ✓ Ties in with existing programs (model)

Cons:

- ✓ Goals are relatively low
- ✓ Technically not sophisticated

**PMAC comments on fourth proposal (San Jose):**

- Public demonstration could have broader transferrable impact to rest of state
- Use of volunteers is good
- Where are letters of participation?
- Challenge of controlling ground squirrels was addressed as a barrier
- Like the project but wonder how much reduction will there be?
- Demo garden a valuable outreach technique

Public comment:

Bill Gaither, PCOC: in a public park setting this could be very valuable potential learning for other cities

Summary:

Pros:

- ✓ High exposure in a public park
- ✓ Demonstration garden
- ✓ Transferability
- ✓ Addresses barriers
- ✓ Use of volunteers

Con:

- ✓ How much actual reduction?

### **PMAC comments re fifth proposal (Retail):**

- Seems like it could have broad impact so I want to hear from those who rated it low
- Seems very self-serving, a training proposal not an Alliance in implementing IPM
- Bulk of personnel costs is contract, not just paying someone's salary.
- Seems to just substitute one chemical for another
- But isn't goal of IPM to substitute less toxic products if they work?
- Without addressing efficacy, does it have a truly beneficial impact?
- At first I liked the sound of it, but I didn't see the buy-in from the big-box stores – good first taste but weak finish
- Nice idea but how realistic – what would motivate the advocates to do the work? – doesn't seem do-able based on the plan
- Using Our Water Our World (OWOW) is valuable and makes it transferable
- Where is the long-term sustainability?
- It does have a budget item to identify long-term strategy, but not sure it's sufficient. I think this project has potential to have the biggest impact
- I like the model – similar to Master Gardeners
- Effective strategy to influence the consumer at point-of-sale
- Advocates seemed to be knowledgeable horticulturalists, but where are they coming from, how are they getting paid?
- Questioning the efficacy of this project
- How will stores react?
- Just trying to get stores to carry range of products so they have less-toxic choices available
- If you educate the store staff, then don't we get at reduction in toxic use by consumers?
- Potential impact, but if it's not realistic, do we get the impact?
- All that sounds good but it's not in the proposal!

### **Summary:**

#### **Pros:**

- ✓ Important concept
- ✓ Uses OWOW
- ✓ Potential high impact
- ✓ Extension of Master Gardener model

#### **Cons:**

- ✓ Training not alliance
- ✓ How realistic and sustainable
- ✓ How much behavior change?

The PMAC was polled on all 5 proposals, ranking them from 1 to 5, with the following results (lower scores indicate more highly ranked projects):

2010/2011 Alliance Grant Review Summary by Reviewer														
Reviewer														
Project	Average	Rank	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	Average	Rank
Implementation of Urban Subterranean Termite IPM in California	2.8	2	3	2	5	1	5	1	5	3	1	2	2.8	2
Pesticide use Reduction in California's Urban Landscapes Through Bay-Friendly Approach	3.7	5	2	5	4	4	2	5	4	2	4	5	3.7	5
IPM Advocates for Retail Stores	2.8	2	1	4	2	2	1	4	1	4	5	4	2.8	2
Integrated Pest Management for the Yard and Garden	3.2	4	4	1	3	5	4	3	3	5	3	1	3.2	4
Pesticide Free Park and Demonstration Gardens at Guadalupe River Park	2.5	1	5	3	1	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	2.5	1

**PMAC comments on the polling focused mainly on the Retail project:**

- Concerned re high ranking of Retail project – it doesn’t seem like an Alliance project
- It develops a program that can be replicable
- I thought it read well and if implemented successfully could have desired impact but I wonder how realistic and sustainable
- The OWOW model builds a relationship and an alliance, so I think it does meet the Alliance goal
- But that doesn’t come through in the proposal
- Both the Retail and the Termite proposals are highly ranked but they lack the business implementation aspects
- Using OWOW and IPM materials to transfer to a new population – a desired goal

Facilitator reminded Committee that we’re seeking a decision with advisement to DPR, not necessarily a consensus agreement.

Facilitator asked and Committee agreed to drop the lowest-ranked proposal from the polling (Bay Friendly).

The PMAC was polled on remaining 4 proposals, ranking them from 1 to 3 only, with the following results (higher score indicates more highly ranked project. In this ranking projects earned points in inverse relation to their ranks: projects ranked 1 received 3 points, 2 received 2 points, 1 received 1 point, 0 rank received no points. The total points were divided by 10 to normalize for the number of reviewers.):

2010/2011 Alliance Grant Review Summary by Reviewer														
Reviewer														
Project	Average	Rank	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	Average	Rank
Implementation of Urban Subterranean Termite IPM in California	0.9	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0.9	4
IPM Advocates for Retail Stores	1.5	2	0	1	0	3	1	1	1	2	0	0	1.5	2

Integrated Pest Management for the Yard and Garden	1.4	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	0	3	1	2	1.4	3
Pesticide Free Park and Demonstration Gardens at Guadalupe River Park	2.1	1	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	1	2.1	1

**PMAC comments on the second round of polling**

- Suggest we give these results to DPR and let staff decide with our additional written comments
- Recommend that we drop the lowest-ranked one here (Termites) and ask DPR to decide on fully funding 2 or partially fund the other 3
- DPR reiterated that they have experience with working with applicants to adjust budgets and partially fund proposals
- Q: Can we go back to Retail and ask them to adjust the proposal to address their deficit? A: Contracting and RFP requirements limit ability to do that
- Committee agreed to drop lowest-ranked remaining proposal (Termites) from further consideration
- Do we fully fund #1 and only one of 2 or 3, or partially fund one or more of all of them?
- DPR has heard our input, let staff decide among relative amounts for all three

**Unanimous approval of this final position.**

**Committee comments on the decision process:**

- Much better process than the past subcommittee process
- Didn't feel that initial review at beginning of meeting was needed
- Liked the review, it was a good refresher
- Q: Can we have applicants here to answer questions? A: Not allowed
- Much better process than the former that felt like a rubber stamp
- Preference is to have the staff do the initial weeding process instead of having subcommittees work on all of them
- Pre-screening a service to the applicants because they don't have to all develop full proposals
- Appreciate summary of proposals from DPR staff at beginning of meeting and appreciate winnowing by DPR staff
- Drawback is that if reviewers are not present at decision meeting then their input is somewhat diminished