

Sustainable Pest Management (SPM) Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes – Monday, June 15, 2026

10:00 am to 12:30 pm – Virtual Meeting and Public Webcast

Welcome & Opening Remarks – Karen Morrison (DPR Director):

- Thank you all for coming today, and for volunteering to be on this committee. The original idea for this committee came from the SPM working group and was ultimately recommended in the 2023 SPM roadmap. It will be no small feat to take those big picture ideas and policies and turn them into practical, on-the-ground implementation. This is where this advisory committee is so essential. Everyone here brings unique perspective and expertise needed for SPM to succeed statewide; experience that will help guide us as we move into this next phase. We want to hear about the challenges you're seeing around sustainable pest management, but also the solutions you're already implementing. Sharing these best practices widely can help convince others that successfully practicing SPM can be a reality. We also welcome your ideas for how we can work together to make the bigger, systemic shifts called for in the SPM Roadmap – those changes that can move California toward sustainable pest management as the de facto system. Your insights will help us understand where the greatest opportunities lie and how DPR can support progress in a meaningful and realistic way.

Housekeeping & Orientation – Martine Boswell (IPM Branch Chief)

- Agenda review
- Meeting logistics:
 - Meetings will be held quarterly, every 3 months for 3 years. The next meetings will be in September and December. They will be held virtually via Zoom for 2-3 hours.
 - Agenda sent to committee members 2 weeks in advance. Committee members will receive emails and surveys between meetings. Files and documents will also be shared via email.
 - Please email questions, comments, and suggestions to SPMAdvisory@cdpr.ca.gov.
- Review of the SPM Advisory Committee Charter (scope and authority):
 - The SPM Advisory Committee will advise DPR on goals, tactics, policies, and partnerships that support the implementation of SPM statewide. Will track and discuss statewide progress towards the implementation of SPM systemwide. The SPM Advisory Committee does not hold decision-making authority.
- DPR Goals (2024-2028 DPR Strategic Plan):
 - Goal 1.1: Develop public and private partnerships and collaborations for implementing sustainable pest management.

- Goal 1.4: Facilitate and support SPM technical assistance and innovation in pest management in collaboration with interested parties.
- Goals for committee members beyond meetings:
 - Stay engaged with DPR between meetings.
 - Share SPM materials and ideas outside of meetings.
 - Please send feedback on SPM to SPMAdvisory@cdpr.ca.gov.
- Public comments:
 - 15-day public comment period after each meeting
 - The public can submit comments to [Smart Comment](#) or by using the QR code.
 - Comments will be reviewed by the committee and included in meeting notes posted on website.
- **Question – Lena Brooks:** Would it be possible to record these meetings going forward, so members who are unable to attend can benefit from the meeting conversations?
 - **Sapna Thottathil:** There were some logistical challenges, but we will consider the recommendation, thank you.

DPR Staff & Committee Member Introductions - All

DPR Introductions:

- **Sapna Thottathil** (*Deputy Director of Sustainable Pest Management*): Thank you for taking the time to participate in this committee.
- **Martine Boswell** (*IPM Branch Chief*): I'm somewhat newer to DPR. Thank you so much for participating. I'm excited to hear from all of you and excited to be working with you.
- **Brian Gress** (*SPM Initiatives Program Manager*): I oversee the Analysis & Strategies Unit for the IPM Branch. I'm looking forward to learning from all of you.
- **Jessica Wong** (*Senior Environmental Scientist - Specialist*)

Committee Members:

- Name and Affiliation
- What are your goals for participating in the SPM Committee?
- What is the state of SPM in California from your perspective?

- **Andrew Sutherland** (*Extension entomologist employed as the University of California's Urban Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Advisor for the San Francisco Bay Area*): I work in urban systems, structural, household, and public health. Most of my work in the bay area, allied with the UC IPM program. I would like to bring more transparency to the IPM program statewide. There are risks due to pests and as well as to pest management. We need to start building equations to manage them and communicate them to our residents.
- **Benjamin Lee** (*Senior Environmental Scientist at CDFA (sub for Kevi Mace, Supervisor at CDFA)*): Engages in SPM in a variety of areas. Our office handles pesticide analysis, several incentive bio farming programs, and research alternative pest management.
- **Daniel Palla** (*Technical Sales Representative for Trécé, Inc. and organic pistachio farmer*): Works for Tracy family farm. Job is to make sure farmers get home safely to their families, and crops are safe for consumers. We are always striving to do better at SPM.

- **James Farrar** (*Director of the University of California Integrated Pest Management Program (UC IPM)*): My goal for participation is to continue to move IPM forward in CA. I used that term (IPM) because that is the name of my program. As to the state of IPM/SPM, there is data showing good adoption in agricultural systems, but there are lots of opportunities in urban pest management systems.
- **Jason Saling** (*Viticulturist at Aperture Cellars*): I work as a Viticulturist with Sonoma County, with a county technical group to arrange tech meetings and alliances and am a program director for ambassador training. My goal is education for the practitioners in the field, and the evolution from IPM to SPM. A challenge is not having an estimation of abandoned fields. Growers were doing a good job previously, but there has been a loss of control. Keeping folks educated about the risks is a big part of my participation in this group.
- **Jimmy Nguyen** (*Food scientist and UC Agricultural and Natural Resources Advisor specializing in sustainable pest management, food safety, and organic production*): Interested in relationship of IPM/SPM with food safety. The state of California has made steps forward, but I see the lack of uniformity of application across crops. Practitioners need more practical tools and advice that fit food systems. Especially interested in how this relates to desert farming, which is currently dealing with pest pressure and climate change. Science-based tools are needed more than ever.
- **Jo Ann Baumgartner** (*Executive Director of Wild Farm Alliance*): I have been working in agriculture for many years and am the Director of the Wild Farm Alliance. We help farmers learn about SPM and how it can benefit nature, insects, and birds. So many systems are in place when it comes to supporting healthy farms. Farming is risky, expensive, and competitive, with long hours. They need to be supported with markets and helpful incentives that can support growers. Would also like DPR to eliminate the most toxic and hazardous pesticides. A lot of farmers don't feel they have financial incentives and support to decrease pesticide use. We need to support biodiversity (birds and insects) as well as help growers continue to feed us.
- **Laura Krueger** (*Board Certified Entomologist and Vector Ecologist with the Orange County Mosquito and Vector Control District*): We educate and protect the public from disease and vector populations. We know from public health that collaboration and participation is effective. I bring hands-on perspective and am advocating for science-based solutions. As a pesticide applicator, I also want to protect pesticide applicators (who have the highest exposure) and keep California healthy.
- **Lena Brooks** (*Deputy Director at Fullwell*): At the highest level, to support meaningful and timely implementation of the SPM roadmap, especially as California pivots to a new administration next year. To ensure that DPR has an achievable plan - with interim benchmarks for phaseouts - to eliminate Priority Pesticides by 2050. This is essential. I'd also like this committee to provide guidance to DPR on comprehensive pest prevention strategies, including ecological farming practices. With regards to SPM procurement, I'd like the committee to come up with a practice verification plan that ensures compliance as well as a way to track quantifiable reductions in agricultural pesticide use. In the context of SPM, my primary interest is agricultural pesticide use. Given that California is the leading organic producer in the country, I believe we already have an excellent baseline for SPM in this sector. Over the last five years or so, California has funded a number of programs - especially in the Department of Food and Agriculture, that support SPM growing practices. For example,

BIFS, the Organic Transition Pilot program, the Conservation Agriculture Planning Grants Program, and the Pollinator Habitat Program. The state has also invested in market development for farmers using practices related to SPM, particularly through our Farm to School program. I am excited to explore how to align across these current efforts in a way that helps achieve SPM Roadmap goals and incentivize more farmers to adopt SPM-compliant practices. *(Sent ahead and read by Sapna Thottathil)*

- **Maggie Rodriguez** (*Director of Global Regulatory and Government Affairs for Pro Farm Group*): Worked in the regulatory and government space for 17 years; worked with state and federal agencies. Goal for this committee is to ensure SPM tools are used across the state, that bio solutions fulfill these needs, and to help streamline processes for bio solutions.
- **Margaret Reeves** (*Senior Scientist at Pesticide Action and Agroecology Network*): One goal is to expand tracking since existing DPR pesticide reporting systems do not track growers using sustainable methods and compliant IPM/SPM growers. Having some clear certification to show compliancy would be great, and with that, we can set up systems where buyers could identify growers that are SPM compliant. We could help them get certified and grow from there. A lot of people don't know about SPM, so we have a lot of education to do.
- **Mayra Sanchez** (*Associate Director of Californians for Pesticide Reform (CPR)*): Would like pesticide reform and greater protection from harmful pesticides. Highlighted SPM roadmap goal of eliminating priority pesticides by 2050, through policies and incentives. We would like SPM to be more clearly defined, verify SPM practices, those that are compliant, and markets for procurement and contracts. Given these challenging issues, I think SPM/IPM could be more widely spread.
- **Michael Mellano** (*Third generation cut flower farmer and former CEO, Chairman of the Board, and Vice President of Production for Mellano & Company*): I'm also an active volunteer with the farm bureau and UCANR. There is some confusion on how SPM differs from IPM. IPM has been a continuous process of improvement, how is it different and how do we communicate that difference? SPM lacks the defined goals; how do we communicate that? We should create clear, definable goals that we can communicate with everyone.
- **Paul Squires** (*Independent Pest Control Advisor (PCA)*): My goal is to be a resource, with 32 years of experience as a PCA and an expert witness on pesticide drift. I would like to create connections and provide support by answering questions on economics. I'm a consultant for organic farmers as well and see value of it; and have opinions on scaling it. Curious about SPM and think there are good IPM tools that we can still use.
- **Renne Pennel** (*President/CEO of Western Plant Health Association (WPH)*): Pleased to participate in this committee. We look at SPM as a transition. The companies that we represent are leaders in technology and products. We can't snap our fingers for full SPM; it'll be a transition to full SPM. Our members hear first what farmers need and what products are out there. We have to remember that we have to stay practical to real-world use.
- **Jennifer Clarke** (*Executive Direct of the California Leafy Greens Research Board*): I have been a pest control advisor, worked in pesticide use enforcement, labor compliance, harvesting operation and food safety. So I've run the gamut in this industry, from field to fork.

→ **Comment - Sapna Thottathil**: Thank you all again for sharing your expertise. We see you as resources; you represent many sectors. I want to highlight that there are many things we agree on. We were drawn to your expertise on managing pest outbreaks, understanding the availability of

alternative practices, and how climate change will complicate pest management. Agriculture is a challenging profession that needs more resources and protection. Thank you for helping us move forward with these shared goals.

Background on Sustainable Pest Management (Presentation) - Sapna Thottathil (SPM Deputy Director)

Presentation Questions/Comments:

- **James Farrar:** DPR is adding 117 new positions, including 7 in Brian's unit. Are there positions being added to the registration branch (PRB) to help enable products to be registered more quickly?
 - **Sapna Thottathil:** Yes, those positions are spread across the department, including PRB. There have also been other changes in that branch to increase efficiency.
- **James Farrar:** Will there be joint meetings with the Scientific Prioritization and Review Committee (SPARC)?
 - **Sapna Thottathil:** As of now, no, the roles and goals of these groups are different and distinct.
- **Margaret Reeves:** The slide that included metrics did not include PUR (Pesticide Use Reports), how will that be implemented? SPM metrics are important.
 - **Daniel Palla:** On my organic farm, I don't apply that many pesticides, so you're not going to see pest use reports for SPM practices.
 - **Margaret Reeves:** Exactly, we could use the same systems for procurement incentives if we know who the practitioners are that are using SPM practices.
 - **Sapna Thottathil:** I acknowledge that better practices are key to SPM, uplifting those is a great goal for this committee. How can we discuss these and work together? Better practices are important.
 - **Margaret Reeves:** Thank you, and what I'm getting at is that because we have the use reporting, we're able to see who doesn't use the priority or highly hazardous pesticides. We have historically focused on pesticides of concern, but we could use the same system to see who is not using those same pesticides, then prioritize those folks with procurement incentives.
- **Michael Mellano:** Focus on science and not assume what solutions are going to work for problems, or assume there is only one solution. Make sure we prioritize solutions that are science-based, and don't put ourselves in a box. Priority pesticides will be eliminated when there are other ways to control the target pest, such as application technology, formulation changes, etc.
 - **Sapna Thottathil:** Completely agree, science is important, we look forward to elevating practical solutions. Thank you for your comment.
 - **Additional comment (for clarification): Sapna Thottathil:** SPARC (Scientific Prioritization and Review Committee) is not developing list of priority pesticides. DPR's authorities haven't changed. The SPARC committee will provide recommendations around mitigation priorities and prioritize actions for the department. Happy to talk more about SPARC and their role, maybe a future presentation and keeping this committee informed on what is happening.
- **Andrew Sutherland (statement):** I noticed with the list of partners, there is a major omission, and that is California's Structural Pest Control Board, part of the Department of Consumer Affairs; they license 28 thousand pesticide applicators and operators. Their

funding stream is different, they do not have competitive grants program, so invite continued coordination between these departments going forward.

- **Andrew Sutherland (question):** As priority pests are identified, one of the conversations regardless of system (ag, non-ag) is going to be critical uses. What are the critical uses for these priority pesticides? Pesticide use reports do not include target pests. That would help us understand the needs of our users are, what the critical uses are, and potential alternatives. This has been a missing part of the conversation in the past.
- **Sapna Thottathil:** The slide mentioned is in development, and I have noted that Structural Pest Control Board is missing. We are in conversations with them in many different ways, including our SPM Cross-Agency Work Group. I definitely recognize that they are important collaborators. And this idea of better understanding target pests, that is something that has been on our minds too.
- **Laura Krueger:** To piggyback on Andrew's point, I saw that you mentioned expanding urban PUR program. Can you say more about that, or is there information available for urban applicators?
 - **Sapna Thottathil:** We're in the very early stages of that, and I think we would benefit from hearing some of your recommendations. We're about to start hiring for that team and building that program out. This will be a topic we come back to more deliberately with this committee.

[Break]

SPM Resource Development (Presentation) – Jessica Wong (Senior Environmental Scientist - Specialist)

Presentation Discussion:

- What are your thoughts on the matrix?
- Is this a framework that works for your sector or organization?
- Does this matrix help articulate how SPM builds on IPM, is SPM more tangible?
- **Andrew Sutherland:** A big piece that may be missing is communication to residents. Often the complexity of the IPM process is not understood or poorly understood. This goes back to my goal of transparency, developing ways to communicate the decision-making processes in pest management and communicating those to the public. So, they can understand why a pesticide is being used, or why an alternative is not being considered. It is a discrepancy across all of these sectors.
- **James Farrar:** The matrix helps to start solidifying the thought process for SPM and provide concrete examples. As we build this out, I hope we find similar examples for urban spaces. I'm concerned that the fear in the grower community is that having only examples around agriculture will make them feel targeted. Having those urban examples will show that this is for pest management in all contexts.
- **Michael Mellano:** It's helpful [the matrix], but looking at it, it's not clear on how SPM really differs from IPM. Maybe identify the components in the matrix that are new concepts, that aren't considered part of IPM. As an IPM practitioner, all the things listed seem to be IPM and the DPR mission. So, helping the farmer community identify understand where is the real difference, it's important; matrix doesn't highlight where the difference is.

- **Jessica Wong:** Okay, so really clarifying the differences between SPM and IPM.
- **Michael Mellano:** Not an A and B situation, most farmers feel that SPM is IPM. What are we doing that is different under SPM, that wasn't part of IPM practices? This will help farmers target their practices and align with DPR.
- **Brian Gress:** Our idea with this matrix was to show that SPM is more like a systems level approach. We have some of those cells at the individual level, a key component of implementing the SPM system is having IPM implemented at those site-specific levels. Then presenting the broader framework of what else SPM covers.
- **Michael Mellano:** Yes, and the matrix is helpful. But at the practitioner level, I do not see the difference.
- **Jessica Wong:** There might not be differences at that individual level, we're trying to think about where we can coordinate better.
- **Daniel Palla:** Something I saw missing is that foreign imported produce will have an unfair advantage. We'll be competing against produce that uses cheaper wages, child labor, pesticides we're not allowed to use, etc. Would like to see more priority on imported produce by upping the sampling done by DPR for harmful pesticides and creating a more even playing field.
- **Jennifer Clarke:** Agree with previous comments, it feels like we are changing the name to something growers are doing already. Like foreign produce, even produce coming from out of the state can be a problem. Growers are leaving California since they will have more cost-effective tools and options out of state. We need to make sure we're not putting California farmers at a disadvantage, with more to comply with, and this feeling like something we're already doing.
- **Margaret Reeves:** Agree with Jim [James] and Mike [Michael], the matrix is great, but in terms of communicating with the public, maybe don't complicate it, refer to IPM. In terms of incentives, we've got various certifications like organic. That's a good place to begin, recognize and verify growers that use those systems. This will give incentive to growers to adopt practices.
- **Jason Saling:** The matrix, from a priority standpoint, it's almost inverted. IPM exists, we've been doing good with IPM for a long time. Recommend showing the evolution of IPM to SPM, then moving to broader scale. IPM has been prioritized on the farms, at an individual level and how they manage their own properties. SPM is reaching out to your neighbors and joining hands in the effort. Not just fighting our own battles (ag or urban), but everything around it that is also contributing to it. How do we communicate it to the public? Instead of top-down messaging, maybe educate at the ground level what the objectives are. Regarding the strategic plan and road map, defining the goals has been an evolution. It puts a definition of where we want to be without exactly how to do it. The committee can define that path by including the farmers and employees and by getting their thoughts and feedback. When discussing with growers, there was a lot of excitement around SPM.
- **Jo Ann Baumgartner:** To me, SPM is using a science-based alternative first. When a PCA fills out a use form, they must sign the form stating that they shared alternatives with the grower. We want science-based alternatives that are biological, mechanical, and cultural before we use toxic pesticides. Regarding the cases studies, we should be including organic growers, and growers that aren't technically organic. We need more focus on them. Sometimes the alternatives are not the best (like extensive tilling), so options are important. We should lift up a lot of what we already know.

- Which audiences should be prioritized and why?
- What kind of outreach or resources do these audiences need?
- How would define successful outreach?

→ How can DPR work with your sectors or organizations to improve understanding regarding SPM?

- **Laura Krueger:** We've had multiple generations learn IPM in college, and a lot of what we're seeing here in the same (for example: terms used). In developing the matrix further, focusing on the differences is very critical. Work on defining differences, so we can move forward in a different way.
- **Maggie Rodriguez:** Outreach materials and resources should have a common message, have clear definitions, and overall initiative will be helpful. To help define the overall message around SPM, that it involves many stakeholders and things that fall outside of the individual farmers. Maybe a Venn diagram that covers all of the stakeholders (individual, agency, local), see where SPM/IPM differs and overlaps; and evolves as SPM gets fleshed out.
- **Daniel Palla:** Regarding outreach, the University of California does a great job and already works with local CAPCA (California Association of Pest Control Advisors) agencies. IPM/SPM has been quieted and controlled because PCAs did not receive continuing education credits for the longest time for SPM practices. With DPR now allowing that, I think there will be a great benefit. PCAs can learn about alternatives like mowing, dicing, non-chemical approaches; I think we'll see a great benefit from that.
- **James Farrar:** In cooperative extension we have a framework for thinking about successful outreach, the people we are communicating with, they learn something new and that influences them to change their behavior, which then creates the condition change that you want. We try to measure those three different levels. It's a process, not automatic. We've seen this in the continual improvement in the PUR report; the decrease in the use of all kinds of risky products. I think successful outreach in that context is helpful. UC IPM and Cooperative Extension would like to be partners with DPR. To synergize and leverage our cooperative extension outreach material, not compete.
- **Paul Squires:** Exposure is a catalyst to understanding. I invite anyone to come out to the ranch and see what is happening on a day-to-day basis. I think a lot of assumptions are made on how we farm, and how I (as a PCA) may recommend the use or non-use of a pesticide. Understanding requires exposure, with DPR on the ground.
- **Renne Pennel:** In these documents, DPR emphasizes that SPM is more of an integrated program. The concerns from grower groups are that SPM means the elimination of products. Preventative programs are very important, not discounting them. But we've seen pest infestations out of control and there aren't currently tools to deal with them. So, the threat is that CA is going to make it more difficult to alleviate those threats. It is important to message that this is not just an elimination of products to reduce nervousness from the farmers around SPM; it's collaborative effort with emphasis on alternatives, and that they will be able to protect their crops.
- **Mayra Sanchez:** Glad the UCs are interested and willing to help push SPM initiatives; they have an important role in informing, research, and education of future farmers and policy makers. They have an important role in pesticide use, enforcement, and compliance. Would like closer engagement with farm bureaus and grower associations and the public. If the public is more aware of this it will increase support. Support growers through programs and through the market.
- **Michael Mellano:** Universities are one of the best partners to deliver the message to the different communities, they have the capacity, respect and impartiality to deliver in a way that the concerned groups would respect and accept. Beyond that, UC and UCANR must be a partner at a high level since expanded practices will require expanded R&D. But we must clarify message first, SPM vs. IPM. As for groups, communicating with the groups that are most concerned with this currently and prioritize them. Urban population is generally

unaware [of SPM/IPM], talking to the groups most concerned will be important. But the message must be refined.

- **Jo Ann Baumgartner:** Wild Farm Alliance has 23 hours of CE courses approved by DPR for PCAs, growers, and others. Getting a lot of positive feedback on those and learning new practices. Also, can we submit thoughts via email [after the meeting]?
 - **Jessica Wong:** Yes, please share your ideas, case studies, urban sector, etc. by email: SPMAdvisory@cdpr.ca.gov.

SPM Incentives Landscape (Presentation) – Brian Gress (SPM Initiatives Program Manager)

Presentation Discussion:

- Have we captured the right programs and organizations? Gaps? Non-ag programs? Crop Insurance?
- What barriers do practitioners face in accessing these programs? Does this resource help?
- How can DPR most effectively distribute this resource to maximize reach and impact?
- **Laura Krueger:** Not a lot of programs available for urban space. Mosquito control exists because none of the science-based controls are used first (like turning off water to not over-irrigate land). Some districts have rebate programs where certain landowners can apply for a rebate if they remove a mosquito site on their property. Maybe a resource could be an explanation on how to develop rebate programs for larger government organizations to enhance science-based alternative use.
 - **Brian Gress:** Thank you, that wasn't on our radar. Yes, love that idea and will look into it. Also happy to talk about different resources, including urban resources.
 - **Laura Krueger:** Were you able to locate any additional urban resources?
 - **Brian Gress:** I know this is an incomplete list, so if anyone else is aware of urban programs, please let us know.
- **Daniel Palla:** The Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) funding pool has shrunk significantly in the last few years; and don't want us to be too reliant on them.
 - **Brian Gress:** Not a positive development, but I appreciate that.
- **James Farrar:** On the urban side, there isn't [an SPM] incentive unless you think of a certification as a marketing device. For buildings there is LEED Certification and Green Shield Certification for urban pest management practitioners. Could there be co-benefits from piggy backing off energy improvement, and get a co-benefit from pest exclusion?
- **Jason Saling:** Applied for multiple grants this year and was turned down. So, there is a low incentive to apply for grants since applying for them is a lot of work upfront. Also, I recommend we train the trainer, [practitioners] go to programs and get CE units, but it doesn't always get translated into their work. Train regional workgroups or RCDs on how to build incentives. Also, farmers who own their land are wondering if they are going to fall out of the Williamson act.
- **Michael Mellano:** List looks good, but for the federal list but you'll have to get cooperation to expand participation (might be difficult). Federal programs like USDA's Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), etc., target Midwest farming practices, not California farming practices. When reaching out to add California practices, they are being denied. Also, they are complex programs, writing and applying for grants, EQIP, etc., and the more complex your business, the more difficult it is. It leads to certain group of people that can tap into that stream of funds, whereas small farmers cannot (due to time and expertise

involved). Unless they hire someone, requiring putting money upfront to write grants. How can we streamline the process to help people get funding?

- **Brian Gress:** Thank you, I'm hoping to learn more about those barriers for growers applying for and obtaining funding from these programs.
- **Michael Mellano:** Crop insurance, a lot of communities don't have access to crop insurance programs.
- **Daniel Palla:** State should lead the way [on SPM], what are they doing with their own buildings? They should set an example with their own pesticide use. Also, state should purchase California grown organic produce for school programs to support California farmers and incentivize SPM practices.
 - **Brian Gress:** Yes, and I also want to flag that we are also running a Cross-Agency SPM Work Group and some of these conversations about building management are happening now, so I appreciate that.
 - **Daniel Palla:** Would it be possible to have a certification on buildings or corporations stating they use SPM?
 - **Brian Gress:** I'm not currently aware of anything like that, but it is something we can look into.
- **Benjamin Lee:** It's nice to see the draft with of the programs listed. This might be down the road, but it would be useful to have a quicker table or tag system to show the eligibility for each program, amounts of funding available for them, incentives. If you go through the list of 20 programs, and you already have difficulty with some of the barriers to application, well defined criteria so they can easily decide which programs or incentives they qualify for would be helpful. Color coding, single row identifier for each, etc. to make it easier to reference.
- **Jennifer Clarke:** Great, comprehensive list. For challenges, it is harder for smaller growers to apply for grants, due to time and effort. Flipside is that larger growers often don't meet AGI requirements that don't factor in rising costs, and it throws them out of eligibility for these grants.
 - **Brian Gress:** Appreciate that, it was not on my radar.
 - **Daniel Palla:** Reminder that it is \$900,000 on income, might want to check with NRCS, might be a misunderstanding on how it is being filled out.
 - **Jennifer Clarke:** Unless mistakes were made, that has been the experience for the leafy green growers.
- **Mayra Sanchez:** Express support for Daniel's idea on the state leading the way on implementing these practices, such as Caltrans and urban spaces. Tax credits are a good idea to explore. When applying for grants DPR and UC system could provide technical support for growers with applying for grants. Also wondering how we can think of implementation of incentives on a regional scale SPM rather than just individual growers.
- **James Farrar:** Regarding UCs and IPM – all properties managed by a UC will have to use IPM to manage pests. They have developed and use a "Stop Light" tiering system for treating pests. Extreme infestations, or red-tier infestations, must go through a request process and have a committee review, to use higher hazard products. Regarding the Foundation for Food and Ag Research, they are collaborating with the IPM Alliance on new initiative working with food supply chain and retailers to develop an IPM incentive program. This will have incentives from the private sector to support the farmers who are doing IPM practices. It's a food retail incentive vs a govt incentive program.
- **Andrew Sutherland:** Missing opportunity or partnership in non-agricultural space is code enforcement. With existing state and local code regarding housing, building, public health, and could address some of the structural exclusion and pest prevention aspects of non-agricultural pest management. In my experience, code enforcement is severely limited by human resources and funding. This is an opportunity to engage with these groups; they can help with enforcement. Incentives are great, but none of them are being enforced. Building

codes and enforcement of codes are essential, requiring partnership at the municipal and local level.

- **Jo Ann Baumgartner:** Regarding what Jim said about the three-color stoplight tier system, we [Wild Farm Alliance] created organic and nonorganic color-coded systems for what is safe for birds. It would be great for DPR to do that for all the pesticides. It would be easier for all growers to understand. And it should be not just on human health, but impacts on soil, water and wildlife too.

Closing Remarks – Sapna Thottathil (SPM Deputy Director)

Thank you for your comments, we clearly have a lot to talk about. I appreciate everyone joining for our inaugural meeting, where we focused on the basics. We look forward to deeper dives into specific topics. We are looking for feedback on the meeting and any questions, so please reach out to: SPMAdvisory@cdpr.ca.gov. We are also looking for feedback on SPM resources and incentives. We have agenda items in mind for the next three years, but please reach out if you have suggestions. We want to hear about success stories and collect case studies. There will be some homework between meetings – surveys, agenda topics, feedback, etc. I'd like to mention again that we have two more meetings before the end of the calendar year. We have a 15-day public comment period and will address comments during the next meeting. Thank you again for joining and your participation.

[Meeting Adjourned]

Public Comments