

EFA-SAP-AAG
Meeting 1 Questions and Responses
For Meeting 2 on 2/25/21

Question #	Data Request	Response
1	Provide information on ground water vs surface water projects, irrigation types that are being adopted, pump types being used, conversation of fuel, IWM and telemetry adoption.	CDFA has done an analysis of the number of groundwater and surface water projects. See meeting 1 materials. CDFA has also prepared a breakdown of project components. Many projects combine multiple project components. See meeting 2 materials. There are some limitations on this analysis. CDFA does not have a breakdown of types of pumps included in projects nor how many projects involve telemetry. Additionally, all applicants must indicate that they will have water measurement following the project. This leads to nearly all projects implementing some elements of irrigation water management (IWM) (i.e. a flowmeter to achieve at minimum IWM Level 1).
2	Provide a break out of who takes irrigation training and the type and irrigation training resources that are available.	CDFA provides applicants with one point in the additional consideration category during technical review if they commit to taking an irrigation training course over the course of the grant agreement or if they can provide evidence of taking a course within the last two years. This training must be beyond the training that the farmer would receive from their vendor that is associated with new hardware installation. The farmer or their employee (e.g., irrigator) can take the training. CDFA hosts a list of free or low-cost training resources on the SWEEP webpage, but farmers are able to select a training outside of these or work with their local technical assistance providers for training. See meeting 2 materials for more details on the percentage of SWEEP awardees who make this commitment. CDFA has not done an analysis of the type or provider of the training. Here is a link to CDFA Irrigation Technical Resources: https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/sweep/IrrigationTechnicalResources.html
3	Provide insight as to why groundwater projects apply more frequently (and information on tail water, recycled water, storm water capture, etc.).	SWEEP projects are required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from on-farm irrigation pumps. This requirement means that farmers without on-farm pumps are not able to submit an eligible project. Surface water users do apply and are awarded (see meeting 1 materials), but they must have some irrigation pumps (frequently a booster or reservoir pump) to achieve the required GHG reductions. Sweep projects often involve multiple components which can include tailwater systems, recycled water or storm water capture. In the latest funding appropriation, projects that involved stormwater capture and/or recycled water received an extra point in the additional considerations category during technical review. This is to align with Proposition 68 funding objectives. Review meeting 1 materials for the scoring breakdown.
4	Provide and elevate success stories.	CDFA hosts videos to highlight implemented projects on the SWEEP webpage. CDFA has also posted blog posts on notable SWEEP projects. See meeting 2 materials. Link to SWEEP Videos: https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/sweep/
5	Provide information from growers on what was challenging and what worked for them.	CDFA gathers feedback from awardees during the verification interview. CDFA has not specifically gathered feedback from unsuccessful applicants beyond public comment opportunities and listening sessions that are commonly held prior to a funding solicitation. CDFA does receive feedback regarding the challenges of unsuccessful applicants through technical assistance providers and other active stakeholders.
6	Categorize what projects are not funded. What is challenging in application process?	CDFA has not done an analysis to identify trends in the unfunded projects. Due to the high-oversubscription rate of SWEEP, many high-scoring projects are not funded. Technical reviewers do provide feedback for all projects, but if a project has scored well there is often little actionable feedback for the applicant to use to improve in a future application. See meeting 2 materials.

EFA-SAP-AAG
Meeting 1 Questions and Responses
For Meeting 2 on 2/25/21

Question #	Data Request	Response
7	Provide data on which projects were prepared by third parties and what type of third party.	In the most recent funding round, CDFA asked applicants if they had received technical assistance from a third party. This question does not currently specify if the project received support from a CDFA funded technical assistance provider, a third party vendor, or other forms of assistance. See meeting 2 materials.
8	Provide a graph illustrating which technologies have received the highest award amount.	SWEEP awardees often combine multiple components and technologies within one project. The SWEEP budget data is not broken out in a way that would allow for analysis of the award funding provided for each type of technology.
9	Provide an analysis of grant applications and grants awarded by the primary language spoken of the applicant.	CDFA has not collected information on the primary language of SWEEP applicants nor awardees.
10	Provide an analysis of grants by farm size in comparison to 2017 Ag Census Data on CA farm sizes.	For several rounds of SWEEP funding, CDFA has asked applicants to indicate their farm size. This information can be compared to Ag Census data. See meeting 2 materials.
11	Provide an analysis of grants awarded by county.	See meeting 1 materials
12	What languages are the outreach materials available in?	CDFA has only provided materials in English. Some, although not all, technical assistance providers provide application assistance in several Non-English languages (e.g., Hmong, Spanish).
13	What programs does CDFA have to do outreach in SDACs and to SDFR farmers and ranchers?	AB 2377 (2018) requires that CDFA make available 5% of each SWEEP appropriation for technical assistance grants. 25% of the funding is required to be spent to provide assistance to socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers (SDFRs). In addition, the Farmer Equity Act (2017) established a Farm Equity Advisor position within CDFA. SWEEP works closely with the Farm Equity Advisor to ensure SDFR participation in SWEEP. Regarding Severely Disadvantaged Communities (SDACs), CDFA has performed application workshops and listening sessions in these locations. The prioritization of SDACs in the most recent rounds of SWEEP was related to Proposition 68 funding.
14	Are results of grants to each operator shared with others for repeatability?	During the project verification interview, awardees are asked if they would be willing to be involved in outreach for the program (e.g., a case study, video or blog post). Furthermore, we do post the project description for all projects that were awarded a SWEEP grant. These project descriptions outline what the funded project consists of. A list of previously awarded project by round can be found here: https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/sweep/stakeholder_info.html
15	How do SDAC or SDFR projects compare to non-SDAC or SDFR projects (in terms of post project quantification).	CDFA just recently began collecting information on SDAC and SDFR projects. These projects have not yet reached the post-project data collection phase and are currently largely in the project implementation phase.
16	Provide data that correlates amount of funding allocated to regional projects as well as GHG and water savings associated with those regions (how many ac-feet of water is saved), include county, crop information, and agricultural output data.	See meeting 2 materials. CDFA collects this data and has provided it in table format which is located below. Some of these data comes from the 2018-2019 California Agricultural Statistics Review that CDFA publishes here: https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/statistics/PDFs/2018-2019AgReportnass.pdf
17	How does EQIP overlap with SWEEP?	EQIP and SWEEP fund similar projects, although EQIP is more broad. Farmers may apply for funding from both programs, but SWEEP has a restriction on funding the same projects components through both programs. The programs have different payment structures. A resource of some of the overlap between the two programs can be found here: https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/sweep/docs/SWEEP_CPS.pdf

EFA-SAP-AAG
Meeting 1 Questions and Responses
For Meeting 2 on 2/25/21

Question #	Data Request	Response
18	How, and to what extent, has SWEEP been planned out thus far in dialogue with high-level agencies and entities?	<p>In the legislation that established SWEEP, the Department of Water Resources and the State Water Resources Control Board were both named as coordinating agencies. In addition to consulting with DWR and SWRCB, CDFA coordinated closely with the California Air Resources Board to establish the greenhouse gas quantification methodology and with USDA NRCS. Input from USDA NRCS was especially critical to the development of the water savings calculator. During the latest funding appropriation (bond funding), California Natural Resources Agency was the oversight agency and worked with CDFA to adapt the SWEEP program to bond funding requirements. The Governor's Office, University of California ANR and Resource Conservation Districts have also been integral partners as the program developed. The SWEEP program also has public comment periods and listening sessions where members of the general public and advocacy groups can provide feedback.</p>

Source: California Agricultural Statistics Review 2018-2019 <https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/statistics/PDFs/2018-2019AgReportnass.pdf>

2018-2019 CDFA California Agricultural Statistics Review				2018-2019 SWEEP Project Data							
2018	County	Total Value \$1000	Leading commodities	Projects Awarded	Projects Applied	% Awarded / Applied	Award Amount	Award amount awarded / Total Ag Value	% of Total Awarded Amount (2018-2019)	Projected GHG Savings (MTCO2e) per year	Projected Water Savings (Acre-in) per year
1	Fresno	\$7,911,893	Almonds, Pistachios, Livestock (Unspecified), Grapes (Table)	74	135	55%	\$6,094,260	0.0770%	32%	1,302	43,999
2	Kern	\$7,469,670	Grapes (Table), Almonds, Pistachios, Milk	9	31	29%	\$868,255	0.0116%	5%	884	11,054
3	Tulare	\$7,213,141	Milk, Oranges (Navel), Grapes (Table), Cattle & Calves	29	69	42%	\$2,245,014	0.0311%	12%	400	33,175
4	Monterey	\$4,258,628	Strawberries, Lettuce, Broccoli, Wine Grapes	2	30	7%	\$198,191	0.0047%	1%	40	1,027
5	Stanislaus	\$3,569,989	Almonds, Milk, Chickens, Nursery	5	14	36%	\$499,569	0.0140%	3%	499	5,229
6	Merced	\$3,254,144	Milk, Almonds, Chickens, Cattle	13	21	62%	\$1,176,520	0.0362%	6%	904	9,825
7	San Joaquin	\$2,594,221	Almonds, Grapes (Wine), Milk, Walnuts	11	50	22%	\$946,200	0.0365%	5%	207	18,577
8	Kings	\$2,351,983	Milk, Pistachios, Cotton (Pima), Cattle & Calves	2	22	9%	\$185,413	0.0079%	1%	8	857
9	Imperial	\$2,226,030	Cattle, Alfalfa Hay, Vegetables, Other Hay	0	8	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
10	Ventura	\$2,103,232	Strawberries, Lemons, Celery, Raspberries	1	19	5%	\$68,200	0.0032%	0%	0	23
11	Madera	\$2,056,955	Almonds, Pistachios, Milk, Grapes (Raisin)	8	21	38%	\$740,890	0.0360%	4%	453	21,325
12	San Diego	\$1,769,801	Nursery (Woody Ornaments), Flowers, Nursery (Plants), Avocados	2	15	13%	\$200,000	0.0113%	1%	44	562
13	Santa Barbara	\$1,522,120	Strawberries, Vegetables, Grapes (Wine), Flowers (Cut)	1	10	10%	\$42,398	0.0028%	0%	1	29
14	Riverside	\$1,299,208	Milk, Nursery, Grapes (Table), Lemons	3	6	50%	\$282,072	0.0217%	2%	149	525
15	Sonoma	\$1,106,663	Grapes (Wine), Milk, Livestock Products, Cattle & Calves	2	10	20%	\$125,841	0.0114%	1%	6	338
16	Napa	\$1,043,195	Grapes (Wine), Cattle & Calves, Livestock Products, Nursery	0	4	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
17	San Luis Obispo	\$1,035,499	Grapes (Wine), Strawberries, Vegetables (Unspecified), Broccoli	5	37	14%	\$409,041	0.0395%	2%	70	2,468
18	Colusa	\$896,504	Almonds, Rice, Walnuts, Tomatoes (Processing), Walnuts	5	12	42%	\$441,584	0.0493%	2%	174	4,963
19	Glenn	\$729,497	Almonds, Rice, Walnuts, Milk	7	34	21%	\$686,918	0.0942%	4%	287	4,647
20	Yolo	\$675,896	Almonds, Tomatoes (Processing), Grapes (Wine), Field Crops (Unspecified)	1	23	4%	\$30,123	0.0045%	0%	9	642
21	Santa Cruz	\$672,817	Strawberries, Raspberries, Nursery Products, Miscellaneous Vegetables	3	10	30%	\$230,159	0.0342%	1%	28	117
22	Sutter	\$606,606	Rice, Walnuts, Clingstone Peaches, Prunes	6	16	38%	\$491,954	0.0811%	3%	288	9,518
23	Butte	\$596,366	Rice, Almonds, Walnuts, Prunes	5	24	21%	\$496,810	0.0833%	3%	201	4,589
24	Sacramento	\$520,613	Grapes (Wine), Milk, Poultry, Bartlett Pears	2	4	50%	\$199,708	0.0384%	1%	29	1,651
25	San Bernardino	\$484,844	Milk, Eggs, Cattle & Calves, Nursery (Woody Ornamental)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
26	Solano	\$362,936	Nursery Products, Vegetables, Tomatoes (Processing), Alfalfa Hay	0	10	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
27	San Benito	\$352,878	Vegetables, Spinach, Lettuce, Grapes (Wine)	1	5	20%	\$9,565	0.0027%	0%	1	6
28	Siskiyou	\$302,163	Nursery Plants, Strawberry, Alfalfa Hay, Cattle	3	5	60%	\$264,901	0.0877%	1%	104	1,420
29	Santa Clara	\$295,484	Mushrooms, Nursery (Woody Ornamentals), Nursery Products (Miscellaneous), Lettuce, Nursery Plants (Bedding)	12	13	92%	\$337,382	0.1142%	2%	35	345
30	Tehama	\$261,595	Walnuts, Almonds, Nursery Products (Miscellaneous), Prunes	10	26	38%	\$925,956	0.3540%	5%	155	6,990
31	Humboldt	\$255,681	Milk, Nursery Products (Miscellaneous), Cattle & Calves (Unspecified), Cattle (Milk Cows)	1	1	100%	\$9,605	0.0038%	0%	0	7
32	Yuba	\$228,878	Rice, Walnuts, Prunes, Livestock (Unspecified)	2	3	67%	\$122,387	0.0535%	1%	60	825
33	Mendocino	\$188,219	Grapes (Wine), Cattle & Calves, Pears (Bartlett), Pasture	1	8	13%	\$69,524	0.0369%	0%	1	143
34	Los Angeles	\$170,889	Nursery Products (Miscellaneous), Vegetables (Unspecified), Field Crops (Unspecified), Nursery Plants (Bedding)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
35	Modoc	\$154,657	Alfalfa Hay, Cattle (Calves only), Potatoes, Hay,	1	3	33%	\$89,947	0.0582%	0%	27	422

Agriculture Data for Question 16
Meeting 2
2/25/21

2018	County	Total Value \$1000	Leading commodities	Projects Awarded	Projects Applied	% Awarded / Applied	Award Amount	Award amount awarded / Total Ag Value	% of Total Awarded Amount (2018-2019)	Projected GHG Savings (MTCO2e) per year	Projected Water Savings (Acre-in) per year
36	San Mateo	\$144,168	Nursery (Plants), Brussels Sprouts, Nursery Products (Miscellaneous), Vegetables	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
37	Lassen	\$117,027	Other Hay, Alfalfa Hay, Vegetables, Cattle	2	4	50%	\$198,024	0.1692%	1%	333	4,843
38	Orange	\$111,279	Nursery (Woody Ornamentals), Vegetables (Unspecified), Strawberries, Citrus (Unspecified)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
39	Lake	\$111,189	Grapes (Wine), Pears (Bartlett), Walnuts, Cattle & Calves	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
40	Contra Costa	\$107,154	Cattle & Calves, Sweet Corn, Tomatoes, Grapes (Wine)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
41	Marin	\$94,121	Milk, Poultry (Unspecified), Cattle & Calves, Pasture (Range)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
42	Shasta	\$81,402	Other Hay, Nursery Products, Cattle, Wild Rice	0	1	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
43	Placer	\$68,130	Rice, Cattle & Calves, Nursery Products (Miscellaneous), Walnuts	0	1	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
44	El Dorado	\$57,241	Apples, Grapes (Wine), Cattle & Calves, Pasture (Range)	0	1	0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
45	Alameda	\$54,850	Grapes (Wine), Cattle & Calves, Nursery (Woody Ornamentals), Pasture (Range)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
46	Amador	\$49,075	Grapes (Wine), Cattle & Calves, Pasture (Range), Alfalfa Hay	1	3	33%	\$100,000	0.2038%	1%	6	72
47	Del Norte	\$47,644	Milk, Cattle (Cows), Nursery (Bulbs), Cattle (Calves)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
48	Mariposa	\$42,218	Cattle & Calves (Unspecified), Pasture (Range), Livestock Products (Miscellaneous), Poultry (Unspecified)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
49	Mono	\$32,347	Alfalfa Hay, Cattle & Calves (Unspecified), Sheep & Lambs (Unspecified), Livestock (Unspecified)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
50	Tuolumne	\$30,832	Livestock (Unspecified), Cattle (Calves Only), Forest Products, Pasture (Range)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
51	Inyo	\$21,500	Cattle & Calves (Unspecified), Alfalfa Hay, Nursery Products (Miscellaneous), Field Crops (Unspecified)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
52	Plumas	\$21,228	Cattle (Steers), Cattle (Heifers), Alfalfa Hay, Pasture (Range)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
53	Calaveras	\$20,989	Cattle & Calves (Unspecified), Grapes (Wine), Poultry (Unspecified), Pasture (Range)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
54	Nevada	\$20,355	Cattle, Grapes (Wine), Pasture (Range), Vegetables (Unspecified)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
55	Sierra	\$10,161	Cattle (Steers), Alfalfa Hay, Pasture (Irrigated), Cattle (Heifers)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
56	Alpine	\$5,157	Pasture (Range), Cattle & Calves (Unspecified), Pasture (Irrigated), Other Hay	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
57	Trinity	\$4,913	Cattle & Calves (Unspecified), Pasture (Range), Pasture (Irrigated), Grapes (Wine)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
58	San Francisco	\$299	Field Crops (Unspecified), Apiary Products (Honey)	0	0	#DIV/0!	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

\$18,786,412