

CONSENT AGENDA

MARCH 12, 2026

1. August 21, 2025 Meeting Minutes

California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC) August 21st, 2025 Meeting Minutes

CISAC Members:

Tim Crothers	David Haviland	Bea Nobua-Behrmann
Gina Darin	Ricky Lara	Katie Sutherland-Ashley
Tom Getts	Shannon Lynch	Martha Volkoff
Ted Grosholz	Lori Nezhura	Lisa Worthington

CISAC Members Absent:

Erik Blosser	Humberto Izquierdo	Helene Wright
Stacy Hishinuma	Brent Johnson	

Guests:

Claire Aicken	Heather Healy	Paul Rugman-Jones
Johnathan Babineau	Elham Jamshidi	Ambika Saini
Rachel Burnap	Thomas Jensen	Joe Scheele
Andy Chang	Doug Johnson	Chris Scianni
Julie Clark	David Juliano	Cherie Shook
Kim Corella	John Kabashima	Stephanie Stark
Atlasi Daneshvar	Gabriella Kalbach	Constance Taylor
Travis Elder	Melonie Morgan	Neil Tsutsui
Jim Farrar	Randall Oliver	Greta Varien
Nathan Fishburn	MacKenzie Patton	Jeremy Wagner
Paul Gilbert-Snyder	David Pegos	Koren Widdel
Lindsey Hack	Sam Raburn	David Wirta
Lu Han	Duke Richardson	
Katie Harrell	Jay Rowan	

Opening:

The California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC) meeting was called to order at 10:02 a.m. on August 21st, 2025. Dr. Ricky Lara welcomed committee members, guests, and staff.

Updates:

Dr. Ricky Lara highlighted the success of the bio-incubators that allowed for the release of the yellow starthistle biocontrol agents. He will be participating at the Entomological Society of America's national meeting in November. The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) will be putting together a symposium celebrating fifty years of biological control.

Lisa Worthington will be part of a scientific panel presentation on pest related concerns, addressing broader landscape concerns such as enhancing landscape resilience and reducing wildfire incidence.

Martha Volkoff shared the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DWF) will receive a small amount of federal funding for the invasive Golden Mussel. DWF offered \$1,000,000 in grant funding for prevention program efforts and have selected the projects to be funded. The Fish and Game Commission gave their approval to proceed with proactively listing the golden mussel and other non-native species of concern as restricted species.

Ted Grosholz shared the Federal Invasive Species Advisory Committee (ISAC) is developing a white paper on marine invasive species and border security. The paper will focus on fouling ship hulls and drawing attention to aquarium and pet species of trade.

Gina Darin from the Department of Water Resources (DWR) shared they are collaborating alongside CDFW on the golden mussel taskforce, and the *Nutria* eradication program. The fish restoration program is successfully continuing efforts on tidal habitat restoration in the Delta and Suisun Marsh.

Dr Shannon Lynch developed a statewide risk map based of the predictive modeling for invasive shothole borer (ISHB), pending release to the public soon. Received funding from CalFire to continue research on the greater shothole borer (GSHB), improve trap optimization, and monitoring efforts in the Santa Cruz area.

David Haviland is planning on a one-year sabbatical leave to continue research work on invasive species issues globally.

Bea Nobua Behrmann gave an update on the golden spotted oak borer (GSOB) Blitz.

David Pegos shared multiple updates. There is a new Medfly quarantine in Santa Clara County. There is an ongoing Spongy Moth eradication project in Monte Nido. Additionally, there is a Japanese Beetle eradication project in Sacramento and Rancho Cordova.

Chris Scianni shared that the California State Lands Commission filed a lawsuit against the Environment Protection Agency (EPA). The lawsuit argues that the EPA's rule issued under the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act (VIDA), unlawfully overrides the state's established biofouling management program.

Doug Johnson highlighted the Cal IPC symposium in November taking place in Ventura. New funds through Department of Pesticide Regulation to continue working on the WeedCut tool. Working with the national forests on weed management programs.

Joe Scheele from Customs and Border Protections discussed the threat of new world screwworm and various methods of control utilized to minimize the spread.

Dr. John Kabashima commented that the South American Palm Weevil has reached Camp Pendleton and there is concern for it spreading in Southern California. A work group in Orange County is being organized for a response program with plans for trapping and treatment. Additional work includes research on a new canker pathogen of pine trees to address ghost canker disease affecting mature pine trees.

Koren Widdel is working with David Pegos on the ISHB Trapping/Mediterranean Oak Borer (MOB) trapping for the next calendar year. She shared that some Californian county agricultural commissioners have been offered funding for spotted lanternfly surveys for this fall. Funding for the high-risk pest exclusion for inspections at parcel terminal and other various pathways has been impacted, affecting the level of service to continue the inspections. They are looking to utilizing the Comprehensive Pest Prevention Program Analysis Report (C3PA) to advocate for funding to prevent the risk from these various entry pathways.

Mackenzie Patton is an Invasive Pest Management (IPM) advisor for the Central Sierra region. She shared that one of Curtis Ewing’s MOB traps in Amador County caught a detection of the beetle. She also provided information on the Glassy-winged Sharpshooters (GWSS) outbreak in El Dorado County and progress on biocontrol.

Randall Oliver shared they are hosting 2025 ISHB fusarium dieback symposium in September at Ladera Ranch. Also reported that the Firewood Taskforce has been able to utilize a Wildlife Urban Interface Climate Action Network Grant to purchase supplies for outreach and education efforts at statewide events.

Committee Business:

Motion: To approve the June 12th, 2025 meeting minutes of the California Invasive Species Advisory Committee.

First Motion: Tom Getts

Second Motion: Tim Crothers

Motion carries: The motion passed unanimously.

Proposition 4 (overview)

\$20,000,000 for purposes of funding invasives species projects and activities recommended by the Invasive Species Council of California (ISCC).

Potential operational allocations include:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Statewide Bond Costs | \$150,000 |
| 2. 7% Overhead | \$1,400,000 |
| 3. Technical Assistance (set aside) | \$500,000 |

Remaining funds **\$17,950,000**

Overarching considerations for these funds include:

1. Preference shall be given to projects that restore or protect biodiversity and ecosystem health.

2. Consideration shall be given to geographical priority.

The law established that the 2024 Climate Bond requires that *at least 40 percent* of the total bond funding, “shall be allocated for projects that provide meaningful and direct benefits to vulnerable populations or disadvantaged communities”. Of this 40 percent, *at least 10 percent* of the total funding “shall be allocated for projects that provide meaningful and direct benefits to severely disadvantaged communities”.

Discussion: Proposition 4 (2024) Invasive Species Grant Application

After lengthy discussion, the Invasive Species Grant application will be revisited after further clarity from administration and CDFA contracts.

Discussion: List of Priority Invasive Species Projects

One page proposal will be submitted per project.

1. Strengthening the iNaturalist reporting system – Shaun Winterton
2. Supporting golden mussel response. Martha Volkoff & Ted Grosholz & Paul Gilbert-Snyder & Lu Han
 - a. Boat decontamination facilities.
 - b. Upgrading water infrastructure for agricultural use.
 - c. Working with the state water project.
3. Supporting ISHB response – Bea Nobua-Behrmann & Shannon Lynch
 - a. Survey, detection, rapid response.
 - i. Traps, tub grinders, chips, drone (equipment + operations [i.e., pilot, license, permits]).
 - b. Outreach and engagement.
 - i. Signage.
 - c. Research.
 - d. Greenwaste and firewood as pathways.
4. Weed management area rapid response – Doug Johnson & Tom Getts
 - a. Including equipment for applications or cultural solutions.
 - b. Training and operators - Workforce development.
5. Continuing weed management area funding – Doug Johnson & Tom Getts
6. Supporting a statewide GSOB response – Bea Nobua-Behrmann
 - a. Survey detention and Rapid response.
 - i. Tub grinder + operations.
 - b. Outreach and engagement.
 - i. Signage.
 - c. Research.
 - d. Tree removal of amplifier trees.
7. Firewood Task Force funding – Randall Oliver
 - a. Signage.
 - b. General funding.

- c. Firewood scout - need agreement to be part of that program (\$1000/\$500).
 - d. Vendors selling firewood.
- 8. Vector Pathway Outreach Campaign – Lisa Worthington
 - a. Don't pack a pest campaign.
 - b. Commercial Driver's License renewal opportunity / video on incoming domestic flights.
 - c. Transportation oriented outreach.
- 9. CDFA's Border Protection Stations - reduction in hours and potential mitigation of that impact – Ricky Lara & David Pegos
 - a. Additional storage capacity, evaluation tools (microscopes, scanners, hatchets, etc.).
 - b. Signage (\$1,000,000 per sign).
 - c. Incinerators.
- 10. Diagnostic Lab at CDFA upgrades (New equipment and emerging technology) – Shaun Winterton & Cheryl Bloomquist & Suzanne Latham
- 11. Biocontrol facility upgrades and new insectary facility (esp. Northern California in Los Alamedas), rearing of beneficial endemic species – Katie Fillippini & Ricky Lara
 - a. Dr. Morgan's facilities.
- 12. Centralized campuses for invasive species dog training facilities – David Pegos & Martha Volkoff & Mariah
- 13. University of California Support – David Haviland
 - a. Quarantine facilities at the University of California, Davis and the University of California, Riverside.
 - b. Anything that supports the University of California Research and Extension Centers (RECS).
- 14. Augment the Emergency rapid response fund (existing) – Martha Volkoff
- 15. Augment Statewide Aquatic Invasive Species Surveys (3 crews) (Existing) – Ted Grosholz & Gina Darin
- 16. Updates on ecological and economic impact reports – Karen Jetter
- 17. Controlling high-risk vectors through incentives and research – David Pegos
 - a. Encourage/Support developing specialty crop market
 - b. UC Small Farm Advisor
- 18. Convene a science advisory panel with the regulation to communicate CISAC outcomes and inform the regulation – Koren Widdel
 - a. Helpful, especially for Ag Commissioners on B-rated pests.
- 19. Workshops to support research collaborations among stakeholders – Shannon Lynch
- 20. Using drones to map invasive species in the wildland (Koren suggested for San Mateo Co.) – Koren Widdel

- a. E.g., adapting use of drones to track invasive species.
- 21. Multi-agency workshop on internet sales, so all agencies working in this area are equipped to make the seizure – David Pegos
- 22. Continue funding for statewide wood borer survey – Joanna Fisher & Shannon Lynch
- 23. Invest in citizen scientist projects that leverage the use of MG, WCA, and CalNaturalists volunteers in invasive species early detection efforts – Shaun Winterton & Bea Nobua-Behrmann
 - a. Collaboration with databases and maps, Google Suite, programs to avoid duplication, including iNaturalist and other citizen scientist-generated maps.
- 24. Funding for workshops on sustainable pest management/IPM with an emphasis on biocontrol – Ricky Lara & Shannon Lynch
- 25. Invasive species tours – David Pegos
- 26. Invasive species summit – David Pegos
- 27. ISCC/CISAC Operational Fund – David Pegos
- 28. Populating Living list – Doug Johnson & David Pegos
- 29. Full-time support for ISCC/CISAC – Gina Darin
- 30. *Volutaria* San Diego Project – Jordan Keys & Doug Johnson
- 31. PlantRight updates and needs – Doug Johnson & David Pegos
- 32. *Caulerpa prolifera* updates and needs – Martha Volkoff & David Pegos
- 33. Outreach coordinator for invasive species for the state – Shannon Lynch
- 34. South American palm weevil early detection and rapid response – Bea Nobua-Behrmann & Mark Hoddle & Ricky Lara

Public Comment:

No comments.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next scheduled California Invasive Species Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for October 16th, 2025, at 10:00 am.

2. October 16, 2025 Meeting Minutes

**California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC)
October 16th, 2025 Meeting Minutes**

CISAC Members:

Erik Blosser	Tom Getts	Katie Sutherland-Ashley
Tim Crothers	Ricky Lara	Lisa Worthington
Gina Darin	Bea Nobua-Behrmann	

CISAC Members Absent:

Ted Grosholz	Humberto Izquierdo	Lori Nezhura
David Haviland	Brent Johnson	Martha Volkoff
Stacy Hishinuma	Shannon Lynch	Helene Wright

Guests:

Claire Aicken	Brad Hooker	Brianne Sakata
Jonathan Babineau	Virgina Jameson	Chris Scianni
Elizabeth Brusati	Karen Jetter	Cherie Shook
Gilbert Canchola	Doug Johnson	Stephanie Stark
Kim Corella	Gabriella Kalbach	Susanna Theroux
Atlasi Daneshvar	Joshua Kress	Neil Tsutsui
Curtis Ewing	Dahmoon Maesomy	Kelly Vandergon
Katie Filippini	Casey McSwiggin	Diane Varley
Nathan Fishburn	Juan Orendain	Mindy Wilkinson
Kevin Gallo	David Pegos	Nick Waelty
Kris Godfrey	Samuel Raburn	Erik Wilkins
Lindsey Hack	Raisa Rahim	Ellen Willis-Norton
Jeremy Haas	Ambika Saini	Karey Windbiel-Rojas

Opening:

The California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC) meeting was called to order at 10:04 am on October 16th, 2025. Dr. Ricky Lara welcomed committee members, guests, and staff.

Updates:

Dr. Ricky Lara from the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) – biological control, shared that they are continuing to rear biocontrol agents for yellow starthistle and the brown marmorated Stink Bug. Release of these agents is planned for later this year. There have been no detections for emerald ash borer from the trapping projects.

Gina Darin from Department of Water Resources (CDWR), shared her department continues to make progress in the tidal wetland habitat restoration. They are continuing their partnership with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) on the golden mussel

response and nutria response. Additionally, the state water project anticipates the golden mussel invasion and is preparing to analyze the cost and maintenance of infrastructure in response.

Tim Crothers shared he attended the Invasive Shothole Borer (ISHB) symposium.

Lisa Worthington from Caltrans presented on the Southern California Governor's Wildfire and Landscape Resilience Taskforce covering an array of topics including wildfire risk reduction, fire prevention and invasive species management.

Dr. Bea Nobua-Behrmann from the University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources (UCANR) shared they hosted the ISHB Symposium. Other updates include a detection of one South American palm weevil (SAPW) caught in a trap in South Irvine. There was another detection of SAPW in Southern Orange County – Rancho Mission Viejo.

Dr. Erik Blosser from the California Department of Public Health shared information on the *Aedes aegypti* (yellow fever). The mosquito is moving from Southern Valley to Northern Valley. The San Francisco – Bay Area now has three new counties having established populations: Santa Clara, Alameda, Contra Costa.

Martha Volkoff from CDFW updated the committee on California Assembly Bill 149 – Golden Mussel Response. The language in the bill was amended to be expanded to invasive mussels and be inclusive of golden mussels. Martha Volkoff additionally shared news on the Western Regional Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species. As the California representative, Martha nominated and secured Sacramento, California as the state to host the 2026 meeting.

Tom Getts with the University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE) shared there is internal organization re-structuring at the UCCE. Programs are to be broken into four program teams – Ethology, Vertebra, Plant Pathology and Weed management.

David Pegos shared that he attended the League of Cities conference and highlighted various invasive species issues to the public. There is a new glassy-winged sharpshooter (GWSS) infestation in Santa Clara County. Oriental fruit fly quarantines in Riverside and San Bernadino counites are ongoing. Upcoming outreach events will include attending the California Association of Pest Control Advisors, to help inform and educate that demographic on relevant invasive species issues.

Victoria Hornbaker announced she will be taking on a leadership role in the CISAC. In preparation for the Proposition 4 funds, Victoria will be assisting in the grant's development and the ensuring compliance with additional rules and requirements.

Brianne Sakata with the CDWR division of operations and maintenance provided an update on the golden mussel. She noted it has quickly spread throughout the state

water project from the Delta all the way to Southern California. It is impacting on the infrastructure, and the initial response is focused on critical systems in the facilities intolerable of biofouling.

Chris Schiani with the state lands commission in the Marine Invasive Species program shared that their program regulates commercial ships in international business, implementing the mandatory bio-fouling management requirements. They have been asked by International Maritime Organization to represent them and their test bio-fouling project to deliver the commercial ships bio-fouling risk assessment and underwater inspection training in the Western hemisphere.

David Pegos inquired the committee members about attending the 2025 North America Invasive Species Management Association (NAISMA) annual conference that is approaching in November at Lake Tahoe. Ricky Lara and Lisa Worthington will be interested in attending from CISAC.

Atlati Daneshvar, Senior Water Resource Specialist from Santa Clara Valley Water, informed the committee the drinking water received from the state water Project and central valley project have been impacted by golden mussel colonization in these two critical sources. They hope to receive support from proposition 4 funding to help mitigate the issue and secure water security for the county residents.

Proposition 4 Overview – Q&A

Diane Varley and Virginia Jameson presented updates to *The Climate Bond and CISAC – Proposition 4*. Diane highlighted two important requirements PCR 93520 and PCR 90140. PCR 93520, states, “preference shall be given to projects that restore and protect the biodiversity and ecological health. Consideration shall be given to geographic equity. The second is PCR 90140, which states, “40 percent of the total funds shall be allocated for projects that provide meaningful and direct benefits to vulnerable populations or disadvantaged communities. At least 10 percent of the total funds available pursuant to this division shall be allocated for projects that provide meaningful and direct benefits to disadvantaged communities.” Additionally, the statutory criteria CISAC must establish needs to meet requirements to prefer, consider, track and direct, measure and evaluate and ensure recipient eligibility.

CDFA Border Protection Station Invasive Species

Juan Orendain from the California Border Protection Stations Branch gave a presentation to the committee on the history of their branch. The BPR was established in 1921 as the first line of defense against unwanted pests. The mission of the BPRS is to prevent exotic pest introductions via overland highways at California’s borders with neighboring states. The goal is to minimize the chance that vehicles entering the state are carrying commodities infested with pests that pose a serious threat to California’s

agriculture. Tactics of inspections include fruit and vegetables, nurse stock, plant debris, firewood, soil, hay, seeds, grain, noxious weeds, aviary etc. There are now sixteen border stations throughout California on all major highways and interstates. All types of vehicles are inspected including private/commercial, passenger, self-moving and recreational. Additional inspections include fish and wildlife watercraft for aquatic invasive species and the CDFA livestock branch.

Comprehensive Pest Prevention Program Analysis

Victoria Hornbaker gave an update to the presentation on the Comprehensive Pest Prevention Program Analysis (C3PA). This will be the first large-scale analysis of CA pest prevention system since 1997. The analysis seeks to identify strategies and tools to support a modern pest prevention system. Additionally, it will evaluate the effectiveness of pest risk abatement from the new pathways and current exclusion system. Victoria announced that the analysis is complete, and CDFA has completed their review and provided feedback. Discussion is taking place on how to streamline the overarching comments and collaboration with the few California agricultural commissioners is underway to include those comments as well.

Invasive Species Council of California (ISCC) Meeting Agenda Development

The next presentation was on the ISCC's December 8th meeting Agenda. The following members expressed interest in covering the following topics of interest:

- California Wildfire and Forest Resilience Taskforce – Lisa
 - Tree Mortality/ invasive species/ invasive grasses
- Proposition 4 – Diane/Julie (DNRA)
- Nutria Eradication – Gina
- Golden Mussel – Martha Volkoff
- Climate Smart Ag – Virginia
- Rats – Michelle Dennis/Kevi Mace
- CISAC Summit/ tours – Discussion session
- Weed Management Areas – Michelle Dennis
- Emerald Ash Borer
- South American Palm Weevil
- AB-900: adding stewardship on Proposition 4 and 30x30
- Highlight accomplishments – David

Committee Business

The Board identified members interested in participating in an Invasive Species Tour and Summit Subcommittee meeting: Gina Darin, Martha Volkoff, Humberto Izquierdo, Dr. Ricky Lara, Tim Crothers, Lisa Worthington, Dr. Katie Sutherland-Ashley, Dr. Bea Nobua-Behrmann, Tom Getts, and Dr. Shannon Lynch.

ISCC Funding Projects

David Pegos provided an update on the ISCC funded projects. CDFA is working with the University of California Invasive Pest Management (IPM) program and UCANR to finalize the contract for assistance in Invasive Species Summit & the Invasive Species Tours. The operational fund has \$24,708.59 in funds remaining. The work for the Living List and Pathways Prioritization is pending until the agreement with UC IPM and UCANR is in place. Which will help to assist in executing the goals of capturing the species for the living list and report. The reserve fund has two projects identified: *Caulerpa prolifera* eradication at the San Diego Port and *Plecostachys serpyllifolia* (petite licorice) eradication at the Santa Rosa Islands of the Channel Islands National Park.

For the Invasive Shothole Borer, \$802,187.50 has been identified for the counties to complete trapping projects. A new species of shothole borer (Greater shothole borer) identified in Santa Cruz. The efforts are ongoing for eradicating *Volutaria* in the Borrego springs area of San Diego County; the contract was extended for an additional year to allow for optimal trapping due to weather conditions. The exotic woodborer survey has spent half of the funds in 2024; the other half will be executed in 2025. These funds have allowed for additional locations of traps and types of lures. To support the exotic aquatic species survey there was the acquisition of a boat, and the program plans to use funds to expand opportunities to search for aquatic invasive species. The Yellow Star Thistle Biocontrol Incubators are in operation and producing biocontrol agents which have been distributed throughout the state. Lastly, the *Caulerpa* project in Newport Bay is on-going with diving efforts for eradication of *Caulerpa*.

Public Comment:

Curtis Ewing: California Firewood Taskforce is on track with objectives. There may have been a reported positive of the Mediterranean Oak Borer in Marysville, confirmation is pending. MOB is spreading, presently in Amador, El Dorado and continuing to spread into the Foothills and further.

Karey Windbiel-Rojas: Presenting miniseries of webinars to share general information to public, covering topics of invasive pests. Three more webinars will be offered, on the first Wednesday of each month.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. The next scheduled California Invasive Species Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for December 10th, 2025 at 10:00 am.

3. January 29, 2026 Meeting Minutes

California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC) January 29th, 2026 Meeting Minutes

CISAC Members:

Erik Blosser	Humberto Izquierdo**	Lori Nezhura
Tim Crothers	Ricky Lara	Bea Nobua-Behrmann**
Gina Darin	Shannon Lynch	Katie Sutherland- Ashley
David Haviland**	Superna Metha*	Martha Volkoff

*Proxy

**Virtual non-voting

CISAC Members Absent:

Tom Getts	Stacy Hishinuma	Helene Wright
Ted Grosholz	Brent Johnson	

Guests:

Jonathan Babineau	Victoria Hornbaker	Zoe Pierrat
Elizabeth Brusati	Jessica Hurlimann	Peter Roediger
Rachel Burnap	Doug Johnson	Paul Rugman-Jones
Julie Clark	Jennifer Ketterlin	Ambika Saini
Brad Cook	Jasmine Lopez	Chris Scianni
Nathan Fishburn	Hector Alejandro Merchan	Cherie Shook
Trevor Fox	Melonie Morgan	Stephanie Stark
Brian Gress	Randall Oliver	Bryan Sullivan
Lindsey Hack	Mackenzie Patton	Tyler Tkachuk
Heather Healy	David Pegos	David Wirta

Opening:

The California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC) meeting was called to order at 10:03 am on January 29th, 2026. Gina Darin welcomed committee members, guests, and staff.

Ambika Saini took roll and noted that there was not a quorum for the meeting.

Introductions and Updates:

Gina Darin, Department of Water Resources (DWR) began her position as chair of the CISAC. She provided a brief history on the establishment of the committee and its significant benchmarks achieved to date. She highlighted the committee’s goals for 2026, with consideration to the Invasive Species Council of California (ISCC) secretaries’ feedback. This includes providing recommendations to the ISCC on cross agency collaboration opportunities, a meaningful invasive species summit and tours, and the distribution of proposition 4 funds. Other updates include continuing work on the golden mussel task force, nutria eradication program, and dealing with aquatic weeds in the Delta.

Martha Volkoff from Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) provided an update on *Caulerpa prolifera* eradication. Her department was advised that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is reprioritizing the federal support that was previously allocated for *Caulerpa*. Additionally, she shared that the Western Regional Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species will meet in Sacramento from September 23rd through the 25th and inquired about sponsorship from CISAC.

David Pegos with the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) shared that the eradication programs for the Japanese beetle in Northern California, the spongy moth eradication in the Monte Nido area of Los Angeles County, and invasive fruit fly eradication projects in Southern and Northern California are ongoing. He has been traveling to various events for outreach and education including the New York Times travel show and will prepare for additional travel shows through the Don't Pack a Pest campaign. The agreement for a joint interagency emerald ash borer (EAB) action plan with Jim Frarrar has been executed. Updates with the invasive shot hole borer (ISHB) and Mediterranean oak borer (MOB) include four executed agreements, with the remainder in CDFA's contracts office for processing and review. The supplies for these county projects are ready to be sent out to the counties. The MOB agreement is being developed in support of Dr. Curtis Ewing.

Dr. Ricky Lara from CDFA Biological Control Program (Program) reported that they are planning more releases from the two incubators purchased for yellow star thistle biocontrol in spring this year. The program is developing the final version of the CDFA IPCB / Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) Action Plan 2026 / for EAB Monitoring in California to allow for proactive monitoring for this invasive species. There is a new biological control agent for diamondback moth, which will be tested at the CDFA quarantine facilities. Lastly, as a member of W5185: Biological Control in Pest Management Systems of Plant Pests, CDFA will jointly host the next multi-state research project with the Entomological Society of America.

Victoria Hornbaker, CDFA provided an update on proposition 4 – The Climate Bond. She notified members that progress is being made on the program application and the other components. She also gave a reminder to members to respond to the doodle poll sent out to schedule the next CISAC meeting in February. Furthermore, Victoria and Gina have revised the CISAC agenda template for meetings moving forward. Lastly, she noted that there have been four quarterly meetings planned for the ISCC, which will have doodle polls sent out in advance for scheduling purposes.

Dr. Katie Sutherland-Ashley, Office of Health Hazard Assessment, shared that her office is producing public outreach materials regarding the urban pesticides applied for treatment in the spongy moth eradication effort. Her office is also working with CDFA and Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) to develop environment monitoring strategies for spongy moth treatments.

Shannon Lynch, University of California Davis shared that the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) provided funding to allow for trap optimization to

expand monitoring efforts on the greater shothole borer (GSHB) found in Santa Cruz County. They are also using host range testing to assess the potential host range. GSHB is primarily attacking box elder trees but also infests willow, oak, and certain sycamore species. Dr. Lynch also announced she will be going to Western Australia in March, to continue research on ISHB and polyphagous shot hole borer. She will be presenting information and data collected in California, including risk mapping developed from research. She also reminded members about the CISAC Outreach and Education Subcommittee meeting scheduled for January 30th.

Superna Mehta represented the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in this meeting. She shared information on the updated noxious weeds list: which has increased from 52 to 132 weed species listed now. She combined several tools and maps from various state agencies to inform the list comprehensively and collaborated with CDFA on these efforts.

Tim Crothers, West Coast Arborists shared news that their business has expanded due to increasing invasive pest pressure. On the landscape level they have noticed urban trees planted by architects showing the effects of monoculture designs that are contributing to certain tree species being susceptible to invasive pests. This shows the difficulty faced while considering sustainable pest management (SPM) goals.

Dr. Bea Nobua-Behrmann, University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE) provided updates on gold spotted oak borer (GSOB) and South American palm weevil (SAPW). She informed the committee that in 2026 both University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources (UCANR) and CalFire released statements that GSOB was confirmed in Ventura County. Dr. Nobua-Behrmann is continuing with a GSOB Blitz, providing community driven detection program training and education to volunteers. Two beetles in two separate traps were found in August and October of 2025. Additionally, at the end of last year there were detections of SAPW in several palm trees in San Onofre State Beach. Her group is working with the local county agriculture commissioner's office to craft a rapid response plan to address the infestation.

Humberto Izquierdo, Yolo County Agricultural Commissioner shared an update on the developments from the Broomrape Board. The board is working to facilitate a compliance agreement program to prevent the movement of broomrape in processing tomatoes.

David Havaland, University of California Statewide IPM Program is on sabbatical leave but was able to join the meeting. He highlighted noticeable differences in other countries' airport practices related to invasive species management.

Rachel Burnap, Los Angeles County Agricultural Weights and Measures, serves as chair for the California Forest Pest Council (Southern California committee). She announced that the council will have a Spring conference on February 4, 2026. She also serves as the co-lead of the Los Angeles County community forest management

plan - invasive pest management group. This group is concerned with the spread of GSOB and provides outreach and technical training.

Dr. Erik Blosser, Department of Public Health emphasized their main invasive species of concern is the *Aedes aegypti* (yellow fever) mosquito. He also shared their first detection of Dengue fever in a local California mosquito in Los Angeles County. There are several mosquitoes and tick species that he would like to propose be added CISAC invasive species list.

Jenny Ketterlin, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shared she is continuing monitoring efforts on management of *Nutria*, *Caulerpa* and more recently on golden mussel. She reminded members that the National Invasive Species Awareness Week is coming up soon February 23-27 and asked those who can, to spread awareness on their social media platforms. Lastly, she highlighted the successful partnership with United States Geological Survey to eradicate the newly invasive fringe-toed lizard, which resulted from the pet trade.

Randall Oliver, UCANR shared updates on the outreach events he has participated in recently. The events include the California State Association of Counties, League of Cities and the International Sportsmen Exposition. He is also working on a project that will revitalize websites related to pest management. Lastly, he shared he is planning for retirement in March.

Committee Business:

A quorum was not established for the meeting, so action items were tabled until the next meeting.

Discussions:

Invasive Species Council of California (12/8/2025) Meeting Recap

Presentations were given to the secretaries on various topics of important emerging issues selected by CISAC such as tree mortality, invasive grasses, golden mussel, weed management areas (WMAs), Emerald ash borer, and the SAPW. The secretaries would like to be able to make recommendations on these topics and to be presented with tangible requests from CISAC on how to better support these issues.

Gina Darin and David Pegos highlighted Dr. Nobua-Behrmann's presentation as one the secretaries felt was most strongly aligned with presenting the invasive species threat and the ask for support on solutions that would help to mitigate that threat. Secretary Crowfoot also suggested the State Parks could be monitoring opportunity to expand the efforts for SAPW.

Gina shared that Secretary Crowfoot asked for a follow up on the Golden Mussel Task Force presentation and wanted to better understand how the agencies are working together and what is still needed to support these efforts from the ISCC. Gina shared that Secretary Ross would like the consideration of a "climate change lens" in the projects that CISAC funds. Additionally, Secretary Ross requested strategic planning for

Invasive Species Summit. There should be consideration of the role for the ISCC itself in a broad perspective and a three-to-five-year outlook to be regarded for the summit.

Secretary Crowfoot understands the value of inter-agency efforts and would like to see more information on the following items:

- Where is there overlap between agencies?
- Are there overlapping responsibilities and resources that can be shared?
- What are best practices and management techniques?
- Clarity on who are the authorities on certain species?
- Are there management gaps that can be identified?
- Are there resource needs for key priorities?

Secretary Crowfoot asked for CISAC's recommendation on how ISCC can take a more cohesive management approach on invasive species.

Gina suggested creating a list on the CISAC webpage showing regional inter-agency cross collaboration, geographical scope, and taxa to help identify the gaps and provide information to the ISCC. Dr. Lynch suggested a network analysis showing a list of information showing the CISAC members, which agency/organization they are from, the taxa they work on, partnerships on those issues and what are the challenges faced in addressing those invasive species issues. This would provide a visual representation of the relationships between agencies and partnerships CISAC hosts and the invasive species of key priorities. David Haviland concurred with creating flowchart type of display to showcase the interactions across the state and the collaborative efforts.

Martha Volkoff noted the possibility of funds/no funds should be taken into consideration with these suggestions to challenges or gaps faced. While suggestions can provide answers, funding availability will play a role in the ability to strengthen networks and create opportunities. By identifying the lack of funding for some of the issues, that challenge can be shared with the ISCC secretaries to better inform them of their capability to provide solutions, especially where CISAC faces limitations. Dr. Lara voiced support for the network analysis and agreed that by capturing this data we can show room for improvement and the funding that's available and where there are gaps to work on.

Gina Darin, also noted Secretary Crowfoot, would like outcomes from the summit to capture five-to-ten invasive species threats, taxa/pathways and the solutions to address those threats. Other areas of interest that CISAC members pointed out to address to the secretaries included potential overlaps with public health, Caltrans districts, and collaborative pathways. Additional recommendations from Secretary Crowfoot were to elevate threats to be visible at executive level, clear requests of what ISCC can do from every presentation given to secretaries, meet with the secretaries more often and draft concepts for ISCC to review.

Goals for Invasive Species Advisory Committee 2026

1. Identify cross-agency collaboration opportunities.
2. Host a high-quality Invasive Species and Tours and Summit.
3. Distribute Proposition 4 funds.

Gina Darin proposed the executive committee take on the first goal of providing the cross-agency collaboration. The committee went around the room and had members share their expectations and goals for CISAC. Dr. Lara appreciates learning about other ecological achievements and contributions towards other sectors/ and understanding the natural resources needs. Dr.Sutherland- Ashley looks forward to seeing opportunities related to human health as CISAC takes a more comprehensive perspective on collaboration. Dr. Lynch would like to push for progress on ISHB research to support management decisions.

Superna would like to see further collaboration on weed management areas (WMA), and to continue collaborating with CDFA. Tim respects the need for collaboration but emphasized considering if collaboration will lead to action on key issues. Humberto would like to highlight the success of prevention efforts such as the dog teams, as a tool for early detection of invasive species. Dr.Blosser looks forward to contributing to broader public health connections to public health. Dr. Nobua-Behrmann noted there is collaboration and action planned but the issue of funding is what hinders progress on these key issues. Chris Scianni supported Humberto's suggestion of highlighting prevention activities and pathway management of species-specific issues.

Gina Darin led the discussion on leveraging existing cross-agency collaboration by examining successful programs funded. She would like the WMAs to be a high priority to present to ISCC and members agreed they serve as a good model for leveraging funds. WMAs were a high priority issue selected from the last summit that has been successful in obtaining funding and collaborating. Members agreed that it is important to demonstrate the need for consistent funding and show the impact of investments to the WMA with quantifiable evidence.

There was a suggestion to ask ISCC to send a member for WMAs as agency representative for further collaboration. Some members suggested developing a subcommittee to focus on this topic. Others suggested using a working group for information gathering and then presenting that to CISAC to give recommendations to the ISCC. Martha added that this issue crosses multiple agencies and may serve as an incentive for a priority funding pathway. She also suggested modernizing invasive species management as a contemporary issue that the secretaries can elevate to higher levels.

Martha led the discussion on the California Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan.

The document was an interagency plan created and published in 2008 and has not been updated in some time. There is revision needed, hindered by lack of staffing and program capacity. There are challenges such as jurisdiction issues, where permission and authority over land is not defined. Other roadblocks are the California Environmental Quality Act exemptions needed. There is also opportunity for interagency collaboration as there are various groups involved such as WMAs, local county agriculture commissioners, CDFA and DWR. Creating a subcommittee to work on a proposal would allow for collaboration and integrate solutions to roadblocks. If there are legislative changes needed, informing the NRA secretary would be beneficial in bolstering support. The Invasive Species Summit can be used to flesh out ideas as part of developing and informing an action plan.

The University of California (UC) Program Teams discussion was led by Dr. Nobua Behrmann. The push for the new programmatic structure was spurred by strategic initiatives the UC wants to reach as an institution. The teams are organized as follows: Agronomy and Horticulture, Animal Production Systems, Community and Economic Development, Integrated Pest Management, Natural Ecosystems and Working Landscapes, Youth, Families, and Communities.

For CISAC's purpose, invasive species could be regarded in these programmatic teams. The program teams convene and present opportunities where they create workgroups for specific projects. Collaboration from non-UC folks can be beneficial to these program teams and their workgroups. There were suggestions from CISAC members to highlight needs by presenting species to bring awareness. CISAC can engage the working groups by reaching out to the team leaders. Tom Getts will be a great connection to help collaborate with program teams.

Gina asked the CISAC members about other connections and resources to leverage. Dr. Lynch suggested the CISAC ISHB Subcommittee as a great case study of collaborative governance. The subcommittee was able to capture different interests from groups engaged in the issue and helped inform actions on addressing the growing issue. This showed the precedent on how effective and rapid decisions can be made through collaboration.

Doug Johnson suggested also looking at the DPR in connection with SPM. DPR is creating a list of products they want to phase out to meet the initiative. But there is concern in the WMA community about the impact of these restrictions, such as the potential loss of active ingredients used in weed management. The SPM process has never involved communities such as WMA and ecological restoration as the focus is on agriculture and urban uses. He recommended having representatives from these groups assist DPR in developing recommendations and to mitigate further issues.

Another issue highlighted by Doug was the impact of DPR licensing for urban pesticide use in the field of Invasive Pest Management. DPR has added a new license requirement for pesticide applicators and there is concern that it may create confusion for applicators. He suggested due to the unique application type to look at whether there

should be specific licensing for wildlife and weed management people and agencies to follow regulations or code. The committee members suggested bringing this forward to the secretaries for awareness so there is representation from WMAs informing the pest management. Victoria suggested reaching out to Sapna, Chief of the SPM branch at DPR. She oversees the roadmap implementation and can be a beneficial contact.

Dr. Lara provided a suggestion on other connections and resources to leverage. He brought up the benefit of biocontrol in connection with leveraging resources. Even though we have many resources in California, we are not self-sufficient because some of the invasive species come from various locations, requiring sourcing biocontrol from their origin. He asked the committee to consider how we maintain diplomatic relationships and execute agreements with partners outside of California and internationally to better source agents from the origin.

Brian Gress from DPR spoke on the implementation of SPM. He went over the intent of the roadmap which prioritizes prevention and exclusion. They want to seek out diverse range of voices to help with implementing SPM goals tools, and practices. They have created two new committees, the Scientific Prioritization and Review Committee (SPARC), which will look at prioritizing pesticide for evaluation and mitigation, and the SPM advisory committee to help implement SPM and identify alternative products. He reminded the committee there are opportunities to engage as public member.

Trevor Fox, CDFA talked about why Resource Conservation Districts (RCD) are crucial to WMA efforts. The RCDs continue to support the WMAs activities when there are gaps between the local county agriculture commissioners and RCDs. The new focus with WMAs is trying to get collaboration with Caltrans through data sharing regarding weed operations and developing the priority weed list. WMAs want to be involved in the conversation with Caltrans. There is progress on the WMA Advisory Committee and they are assembling packets, to send to Secretary Ross for approval.

Public Comment:

Jenny Ketterlin commented on the cold-tolerant alligator weed biocontrol agent research, noting that biocontrol development for the alligator weed flea beetle has stalled due to a reduction in federal funding.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 p.m. The next scheduled California Invasive Species Advisory Committee meeting is to be determined.

4. February 19, 2026 Meeting Minutes

**California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC)
February 19th, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

CISAC Members:

Erik Blosser	Humberto Izquierdo	Chris Scianni
Tim Crothers	Ricky Lara	Katie Sutherland-Ashley
Gina Darin	Shannon Lynch	Martha Volkoff
Tom Getts	Lori Nezhura*	Lisa Worthington
Ted Grosholz	Bea Nobua-Behrmann*	

Virtual (agenda address posted) *

CISAC Members Absent:

Stacy Hishinuma	David Haviland	
Helene Wright	Brent Johnson	

Guests:

Jonathan Babineau	Doug Johnson	Cris Sarabia
Elizabeth Brusati	Jasmine Lopez	Steve Schoenig
Brad Cook	Stephanie Lucero	Christopher Shogren
Leah Elwell	Tanya Meyer	Cherie Shook
Jim Farrar	David Pegos	Jonathan Thompson
Nathan Fishburn	Nicholas Rasmussen	Tyler Tkachuk
Lindsey Hack	Jhalendra Rijal	
Heather Healy	Paul Rugman-Jones	
Victoria Hornbaker	Ambika Saini	

Opening:

The California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC) meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. on February 19th, 2026. Gina Darin welcomed committee members, guests, and staff.

Committee Business:

Quorum met, no action on committee business.

Victoria Hornbaker provided the members with a briefing on the onboarding process and outlined the remaining steps that members needed to complete by March 15th. She asked members to respond to doodle polls for scheduling the next quarterly meeting dates, three to four weeks prior to the ISCC meetings. She informed members that there will be a new standardized agenda format for CISAC meetings moving forward. Additionally, any materials to be shared during the meetings must be posted at least ten days in advance.

The new fiscal display was presented to the members. Discussion took place among members about which type of display would best convey the relevant details for the committee.

Gina asked the committee if anyone was interested in serving in the vice-chair or secretary positions. Dr. Bea Nobua-Behrmann and Lisa Worthington expressed interest in the vice-chair position.

Gina and Victoria shared the CISAC charter and proposed edits to the existing charter. For the scope and objectives section, Gina proposed removing “stakeholders” from the language of the charter and replacing it with “interested parties”. Lisa asked if the description of the duties section of the charter could separate the duties and the deliverables. Members deliberated on the service period of the term a member can be appointed. Further changes will continue to be discussed at another time.

Leah Elwell from the Western Regional Panel presented information about the Aquatic Nuisance Species September meeting in Sacramento. She requested support in sponsorship for the organization. There was support vocalized by members in CISAC providing sponsorship.

Discussion:

Dr. Shannon Lynch provided a summary from the CISAC subcommittee on Outreach and Education for the Invasive Species Summit and Tours meeting. The secretaries would consider a successful outcome from the summit and tours, knowing five to ten threats of invasive species and pathways, and the steps forward. Another important perspective to consider is how climate change influences those top threats. The subcommittee discussed four goals for the summit and tours.

1. Identify major invasive species threats to California’s agriculture, natural resources, and unique biodiversity.
2. Increase government officials understanding of California’s pest prevention systems.
3. Identify three to five realistic actions to address invasive species threats over the next three to five years.
4. Improve cross jurisdictional coordination and accountability within California’s pest prevention systems.

Lisa suggested changing the second goal to “increase government officials understanding of solutions to address invasive species threats”. Dr. Ted Grosholz recalled from the last summit that the dot stickers were used to highlight top priorities and suggested using a similar type of exercise to identify where the gaps are. He suggested that a critical part of cross jurisdictional participation is by identifying where things are missing connections. Dr. Ricky Lara commented that specific activities from the summit and tours will support accomplishing the broad goals. Dr. Lynch also stated that a major focus for these sessions would be to analyze interagency collaboration performance, identify where gaps are, and what improvements are needed to address those gaps across networks.

Dr. Lynch brought up concerns about scheduling the summit and tours. There are two options the subcommittee would like to consider.

Option one would be to hold the Invasive Species Summit in January 2027; the California legislature calendar is open, and participation would help inform legislative action. Additionally, there would be a virtual summit or hybrid discussion in August or October 2026 after the invasive species tours. Topics of discussion would include identifying threats and actions in preparation for the January 2027 summit and maintaining momentum from the tours in the summer. Site visits for the tours would be planned between May and November 2026.

Option two would be to hold the Invasive Species Summit in August 2026, and hold site visits for the tours would be between May and June 2026. Benefits for this option include having the current legislature members in office.

If the summit is pushed to September or October 2026, there is concern that there would be significantly less legislative participation.

Martha Volkoff asked how tour attendees are selected. Dr. Lynch responded that the Committee will prioritize attendees and will include government/legislative participation, land managers, growers, invasive species management and other interested parties.

Gina brought up the discussion topic of leveraging existing cross-agency collaboration on Weed Management Areas (WMAs). WMAs were recognized by the committee as a high priority from the last invasive species summit and a successful program with consistent funding. Gina would like the committee to form a subcommittee or a working group and develop recommendations for the secretaries on this topic.

Tom Getts proposed forming a subcommittee or a working group for the WMAs. Gina highlighted that partnerships and collaborations have contributed to the success of the WMAs. Gina asked the committee if there was any opposition against forming a new subcommittee to put together recommendations for the secretaries on sustainable funding for WMAs at CDFA. Victoria suggested forming a working group, which would have two CISAC members: Tom Getts and (second member to be determined). The working group would collaborate with the Weed Management Advisory Committee once it's formalized.

Gina broached the topic of Aquatic Weed Jurisdiction. She proposed forming a subcommittee or a working group to address this issue. Chris Schianni, Martha Volkoff, Humberto Izquierdo and Ted Grosholz all expressed interest in being part of a subcommittee on aquatic invasive species.

Gina inquired about where committee members were leaning on the two options presented to the committee for the Invasive Species Summit and Tours. Option one is holding the summit in January 2027, and option two is holding the summit in August

2026. The committee's results were mixed, and recommendations will be given to the secretaries to decide at the next ISCC March meeting.

Public Comment:

Doug Johnson from Cal-IPC acknowledged January 2027 would allow for more time to plan the Invasive Species Summit and Tours. He did say there was the factor of administrative change to consider as well.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:59 PM. The next scheduled California Invasive Species Advisory Committee meeting is to be scheduled after a doodle poll.

5. Approval of Proposed Dates for the 2026 CISAC Meetings

- **June 4th prior to July 6th ISCC Meeting**
- **September 17th prior to October 12th ISCC Meeting**
- **October 29th prior to December 7th ISCC Meeting**

**California Invasive Species Advisory Committee
CHARTER**

**Approved April 8, 2009
Amended August 2, 2011
Amended October 3, 2022
Amended XXX, 2026**

I. Official Designation

California Invasive Species Advisory Committee

II. Scope and Objectives

The purpose of the California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC) is to advise the Invasive Species Council of California (ISCC) on a broad array of issues related to preventing the introduction of invasive species and providing for their control and/or eradication, as well as minimizing the economic, ecological, and human health impacts that invasive species cause. The CISAC will maintain an intensive and regular dialogue with other interested parties to explore these issues and develop recommendations.

III. Description of Duties

Provide advice and recommendations to the ISCC relating to the ISCC's role in:

- A. Coordinating state agency activities concerning invasive species;
- B. Making recommendations for funding as available;
- C. Developing and maintaining a list of invasive species that have a reasonable likelihood of entering or have entered California for which an exclusion, detection, eradication, control, or management action by the State might be taken;
- D. Encouraging planning and action at local, tribal, state, regional, and ecosystem-based levels to harmonize activities concerning invasive species;
- E. Developing recommendations for inter-state cooperation in addressing invasive species;
- F. Developing recommendations to prevent invasive species from entering the State through all points of entry and pathways;
- G. Developing guidance to state agencies pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) on invasive species matters;
- H. Facilitating development of a coordinated network to document, evaluate, and monitor impacts from invasive species;
- I. Facilitating establishment and enhancement of a coordinated, information-sharing system on invasive species that utilizes the latest technologies;
- J. Developing a system for reporting sightings of invasive species and referring those reports to the appropriate agency;
- K. Facilitating educational and outreach activities to increase awareness of invasive species issues;
- L. Anticipating effects of climate change on the introduction, establishment, and spread of new and existing invasive species; and

M. Developing an Invasive Species Action Plan, a statewide plan for dealing with invasive species including an Early Detection and Rapid Response Plan.

The CISAC will provide its advice based upon input from and cooperation with other interested parties and existing organizations addressing invasive species issues.

IV. Duration

The CISAC has no sunset provisions and is expected to operate indefinitely. However, the CISAC's continuance is subject to review and renewal of this charter every two (2) years on the biennial anniversary of the adoption of this charter.

V. Agency Official to Whom the Committee Reports

The CISAC reports through the ISCC's Liaison to the Council.

VI. Agency Responsible for Providing Necessary Support

All staff and support functions required for operation of the CISAC will be supplied by the Department of Food and Agriculture and/or the Natural Resources Agency as determined by the Secretaries of those agencies.

VII. Estimated Annual Operating Costs

Support for the operation of the CISAC will rely on existing staff and resources, until such time as the State may allocate funds necessary for the operation of CISAC.

VIII. Allowances for Committee Members

Members of the CISAC and its subcommittees will serve without pay. However, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services of the CISAC, members, to the extent funding is available, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence.

IX. Committee Membership

CISAC will consist of no more than 19 voting members, made up as follows:

- Four members appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Food and Agriculture;
- Four members appointed by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency;
- One member appointed by the Secretary of the Environmental Protection Agency;
- One member appointed by the Secretary of the State Transportation Agency;
- One member appointed by the Secretary of the Health and Human Services Agency;
- One member appointed by the Director of the Office of Emergency Services;
- One member appointed by the California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association;
- Six members appointed by the co-chairs of the Invasive Species Council of California to create a diverse make up.

Members of the CISAC will be knowledgeable in and represent one or more among, but not limited to, the following groups and organizations:

- Biologists
- Ranchers
- Foresters
- Farmers
- Academics / Researchers
- Public Health Specialists
- Government Representatives
- County Agricultural Commissioner's Representatives
- Invasive Species Management Specialists
- Persons involved with Global Commerce
- Non-Governmental Environmental Representatives
- Expertise in climate change and ecosystems
- Public Relations Specialists
- Lawyers specializing in Invasive Species Policy
- Public Member
- Industry Representatives
- Educators
- Tribal Government Representatives
- Information / Database Managers
- Economists
- Risk Assessment Analysts

Members will serve a maximum of two (2) three (3)-year terms, but may be reappointed in special circumstances by the ISCC.

The ISCC co-chairs reserve the right to request the appointing/designating ISCC Member(s) replace CISAC members who are unable to fully participate in the CISAC, or who miss three (3) consecutive, regularly scheduled meetings of the CISAC.

Vacancies shall be immediately filled by the ISCC based on recommendations from CISAC for the unexpired portion of the terms in which they occur.

Members should identify a non-voting representative to attend meetings if they are unable to participate.

X. Officers

The Committee may elect from its members a Vice-Chairperson, and Secretary. Elections will occur during the first meeting of the calendar year. The Secretary and Vice Chairperson of the CISAC will be chosen by a majority vote of the advisory committee members, with the authorization from the co-chairs of the ISCC or designee. One year following the vote, the Vice Chairperson of the CISAC automatically becomes Chairperson. Following one year as Chairperson, the Chair automatically becomes the Past Chairperson of the CISAC. The Executive Committee of the CISAC is made up of the Secretary, Vice Chair, Chair, and Past Chair.

1. Chairperson

The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the committee. The Chairperson shall appoint the members of all subcommittees. The Chairperson shall serve as Chairperson of the Executive Subcommittee and serve as a non-voting ex-officio member of all other subcommittees.

2. Vice-Chairperson

The Vice-Chairperson shall act as and perform all the duties of the Chairperson in the Chairperson's absence. He or she shall perform additional duties as may be assigned by the Chairperson or the Committee. If the Chairperson is absent or becomes disqualified for any reason, the Vice-Chairperson, if qualified, shall serve as acting Chairperson until the Committee elects a new Chairperson.

3. Secretary

The Secretary shall serve as a member of the Executive Subcommittee and shall perform additional duties as may be assigned by the Chairperson or the Committee.

XI. Subcommittees

1. Subcommittees; Appointment

The Committee may appoint subcommittees composed of both members and non-members of the Committee to advise the Committee in carrying out its purposes. Subcommittees may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. Outreach and Education Subcommittee
- b. Science Subcommittee
- c. Finance Subcommittee
- d. Grant Review Subcommittee
- e. Other Subcommittees as needed

The Chairperson of the Committee shall appoint all subcommittee chairpersons and shall appoint all members of each subcommittee after consultation with the subcommittee Chairperson affected. Appointments are subject to approval by the Committee and may be changed from time to time as determined by the Chairperson and with concurrence of the Committee. Committee members and other interested persons who are voting subcommittee members may serve as subcommittee chairpersons, and no subcommittee member shall serve as chairperson of more than one (1) subcommittee.

2. Notice

Notice of all subcommittee meetings shall be provided in the same manner provided for in noticing Committee meetings.

3. Quorum

A majority of the voting members of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum and the acts of a majority of the voting members present at a meeting at which a quorum is present shall constitute the act of the subcommittee.

4. Attendance

Failure of any member of a subcommittee to attend two (2) consecutive regular meetings of a subcommittee without an excuse acceptable to the subcommittee, or failure of any member to attend three (3) consecutive meetings of the subcommittee for any reason may cause a vacancy on the subcommittee and the member may be deemed to have been disqualified, unless the subcommittee, by majority vote, expressly waives implementation of this provision.

XII. Subgroups

As deemed necessary, the Committee Chairperson, in consultation with the Liaison to the Invasive Species Council of California, may convene working groups or subgroups to support ISCC functions. Such groups will report directly to the CISAC.

XIII. Estimated Number and Frequency of Meetings

The CISAC will meet at the call of the CISAC Chairperson with the approval of the ISCC's Liaison to the Council, approximately four times per year. Meetings may be held less frequently or more frequently determined by the workload of the CISAC, but in no case less than once per year.

XIV. Ethical Responsibilities of Members

No committee or subcommittee member shall participate in any specific matter including a lease, license, permit, contract, claim, agreement or related litigation with the department or agency in which the member has a direct financial interest.

2026 Invasive Species Control Grant Program Request for Grant Proposals



Released:

DATE TO BE ANNOUNCED 00, 2026

Grant Applications Due:

By 5:00 p.m. on DATE TBA 00, 2026

Late submissions will not be accepted.



California Department of Food and Agriculture
Invasive Species Council of California
cisac@iscc.ca.gov
1220 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Contents

About the Program	3
Background	3
Authority	3
Purpose	3
Funding, Duration	4
Priority Funding	4
Eligibility	5
Timeline	5
Technical Assistance Resources	5
How to Submit a Grant Proposal	6
Proposal Review and Evaluation	6
Notification and Feedback	7
Award Process	8
Overview of Grant Management	8
Grant Agreement Execution	8
Requirements and Limitations	8
Executive Order N-6-22 – Russia Sanctions	9
Public Disclosure	9
Grant Regulations	9
Allowable Costs	9
Unallowable Costs	10
Grant Terms and Conditions	10
Payment Process	11
Reporting Requirements	11
Evaluation	11
Criteria	11

About the Program

Background

Invasive species threaten the economic and environmental vitality of California. California is a biodiversity hotspot home to 650 bird species, 220 mammals, 100 reptiles, 75 amphibians, 70 freshwater fish, 100 marine fish and mammals, and 6,500 taxa of native plants. Additionally, California's \$51 billion in agricultural production includes more than 400 commodities and produces approximately 50% of the specialty fruits, vegetables, and nut crops for the United States of America. This unique biodiversity across ecosystems is threatened by emerging and re-emerging invasive species, including land-dwelling and aquatic organisms, that impart a severe environmental and economic impact in the state. Recent and ongoing climate events and increased passenger travel and commerce impact every part of California and creates a favorable environment for the spread of invasive species. Given California's range of geographies and biomes, diverse populations and their needs, and existing infrastructure, invasive species are recognized as a major threat to California's biodiversity and resilience to a changing climate.

Authority

In November 2024, California voters approved a \$10 billion General Obligation Bond called the Safe Drinking Water, Wildfire Prevention, Drought Preparedness, and Clean Air Bond Act of 2024. It is also commonly known as the "Climate Bond." This bond allocates \$10 billion across state agencies to confront climate change, protect California communities and nature from its impacts, and improve the lives of Californians. The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) on behalf of the Invasive Species Council of California (ISCC) is pleased to announce funding availability for the through the Climate Bond for Invasive Species Control Grants (ISCG) in the amount of \$16,450,000.

Purpose

The purpose of this grant program is to support work on minimizing the economic, ecological, and human health impacts caused by invasive species that have been or are likely to be detected in California. Grants of \$100,000 to \$1,000,000 will fund invasive species control work throughout California with an emphasis on projects that restore and protect biodiversity and ecosystem health. Priority shall be given to projects that are species-specific, time-sensitive, new to a geographic region, and likely to prevent the establishment of that species. Projects shall minimize the economic, ecological, and human health impacts caused by invasive species and restore and protect biodiversity and ecosystem health, with particular attention to projects providing direct and meaningful benefits to disadvantaged communities, severely disadvantaged communities, and vulnerable populations.

Funded projects may include, but are not limited to, management actions for preventing introduction of invasive species, control, containment or eradication of an invasive species, and outreach, education, and research related to invasive species ISCC will

award grants through a competitive one phase application process. Grant proposals will be submitted to CDFA where they will undergo a two-phase review process, including an administrative review by CDFA and a technical review by California Invasive Species Advisory Committee (CISAC). Based on the outcome of the administrative and technical reviews, proposals will be submitted to ISCC for approval and funding. These application guidelines provide an overview of the ISCG application process and requirements.

Funding, Duration

CDFA on behalf of the ISCC will award \$16,450,000 in Proposition 4 funds for ISCG projects within California.

Individual grant awards can range from \$100,000 to \$1,000,000, and CDFA reserves the right to offer an award amount other than the amount requested.

The maximum grant duration is 24 months; awarded projects and all associated expenditures must be completed within 24 months of the agreement start date. Costs incurred before the beginning of the grant agreement will not be reimbursed. Extensions will not be allowed.

Priority Funding

The Climate Bond language requires that “at least 40 percent of the total funding made available pursuant to this division shall be invested in programs or projects that provide direct and meaningful benefits to disadvantaged communities, severely disadvantaged communities, and vulnerable populations.” The following definitions come directly from the bond (PRC Section 90100) and will be used across 2024 Climate Bond programs:

- Disadvantaged community (DAC): A community with a median household income of less than 80 percent of the area average or less than 80 percent of statewide median household income.
- Severely disadvantaged community (SDAC): A community with a median household income of less than 60 percent of the area average or less than 60 percent of statewide median household income.
- Tribe: A federally recognized Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized Native American tribe listed on the California Tribal Consultation List maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission
- Vulnerable population: A subgroup population within a region or community that faces a disproportionately heightened risk or increased sensitivity to impacts of climate change and that lacks adequate resources to cope with, adapt to, or recover from such impacts. (Note: tribes are considered vulnerable populations)

CDFA will evaluate a target population’s status as a disadvantaged or severely disadvantaged community using the Climate Bond (Proposition 4) (S)DAC Status tool built for this purpose and give scoring preference to these priority populations. CDFA will

evaluate a target population’s status as a vulnerable population using the Climate Vulnerability Map in combination with the definition provided and will give scoring preference to these priority populations.

Eligibility

Projects must be based in California and provide direct benefit to California.

Eligible applicants must be a:

1. Public college or university,
2. Federal, state, or local government entities, including Tribal entities,
3. 501(c)(3) Non-profit organization,
4. Special district,
5. Joint powers authority,
6. Mutual water company.

Timeline

Release Request for Grant Proposals	
Webinar	
Grant Proposals Due	
Review Period	
Announcement and Funding Award	

Technical Assistance Resources

To support the development of competitive proposals, CDFA will offer application technical assistance (TA) to eligible applicants for ISCG funding. Applicants can request TA by emailing the ISCC at cisac@iscc.ca.gov.

TA providers will support all eligible grant applicants with technical assistance.

Application TA activities may include, but are not limited to:

- Direct application assistance, including clarification of application requirements, financial analysis, review of responses and application coordination.
- Assistance with the compilation/development of all application materials (project proposal, estimated timeline, budget, pre-development documents (if available));
- Identification of project area, integration of projects, and
- Assessment of project readiness

Important points about application technical assistance:

- Applicants are not required to receive TA.

- Receiving application TA does not guarantee that an applicant will be awarded a grant.

An online workshop will be held <INSERT DATE and TIME> to answer questions about the grant opportunity and the grant submissions process. The workshop will be recorded and available to watch through the deadline for submission of applications.

How to Submit a Grant Proposal

Applicants are required to complete and submit the Invasive Species Control Grant Program Application using the required application template available [insert where the template will be posted].

The Grant Proposal Application consists of the following sections:

- Cover Page and Proposal Narrative (Template Attached)
- Budget and Budget Narrative (Template Attached)

Grant proposals must be submitted electronically to [insert e-mail address] no later than 5:00 PM PST on XXX. Late proposals will be disqualified.

Files to Upload:

1. Cover Page and Project Narrative. Include a complete project narrative.

2. Budget and Budget Narrative. Include a complete budget table and budget narrative

3. Project Leader(s) Resume(s). Include a two-page resume, including a list of relevant publications. Also include a description of current research/outreach activities; provide information on all current and pending projects, whether or not there is a specific time commitment and how it will impact the proposed project.

4. Collaborator's Statement of Commitment. Include a letter from each collaborator describing their role in the project and statement of agreement to participate in the project.

5. Letters of Support. Include a letter from each supporter explaining the rationale for their support. Scanned copies of letters are acceptable

Proposal Review and Evaluation

Administrative Review

The purpose of the administrative review is to determine whether the grant proposal meets all application requirements, including reviewing the proposal and budget for accuracy and completeness. The administrative review will occur after the application due date.

Technical Review

A technical review will be completed by the CISAC members, who will review the proposals and evaluate their merits. The CISAC will convene a meeting to complete individual reviews and finalize scores for each proposal. Any member of the committee who is connected to a submitted project will be excluded from any discussions or decisions regarding that project. The technical review will be completed using the review criteria established within this document.

The technical review will not factor matching funds into application scores as that practice can disadvantage low-resource organizations in the process of building capacity

The CISAC will make funding recommendations to the ISCC based on the outcomes of the administrative and technical reviews. The ISCC will select proposals for funding.

Disqualifications

The following will result in the disqualification of a grant proposal:

- Incomplete grant proposals, including grant proposals with one or more unanswered questions and/or missing, blank, unreadable, corrupt, or otherwise unusable attachments
- Grant proposals requesting more than the maximum or less than the minimum award amount
- Grant proposals requesting funds outside of the grant term
- Grant proposals with unallowable costs or activities necessary to complete the project objectives
- Projects occurring out of state or with out-of-state project leads
- Proposals from ineligible entities

APPEAL RIGHTS: Any discretionary action taken by the ISCC may be appealed to the CDFA's Office of Hearings and Appeals within ten (10) calendar days of receiving a notice of disqualification from CDFA. Email notification shall serve as the date of service. The appeal must be in writing and signed by the responsible party named on the grant application or their authorized agent. It must state the grounds for the appeal and include any supporting documents and a copy of the decision being challenged. The submission must be sent to the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Office of Hearings and Appeals, 1220 N Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 or emailed to CDFA.LegalOffice@cdfa.ca.gov. If submissions are not received within the time frame provided above, the appeal will be disqualified from consideration.

Notification and Feedback

Grant proposals that are disqualified during the administrative review will be notified by email within three weeks of the grant proposal's due date. All other applicants will be notified by email regarding the status of their grant proposals in [timeframe]. Feedback generated during the review periods will be provided to applicants upon request.

To ensure all communications are received, points of contact listed in the application should add [e-mail] to their email safe senders list, address book, or contact list

Award Process

Overview of Grant Management

Successful applicants will receive a Grant Award Procedures (GAP) Manual with instructions on grant administration. The GAP Manual outlines detailed processes and policies for financial management, performance management, grant beneficiary relationships, and requested changes to the grant agreement.

Grant Agreement Execution

All applicants will be notified regarding the status of their proposal by <insert date>. Applicant's whose projects are not funded may request comments from <insert contact name and email> within 30 business days of transmittal of the funding denial.

CDFA Office of Grant Administration will initiate the Grant Agreement process with successful applicants. The process of executing a grant agreement may take several months. Awardees will receive a Grant Agreement package with instructions regarding award requirements, including information on project implementation, reporting, and payment process.

Communication during the grant execution process is done primarily via email. CDFA will provide deadlines for each step in the process. CDFA reserves the right to rescind an award due to lack of response from an applicant selected for award. Once a grant package is selected for funding it may take CDFA's Office of Grants Administration up to 90 days to fully execute the grant agreement.

Requirements and Limitations

Funding may supplement, but not supplant, existing activities/programs and funding.

- Supplement is defined as adding to existing funds to enhance or expand existing activities.
- Supplant is defined as replacing existing funds for an ongoing activity or funding an already funded activity.

Executive Order N-6-22 – Russia Sanctions

On March 4, 2022, Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order (EO) N-6-22 regarding Economic Sanctions against Russia and Russian entities and individuals. “Economic Sanctions” refers to sanctions imposed by the U.S. government in response to Russia’s actions in Ukraine, as well as any sanctions imposed under state law. By submitting a bid, proposal, or application, Bidder/Applicant represents that it is not a target of Economic Sanctions.

Should the State determine Bidder/Applicant is a target of Economic Sanctions or is conducting prohibited transactions with sanctioned individuals or entities, that shall be grounds for rejection of the Bidder’s/Applicant’s bid/proposal/application any time prior to contract/agreement execution, or, if determined after contract/agreement execution, shall be grounds for termination by the State.

Public Disclosure

ISSC is responsible for reporting on the status and use of Climate Bond funds. The California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), which administers the Bond, may require ISSC to report any or all the data collected from the program.

ISSC will post summary information about the applications submitted to these programs, the projects awarded, and outcome information, including project final reports.

Data associated with these grant programs are subject to public disclosure through the California Public Records Act (CPRA). The CPRA states that every citizen has the right to inspect and/or obtain a copy of any public record. Certain records are exempt from disclosure under the CPRA. The CDFA Legal Office shall determine if a record is exempt from disclosure.

Grant Regulations

All awarded projects are subject to the Grant Administration Regulations set forth by CDFA at: <https://www.cdca.ca.gov/Regulations/General/FinalGrantAdminRegs-Text.pdf>

Allowable Costs

Allowable costs include those costs necessary to complete the grant objectives and include, but are not limited to the following

1. Salaries and fringe benefits for staff conducting work on the project.
2. Operating expenses for items required to complete work on the project.
 - a. Supplies must be used exclusively for the project.
 - b. Travel necessary to complete the work of the project.
 - c. Equipment necessary to complete the work of the project.

- d. Contractor expenses associated with subawards identified in the agreement for completion of work associated with the project.
- e. Attendance at meetings or conferences in alignment with the work project.
- f. Outreach and communications costs associated with the project.
- g. Training necessary to complete the project.
- h. Indirect costs incurred for common or joint objectives that cannot be specifically identified with a particular project

Unallowable Costs

Unallowable costs will not be reimbursed and include the following:

Unallowable Items of Cost

1. Expenses for delta conveyance facilities.
2. Costs associated with compliance with California Environmental Quality Act
3. Costs of promotional items, memorabilia, gifts, souvenirs, and similar items.
4. Costs of advertising and public relations that are not directly related to the purpose or objectives of the grant program or grant award.
5. Costs of alcoholic beverages.
6. Costs for overtime.
7. Costs incurred for contributions and donations from the recipient to other entities.
8. Costs for entertainment, amusement, diversion, or social activities, including any associated costs.
9. Costs resulting from the recipient's failure to comply with grant program requirements, grant award terms and conditions, or applicable laws.
10. Costs associated with fundraising, including financial campaigns, endowment drives, solicitation of gifts, donations, and bequests, and similar endeavors to raise capital or obtain contributions.
11. Costs associated with applications for patents, copyrights, or trademarks.
12. Costs associated with lobbying.
13. Costs such as incorporation fees, business license fees, and other costs related to organizing a business or similar entity.
14. Pre-award costs.
15. Lease-to-own costs.
16. Costs of selling and marketing any products or services.
17. Costs of sponsorships.
18. Costs that accrue due to the negligent or willful failure of the recipient to prevent such costs.

Grant Terms and Conditions

If awarded a grant from CDFA, the grant recipient will be expected to sign an agreement abiding by certain terms and conditions, including but not limited to:

- Submission of semi-annual, annual and final performance reports. (samples attached)

- The grant recipient understands that CDFA may conduct site visits at any time during the grant period.
- Grantee is required to establish project signage and share videos or press releases about the project.
- Grantee and or cooperators may be asked to provide project updates at ISCC and/or CISAC meetings, in-person or virtually.

Payment Process

If awarded, recipients will be subject to all applicable State regulations. Recipients are required to submit invoices at least quarterly, but no more frequently than monthly for reimbursement of actual expenses incurred to support approved project activities. Invoices must include documentation to support reimbursement requested. Recipients may be eligible to receive an advance payment to cover anticipated project expenditures. Advance payments may not exceed 25 percent of the total award and will need to be submitted to CDFA for approval. Ten percent of the total amount of the award will be withheld until receipt, review, and approval of the Final Performance Report.

Reporting Requirements

Reporting requirements include a semi-annual and annual report each year and a final report after the project is completed.

- The semi-annual report will cover the first 6 months of the project year 1 and 2 and is due no later than 60 days after the end of the 6-month period.
- The annual report will cover the second 6 months of the project year 1 and is due no later than 60 days after the end of the 6-month period.
- A final report will be due no later than 120 days after the end of the grant.
- The principal investigator or other key personnel may be asked to present updates or outcomes of the project at CIASC or ISCC public meetings. The presentation will provide information about project goals, objectives, and results.

Evaluation

Criteria

All applications will be evaluated based on the criteria detailed below.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	Max points
Project Merit	40

<p>Justification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Need and Beneficiaries:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The defined problem poses an actual or imminent significant threat to California’s economy, environment, or human health. – The defined problem poses an actual or imminent threat across a large geographic scale (regional/statewide level). – Proposed project indicates potential contribution to long-term problem resolution. – For research proposals, new information to be generated is a logical next step based on the previously conducted related research or efforts described in the proposal. • <u>Alignment with Priorities:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Addressing the defined problem aligns with the goals of the grant. – Proposed project will benefit California across multiple sectors (agriculture, environmental, human health). – Proposed project aligns with documented state priorities (department, agency, governor’s). <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed objectives effectively address the stated problem. • The proposed objectives align with grant goals. • The proposed objectives align with state priorities. <p>Tasks and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed tasks and methods are appropriate to fulfill the objectives. 	<p>15</p> <p>10</p> <p>15</p>
<p>Project Team and Resources</p>	<p>30</p>
<p>Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders + collaborators: The project leaders have complementary and integrated expertise, and their leadership approach/governance and organizational structure is appropriate for the project. • The project proposal has strong support from relevant organizations/individuals. 	<p>20</p>
<p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organizational and institutional support, equipment, and other physical resources available to the project leaders are adequate for the project proposed. • The project will benefit from the unique features of the scientific, cultural, environment, and/or collaborative arrangements. 	<p>10</p>
<p>Feasibility</p>	<p>30</p>

Cover Page

Project Title: Provide a unique and concise title for the proposed project that describes the project.

Project Type: Prevention, containment/control, eradication, outreach, education, research, other (describe)

Target Species: Identify the invasive species (one or more) to be addressed by the project

Geographic Scope

Grant Funding Amount Requested

Project Start and End Dates

PROP 4 INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL GRANT APPLICATION – COVER PAGE AND
NARRATIVE APPLICATION

Applicant Organization: Legal name of the organization that will serve as lead for the project and will receive and oversee the use of grant funds.

Organization Type

Taxpayer Identification Number: Enter the applicants 9-digit taxpayer identification number in the format ##-#####.

Project Summary (not to exceed 500 words): Concisely describe the need for the project, approach to be taken to address it, and expected outcomes.

Project Narrative

The narrative must address each section below. This content will be the basis for the review and scoring of each proposal as outlined in the Evaluation section. The Project Narrative should not exceed 12 pages (single-spaced), excluding figures, tables, and references. Supporting documents should be added to the end of the Project Narrative and will not count towards the page limit.

Section One: Overview

- 1.1 Need and Beneficiaries: Describe the problem, and how the proposed project will minimize the economic, ecological, and human health impacts caused by invasive species. Identify beneficiaries, such as communities, resources, biodiversity, agriculture, water quality, climate adaptation, carbon sequestration, industries, and sectors, etc. that will benefit from this project.

1.2 Alignment with Priorities: Identify and describe how the proposed project contributes to documented priorities relevant to the State, including but not limited to projects that are species-specific, time-sensitive, new to a geographic region, and likely to prevent the establishment of that species. Projects shall minimize the economic, ecological, and human health impacts caused by invasive species and restore and protect biodiversity and ecosystem health, with particular attention to projects providing direct and meaningful benefits to disadvantaged communities, severely disadvantaged communities, and vulnerable populations. Reference documents, identify specific actions in those documents, and tie them to the proposed project.

Section Two: Project Objectives

2.1 Objectives and the questions to be addressed: Define the objectives, how each objective contributes to meeting the defined need and beneficiaries, and how each objective will be met.

Section Three: Tasks and Methods

3.1 Tasks and subtasks: For each objective, define and describe each task and subtask that will be implemented, and explain how they contribute to that objective.

3.2 Methods: Define and describe the methods that will be used to accomplish each task and/or subtask.

3.3 Timeline. Describe when each task and subtask will be completed. Include interim deadlines and work products, and when data and reports will be shared with CDFA.

3.4 Data Management Plan: Include a data management plan, if applicable, that addresses data collection, quality control, the electronic repository for the data, how it will be backed up and archived, and its availability to the public

Section Four: Deliverables, Expected Outcomes and Benefits

4.1 Define and describe what products, benefits, or intellectual advances will result from the project. Characterize as appropriate for the type of project being implemented.

4.2 Describe how this project benefits the following:

- Protects biodiversity, ecosystem health and/or human health;
- Advances justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion;
- Leverages funding through cost-sharing with collaborations.

Section Five: Success Criteria

5. Define and describe how implementation of the project will be assessed quantitatively or qualitatively. Detail what measures will be used to evaluate project outcomes, and how they will be assessed and reported to CDFA.

Section Six: Supplemental Information

6.1 Include any supplementary information/documents/maps which you feel are essential to the review committee in assessing this proposal. If including attachments, submit them as PDF files.

Section Seven: Project Team

7.1 Project Team and institutional resources: List the names of the team members, and describe institutional resources and equipment (if applicable) that will be used for project implementation. Submit a CV/resume for each team member (not to exceed two pages) as a PDF file with this application.

7.2 Partners. List contributing partners on this effort. Substantiate their role with a one-page letter from each on their letterhead, submitted as a PDF file with this application.

7.3 Project Supporters. Attached letters of Support for all entities listed here.

Section Eight: Applicant Information

Project Lead

Name

Institution

Address

Phone number

Email address

Contract Administration

Name

Institution

Address

Phone number

Email address

PROP 4 INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL GRANT APPLICATION – BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE TEMPLATE

Complete the budget table and provide a detailed budget narrative of your proposed budget broken into years 1 and 2 (see below). An Excel version of the budget table can be found on the ISCC webpage: <INSERT LINK> Costs that are not personnel, operating expenses, or subawards should be listed individually under other direct costs. All allowable and unallowable expenses can be found in detail in the Request for Proposals or the Grant Management Guidelines. Unallowable costs will not be reimbursed.

BUDGET CATEGORY	From: To:			
		Year 1	Year 2	Total
(1) PERSONNEL: <i>Salary and fringe benefits.</i>				
Salary				
Fringe benefits				
(2) OPERATING EXPENSES				
Travel				
Materials & Supplies				
Equipment				
SUBAWARD <i>IDC Calc</i>	<i>Not subject to</i>			

(3) OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODC) <i>IDC Calc</i>	<i>Subject to</i>			
<i>Other direct cost 1</i>				
<i>Other direct cost 2</i>				
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS				
(4) Indirect (F&A) <u>F&A costs Base</u> <i>Rate MTDC *</i>				
TOTAL COSTS FOR PROPOSED PROJECT PERIOD				
FUNDING REQUESTED				

* MTDC = Modified Total Direct Cost

PROP 4 INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL GRANT APPLICATION – BUDGET AND BUDGET
NARRATIVE TEMPLATE

The budget narrative should be provided in a paragraph format for each budget category. The budget narrative, supported by the budget table, is the basis for the review and scoring of each proposal as outlined in the Evaluation section. Budgets should only include allowable costs as defined in the Allowable and Unallowable Costs section above. Budget narrative should identify the funding from external sources. Provide a clear explanation describing other funding sources and their contributions to the overall project.

Assume a start date of 06/01/2026 and explain all of the following:

1. **Personnel:** *Actual* salary/pay rate and fringe benefit information for all Key Personnel and any Other Personnel (as applicable). When calculating out years, include anticipated Cost of Living Adjustments (COLAs) and planned salary increases. For new personnel, provide a reasonable estimate based on prior experience or research.
2. **Operating Expenses:** Itemize and justify all of the following operating expenses:
 - A. **Supplies:** Itemize and justify all supplies to be purchased. Supplies include all consumable materials with an acquisition cost less than \$5,000 per unit. Supplies must be used exclusively for the project. For each grant year, provide an itemized list of projected supply expenditures, the approximate dollar amount for each item, and describe how it will support the purpose and goal of the project.
 - B. **Travel:** The maximum travel rates allowable are the _____ rates in effect at the time of travel as established by the California Department of Human Resources (CalHR) or by their institution's travel policies.
 - C. **Equipment:** Tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and a per-unit acquisition cost of \$10,000 or more. The acquisition cost includes the cost of any necessary accessories and all incidental costs incurred to put the asset into place and ready for its intended use.
 - i. Special purpose equipment is used only for research, scientific, or other technical activities. For example, electron microscopes, spectrometers, and dairy digesters are special purpose equipment.
 - ii. General purpose equipment is not limited to research, scientific or other technical activities. For example, office equipment and furnishings, modular offices, telephone networks, information technology equipment and systems, air conditioning equipment, reproduction and printing equipment, and motor vehicles are general purpose equipment.
3. **Subawards:** Contractor may be included in the budget but do not submit their own budget template.

PROP 4 INVASIVE SPECIES CONTROL GRANT APPLICATION – BUDGET AND BUDGET
NARRATIVE TEMPLATE

4. **Other Direct Costs:** Identify and explain any additional expenses not covered by the above categories. Other expenses include, but are not limited to: conferences or meetings, communications, speaker/trainer fees, publication costs, data collection, and other budgeted costs associated with the project.

5. **Indirect Costs:** Costs incurred for common or joint objectives that cannot be specifically identified with a particular project, program, or organizational activity. Typical indirect costs include but are not limited to rent, utilities and internet service, cellular and land-line telephone service, general office supplies, and insurance. ISSC provides for indirect costs as a percentage of the award but does not oversee the use of these funds.
 - A. ISSC reimburses indirect costs based upon the Modified Total Direct Costs, which is the sum of all costs subject to the indirect rate.
 - B. Applicants may request the following indirect cost rates, as allowable in the Climate Bond Legislation:
 - C. The *de minimis* federal indirect cost rate of 15%
 - D. A previously negotiated indirect cost rate, pursuant to a Primary Applicant/Subrecipient(s) agreement with CDFA (*Supporting Documentation Required*)
 - E. A rate negotiated by the Primary Applicant/Subrecipient(s) in the last 5 years with another state agency (*Supporting Documentation Required*)
 - F. A rate proposed by the grantee in the grantee's program application with the administering state agency if the grantee does not have an existing state rate (*Justification Required. The TRC and ISSC will evaluate the request and justification in the context of the proposal's scope and budget*).

6. Indicate any Federal, State, or other grant program(s) providing funding for this project, as well as any partner providing cash funding or in-kind contributions toward the completion of the project. Provide the name of the organization, the name and contact (telephone number and email address) of primary contact of the organization, and the amount(s) of funds and/or in-kind services they have committed.