



UC Small Farms Network

University of California
Agriculture & Natural Resources

California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
climate@cdfa.ca.gov • <https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/climate/>

RE: Climate Resilience Strategy for California Agriculture Request for Feedback

Dear CDFA,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit feedback on the draft CDFA Climate Resilience Strategy for California Agriculture.

Since 2021, the University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources (UCANR) Small Farms Network team of nine extension staff and academics funded through CDFA's California Small and Underserved Producer (CUSP) program has assisted small-scale, medium-sized and historically underserved farms in applying for direct-to-producer disaster relief funding opportunities. Our team offers technical assistance in six languages. We have assisted farmers whose wells went dry during the drought, growers whose crops flooded during winter storms, and specialty crop producers whose greenhouses collapsed due to high winds. Our team knows first-hand the impacts climate change has on farms and the farming community. We appreciate CDFA's work towards developing a Climate Resiliency Strategy for California Agriculture.

In response to CDFA's request for feedback on the draft CDFA Climate Resilience Strategy for California Agriculture, the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP team offers the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1:

Re: Pillar 1: Support a Thriving and Resilient Food Sector

- *Chapter 1. Foster a Robust and Sustainable Agricultural Economy*
 - 1.1.2 Effectively promote and deploy the California Underserved and Small Producers (CUSP) program

Since 2021, the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP-funded staff alone have provided over 2,700 technical assistance sessions, 90% of which served farmers from historically underserved communities. In addition, our CUSP team has connected small-scale producers to over \$4 million in direct-to-producer disaster relief funds. Some of the growers we work with have commented that the CUSP grant funds, along with the technical support provided by the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP team, were pivotal in their decision to continuing to farming. Given that current funding for CUSP direct-to-produce grants is set to expire by the end of 2026, farmers will lose this critical lifeline when the program terminates.



In the event additional funding gets allocated to CUSP and the program is refunded, the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP team offers the following recommendations to allow CDFA to build off lessons learned from previous rounds of direct-to-producer CUSP grants and continue to improve the program. In addition, given that CUSP has a block-grant organizational structure, many of these recommendations may also be relevant to other block-grant organized programs, such as the CDFA Climate Smart Agriculture Initiative programs.

1) Recommendations to continue to improve the CDFA CUSP Program

1. To ensure public awareness of CUSP grant application periods and grant administrator contact information, keep the CDFA CUSP website (<https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/cusp/>) updated with up-to-date application periods and award distribution dates, as well as ensure that the name, phone number, email address, and physical address for the grant administrator from each CUSP block grant organization is listed on the website. If there are two different grants being offered, i.e. Extreme Weather Relief grants & Drought Relief grants, make sure it is clear which grants an organization is accepting, as well as the timelines for the two specific grants.
2. Standardize CUSP grant marketing materials across all block grant organizations so that farmers know that they are applying to a CUSP grant from CDFA.
3. Standardize the CUSP grant application form to ensure that the application process is the same for all CUSP block grant organizations.
4. Requesting additional required information above and beyond the standardized application should not be allowed. For example, block grant organizations should not be allowed to require farmers to provide personal information, data, photos, lease agreements, or other information beyond what is required by CDFA.
5. Provide clear guidelines on the appropriate use of the CUSP Technical Assistance Provider checklist.
6. Provide a list of accepted verification documentation, as well as a database of previously accepted verification document examples to assist farmers, TA providers, and granting organizations in clearly understanding CUSP grant documentation requirements. Distinguish between required documentation for farmer identification versus proof of need or hardship.
7. Standardize the award wait times and fund distribution processes so that awardees receive funds in a standard and reasonable time frame. Upon submission of the application, granting organizations should communicate expected application response timelines to applicants and affiliated technical assistance providers. Any unforeseen delays in the timeline should be immediately communicated to applicants and technical service providers.
8. Standardize the manner in which award amounts are determined so that they are standard across all block grant organizations.
9. Fully fund initial requests for documented grant amounts, while respecting annual grant caps, so that applicants receive impactful relief payments.



10. In our experience, farmers who apply for multiple CUSP relief grants, as a way to reach the full amount of their requested funds, may not be awarded a second grant. For example, if a farmer applies for (and has documentation to corroborate) a \$15,000 CUSP grant from one CUSP block grant organization, but is only awarded \$5,000, it is less likely that they will be awarded the \$10,000 if they apply to second CUSP block-grant organization within the same application year. This may be because previously awarded applications are given lower priority than applications that have not been awarded. Fulling funding grant requests up front could help ensure that applicants receive impactful relief payment amounts.
11. In addition, given that CUSP extreme weather grants are now awarding grants for multiple types of disasters, it could be a good point in time to gather input to reconsider whether \$20,000/year cap is adequate relief funding for small- and medium-scale farms.
12. Ensure that block grant recipient organizations do not give favor to their own clientele but accept applications from all eligible producers, as well as fund all awarded applicants, including those from outside the organization's service area, according to the same funding rubric.
 - a. Our team has had experiences where growers are awarded lower amounts by a CUSP block grant organization simply because they are not in the block grant organization's service region, and, if the grower had been in the organization's geographic service region, they would have received the full award amount for their documented losses. In these cases, to reach their fully documented loss amount, the grower must then apply for an additional CUSP grant through a different CUSP block grant organization. This results in farms from outside regions, and the TA providers that support them, having to put in additional work to receive full funding for justified and documented losses. In addition, farmers are frequently requested to provide additional loss documentation in the second application, above and beyond the initial documentation in their first application, even if the justification for not fully funding the first application was solely based on geographic location. As noted in point '1.11' above, second applications may also be more likely to be rejected.
13. Improve CUSP block grant organization institutional memory by creating a mechanism to archive and communicate past decisions regarding CUSP grant implementation processes to ensure that all CUSP block grant organizations implement agreed upon changes.
14. Develop standardized new-staff onboarding training for all CUSP TA providers and direct-to-producer grant administrators so everyone has the same understanding of CUSP block-grant requirements and expectations, including, but not limited to, what is acceptable verification documentation and what information block grant organization cannot ask farmer applicants to provide.
15. Continue to facilitate communications between CUSP block grant organizations, to ensure consistent and streamlined grant application and award processes.



16. Ensure that CUSP block grant organizations have the financial support and staff capacity they needed to successfully administer CUSP direct-to-producer grants.
17. Create a mechanism for farmers to give direct feedback to CDFA on their experience with CUSP block grant organizations and any comments or concerns that may arise.
18. Implement accountability measures to ensure that grants reach the intended small and medium-scale California agricultural producers — including socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers — while adapting CUSP grant documentation requirements to reflect the different business circumstances of smaller operations.
19. Consider additional CDFA relief programs for losses not included in the CUSP program. For example, quarantine related expenses were initially included as an allowable expense in CUSP Extreme Weather Relief grants, but were removed because it was difficult to find scientific evidence to tie any specific quarantine pest to extreme weather, in part because quarantined pests are logistically difficult to research given their small population and quarantine restrictions. Given this, consider alternative CDFA programs to support small-, mid-scale, and historically underserved growers in addressing and recovering losses from increased agricultural pest and disease pressures due to climate change.

3. Best practices to ensure that all small- and medium-scale farmers and ranchers have equal access to relief grants

California Underserved and Small Producer Program (CUSP) relief grants are targeted to small- and medium-scale farmers and ranchers that qualify for the program, including historically underserved/socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.

For over 40 years, the UCANR Small Farms Network county-based advisors and staff have supported small-scale and historically underserved/socially disadvantaged farms throughout California, including supporting these farmers in applying for economic relief grants. Through our work, we have found that the following grant administration practices maintain positive relationships and support a level playing field to ensure that all small- and medium-scale farmers and ranchers, including historically underserved farmers and ranchers, have equal access to grant and incentive programs.

- a. **Grant administration models that set clear application periods with concrete deadlines better serve all applicants, in comparison to first-come-first-serve grant administration models which disadvantage applicants that have limited staff capacity for grant applications, as well as those that rely on language translation and/or technology technical assistance.**

Many small- and medium-scale farmers have limited staff and take on many roles in both farm management and field production. This means that these small- and medium scale farms do not have staff that are dedicated to managing paperwork or filling out grant applications. Applying for grant applications must be juggled with many other



farm-related tasks which can slow down turnaround time, in comparison to operations with more staff capacity.

In addition, for farmers whose primary language is one other than English, translation support is key to applying for grants and incentive programs. Similarly, farmers who are less tech-savvy may rely on the assistance of a more tech-savvy family member or TA provider when applying for grants and incentive programs.

Grant programs that set clear application periods with concrete deadlines support farmers with limited staff capacity, as well as those that rely on language translation and/or technology support in applying for the grant. The application period and concrete deadline allows the farmer and those people supporting the farmer the extra time needed to apply for the grant and/or for language translation and technology support.

First-come-first-serve grant administration models disadvantage farmers with limited staff capacity, as these farmers frequently need more time to complete grant applications as this work is juggled with many other farm tasks. First-come-first-serve grant administration models also disadvantage farmers that rely on language translation and technology support, as these support activities require additional time and coordination. Because of this, it takes more time for farmers who rely on translation or technology support to complete their applications and respond to questions from grant administrators, when compared to farmers who can apply and respond directly without needing to coordinate technical assistance.

To provide a level playing field for all grant applicants, the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP team recommends that CUSP block grant organizations administer their grants by setting clear application periods with concrete application deadlines, and then review applications after the deadline, instead of using a first-come-first-serve application model.

b. Offer Language Translation and Technology Support Throughout the Entire Grant Process

While document translation is a first step toward language accessibility, bilingual technical assistance provides better support. By funding bilingual technical service providers to assist small-scale and historically underserved growers in applying for CUSP grants, the CUSP program does an excellent job in supporting CUSP grant applicants whose preferred language is one other than English. Similarly, CUSP-funded technical service providers provide technology support, when needed, to farmer applicants. By supporting both language translation and technology support throughout the entire CUSP relief grant process---from application support to award check delivery---the CUSP program is succeeding in its goal of providing grant-related technical support of small-



scale and historically underserved farmers. In contrast, grant programs that offer application forms translated into various languages, but conduct most application follow-up communications in English, do not fully support grant applicants whose preferred language is one other than English.

Given that not all organizations have bilingual technical assistance staff for the diversity of languages spoken by farming communities in California, the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP team encourages CDFA to continue to hold space to allow CUSP block grant organization and technical service providers to coordinate language support among organizations.

c. Maintain Consistent Relationships with Farming Communities via Long-term Funding for Technical Assistance Providers

In general, many farming communities distrust government agencies. In addition, farm communities not traditionally served by agriculture extension or government farm programs, or farm communities that were historically discriminated against by said programs, may have even deeper distrust of government funded programs that aim to support California's farm communities. Building relationships in communities takes many years. Long-term funding that allows agricultural technical assistance organizations to maintain consistent staffing, so that the same technical assistance provider works in the same community over a long timespan, supports the development of trusted relationships with farm communities. Short-term funding, which results in high staff turnover, or projects that get started then stop, can, on the other hand, can strain community relationships.

d. Ensure that grant verification documentation reflects the diversity of farm operations that apply to relief grants

Small-scale farms run by sole proprietors may have different business documentation that larger operations. Ensuring that the grant verification documentation required by the grant reflects the diversity of operations that apply to the grant, will ensure that agricultural operations of any scale can apply.

By offering technical service providers the option to verify drought impacts through the Technical Assistance Checklist for the CUSP Drought Relief and Extreme Weather grants, the CUSP program provides an additional resource for small-scale and historically underserved producers to use when documenting their drought impacts. See Attachment I for a copy of the CUSP Drought Relief checklist.



- e. **Clear and timely communications throughout the granting process---including communicating unforeseen delays---maintains trust and positive relationships with farmer and rancher applicants.**

As noted previously, many of the farm communities with which the UCANR Small Farms Network works are slow to trust technical service providers. Our team puts a lot of effort into cultivating and maintaining positive relationships with our clientele. This work takes years of effort and is key to our success in assisting growers in applying to grants and incentive programs, including CUSP grants. Communication is key to maintaining these relationships.

In the past, there have been relief granting organizations that fail to communicate in a timely manner with applicants. A farmer may submit an application for a relief grant and not hear anything on the status of the application for months, with follow up emails and phone calls going unanswered by the granting organization. We have also had experiences where awarded grant applicants were notified that they had been awarded and that checks would be sent out soon, yet the checks were not sent out until four months after the notification. No explanation was given for the delay.

While we understand that unforeseen challenges come up, the lack of communication around these challenges erodes farmer trust, both in the relief grant program and in the technical service providers associated with the grant program. We have had growers contact us to ask if the relief grant they applied to was fraud, since they provided many personal details to the granting organization and did not hear back from the organization in a timely manner. Other growers we have worked with simply grew frustrated by the lack of communication and long wait times and are now no longer interested in participating in future rounds of relief program grants.

To avoid these challenges in the future, we recommend that CUSP block grant organizations maintain contact with farmer applicants and associated technical service providers throughout the granting process, including communicating unforeseen changes in deadlines related to the grant-review and award check-distribution processes.

Recommendation 2:

Re: Pillar 1: Support a Thriving and Resilient Food Sector

- *Chapter 1. Foster a Robust and Sustainable Agricultural Economy*
 - 1.5 Private investment in climate-smart agriculture via voluntary carbon markets

The implementation of carbon credits needs to address diverse farm scales. It is our team's experience that carbon sequestration incentive programs that rank applications solely on the



amount of carbon sequestered disadvantage small-scale farms, in that small-scale farms frequently have less competitive applications because their limited acreage limits the total amount of carbon they can sequester.

Recommendation 3:

Re: Pillar 2: Protect Natural Systems Critical to Agriculture

- *Chapter 7. Deploy Sustainable, Adaptable, and Integrated Pest Management*

Due to the economic pressure on small scale farms that lease land, crop selection can largely be driven by what high-value products a farm can sell to the markets that are available to them. This can cause growers to be constrained to 1-2 crops per year which can cause pest and disease pressure to build up. In addition, growing on small-acreage parcels can limit rotation possibilities. The limitations of the markets, and other constraints of small-scale growers, need to be addressed in CDFA's strategies to address Integrated Pest Management. If an IPM strategy is not economically viable, growers may be hesitant to put the IPM strategy into practice.

Recommendation 4:

Re: Pillar 3: Encourage Resilient Agriculture Practices

- *Chapter 9. Enhance Agricultural Practices to Support Clean Air Communities*
 - 9.1.3 Increase access to equipment upgrades and changing agricultural operation practices that improve air quality.

Tractor replacement programs are popular with the farmers with which the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP team works. We have included feedback below to further improve these programs.

1. Currently the CORE program has only one costly tractor model available through the program, which limits this program's utility to farmers.
2. While not a CDFA program, the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP team has worked with a number of growers to obtain replacement tractors through the USDA NRCS Combustion System Improvement (Tractor Replacement Program). The program is very helpful for small farms. The program allows small farms---that usually have older tractors (some are 30+ years old)---receive cost share funding to replace the old tractors with newer Teir 4 Final tractors that are better for air quality. We have included some reflections on this USDA program below, in the event CDFA would like to glean lessons learned from USDA programs for similar CDFA tractor replacement programs.
 - a. Benefits: The USDA NRCS Combustion System Improvement program allows the grower to purchase a newer, more reliable tractor that is mostly funded through



- USDA. With out this program, the small farms our team works with would typically not have funds for a brand new tractor.
- b. Challenges our team has observed related to small-scale and historically underserved farmers accessing USDA tractor replacement programs
- i. knowing when the best time is to apply or if funding is available
 - ii. knowing where to apply
 - iii. assistance for growers with limited English
 - iv. the vast amount of documentation needed to complete and submit to USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA) in order to apply.
 1. This process can take months of back and forth to compile documentation and complete intake forms.
 2. USDA NRCS staff cannot help growers with documentation support because it would be considered “coaching” and they are not allowed to do so.
 - v. funds are somewhat limited and very competitive because small farms are competing against all farmers that apply for the same program.
 - vi. The funding cycle is usually only once per year (may two times if there are extra funds available).

Recommendation 4:

Re: Pillar 3: Encourage Resilient Agriculture Practices

- *Chapter 10. Advance Climate-Smart and Healthy Soil Practices*

Healthy Soils Program grant administration should to be adaptive to the needs of small-scale specialty growers. It is the UCANR Small Farms Network CUSP team’s experience that deadline extensions have turned out to be crucial for compost application in certain extended-season cropping systems. For example, some small-scale strawberry growers hold down costs by keeping their strawberry plants in the ground for a second season, meaning that the Healthy Soils compost application schedule must be drawn out if it is to accommodate these growers. Having the ability to extend implementation deadlines has assisted growers in both implementing soil health practices while maintaining economically viable production practices.

Many compost suppliers will not work with small farms because they require a 50-ton minimum. There can also be challenges with compost delivery on small farms. Compost is usually delivered by semi-trucks. Small farms may not have good access points to fields or farmland for vehicles of this size. Our team has worked with compost suppliers who initially agreed to work with small farms, but after experiencing these delivery access challenges, did not want to work with small-scale growers the next year.



It can also be challenging to find compost suppliers who are willing to both deliver and spread the compost. If a grower can only get the compost delivered by the compost supplier (and not spread), this means the grower has to hire an additional contractor to spread the compost. This additional cost may mean that the grower spends more money that was allocated in the grant for the project. In addition, spreading companies typically work with larger farms and prioritize projects with more acreage. This can lead to delays in spreading on small farms. This pushing back of the spreading date can lead to delayed planting schedules, crop production, growing/harvesting and resulting in crops coming in later than planned, which results in decreased income for the farmer.

In some regions for California equipment sharing libraries offer compost spreaders that help mitigate some of these challenges with compost spreading. But, these libraries are currently limited in number and the existing libraries have a limited number of equipment.

The CDFA Healthy Soils Program should address the logistical challenges of compost delivery and spreading for small-scale operations in the next round of Healthy Soils Program grants.

Recommendation 5:

Re: Appendix A: Integrating Equity Principles for Agriculture

The UCANR CUSP team offers technical assistance in English, Spanish, Hmong, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Korean. It is our experience that while language translation is a good first step toward language accessibility, translation on its own does not necessarily result in language access. Technology barriers also need be addressed when considering language accessibility. If CDFA offers an online form in multiple languages, but a farmer does not use the internet, then the farmer does not have access to the translated form. CDFA should consider technology barriers, as well as the preferred communication preferences of California's farms when developing their language access plan.

Our team also comments that they frequently end up translating CDFA resources twice. Once into the preferred language of the farmer and then again to explain highly technical scientific or regulatory terms included in forms or other CDFA communications. We appreciate CDFA's efforts to use only plain language in their communications, as this will assist in language accessibility in numerous ways.

As noted previously, many farmers do not trust government agencies. Our team has found the fact that we are not affiliated with a regulatory agency is helpful in conducting our work, as it means that growers are more willing to trust our team than they would someone from a regulatory agency. In this way, funding bilingual third-party technical assistance providers also assists with language accessibility.



UC Small Farms Network

University of California
Agriculture & Natural Resources

Final Notes:

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft CDFA Climate Resiliency Strategy for California Agriculture. We are happy to provide additional information on any of our comments.

Best Regards,

Meaghan Donovan
Small Farms Program Manager
University of California Small Farms Network

Carrie Teiken
Associate Director of Small Farms
University of California Small Farms Network

*Although we are university employees, any opinions or statements in this document we make as individuals and not as representatives of the University or any of its offices or units.

Attachment I: CDFA- CUSP PROGRAM

Technical Assistance Checklist for CUSP Drought Relief Aid

Farmer Information

Name: _____

Farm Address: _____

City _____ ZIP Code: _____

County: _____ Phone: _____

Email: _____

Acres: _____ Leased/Owned: _____ APN: _____

Latitude: _____ Longitude: _____

Water Source(s): _____ Agricultural groundwater well _____ Domestic groundwater well

_____ Surface/canal water _____ City/municipal water _____ Storage pond or tank

_____ Other : _____

Demographic Information: Race: _____ Ethnicity: _____

Gender: _____ Check if: _____ BIPOC _____ SDFR _____ Immigrant or refugee

Land is in active production and farmer involved in day-to-day operations _____Y _____N

Land is in active production and landowner manages farm on behalf of tenant farmers _____Y _____N

Check if farmer is not eligible for _____SWEEP or _____EQIP

-SWEEP: not eligible if already receiving SWEEP or EQIP funding

-EQIP: not eligible if already receiving SWEEP or EQIP funding, or not eligible to receive federal funding, or renting farmland and difficult to get landowner's permission

Is this farm in a critically overdrafted basin as defined by DWR under SGMA? _____Y _____N

<https://water.ca.gov/programs/groundwater-management/bulletin-118/critically-overdrafted-basins>

Total number of crops per year: _____ List representative crops and/or animal species below:

CDFA- CUSP PROGRAM

Technical Assistance Checklist for CUSP Drought Relief Aid

Cover Sheet and Instructions

This checklist can be completed by technical assistance (TA) providers assisting farmers with applications for drought relief funding under the California Underserved and Small Producer (CUSP) Program, particularly for farmers unable to access other types of required documents. The checklist documents drought-related challenges and impacts that can be observed either visually at an on-farm visit by the TA provider, or through verifying information that can be gathered from other agencies.

It is not necessary to fill out every section on the checklist. The checklist is designed to document whatever drought-related challenges can be observed and/or verified by the TA provider. The TA provider can complete all sections that apply to the farmer in question, and that they are able to provide based on their technical expertise and/or diagnostic equipment, and leave the rest blank. Eligibility and funding level will be determined by the organization directly awarding the drought relief grants.

Please use your best judgment to determine what drought-related conditions the farmer is experiencing and what they need to address these issues. You may provide comments to explain the farmer's situation and/or describe challenges not included on the checklist. Please sign on the cover sheet to confirm your observation and/or verification of drought related impacts.

After completing the checklist, please check all the sections below that apply:

- _____ A. Crops showing evidence of water stress
- _____ B. Loss of access to surface water or city/municipal water
- _____ C. Loss of access to groundwater
- _____ D. Irrigation system challenges
- _____ E. Changes in production practices in response to drought

Technical Assistance Provider Organization: _____

Comments on Drought Conditions, Assistance Needs, and Recommendations:

By signing below, I attest that the conditions indicated on the checklist are accurate to the best of my ability to observe and verify:

Printed Name: _____ Title: _____

Signature Date

Email _____ Phone _____

CDFA- CUSP PROGRAM

Technical Assistance Checklist for CUSP Drought Relief Aid

Checklist for Observation of Drought-Related Conditions

A. Crops showing evidence of water stress

- ☐ Crops affected: _____

Symptoms/effects observed:

- ☐ Leaves wilting around the whole plant, without signs of disease (e.g. spots or mottling)
- ☐ Leaves scorched brown at tips or with large brown, dried patches
- ☐ Crops stunted or dying back, without signs of disease (e.g. spots or mottling)
- ☐ Plants are still alive, but not producing at normal yield
- ☐ Crops that died still visible in field

Water stress severity: (circle number that applies)

| Water stress severity rating | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20% or less of crop production visibly affected | 20 - 40% of crop production visibly affected | 40 - 60% of crop production visibly affected | 60 - 80% of crop production visibly affected | 80 - 100% of crop production visibly affected |

- ☐ Date of last regular irrigation (normal application of water to meet crop needs) _____
- ☐ Age of orchard or vineyard, if known: _____
- ☐ Check if geotagged photos attached
- ☐ Check if other photo evidence attached
 - Photo date: _____
 - Photo taken by: _____
 - Location: _____
 - Description: _____
 - Date of TA provider farm visit or other confirmation: _____

- ☐ Description of crops and effects of drought stress: _____

CDFA- CUSP PROGRAM

Technical Assistance Checklist for CUSP Drought Relief Aid

Estimation of crop losses, if known:

| Crop | # Acres or # Rows | Date Planted: | Estimated Yield Value | Estimated % Lost | Estimated Income Lost |
|----------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Ex: Okra | 2 acres (80 rows) | May 15, 2022 | 1200lbs x \$3/lb = \$3600 | 90% | \$3240 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

B. Loss of access to surface water or city/municipal water

- ☐ Verification of irrigation or water district surface water delivery run length
Dates: _____
- ☐ Verification of increased surface water delivery or city/municipal water rates:
_____ Prior rate _____ Dates _____ Current rate _____ Dates _____
How documented (call irrigation district, website, bills, email, etc.) _____

- ☐ Name of district, city, or other provider: _____
Contact info: _____
Website: _____
- ☐ Repairs needed to infrastructure to access surface water
 - ☐ Connection to canal or other surface water delivery system
 - ☐ Equipment to carry surface water to farm
- ☐ Increased restrictions on surface water or city/municipal water source use
(explain): _____
How documented (website, notification, etc.): _____
- ☐ Check if geotagged photos attached
- ☐ Check if other photo evidence attached
 - Photo date: _____
 - Photo taken by: _____
 - Location: _____
 - Description: _____

 - Date of TA provider farm visit or other confirmation: _____

CDFA- CUSP PROGRAM

Technical Assistance Checklist for CUSP Drought Relief Aid

C. Loss of access to groundwater

Pump Information:

- ☐ Type of pump: _____ turbine _____ submersible
- ☐ Pump horsepower: _____ hp
- ☐ Water flow rate when pump is turned on: _____ units _____
- ☐ Water flow rate in previous years, or expected from system: _____ units _____
- ☐ Low flow rate _____ or no water _____ when pump is turned on
- ☐ Pump shared with _____ other growers
- ☐ Pump efficiency test conducted: Date: _____ Provider: _____
Overall efficiency: _____ Standing water depth: _____
TA provider or pump tester recommends repairs: ____yes____no
- ☐ Pump shows need of repairs:
 - ☐ Motor problems (e.g. burning oil, motor noise, high power drain, not starting)
 - ☐ Shaft rusted, corroded, or damaged
 - ☐ Moving parts (bowls and impellers) rusted, worn, or damaged
 - ☐ Low pump efficiency
 - ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Pump sucking air or sand, sounds of cavitation or surging, or shaking/vibration: _____

Well Information:

- ☐ Type of well: _____ agricultural _____ domestic Depth if known: _____
- ☐ Well completion report available: ____Yes ____No Depth from report: _____
- ☐ Depth of standing water level, if known: _____
- ☐ Check if geotagged photos attached
- ☐ Check if other photo evidence attached
 - Photo date: _____
 - Photo taken by: _____
 - Location: _____
 - Description: _____
 - Date of TA provider farm visit or other confirmation: _____
- ☐ Description of problems with groundwater access and recommended emergency actions: _____

CDFA- CUSP PROGRAM

Technical Assistance Checklist for CUSP Drought Relief Aid

D. Irrigation system challenges

- ☐ Emergency repairs needed to irrigation system to support more efficient water use:
 - ☐ Leaking pipes, valves, or other components needing repair or replacement:

 - ☐ System components needing replacement (layflat, drip tape, emitters, connectors, sprinklers, etc.): _____
 - ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Other irrigation components needed: _____
- ☐ Check if geotagged photos attached
- ☐ Check if other photo evidence attached
 - ☐ Photo date:
 - ☐ Photo taken by:
 - ☐ Location:
 - ☐ Description:
- ☐ Date of TA provider farm visit or other confirmation: _____

E. Changes in production practices in response to drought

- ☐ Land taken out of production due to less water and/or higher utility costs
 - ☐ Acres fallowed: _____ Total acres prior to drought: _____
 - ☐ Visual verification of non-cultivated land
- ☐ Changes in timing or length of irrigation events (e.g leaving pump on longer, irrigating during peak hours, having to split with neighbors, etc.): _____

- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Check if geotagged photos attached
- ☐ Check if other photo evidence attached
 - ☐ Photo date:
 - ☐ Photo taken by:
 - ☐ Location:
 - ☐ Description:
- ☐ Date of TA provider farm visit or other confirmation: _____

Additional Comments: