

SUMMARY | PEST MANAGEMENT ALLIANCE GRANT REVIEW MEETING

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

May 8, 2025

Produced by the CSU Sacramento College of Continuing Education

Contents

1. Attendance.....	2
2. Opening Comments and Background	3
3. Alliance Grant Proposal Overview	3
4. Alliance Grant Proposal Discussion.....	8
Eskalen - Grapevine IPM	8
Baumgartner – Small Farm Resources.....	9
Taravati – IPM for Low-Income Housing	10
Burger – Roadside Weed IPM	11
Siemer – IPM in Lassen County.....	12
Rugman-Jones – SIT for ACP	13
Dakin – Pollinator Partnership.....	15
Ibrahim – Healthy Homes in South Los Angeles.....	16
Baer-Imhoof – IPM for Beekeeping	17
Dietrick – Backyard Citrus	18
Choe – Structural Wood IPM	19
Taravati – XR Tech for Training.....	20
Zumkeller – Precision Weed Control	21
Pan – Smart Probes.....	22
Weise – Contra Costa RCD	23
Wright – SPM Training	24
Gort – Laguna Beach EDRR	25
Schloemann – Shot Hole Borer Pilot Project	27
Berry – Sanitation Trainings.....	29
5. Decision on Recommendations	30
6. Closing Remarks	32

Attendance

Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) Members

1. Brenna Aegerter, UC Cooperative Extension
2. Whitney Brim-DeForest, UC Cooperative Extension
3. Greg Browne, USDA Agricultural Research Service
4. Patrick Dosier, California Association of Pest Control Advisers
5. Jonathan Evans, Center for Biological Diversity
6. James Farrar, Director, UC Statewide IPM Program (Ex Officio)
7. Terry Gage, California Agricultural Aircraft Association
8. Jessica Gonzalez, California Certified Organic Farmers
9. Brian Gress, California Department of Food and Agriculture (Ex Officio)
10. Elizabeth Henry, Pro Farm Group, Inc.
11. Hanna Kahl, Community Alliance with Family Farmers
12. Amalia Bernardo Martinez, Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueño
13. Alison Laslett, Santa Barbara Vintners
14. Gabriele Ludwig, Almond Board of California
15. Nick Lupien, California Association of Pest Control Advisers
16. Eric Stein, Western Plant Health Association
17. Margaret Reeves, Pesticide Action Network North America
18. Bill Turechek, California Strawberry Commission
19. Efrain Velasco, California Pest Management Association
20. Karey Windbiel-Rojas, UC Statewide IPM Program

California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

21. Dr. Karen Morrison
22. Dr. Sapna Thottathil
23. Aimee Norman
24. Dr. Tory Vizenor
25. Dr. Matt Fossen
26. Baljot Biring
27. Dr. Andy Viet Nguyen
28. Jordan Weibel
29. Hannah Ferguson
30. Sean Detwiler
31. Shannon Mooney
32. Kurt Hildebrandt
33. Peggy Vargas-Paranial

Facilitation Support, CSU Sacramento

34. Ariel Ambruster
35. Corin Choppin

Opening Comments and Background

Introductions and Opening Comments

Karen Morrison, Director, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) welcomed everyone and thanked Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) members for their time.

Dr. Morrison recognized two outgoing PMAC members for their years of service:

- Sarait Martinez, who represented the Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueño as Anne Katten's alternate
- Jimena Diaz Leiva, who represented the Center for Environmental Health

Dr. Morrison welcomed two new committee members to the PMAC:

- Amalia Bernardo Martinez, who is filling Sarait Martinez's vacancy as Anne Katten's alternate and is representing the Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueño
- Chris Flores, who is filling Humberto Izquierdo's vacancy as the primary representative for the California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association

Sapna Thottathil, Deputy Director, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) shared two department-related announcements with PMAC members.

- On April 8th, 2025, DPR hosted a Pesticide Prioritization Workshop to facilitate the sharing of information around DPR's work to characterize pesticide risk and develop mitigation in a public and accountable way. The workshop also covered DPR's proposed approach towards developing a new advisory committee that will focus on prioritization. Public comments on the information presented during the Pesticide Prioritization Workshop were accepted through May 8th, 2025, and will inform next steps for continuing this work.
- DPR has released draft documents outlining the formation and role of a new Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, and is accepting public feedback around the committee's scope of work and membership criteria through May 15th, 2025.

Public comments and questions would be taken after each proposal item, in the room, via email to PMAC@cdpr.ca.gov for those watching the meeting by webcast, and by raised hand on Zoom in the webinar.

Alliance Grant Proposal Overview

Dr. Andy Viet Nguyen, DPR's Integrated Pest Management Branch (IPM) Alliance Grants Program Lead, highlighted the Alliance Grant proposal focus of the meeting. He then shared updates regarding the 2025 Alliance Grants Program. He indicated there is \$1.9 million in funding available, and that there will be a shared funding pool between the Alliance and Research Grants programs. He shared six priority topic areas for the Alliance Grants:

1. IPM for underserved or disadvantaged communities
2. Decreasing the use of pesticides of high regulatory interest
3. Advancement of urban IPM and safer, more sustainable pest management tools and strategies in urban settings
4. Advancement of IPM and safer, more sustainable pest management tools and strategies in agricultural settings adjacent to or near a school(s)
5. Meeting the IPM needs of small growers; and/or
6. Alignment with two or more of the three sustainability pillars from the Sustainable Pest Management (SPM) Roadmap:
 - a. Human Health and Social Equity
 - b. Environmental Protections
 - c. Economic Vitality

Dr. Nguyen announced 27 total submissions for the Alliance Grant program this year with a total funding request of \$7,975,296. After initial screening of the applications, DPR staff disqualified 8 of the proposals, and moved 19 of the proposals to full review.

Dr. Nguyen noted that there was a high quantity of applications received for both the Research and Alliance Grant program this year. This trend is expected to continue in future years as grant funding increases. He reported that changes will be made to the review process to address the significant proposal review workload for PMAC members caused by the quantity of proposals and the short length of the time during which PMAC members had the opportunity to review them. Changes to the review process will be discussed further at the next meeting of the PMAC in August 2025.

Dr. Nguyen informed attendees that the application period for the 2026 DPR Grants Program will open in the summer of 2025. The 2026 grants cycle is expected to have \$4.9 million in available funding. Starting in the 2026 grants cycle, DPR plans to combine the Research and Alliance Grants program into a single grants Program.

A PMAC member asked whether in August DPR would gather feedback from the PMAC or inform the committee around review process changes for the 2026 grants cycle. Dr. Thottathill said both would occur. She clarified that, because the next solicitation period will begin in the summer of 2025, some of the process changes will need to be implemented before the next meeting of the PMAC. However, DPR definitely wants PMAC feedback. The goal is to continue working with the PMAC in a more strategic and efficient way, given that the volume of proposals is expected to continue growing.

Dr. Nguyen noted that the Legislature passed AB 2113 in the summer of 2024, which enshrined the definitions of both IPM and SPM in the Food and Agriculture Code.

2025-2026 Alliance Grant Summary of Proposals

Proposal Short and Full Title	Principal Investigator	Budget
Eskalen - Grapevine IPM Promoting Effective Integrated Pest Management Practices for the Control of Grapevine Trunk Diseases	Dr. Akif Eskalen	\$114,205
Taravati (IPM) - IPM for Low-Income Housing Bridging the Gap in IPM Training for Low-Income Housing	Dr. Siavash Taravati	\$272,879
Burger - Roadside Weed IPM New Trainings and Online Resources to Improve Weed Management Practices Along Roadsides and Other Non-Crop Environments	Dr. Jutta Burger	\$206,662
Siemer - IPM in Lassen County Mulching, Educating, and Grazing – Oh My! An Integrated and Sustainable Approach for Solving Pest Management Problems in Lassen County, California	Ms. Kelsey Seimer	\$386,925
Choe - Structural Wood IPM Reinventing Integrated Pest Management System for Wood Destroying Insects	Dr. Dong-Hwan Choe	\$306,283
Baumgartner - Small Farm Resources Empowering Small and Latino Farmers with Resources to Enhance Pest Management through Biodiversity Practices	Ms. Jo Ann Baumgartner	\$316,657
Zumkeller - Precision Weed Control Demonstration and Development of Best Management Practices for Precision Weed Control in a Dual Sprayer System to Reduce Herbicide Use in San Joaquin County Vineyards	Ms. Maria Zumkeller	\$61,665
Ibrahim - Healthy Homes in South LA Advancing Healthy Homes in South Los Angeles	Ms. Nancy Halpern Ibrahim	\$400,000
Rugman-Jones - SIT for ACP Pilot Program to Evaluate the Feasibility of Using the Sterile Insect Technique to Control the Asian Citrus Psyllid in Residential Areas of Southern California	Dr. Paul Rugman-Jones	\$399,953
Dakin - Pollinator IPM Reinventing Integrated Pest Management System for Wood Destroying Insects	Mr. Miles Dakin	\$375,626

Proposal Short and Full Title	Principal Investigator	Budget
Baer-Imhoof - IPM for Beekeeping Empowering Disadvantaged and Underserved Communities: Promoting Integrated Pest Management in Gardening and Beekeeping	Dr. Barbara Baer-Imhoof	\$372,171
Dietrick - Backyard Citrus Healthy Backyard Citrus Program	Ms. Jan Dietrick	\$388,216
Taravati (XR) - XR Tech for Training Demonstrating Pest Control Workforce Development Using Extended Reality (XR) Training	Dr. Siavash Taravati	\$313,698
Weise - Urban Ag IPM Urban Agriculture Integrated Pest Management Educational Workshop, Planning, and Implementation	Mr. Ben Weise	\$343,441
Wright - SPM Training Introductory Class on Sustainable Pest Management with a Needs Assessment and Feasibility. Survey to Give a Model Design for Future Longer Term a Job Training Program	Ms. Holly Wright	\$59,025
Pan - Smart Probes Expansion of Smart Probe Technology Utilization for Reducing Pesticide Use and Risks in Human and Environmental Health	Dr. Zhongli Pan	\$356,274
Berry - Sanitation Trainings Sanitation Training for Sustainable Pest Management in Affordable Housing: Empowering Residents with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities	Mr. Roland Berry	\$240,886
Gort - Laguna Beach EDRR Laguna Beach Early Detection Rapid Response Network	Mr. Christopher Gort	\$228,003
Schloemann - Shot Hole Borer Pilot Project Invasive Shot Hole Borer Response Pilot Program for the City of San Jose	Ms. Kallie Schloemann	\$399,300

Seventeen PMAC members reviewed proposals ahead of the meeting and submitted ranks. Dr. Nguyen shared that initial ranking, as presented in the following chart, shown in ranked order.

2025 Alliance Grants Program Initial PMAC Proposal Rankings (average of 17 rankers)

Principal Investigator	Project Short Title	Pre-Meeting Rank	Average Rank	Standard Deviation	High	Low
Eskalen	Grapevine IPM	1	5.47	4.75	1	17
Baumgartner	Small Farm Resources	2	6.13	4.81	1	16
Taravati (IPM)	IPM for Low-Income Housing	3	6.47	4.79	1	16
Burger	Roadside Weed IPM	4	7.06	5.21	1	16
Siemer	IPM in Lassen County	5	7.16	4.37	1	13
Dakin	Pollinator IPM	6	8.27	4.82	2	18
Rugman-Jones	SIT for ACP	7	8.44	4.63	3	18
Ibrahim	Healthy Homes in South LA	8	9.18	4.57	2	19
Dietrick	Backyard Citrus	9	9.24	4.58	2	17
Baer-Imhoof	IPM for Beekeeping	10	9.32	5.60	2	19
Choe	Structural Wood IPM	11	9.47	5.91	1	19
Taravati (XR)	XR Tech for Training	12	9.97	4.09	3	18
Zumkeller	Precision Weed Control	13	10.35	5.14	2	19
Pan	Smart Probes	14	10.44	4.15	4	19
Weise	Urban Ag IPM	15	11.24	4.54	3	18
Wright	SPM Training	16	12.71	4.50	4	18
Gort	Laguna Beach EDRR	17	13.12	4.21	6	19
Schloemann	Shot Hole Borer Pilot Project	18	13.41	3.82	4	19
Berry	Sanitation Trainings	19	14.38	4.80	3	19

Quorum Count

Aimee Norman, DPR IPM Branch Chief, conducted a verbal roll call to verify PMAC member attendance achieved quorum, in accordance with the state's Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. Ms. Norman reminded PMAC members of their legal obligation to disclose any conflicts of interest and initiate recusal as appropriate. Ms. Norman announced that DPR had been notified in advance of the meeting of the following PMAC member conflicts of interest or recusals:

- Jim Farrar recused from the Burger, Choe, Dakin, Siemer and both Taravati proposals due to having working relationships with PIs and named personnel
- Karey Windbiel-Rojas recused from the Choe and the Taravati (IPM for Low-Income Housing) proposals due to being listed as unpaid key personnel for those projects
- Siavash Taravati recused from ranking and discussing all proposals as the submitter of two proposals

In addition, during consideration of the proposals, the following recusals were made:

- Hanna Kahl recused from the Baumgartner and Dakin proposals

Ms. Norman noted that four PMAC members were being represented by their alternates:

- Sapna Thottathil for DPR Director Karen Morrison
- Amalia Bernardo Martinez for Anne Katten
- Brian Gress for Karen Ross
- Eric Stein for Renee Pinel

Ms. Norman noted that Ex Officio members do not count toward quorum and affirmed that a minimum of 13 for quorum had been attained. See above for the attendance list. Ms. Norman notified members that DPR is required to monitor and maintain quorum during the meeting and that members should notify DPR of the need to leave the meeting or be off video for more than five minutes.

Alliance Grant Proposal Discussion

The facilitator, Ariel Ambruster from California State University, Sacramento, outlined the process for proposal review and led PMAC members in a discussion on whether there was an obvious bright line separating out proposals they would recommend not funding, to help focus their time that day on the more highly rated proposals. She reported that, given the large number of proposals before the PMAC, DPR staff had suggested to PMAC a line below the **Weise proposal, 15th** out of 19 proposals. The PMAC would still briefly review the last 4 proposals. The PMAC agreed with DPR's suggested bright line.

Discussion of Proposals

PMAC members discussed the merits, concerns, and areas needing clarification for each project proposal, in the order of their initial ranking. Below is a summary of PMAC members' comments for each proposal. Comments reflect individual PMAC member observations, not consensus opinions. Thus, merits and concerns may occasionally appear to be contradictory.

Eskalen - Grapevine IPM

Merits

- The proposal's budget seems reasonable.
- The proposal is focused on managing an important disease that affects grapes.
- The proposal focuses on increasing adoption of preventive practices that are already known to work.
- The economic benefits of preventative measures such as those described in the proposal are well documented.
- There is a strong team of specialists, grape advisors, and the Lodi Winegrape Commission behind the proposal.
- The proposal is well written, well researched and clear in what it's proposing.
- The proposal leveraged and built upon preexisting knowledge about trunk diseases.
- The proposal addresses challenges that have made it difficult for preventive approaches to be applied effectively.

Concerns

- To be effective, preventive practices have to be utilized years before the symptoms of trunk disease appear. This can be difficult for people to think that far in the future when they are doing their management practices.
- The proposal takes an ecological approach, but there wasn't any mention of plant health or soil nutrient management with respect to ensuring plant health and resistance.
 - In response to the concern about plant health and soil nutrient management, a PMAC member noted that, because of their long-term nature, the diseases which the proposal focuses on can't be easily controlled through soil health management.
- The letters of support were all from the year 2022, which was some time ago.
- Some letters of support mentioned bacterial endophyte applications, but there was no mention of that in the proposal itself.
 - In response to this concern, another PMAC member said that the microbial elements are registered in the proposal.
- The proposal currently lacks a commercialized component, which prevented estimates from being provided in the economic cost-benefit analyses.
- The proposal mentions surveying attendees, but doesn't elaborate on the questions that will be asked in the survey.
- Ideally, there would be more indicators to measure than just attendance.
- The proposal highlights nurseries as a key site for potential infection, but doesn't focus on nurseries in the outreach component.
- The proposal seems specifically focused on productivity and grower profitability. It's not clear how the proposal ties into impacts on human health or social equity.

Points of Clarification

- How will the surveying component mentioned in the proposal be used to measure success?

Public Comment

- None.

Baumgartner – Small Farm Resources

Merits

- The establishment of habitat aligns very closely with the SPM roadmap.
- Working with Latino farmers and producing bilingual training materials meets some of the SPM requirements.
- A very experienced team with strong relationships in the Salinas Valley and Santa Cruz areas and working partnerships with growers is behind the proposal.
- The proposal offers an effective model for farmer-to-farmer learning.
- This proposal addresses the social need to support the education of those farm workers who move into becoming farmers themselves.
- The proposal's Spanish-language guide materials would be very useful.

Concerns

- The letters of support were all from participants in the project.
- The proposal's budget seems expensive relative to the amount of outreach events they aim to conduct.
- Why is the applicant paying growers to attend outreach events?
- The proposal includes plans for a demonstration plot in the last year of the project. However, it would take multiple years to demonstrate the impacts that the soil health methods described in the proposal could have on the ecosystem of a farm. It's unclear what value a demonstration plot will add to the project if it's only implemented in the final year.
- The sentiments expressed in the letters of support were repetitive of one another.
- A concern was expressed about how the project's budget was lined out.
- The proposal covers a timespan of three years, but only includes plans for four field days.
- The proposal lacked detail around how growers would be engaged in the demonstration plots, or about how the demonstration plots would be maintained or utilized for educational purposes.
- The proposal did not feature sufficient information about how the demonstrations mentioned would be conducted.
- It was difficult to identify the resources allotted for the demonstration plots in the proposal's budget.
- The proposal's budget is limited in scope, with few participants.
- The proposal plans to pay honorariums to speakers who participate in outreach events, and that may entail compensating members of the project's team who are already receiving salaries as subcontractors.
- The proposal lacked detail around what practical information would be conveyed through the field days and farm tours.
- The proposal's farm tours overlap with the field days.
- It's unclear what tangible benefits the proposal will produce if it receives funding.

Points of Clarification

- A PMAC member asked whether the ideas mentioned in the proposal have been tested already.

Public Comment

- None.

Taravati – IPM for Low-Income Housing

Merits

- The proposal directly addresses human health and social equity issues.
- The proposal focuses on reduced risk pesticides, which aligns with the goals of the SPM pillars.
- The proposal is to compile preexisting information into outreach materials in order to better reach residents of low-income housing.

- The letters of support were good.
- The proposal was well written.
- The team behind the proposal is very experienced.
- The proposal features effective usage of citations and figures.
- The letters of support were differentiated from letters of commitment so that the letters that were submitted by members of the project team were easily identifiable.
- The proposal includes a list of affected pesticides.
- The proposal is focused on high-risk pesticides that are important targets for risk reduction.
- The proposal detailed the success metrics that would be used before and after evaluations.
- There was good pest control provider representation in the letters of support.

Concerns

- The Pls plan to collaborate with partners from Cornell and Hawaii when there are many qualified potential partners within California.
- No pest control companies are engaged in the proposal.
- A PMAC member was concerned that the educational methods outlined in the proposal, such as Zoom meetings and brochures, would not be effective in instructing the target populations. For example, the staff in group homes are best trained through in-person instruction because of the type of work they're engaged in, and the aforementioned educational tools are not likely to be effective for that population.
- There is a bang-for-the-buck issue with several of these proposals, the cost to impact a relatively small amount of housing units.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Burger – Roadside Weed IPM

Merits

- Roadside weed control is extremely important for wildfire mitigation.
- This proposal helps fill an important gap regarding the communication of scientific information to actual practitioners.
- The proposal focuses on disadvantaged communities.
- The proposal's alliance team is very diverse.
- The proposal targets 200 trainees and one thousand post-surveys.
- The proposal is building on the WeedCUT decision tool.
- The proposal's focus on working alongside parks and roadsides is important and will benefit the general population.
- The proposal would train people who can train others to maximize the project's outreach and impact.

- The proposal features a detailed outreach plan which clearly outlines the steps the project team will take each year.
- The proposal identifies clear metrics of success.
- The outreach plan very clearly lays out the activities.

Concerns

- The proposal's title is centered around outreach, but the bulk of the project is focused on updating and improving the WeedCUT tool, which gives the impression that the training aspect is secondary.
- The proposal's outreach plan lacks clarity around how it would reach the populations the PIs are targeting.
- It's unclear how the proposal will reduce the need for pesticides.
- What the proposal calls IPM is not ecologically-based pest management.
 - A PMAC member responded that effective weed IPM involves ensuring pesticides are properly applied, especially in roadside weed control.
- The proposal's team features a good array of agencies, but lacks community partners.
- The proposal did not feature any discussion of non-pesticide methods except mowing.
 - In response, a PMAC member noted that the WeedCUT tool includes many non-chemical approaches to weed control, such as mowing, trimming and flaming.
- The proposal's plan for five in-person trainings does not seem sufficient.
- The proposal lacked a list of affected pesticides.
 - In response, another PMAC member said they had seen a list of pesticides in the application.
- The proposal does not clearly outline the personnel time needed for the project.
- The barriers towards adoption were not discussed in the proposal.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Siemer – IPM in Lassen County

Merits

- Liked the proposal's focus on sustainable approaches for dealing with different types of pests, and outreach, and identification.
- Lassen County was the area most affected by the Dixie Fire, and there is an important need for future vegetation and fire management in the area as the forest regrows.
- The proposal targets a community which has been greatly adversely impacted and economically disadvantaged, which aligns with the pillars of the SPM strategy.
- The proposal features promising approaches toward dealing with weed management in a sustainable way.
- The application includes strong letters of support.

- The project's focus on alternative weed control methods that have been proven to be effective.
- The project addresses multiple issues in one comprehensive proposal.
- The concept of offering vouchers for replacement plants as part of the Purge the Spurge campaign is creative and practical.
- This seemed like the PIs have authentic partnerships to serve disadvantaged communities, which could result in success.
- The proposal features a detailed outreach plan.
- The project would utilize felled and burned trees for its purposes.
- The proposal plans to involve multiple schools, cooperatives, fire councils and tribal groups in its community-based approach.
- There is an impressive alliance behind the proposal.
- The project should result in improved control of two serious weed problems and control of vegetation in post-fire areas with reduced herbicide use.
- The alliance members seem qualified to conduct effective outreach.

Concerns

- The proposal is focused on one local area; a PMAC member said they would like more details around how the work could be broadened to apply to other parts of California.
- The project's budget seems expensive.
- The puncture vine and grazing components of the proposal are about demonstrating that those approaches can help manage weed issues, but the project's home garden component just involves paying residents to remove invasives instead of trialing a new approach and learning from it.
- Funding this proposal would help pest management efforts at a local level in Lassen County, but seems unlikely to generate new methods or approaches.
- The grazing component of the project is very expensive.
- The proposal lacked a cost-benefit analysis of using grazing methods instead of utilizing pesticides.
- The team behind the proposal doesn't include any experts in grazing, even though evaluating grazing and the impacts of grazing after a wildfire is a significant component of the project.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Rugman-Jones – SIT for ACP

Merits

- The proposal has an area-wide scope.
- The sterile insect technology approach for reducing ACP populations can be a game changer.

- The proposal builds on previously awarded funding by DPR to start testing SIT on a larger scale.
- The use of SIT wouldn't necessarily have to rely on action by individual homeowners, depending on how it's utilized.
- There is a strong team working on the project, including the California Department of Food and Agriculture, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Citrus Research Board.
- SIT has been used effectively to address issues with other pests.
- The proposal contributes to addressing an important statewide issue in a timely manner.
- Protecting California commercial citrus from ACP and Huanglongbing (HLB) is vital.
- The proposal has broad statewide significance.
- The proposal features the use of already proven technologies.
- Working with urban populations to encourage residents to adopt changes and report pest issues is very time consuming. This proposal is a useful approach towards addressing the difficulty of getting urban populations to adopt IPM techniques.

Concerns

- One PMAC member was concerned about the project's scale. The proposal targets 15 residential properties, each with four to ten citrus trees, but it's unclear how many insects are on each property and thus whether the scope of the model will be able to determine the overall effectiveness of the approach.
- Staff salaries are a very prominent part of the proposal's budget.
- There was no demonstration of industry support.
- One PMAC member said they would like to see more emphasis on disease management and on methods such as soil management, plant nutrition and building resilience.
 - In response, another PMAC member said that citrus greening has been researched for over twenty years in Florida, but the research hasn't yet produced an efficient method to reduce ACP populations, so relying only on soil and healthy plants would not be sufficient to address the issue.
- There were no letters of support from homeowners in targeted areas.
 - In response, another PMAC member said it is likely the project team would ask UCCE Master Gardeners who have citrus in their backyards to be test sites.
- The proposal does not address how its methods could be scaled up.
- There was concern about the size of test plots.
- It's unclear if sufficient community trust has been established for this project to be implemented successfully.
- One PMAC member said they could not identify in the proposal if CDFA permitting was confirmed.
 - In response, another PMAC member said that CDFA permitting would not be required as the insect is already present in the targeted area.
- Could the large number of sterile populations that need to be released vector the pathogen before they die?

- HLB is a long developing disease; if there are hot trees in an area, they may hinder the effectiveness of releasing sterile insects.
- Southern California is the only location where both the vector and the pathogen occur together. The best place to investigate the best approach toward suppressing the population of the vector may be an area where the pathogen is not present.
- A PMAC member questioned whether the cost of the amount of full-time salaries requested in the proposal was justified for this one project.

Points of Clarification

- Can this project realistically be scaled up to commercial use?
- If the project requires a ratio of sterile to native populations of ten to one, is it achievable at a commercial scale?
- If the project can be scaled up, who would bear the costs involved?
- There are other grant programs that are more targeted toward preventing serious invasive species like ACP, such as CDFA's Proactive IPM Solutions Program and others. Is the Alliance Grant the best funding source for this proposal?
- Has the proposal secured the necessary permitting to release the insects?
- What is the ratio of males to females in the released populations?

Public Comment

- None.

Dakin – Pollinator Partnership

Merits

- The project is really aiming to address some of the hurdles around IPM adoption, such as cost and benefits and helping growers see why it is in their self-interest to do IPM for key pests in orchard crops.
- The proposal includes specific metrics to measure success.
- The proposal conveys a good understanding of how to engage growers with meaningful outreach materials.
- The targeted focus on pollinator habitat can generate far-reaching benefits as a holistic approach consistent with SPM, if proper attention is given to habitats for beneficial organisms and other ecosystem services.
- The proposal fits into the agricultural IPM and pollinator protection categories while promoting the SPM pillars.
- The proposal is very education-focused.
- The proposal has high impact potential and can benefit rural and underserved farming communities.
- Pollinator Partnership is on the cutting edge at establishing pollinator habitat and is addressing the real needs around this.
- The proposal adds additional dimensions to existing IPM methods, such as cost-benefit analysis and information around the impacts on pollinators.

Concerns

- The letters of support were repetitive and seemed generic.
- The proposal did not mention the UC IPM program for tree crops, IPM advisors or farm advisors. A PMAC member would like to see these existing resources tied into the proposal.
- There was no mention of partnering with grower groups around outreach efforts.
- The proposal's goals were unclear.
- The team behind the proposal is large, but their roles are not clearly defined in regard to what they would contribute to the project.

Points of Clarification

- Will this proposal duplicate ongoing projects by industry, environmental groups, or past grant recipients?

Public Comment

- None.

Ibrahim – Healthy Homes in South Los Angeles

Merits

- The proposal involves a hands-on approach around engaging with residents.
- The strong letters of support demonstrated the merit of the proposal's engagement strategy.
- The proposal has a human health focus and an objective of mitigating the human health impacts of pests.
- The proposal aims to benefit residents in underserved communities that are most affected by asthma triggers from pests, cockroaches and commensal rodents.
- The proposal's team has a good track record in achieving results in housing units in Los Angeles.
- The proposal has potential to generate savings in health systems.
- The proposal takes a prevention approach.
- The outreach methods described in the proposal were very clear.
- The letters of support demonstrated strong community buy-in from Spanish-speaking residents of the areas targeted in the proposal.
- The proposal has a strong focus on IPM and the environment.
- The proposal includes a public housing nonprofit contract component.
- The proposal has an education focus.
- The work outlined in the project is very scalable.
- This proposal has the potential to reduce the risk of the misapplication or over-application of pesticide.
- The proposal includes culturally sensitive outreach strategies.
- The proposal utilizes *promotoras* to educate impacted populations.
- The proposal could have significant benefits to public health through reducing exposure to both asthma allergens and indoor pesticides.

Concerns

- This proposal involves continuing to fund a project which has been previously awarded funding from DPR on similar terms and has been active for a three-year timespan already. The team behind the proposal is capable, but the lack of scaling is concerning as the project currently only affects a small proportion of homes. It would be helpful to see more evidence of the team's efforts to expand their model beyond its current scope to be applicable for use by other groups that work with low-income housing.
- There is an urban IPM advisor working with the UC Cooperative Extension and UC IPM in Los Angeles County that is already engaged in the type of outreach and research described in the proposal. The proposal did not include mention of working with UCCE and the IPM advisor actively engaged in similar work in Los Angeles.
- Most of the project's budget is allotted to salaries.
- It would be helpful to see an analysis of the impact past funding has had and a model of how the PI's research can be practically applied to other areas.
- The proposal mentions partnering with the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles, (HACLA), but lacked a letter of support from HACLA.
- The proposal lacked letters of support from other members of the alliance team.
- The proposal has a sole focus on the Esperanza facility.

Points of Clarification

- South Los Angeles is an important area, but how can the proposal's methods be applied to other areas, such as the Central Valley?
- How can the project, if successful, be scaled up to generate a greater statewide benefit?

Public Comment

- None.

Baer-Imhoof – IPM for Beekeeping

Merits

- The project has a goal of protecting urban honeybee populations.
- The proposal includes collaboration with the Compton Community Garden and Parrot Farm.
- The proposal would promote the use of the BeeWhere platform in marking the locations of beehives.
- The proposal plans to conduct trainings in English, Spanish and Chinese, which could be especially effective in the targeted areas.
- The proposal's focus is on gardens and beekeepers in disadvantaged communities.
- The team has already established a level of trust with the beekeeping community of Southern California.
- Beekeepers often misuse chemical compounds around Varroa mites, and the proposal's focus on educating beekeepers and gardeners around reducing pesticide use is appealing.
- The proposal was very detailed about the specifics of the IPM components that were highlighted.

- The proposal includes economic considerations such as how beekeeping training can generate income in various ways.
- The proposal is well written.
- There are strong letters of support.

Concerns

- A PMAC member disagreed with classifying beekeepers as an underserved community.
- A PMAC member raised concerns that the proposal did not involve engagement with the UCCE Master Gardener Program, which has experience in gardening practices education.
 - Another PMAC member said the UCCE Master Gardener Program submitted a letter explaining how they are engaged with the proposal.
- The proposal didn't make its sources of information clear and did not feature any references to the plethora of information collected by UC IPM.
- It seems like this project may duplicate past efforts.
- The proposal does not involve engagement with the California Master Beekeeper Program.
- The proposal lists neonics in its list of affected pesticides. Neonics are already banned for use by non-licensed urban users.
- It would have been helpful to blend how pollination and urban gardeners can work together and learn from each other to facilitate a more blended IMP approach.
- The proposal targets community gardens and beekeeping clubs in the San Diego and Los Angeles areas with the plan of developing a future plan to reach a wider audience. The component of engaging a wider audience could have been featured more prominently in the proposal's current plan.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Dietrick – Backyard Citrus

Merits

- The proposal brings together an interesting array of collaborators to address how to better control ACP in residential areas to reduce the risk of the disease being transmitted to commercial crops.
- The proposal focuses on HLB management through soil remediation and biocontrol amendments to improve soil quality and protect citrus root growth.
 - In response to the point about soil remediation, a PMAC member noted that HLB has not affected commercial citrus crops for the most part. If HLB becomes endemic in commercial citrus, as it is in Florida, cultural methods can be considered, but they shouldn't be focused on until HLB moves past an invasive stage.

- The proposal identifies specific pesticides and the human and environmental risks related to those pesticides.
- The proposal focuses on building a future for the type of work it describes by incorporating college and high school students in its efforts.
- The roles of the distinct partners are clearly and succinctly described.
- This proposal involves and leverages the work of UC Cooperative Extension and local master gardeners.
- The proposal has a focus on encouraging better management of backyard citrus.
- In the long term, the proposal could generate contributions for biocontrol.

Concerns

- Poor care of backyard citrus has less to do with pest management than irrigation, nutrient management, and insufficient pruning. There wasn't enough evidence in the proposal to demonstrate that the over-application of pesticides in backyard citrus is a significant issue.
- Fertilization methods can only mask HLB.
- The proposal is unclear as to whether the PIs are regularly testing the trees involved in the project for HLB disease.
- The proposal lacks any economic analysis component.
- The proposal is unclear around what methods will be used to assess the efficacy of the project.
- Given what is known about the disease, cultural care for HLB does not merit funding by an IPM program.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

[Choe – Structural Wood IPM](#)

Merits

- The proposal addresses the connection between realtors, pest control, and unnecessary home fumigations
- The proposal focuses on coalescing preexisting information in one place.
- The proposal addresses questions from those who determine the necessity of treatments and from homeowners about the need for fumigation.
- Reducing fumigation would have a significant impact on one of the key pesticides of concern.
- The proposal may be simplistic, but addresses unfulfilled informational needs.
- This PI has submitted past proposals which have led to great research around methods to avoid the use of sulfuryl fluoride for structural fumigation.

- It's critical that DPR fund proposals to move the state away from sulfuryl fluoride because it is a highly potent greenhouse gas and a toxic air contaminant that doesn't prevent the pests it removes from coming back.
- The potential impacts of the proposal are very broad, given the amount of house fumigation in California.
- The training modules seemed very targeted.
- The proposal features plans for a decision support tool to help homeowners make informed choices.
- The proposal incorporates field trials to compare chemical spot treatments and the efficacy of other methods.
- The proposal fills the social equity SPM pillar through its focus on tenant-friendly solutions for multi-unit housing.
- The proposal includes a component around consumer educational materials and improvements to labelling.
- The proposal gives attention to the role of inspectors and public input.

Concerns

- The proposal features an analysis of different types of alternatives to fumigation instead of promoting pest control strategies that would avoid the need for fumigation.
- It is unclear how the database created by the proposal could be used to broadly influence practices.
- A PMAC member was concerned about the PI's ability to balance several ongoing DPR grant-funded programs at once.
- The majority of the project's budget is allotted toward salaries.
- The budget for the proposal seems expensive for its purposes of information collection.
- A PMAC member would have preferred seeing a broader alliance team beyond UC faculty.
- The proposal lacks a connection to the targeted industry.
- The outreach component of the project is limited to online resources.
- It is unclear how the proposal will measure the long-term efficacy of usages. Without this element, the project is unlikely to influence future practice.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Taravati – XR Tech for Training

Merits

- The proposal forwards innovative methods of providing hands-on education cheaply and utilizing technology to train experts.

- If the proposal is successful in engaging the targeted audience, the rodenticide aspect could be applied to other areas where rodenticide management is key, such as restaurants or food processing facilities.
- This proposal helps advance access to hands-on training in areas like rodent management, where additional training resources are very needed.
- The proposal fulfills each of the SPM sustainability pillars.
- The proposal has a helpful focus on workforce development.
- The proposal features plans to reach out to underserved communities and high schools.
- Once the technology used in the project is finetuned, it has great potential for scalability.
- The proposal promotes reduced reliance on high-risk pesticides, like rodenticides, which is important in the context of California's evolving regulatory environment.
- The proposal includes a great format to communicate information to applicators.
- The proposal has the potential to generate a broad statewide benefit.
- The proposal's budget was reasonable given what it aims to produce.

Concerns

- How can the efficacy of the learning methods advanced in the proposal be measured in comparison to more traditional learning methods?
 - Another PMAC member noted that the proposal does feature an assessment component taking into account whether the rates of passing licensing exams are improved by the project's methods.
- The proposal includes partnership with a private company to develop the virtual reality model. It's unclear how the proposal will guarantee that UC IPM can maintain a stake in that technology in the future.
- In the past, UC IPM has contracted private companies to develop advanced technologies, only for those technologies to have to be abandoned when funding is exhausted due to costs of updates and maintenance.
- It's unclear how the proposal will increase IPM practices by pest control professionals.
- Workforce training is valuable, but it's unclear how the proposal fits the goals of the Alliance Grants Program.
- The proposal does not address the cost for users to access virtual reality goggles, which will be necessary for engagement with the training technologies it aims to introduce. It may not be economically feasible for participants to access that equipment.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Zumkeller – Precision Weed Control

Merits

- The proposal focuses on taking advantage of existing spray technologies and making them practically usable in vineyards.
- The proposal allows for much more targeted pesticide use.
- There are good letters of support.
- The LangeTwins Winery, which has been innovative in this area, is involved in the project.
- The proposal builds off of work around sustainable wine grape growing that goes back twenty years.
- The proposal is requesting a relatively small budget to continue sustainable practices.
- The proposal could generate positive impacts for the whole of California's wine industry.
- The proposal utilizes technology proven in annual cropping and applying it to spraying the vine row.
- The proposal includes plans to transfer information collected by the project to their local UC Cooperative Extension for further dissemination.
- The proposal plans to demonstrate the efficacy of its approaches around reducing herbicide usage and reducing costs.
- The team behind the proposal has a good track record in regard to grower outreach.
- The growers involved in the proposal are also conducting broader efforts to demonstrate integrated crop and livestock systems, biopesticides, and how these practices can be layers, although the proposal does not mention these efforts.

Concerns

- Over 50% of the proposal's budget is dedicated to adapting systems to work more efficiently for a single vineyard.
- Precision agriculture is not IPM.
- The proposal states that it aims to reduce the use of the pesticides it targets in convention agriculture without requiring a major shift in farming philosophy, which is contradictory with the goals of SPM, as SPM is about changing farming practices.
 - In response, another PMAC member said that SPM is also about new technologies to reduce pesticide use, and not solely about changing farming practices to be entirely biologically based. According to that understanding, this proposal fits into the goals of the SPM roadmap.
- The proposal does not compare the methods it forwards with the efficacy of other methods of weed management.
 - In response, a PMAC member noted that the proposal includes a sentence about measuring the efficacy of its methods, but does not go into detail.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Pan – Smart Probes

Merits

- A PMAC member appreciated the proposal's focus on the post-harvest space, as not many projects take post-harvest into account.
- The proposal focuses on improving pest monitoring and early detection of pest issues.
- The proposal incorporates AI in its approach to help pest managers maximize the potential of new technologies in areas like scouting.
- The approach includes a strong analysis of economic benefits.
- The proposal effectively demonstrates how it utilizes past work to inform its current approach.

Concerns

- A PMAC member expressed concern that the proposal focuses on further testing when it's unclear how that testing fits into the goals of the Alliance Grant.
- It is unclear how the trapping system described in the proposal differs from automated trapping systems that are already on the market and widely used.
 - In response, another PMAC member said that this monitoring tool is unique in that it enters warehoused stockpiles or nuts or fruit, which has not been done before. It also helps monitor reinfestation, which may be an issue as products may be stored for longer with the recent disruption in shipping.
- The proposal seems to be focused more on validating the merits of a commercial product rather than on advancing IPM. It may make more sense for those marketing this tool to fund this research instead of DPR funding the project.
- A PMAC member was concerned about the prospect of funding research and development for the PI's startup company.
- This project seems more suited to be a research proposal.
- The team is missing someone with the biological knowledge and insights needed to mesh the new technology with practical pesticide application.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Weise – Contra Costa RCD

Merits

- the proposal focuses on helping growers and urban-adjacent farms address IMP challenges in a region particularly in need of assistance.
- This proposal builds on the Wild Farm Alliance's biological management tools.
- The proposal has a helpful focus on rodents and rodenticide use.
- The proposal uses biocontrol approaches such as owl boxes.
- The proposal's team blends traditional IPM outreach partners and non-traditional partners like the Wild Farm Alliance.

- The team plans to develop an assessment tool for pest management needs in order to create a pest management plan. The proposal's work is extendable in its benefit and can be used beyond the targeted area.

Concerns

- This proposal offers \$1000 stipends to growers, which seems excessive. The proposal also offers stipends to speakers who are already employed to do outreach, so not a good use of funds.
- There seems to be a mismatch between the project's rationale and its scope of work. The project's rationale focused on rodents, rodenticides, and using birds of prey to manage rodents. However, the content of the proposal mainly consists of general IPM plans for urban or urban-adjacent farms, which is much broader than the focus of the project's rationale.
- The proposal's objectives are unclear. Workshops are mentioned, but the number of workshops, their content, or their goals in terms of outreach aren't defined.
- The proposal's list of affected pesticides only includes rodenticides, most or all of which can no longer be used due to new 2025 regulations. It seems that the project's team was not engaged with the regulatory developments around rodenticides.
 - In response, another PMAC member said they weren't sure whether the ban on rodenticides applied to agricultural usage.
 - Another PMAC member said the ban on rodenticides includes limits on agricultural usage, and the rodenticides in question can't be used in the urban areas targeted by the proposal.
 - A third PMAC member said that, in their understanding of the rodenticide ban, all food production sites are exempt from the new regulations.
- The proposal lacks a qualitative or quantitative population monitoring component for the pests it targets.
- The proposal's definition of farmer and urban agriculture are very broad.

Points of Clarification

- Will the 2025 ban on rodenticides prevent the use of rodenticides in the urban or urban-adjacent areas targeted by the proposals?

Public Comment

- None.

Wright – SPM Training

Merits

- The proposal is well supported via strong letters.
- There are only a minor amount of funds requested.
- The proposal contains good SPM approaches.
- The proposal takes a preventative approach to invasive plant management.

Concerns

- The write-up lacks focus and clarity, and is vague and confusing.
- It's not clear what partners are on the project's alliance team, or who is working on it

- The project seems to be mostly geared toward working with college students, but it is not clear.
- The proposal was not written clearly.
- The groups mentioned in the proposal don't align with the support letters.
- A PMAC member questioned if the team behind the proposal has the skills required to conduct a worthwhile class.
- The project is very limited in scope.
- Because the proposal's tasks are not clearly described, it was hard to tell if the project could be completed within the grant period.
- The project's financial benefits seemed tangential at best.
- The proposal focuses on training around the SPM roadmap, and it's not clear how that aligns with the purpose of this grant program.
- The PIs are going to provide information about pesticides used in restoration, but they are not using them. The restoration is centered around invasive plant species.
- If the area is restored, there won't be a need to use herbicides to remove invasive plants.
- High-risk pesticides are not mentioned in the proposal.
- It isn't clear what pesticides would be used or reduced.
- The proposal does not mention any pesticides.
- The proposal includes a feasibility assessment survey, but does not feature much detail.
- The needs assessment seems unnecessary – we know the need with the current high use of hazardous pesticides.
- The proposal lists a number of problems related to monocultures of invasive species but doesn't include an explanation of how or why monocultures create the negative impacts described.
- No argument was given for how this geographically narrow project can have wider application.
- Is this project centered around habitat restoration or invasive plant management? It's unclear what the project is modelling.
- How is any of what the project covers tied to SPM, aside from managing invasives?

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Gort – Laguna Beach EDRR

Merits

- The proposal features a clear IPM strategy of early detection, monitoring and limiting chemical intervention.
- It includes well-thought-out processes: field surveys, citizen science via iNaturalist, rapid response protocols, data management.

- It includes a good community engagement plan with workshops, signage, radio outreach — lots of channels.
- This is a well-written proposal to detect, prioritize non-chemical controls, communicate and use herbicides in a very targeted, controlled manner.
- Its outreach effort is decent.
- It includes good letters of support.
- This would be a strong local program for invasive plant species.

Concerns

- There was limited detail on all aspects, making it challenging to support this proposal further.
- The percentage of FTE is not clearly listed for salaries, so a reviewer is not sure what percentage of time each person is committing for the salary.
- There is no discussion of which invasives and what problems they caused for whom or what ecosystem functions. How do different species (and those of concern here specifically) vary in their ability to influence pollination, water filtration, and carbon sequestration?
- The proposal is very limited in geographical scope.
- It includes no new tools, just surveillance.
- The list of active ingredients the PIs propose to use is the same as the ones they want to reduce.
- Not much specific information is given on implementation expansion of SPM or general community education on those matters.
- The proposal states that it aligns with the roadmap, but it is not clear how the actions planned align clearly.
- The proposal focuses on implementation of an IPM project with no focus on adoption or expansion of techniques
- The proposal lacks acknowledgement of the social equity portion of the SPM pillars.
- The proposal focuses specifically on mapping, and there is no plan as to how this will affect pesticide use.
- Although actions are proposed, they are not clearly identified: how many workshops, where or how many outreach materials are not described.
- The majority of the proposal's budget is paying for the lead PI on the project.
- It is not clear what the project's impact will be compared to the requested funds.
- The proposal is not well-aligned with DPR priority areas.
- The proposal has a very limited geographic scope to Laguna Beach. The impact on the rest of California is unclear. It will have limited benefits because it is limited to the Laguna Beach area.
- It has a large budget.
- While early detection of invasive species infestations and rapid response can reduce the amount of herbicide use, it is still concerning that some of the herbicides relied upon are high toxicity.

- The approach is more focused on detection over mitigation.
- There is not a really clear plan to show economic benefits.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Schloemann – Shot Hole Borer Pilot Project

Merits

- There is a good support letter from UC ANR.
- The proposal has a clear explanation of public health and environmental risks (air quality, heat, mental health, noise, stormwater) tied to canopy loss.
- The goals are clear: monitoring, treatment, removal, and education focused, especially on disadvantaged communities.
- The proposal has a focus on the use of softer products.
- The proposal aligns well with the Alliance’s mission by focusing on urban sustainability and environmental equity.
- This is a local project with statewide benefit to the environment.

Concerns

- The project is very limited in scope and location.
- There is only one letter of support.
- The Alliance could be larger and composed of different elements.
- Outreach methods are unclear.
- The proposal lacks a comparison of the proposed IPM system to other methods currently used (only indirectly implied).
- The PIs do not clearly state how the project will overcome specific economic barriers for different environments (urban versus wildland mentioned generally).
- The project won’t start treatment until Spring 2026, so the timeline may be slow.
- The PIs could add more specific plans to engage and empower residents in early detection and rapid reporting beyond just outreach.
- The PIs should consider partnership with private property owners for comprehensive canopy protection.
- The entire budget is tree treatment, totaling over \$100,000 a year.
- This is an interesting proposal, but it feels more like an attempt to get funding to deal with ISHB in San Jose rather than for the stated purpose of this funding source.
- The proposal is lacking detail in many areas. How specifically is all of this going to be accomplished?
- The outreach efforts are lacking detail; it doesn’t seem to be a priority.
- There are no metrics on outreach success.
- There was no discussion of the ecology of the pest beetle or the pathogen for which the beetle is a vector in the proposal.

- The pesticides listed are not on list of high-risk pesticides.
- Though there is mention of a local non-profit, the Alliance team is small with only a county ag commissioner, an arborist, and someone from UCANR listed. If funded, the project will also include unnamed neighborhood associations and nonprofits; why not name them?
- The project focuses on chemical injections, which, according to UC IPM guidelines, should be integrated with or secondary to cultural approaches.
- There was one good and informative support letter from UC ANR, but that was the only letter.
- The proposal doesn't present much evidence of the Pls' ability to form a coordinated vital alliance team.
- It is not clear how much of a problem SHB is in San Jose.
- The budget is used largely to support treatment and/or removal of trees. Are there that many trees impacted? If so, are they really waiting until 2026 to act? And the proposal only targets parks located in disadvantaged neighborhoods.
- The only IPM practice being used is trunk injection, and it can be called IMP because it is the most targeted use of the pesticides being applied.
- The proposal's focus on tree injections doesn't seem related to the SPM roadmap or priority areas.
- The economic benefits focus on the cost-benefit analysis of the loss of trees centered around tree disposal, and it's unclear how the IPM technique is cost-saving to pest managers.
- The project's cost is high and focuses on tree removal instead of implementation and adoption of IMP techniques.
- There is an educational component for the community, but the dollars are to be used for treatment in public parks, not residential properties.
- Pesticides used for treatment are both listed as highly hazardous pesticides.
- The proposal isn't addressing replacing pesticides with other IPM tactics – it's just identifying trees and treating them or removing them.
- Partnering with others who are engaged on ISHB such as CAL FIRE, CDFA, UC Master Gardeners, UC IPM, and others within UC Cooperative Extension would reduce the cost of starting from scratch with the outreach and material development. There is already a great deal of information out there.
- Overall benefits are unclear because this project is limited to San Jose and most of the grant funds would go to pesticide application (through tree injection) and removal of trees. Use of a systemic neurotoxic insecticide may still be a risk to pollinators in some trees though tree injection does reduce worker and water contamination risks.
- An outreach program is mentioned but not detailed.
- The focus on increasing identification of tree infections and reducing spread is commendable but the proposal doesn't seem to fit as an Alliance project.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Berry – Sanitation Trainings

Merits

- Creative alliance team.
- Laudable goal.
- Interesting proposal focused on sanitation.

Concerns

- Letters somewhat limited; mostly from collaborators.
- Project is lacking in sufficient detail.
- The target audience, although important, is a bit limited in numbers for a large grant.
- No data with quantified results to build off of (that measurable increases in sanitation will significantly decrease pesticide usage).
- It's unclear how the proposal will benefit all Californians, as it is targeted toward a subset of people in LA County.
- Budget seems a bit high.
- No representation of state personnel like UCCE; do the other team members have experience working with IDD adults?
- Pests and pesticide specifics are not outlined.
- Focusing on sanitation; not really full IPM approach though.
- It would be better if they had someone from an extension background.
- Materials cost is listed but specifics are not given.
- The proposal does not enough specifics about what pests and pesticides are targeted and how this can effectively be reduced by sanitation.
- The focus on sanitation alone is too limited; there are other components of prevention of pest-conducive conditions.
- The proposal does not mention what practices the PIs are using. The proposal suggests the PIs are only talking about cleaning materials and nothing about caulking, for example.
- Why just eliminate TAC pesticides? They should, right off the bat, identify which pesticide they're addressing; they don't; only one is mentioned in a reference document.
- It is not clear what the real need is. There is no doubt that a clean house is less prone to pest infestation, and that point can be easily made by any pest control professional.
- Aside from cleaning (sanitation), what other IPM practices are being taught?
- It is not clear what the economic benefits will be since regular pest control visits are continued.
- The PIs should focus on training the trainer-style trainings, rather than direct IDD training.
- Key personnel don't have experience in IPM, but in tech and teaching.

- Letters of support are from people receiving the grant.
- The proposal is geographically limited to LA County, so there is limited impact.
- The support letters are from individuals benefiting financially.
- The PMAC received a similar proposal last year for nearly the same thing. It's better written this time, but still underwhelming.
- This proposal has a very narrow scope and provides no detail on the content of the training.
- The fact that the proposal makes reference to sanitation and cleaning products without listing the products is concerning.
- Only one pesticide is listed and that one is used more for termites than rodents, roaches or other pests that sanitation and exclusion are important controls for.
- The alliance members do not have experience in training adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities.
- The budget of 50% full time work for the PI and an assistant seems excessive.

Points of Clarification

- None.

Public Comment

- None.

Following discussion of each proposal, public comment was invited. No public comments were received.

Decision on Recommendations

Process Discussion/Questions

During the meeting, PMAC members occasionally raised issues regarding process. Those included:

Re-Ranking and PMAC Recommendations

Based on the discussion, 16 PMAC members re-ranked the proposals.

Quorum was confirmed and the re-rankings were reviewed. Re-rankings are shown in the table below. The overall ranking order saw changes: the highest ranked proposal remained the same, but there was significant reordering among the mid-range and lowest ranked proposals, including two proposals, the Choe and Zumkeller proposals, that each moved up six positions.

The PMAC's re-rankings elevated:

- Taravati - IPM for Low-Income Housing
- Burger - Roadside Weed SPM
- Siemer - IPM in Lassen County
- Choe - Structural Wood IPM
- Zumkeller - Precision Weed Control

- Weise - Urban Ag IPM
- Wright - SPM Training
- Berry - Sanitation Trainings

2025 Alliance Grants Program Final PMAC Proposal Rankings (average of 16 rankers)

Principal Investigator	Project Short Title	Final Ranking	Pre-Meeting Rank	Average Rank	Standard Deviation	High	Low
Eskalen	Grapevine IPM	1	1	4.31	3.87	1	16
Taravati (IPM)	IPM for Low-Income Housing	2	3	4.64	3.37	1	12
Burger	Roadside Weed IPM	3	4	5.93	4.97	1	16
Siemer	IPM in Lassen County	4	5	6.8	3.58	1	13
Choe	Structural Wood IPM	5	11	7.29	4.59	1	17
Baumgartner	Small Farm Resources	6	2	7.93	4.93	1	16
Zumkeller	Precision Weed Control	7	13	8.19	6.12	2	19
Ibrahim	Healthy Homes in South LA	8	8	8.38	3.72	1	13
Rugman-Jones	SIT for ACP	9	7	8.44	4.39	3	18
Dakin	Pollinator IPM	10	6	8.71	3.28	2	14
Baer-Imhoof	IPM for Beekeeping	11	10	9.25	4.49	3	19
Dietrick	Backyard Citrus	12	9	9.38	4.51	2	18
Taravati (XR)	XR Tech for Training	13	12	9.4	4.11	3	16
Weise	Urban Ag IPM	14	15	11.88	3.12	6	17
Wright	SPM Training	15	16	13	5.39	1	18
Pan	Smart Probes	16	14	13.88	4.06	5	19
Berry	Sanitation Trainings	17	19	14.06	5.2	5	19
Gort	Laguna Beach EDRR	18	17	14.31	3.16	7	18
Schloemann	Shot Hole Borer Pilot Project	19	18	15.13	3.08	5	18

A PMAC member proposed submitting the entire record of PMAC initial and final rankings, comments, and discussion to DPR for the DPR Director's consideration.

No PMAC members offered counter-proposals.

A PMAC member who joined the group this year noted that the objective of the Alliance Grants Program is to fund extension or implementation activities rather than research, and several of the proposals under review were substantially focused on research. The member asked if there was an internal DPR process to evaluate such aspects, as he was unfamiliar with what the process will be after the PMAC makes its recommendations.

- In response, Facilitator Ariel Ambruster said the PMAC's recommendations will be forwarded to the DPR Director, along with a separate set of recommendations from DPR staff, and she will take both sets of recommendations into consideration in making her decisions about which proposals to fund.

- Aimee Norman, DPR IPM Branch Chief, also noted that, in past years, the funding pools for the Alliance Grants Program and the Research Grants Program were discreet, but that this year's funding pool is combined for both programs, although the meetings to consider proposals for either program were held separately. The DPR Director will make funding decisions by weighing all of the proposals, both research and alliance, together. There will be a consideration regarding the blended proposals, as well.

There was no further discussion.

The PMAC took a roll-call vote on the following:

The PMAC recommends that the full complement of the committee's consideration of the Alliance Grants proposals be submitted to the DPR Director for their consideration.

The proposal was adopted unanimously by 19 PMAC members.

Closing Remarks

Deputy Director Thottathil noted the insightful comments she had heard that day, and thanked PMAC members for their interest, commitment and willingness to volunteer, as well as the time they committed to reviewing the proposals and attending the day's meeting.

The next PMAC meeting will take place on August 14, 2025 and a new solicitation for project proposals will open before that meeting.