



# SUMMARY | PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ALLIANCE GRANT REVIEW MEETING CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

May 11, 2017

*Produced by the Center for Collaborative Policy, CSU Sacramento*

## Contents

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance.....                                    | 1 |
| 2. Opening Comments and Background .....              | 2 |
| 3. Rankings Based on Reviewers’ Scoring.....          | 3 |
| 4. Discussion of Proposals.....                       | 3 |
| 5. Revised Rankings and Summary Recommendations ..... | 6 |
| 6. Grant Program Process Feedback.....                | 7 |
| 7. Closing Remarks .....                              | 7 |

## 1. Attendance

### Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) Members

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Mary Grisier, U.S. EPA Region IX   | 9. Terry Gage, California Agricultural Aircraft Association  |
| 2. David Bakke, U.S. Forest Service (USFS)  | 10. Cynthia Corey, California Farm Bureau Federation   |
| 3. John Roncoroni, University of California Cooperative Extension                   | 11. Humberto Izquierdo (substitute), California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association |
| 4. Emily Marquez (alternate), Pesticide Action Network                              | 12. John Steggall, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)                            |
| 5. Ken Giles, UC Davis Department of Biological & Ag Engineering                    | 13. Robert Ehn, Western Plant Health Association   |
| 6. David Still, California State University Ponomo, Agricultural Research Institute | 14. Caroline Cox, Center for Environmental Health  |
| 7. Rebecca Sisco, UC Davis, Western Region IR4 Program                              | 15. Laura Brown, California Citrus Mutual (via webcast).   |
| 8. Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation                        |  |

### California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

- |                           |                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 16. Brian Leahy, Director | 20. Doug Downie     |
| 17. Joe Damiano           | 21. Megan Parker    |
| 18. Mark Robertson        | 22. Melissa Plemons |
| 19. Nino Yanga            |                     |

### Facilitation Support

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 23. Tania Carlone, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS | 24. Alex Cole-Weiss, Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS |
|--|--|

## 2. Opening Comments and Background

### Introductions and Chair's opening comments

Brian Leahy, Director of the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), welcomed everyone and thanked them for joining the meeting. He explained that the goal of the meeting was to obtain the PM!C's recommended Pest Management Alliance Grant proposals for possible DPR funding. Mr. Leahy noted that this was an unusual grant solicitation in that it specifically focused on addressing pesticide use near schools.

### Alliance Grant 2017-2018 Solicitation Focus

Megan Parker, Environmental Scientist provided background for DPR's Pest Management Alliance Grant Program. She expressed that the Alliance Grant Program aims to promote the adoption of established Integrated Pest Management (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 2017-2018 Alliance Grant Program has \$400,000 available for funding proposals. The solicitation focus of the 2017-2018 Alliance Grant program is to promote the adoption of established IPM practices that reduce the use of pesticides on farms adjacent to schools. This focus includes the following:

- A project should target growers who produce commercial agricultural crops adjacent to schools and child care centers.
- "Adjacent" should be interpreted as being within a quarter mile of a school or child day care facility to be consistent with the proposed regulations.
- A project should clearly demonstrate how the use of integrated pest management (IPM) will reduce the use of pesticides near schools and child care centers while also reducing the negative health risks pesticides pose to children.

### Criteria for Ranking Proposals and Grant Program Procedures

Ms. Parker presented the following criteria for PMAC members to use to rank the proposals:

- 1) How well each proposal met the solicitation focus for funding priority; and
- 2) The overall quality of the proposal.

She provided an overview of the grant application process. Key grant program milestones are as follows:

- Six concept proposals were received by February 3, 2017.
- Applicants were invited to submit proposals by February 24, 2017.
- Four full proposals were received by April 4, 2017.
- Following the review period, grant projects will be selected by June 30, 2017
- Project start date is September 1, 2017.

DPR selected 4 project proposals for PMAC members' review. The following table summarizes those proposals:

### 2017-2018 Alliance Grant Summary of Submitted Proposals

| Proposal Short and Full Title   | Principal Investigator                       | Budget      |
|---|--|-------------|
| <b>Bourcier – Farm Fuel</b><br>Continued adoption of ASD through educational workshops, demonstrations, and outreach materials for all California growers | <b>Stefanie Bourcier,</b><br>Farm Fuel, Inc. | \$200,000   |
| <b>Lauritzen - Monterey</b><br>Restricted use pesticide notification near schools   | <b>Eric Lauritzen</b><br>Monterey County     | \$94,538    |
| <b>Wunderlich - UCANR</b><br>Training California’s pesticide applicators to reduce drift near schools   | <b>Lynn Wunderlich</b><br>UC ANR             | \$218,896   |
| <b>Duggal – Santa Clara</b><br>Working in harmony – agriculture with urban edge   | <b>Naresh Duggal</b><br>Count of Santa Clara | \$\$249,994 |

Ms. Parker reminded participants that PMAC committee members who are principal investigators or key team members are not eligible to receive funds through a project unless they recuse themselves from the entire grant review process; PMAC members who serve in an advisory capacity on a proposed project must recuse themselves from review of only that proposal. However, organizations with which the committee members are associated are eligible for funding.

She then introduced the facilitator Ms. Tania Carlone from the Center for Collaborative Policy, California State University, Sacramento. Ms. Carlone reviewed the meeting goals:

- Identify the proposals PMAC considers fundable and unfundable
- Rank those proposals in order of preference
- Record merits and concerns for all proposals
- Provide Grant Program feedback

### 3. Rankings Based on Reviewers’ Scoring

Prior to the meeting, 19 PMAC members reviewed and scored the 4 proposals. The numeric scores were converted to ranks, where 1 was the most highly regarded proposal and 4 was the least, as presented in the following chart:

| 2017/2018 Alliance Grant Review Summary by Reviewer, Initial Review |          |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |             |      |     |           |
|---|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|------|-----|-----------|
| Project   | Rank     | R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8  | R9 | R10 | R11 | R12 | R13 | R14 | R15 | R16 | R17 | R18 | R19 | Avg         | High | Low | \$        |
| <b>Bourcier/Farm Fuel</b>   | <b>1</b> | 1  | 1  | 4  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 4   | 1  | 2   | 3   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 2   | 3   | <b>2.05</b> | 1    | 4   | \$200,000 |
| <b>Wunderlich/UCANR</b>   | <b>2</b> | 4  | 4  | 1  | 2  | 1  | 3  | 2  | 1.5 | 3  | 1   | 2   | 4   | 1   | 1   | 1   | ND  | ND  | ND  | 2   | <b>2.09</b> | 1    | 4   | \$218,896 |
| <b>Lauritzen/Monterey</b>   | <b>3</b> | 2  | 3  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 2  | 3  | 1.5 | 2  | ND  | 1   | 3   | 3   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 1   | 1   | 1   | <b>2.19</b> | 1    | 4   | \$94,538  |
| <b>Duggal/Santa Clara</b>   | <b>4</b> | 3  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 3   | 4  | 3   | 4   | 2   | 4   | 4   | 4   | 1   | 3   | 3   | 4   | <b>3.26</b> | 1    | 4   | \$249,994 |

### 4. Discussion of Proposals

Ms. Carlone commented on the unique solicitation criteria for the 2017-2018 round of grant funding and the unusually small number of proposals received. She reviewed the proposals in

the order of their initial ranking by PMAC members. PMAC members discussed the merits and concerns for all 4 project proposals.

Below is a summary of PMAC members' comments for each of the 4 proposals. Comments reflect individual PMAC member observations, not consensus opinions. Thus, merits and concerns may occasionally appear to be contradictory.

### **Bourcier—Farm Fuel: Continued adoption of ASD through educational workshops, demonstrations, and outreach materials for all California growers**

#### **Merits**

- The project team is experienced and well-qualified.
- Replacing fumigation with Anaerobic Soil Disinfestation (ASD) is a good IPM strategy.
- The project builds upon past work and a successful demonstration project.
- The proposal resubmission addresses the weaknesses identified in the initial proposal.
- The project includes deliverables that can be utilized beyond the grant timeline (e.g. user manuals, videos).
- The project will explore applying ASD to other crops (e.g. processing tomatoes) and additional carbon sources.
- The proposal includes grower training (workshops) and educational materials.

#### **Concerns**

- The project primarily focuses on the adoption of ASD and does not involve schools in a meaningful way.
- It is unclear if adoption of ASD leads to the reduction of fumigants.
- The proposal would benefit from more detailed discussions on when ASD is likely to be successful given limiting environmental factors, the availability and cost of new carbon sources, and the bottom line costs of applying ASD.
- ASD is a useful tool for IPM but has limited application and reach.
- The proposal lacks clear metrics for defining success or evaluating outcomes.
- The project would benefit from more outreach and training for tomato growers.
- Unclear whether ASD is realistic and cost effective in relation to the quantity of water required for treatment.

#### **Requested Clarification**

- Further explain the costs of applying ASD.
- Address potential carbon sources and their costs.

### **Wunderlich—UCANR: Training California's pesticide applicators to reduce drift near schools**

#### **Merits**

- The project provides practical and useful training.
- Management of drift is an important aspect of IPM.
- Extensive and impressive project team with broad and diverse expertise.

- Clearly describes how the project aligns with economic concerns of growers.
- Training pesticide applicators can potentially impact more than one farm site since people will take the new information and skills with them.
- The proposal includes a pre- and post-test to evaluate success.
- Proposal objectives are well laid out and clear.
- Budget is detailed and reasonable.
- Geographic scope is large but still focused enough to achieve goals.
- This project is easily replicated and the project deliverables can be used in the future for additional training.

### **Concerns**

- The project would benefit from increased involvement with schools.
- Methods for assessing longer-term retention of training information and applicator attitudes could be improved.
- The project focuses on calibration of equipment, not pesticide alternatives or pesticide use near schools.
- The number of trainings is small given the amount of money requested. Would like to see more trainings.

## **Lauritzen—Monterey: Restricted use pesticide notification near schools**

### **Merits**

- The proposal encourages best practices for restricted use pesticides, which are of particular concern around schools.
- Cost effective and well planned.
- The project aligns well with the local context in Monterey.
- The project has capacity to become a model for other places.
- The team is well rounded and diverse.
- PI is well respected and shows responsiveness to community concerns.
- Effectively builds on an existing notification system and provides important information such as the relative toxicity of pesticides.
- Addresses new regulations.
- The proposal successfully engages schools and specifies which schools will be engaged.

### **Concerns**

- The team would benefit from having a scientist with experience in IPM.
- Proposal does not clarify the feasibility or methods for expanding the project.
- The link in the proposal for the existing notification system website did not work.
- It is unclear how the project addresses and includes IPM. Most of the budget is devoted to the notification system website.
- The project requests support for implementing new regulations on agricultural applications near schools. Every county must comply with these regulations.

### **Requested Clarification**

- Clarify how the project will measure the goal of increasing IPM adoption by 10%.

**Duggal—Santa Clara: Working in harmony – agriculture with urban edge**

**Merits**

- The project focuses on IPM demonstration and outreach; demonstration and outreach materials are described well.
- The proposal has impressive goals, a laudable approach, and is a good concept.
- The project has a diverse group of supporters.
- Addressing tensions at the interface of urban and agricultural lands is increasingly important in California as land use patterns change.
- The project has a lot of potential to educate the public. Materials developed for children could be transferred elsewhere.

**Concerns**

- One quarter of the budget is for rodent control inside and outside of the project.
- The proposal does not meet solicitation criteria regarding targeting growers who produce commercial agricultural crops near schools.
- Given the budget, the number of outreach field days seems too few.
- The team does not have a strong agricultural background.
- This project approach includes too many elements. Narrowing the focus might produce a more successful outcome.
- Some of the IPM approaches seem better suited to home gardens rather than commercial agricultural production.
- The proposal lacks detail on how commercial growers will be included and considered.

**5. Revised Rankings and Summary Recommendations**

Based on the discussion, PMAC members who had participated in the initial review re-ranked the four proposals. Re-ranking results are shown in the table below:

| 2017/2018 Alliance Grant Review Summary by Reviewer, Meeting Review |      |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |      |     |           |
|---|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-----|-----------|
| Project   | Rank | R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8 | R9 | R10 | R11 | R12 | R13 | R14 | R15 | Avg  | High | Low | \$        |
| Lauritzen/Monterey  | 1    | ND | 1  | 2  | 2  | 3  | 2  | 2  | 1  | 1  | 2   | 2   | 1   | 1   | 3   | 2   | 1.79 | 1    | 3   | \$94,538  |
| Wunderlich/UCANR  | 2    | 1  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 1  | 1  | 1  | ND | 2  | 3   | 1   | 2   | ND  | 2   | 1   | 2.00 | 1    | 4   | \$218,896 |
| Bourcier/Farm Fuel  | 3    | 2  | 4  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 3  | 1   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 1   | 3   | 2.33 | 1    | 4   | \$200,000 |
| Duggal/Santa Clara  | 4    | 3  | 2  | 3  | 3  | 4  | 4  | 4  | 3  | 4  | 4   | 4   | 4   | 2   | 4   | 4   | 3.47 | 2    | 4   | \$249,994 |

PMAC reflected that the re-rankings demonstrate the value of discussion. Ms. Carlone asked if PMAC members considered any of the proposals to be unfundable. PMAC members agreed that the Duggal—Santa Clara project was unfundable in its current form, but encouraged the project team revise and reapply.

## 6. Grant Program Process Feedback

PMAC members were invited to provide feedback to DPR on the Grant Program review process. Several individuals expressed that they appreciated DPR trying a different approach with the more narrow solicitation criteria, but that it should not become the norm for the grant program.

A committee member added that they were disappointed there were not more high quality proposals that directly addressed the criteria, since the issue of pesticide use near schools is so important. Other committee members said it was helpful to discuss the goals of the Alliance grant program and share diverse perspectives on the meaning of IPM.

Mr. Leahy told PMAC members that DPR submitted a proposal to the legislature to fund the research grant program at current levels for two more years.

The following summarizes PMAC members' suggestions for improvements:

- Make proposal budget information more easily accessible to committee members.
- Notify committee members when projects are awarded.
- Develop criteria that is broad enough to encourage multiple high quality proposals.
- If developing more narrow solicitation criteria, consider ways to encourage more projects to address the particular criteria.
- It is undesirable to only fund one project. If possible, it would be beneficial to have flexibility in the funding.
- Publicize that pesticide use near schools is being addressed.

## 7. Closing Remarks

Mr. Leahy concluded the proposal review discussion by thanking PMAC members for reviewing and commenting on the proposals. Their recommendations provide invaluable input for DPR's proposal review and expand DPR's services overall. He commented that the issue of pesticide use near schools is very important and if the projects are successful, we'll want to see them applied statewide.

### Upcoming PMAC Meeting

- August 10, 2017 (tentative)