

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michelle Pedretti <Michelle.Pedretti.699214407@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 10:48 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michelle Pedretti - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michelle.pedretti.699214407@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michelle and I am a grower from El Nido, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joshua Parolini <Joshua.Parolini.699557856@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 12:23 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Josh parolini - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joshua.parolini.699557856@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Josh and I am a grower from Hanford ca, kings county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Steve Bickley <Steve.Bickley.699359195@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 3:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from steve.bickley.699359195@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Steve and I am a grower from Corning Ca. in Tehama County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Leanne Mord <Leanne.Mord.699034352@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 3:19 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Leanne Mord - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from leanne.mord.699034352@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Leanne and I am a grower from Artois, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Shaun Crook <Shaun.Crook.699031304@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 5:47 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Shaun Crook - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from shaun.crook.699031304@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Shaun Crook and I am a grower from Sonora, CA in Tuolumne County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Donald Blickenstaff <Donald.Blickenstaff.699366003@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 8:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Donald Blickenstaff - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from donald.blickenstaff.699366003@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Donald and I am a grower from Janesville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jazmine Gulart <Jazmine.Gulart.699120142@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 8:01 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jazmine Gulart - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jazmine.gulart.699120142@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jazmine and I am a grower from Salinas, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Erich Hagen <Erich.Hagen.699094195@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 7:52 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Erich Hagen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from erich.hagen.699094195@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Erich and I am a grower from Fallbrook, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: J White <J.White.699036571@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 6:54 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: J White - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from j.white.699036571@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is J and I am a grower from Shandon, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Peter Elgorriaga <Peter.Elgorriaga.712963221@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 6:31 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Peter Elgorriaga - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from peter.elgorriaga.712963221@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Peter and I am a grower from Firebaugh, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dan Drumonde <Dan.Drumonde.712963049@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 6:17 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dan Drumonde - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dan.drumonde.712963049@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

Dan Drumonde grower

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Alida Veenhoven <Alida.Veenhoven.712962936@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Friday, August 2, 2024 6:09 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from alida.veenhoven.712962936@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Alida Veenhoven and I am a grower from Bakersfield, CA, Kern county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: George Tudor <George.Tudor.699121358@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:18 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: George Tudor - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from george.tudor.699121358@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is George and I am a grower from Mecca, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jason Erickson <Jason.Erickson.699120120@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:30 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jason Erickson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jason.erickson.699120120@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jason and I am a grower from Madera, California and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gregory Overton <Gregory.Overton.699024635@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:24 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gregory Overton - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gregory.overton.699024635@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gregory and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Carolyn Mariscotti <Carolyn.Mariscotti.699536462@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:00 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: @first_Carolyn @last_Markscotti DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from carolyn.mariscotti.699536462@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is I am a grower from and_state county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Pam Sheppard <Pam.Sheppard.712818406@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 4:49 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Pam Sheppard - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from pam.sheppard.712818406@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Pam Sheppard and I am a grower from Biggs in Butte County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Maddie Cook <Maddie.Cook.699081474@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 3:29 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Maddie Cook - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from maddie.cook.699081474@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Maddie and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Patrick Molnar <Patrick.Molnar.699074783@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 2:58 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Patrick Molnar - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from patrick.molnar.699074783@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Patrick and I am a grower from Cayucos, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tom Dowd <Tom.Dowd.699029275@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 2:43 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tom.dowd.699029275@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tom Dowd and I am a grower from Durham, CA and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Guy Keilman <Guy.Keilman.699331170@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 2:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Guy Keilman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from guy.keilman.699331170@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Guy and I am a grower from Napa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Daniel De Wees <Daniel.DeWees.699027809@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 1:50 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: @fDaniel De Wees - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from daniel.dewees.699027809@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Daniel and I am a grower from Merced, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Thomas Coleman <Thomas.Coleman.699037550@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 1:25 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Thomas Coleman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from thomas.coleman.699037550@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Thomas and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tanner Torrano <Tanner.Torrano.699563228@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 1:19 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tanner Torrano - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tanner.torrano.699563228@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tanner and I am a grower from madera county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Margit Sands <Margit.Sands.712810215@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 12:52 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from margit.sands.712810215@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Margit Sands and I am a grower from Gridley, CA, Butte Co. and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Debra Lundberg <Debra.Lundberg.712810011@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 12:47 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Debra Lundberg - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from debra.lundberg.712810011@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Debra Lundberg and I am a grower from Richvale California and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ernest Reichmuth <Ernest.Reichmuth.699023462@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 12:31 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ernest Reichmuth | DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ernest.reichmuth.699023462@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ernest Reichmuth and I am a PCA from Madera, and work in Madera County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jennifer Billalba <Jennifer.Billalba.699239770@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 12:30 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jennifer.billalba.699239770@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jennifer Billable and I am a harvester from Madera county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Chris Wichman <Chris.Wichman.712808448@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 12:15 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Chris Wichman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from chris.wichman.712808448@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Chris and I am a grower from Fresno California and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Anne Deniz <Anne.Deniz.712808131@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 12:03 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Anne Deniz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from anne.deniz.712808131@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Anne and I am from a family of growers and a supporter of many growers from Madera County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bret Leishman <Bret.Leishman.699160210@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:49 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bret Leishman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bret.leishman.699160210@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bret and I am a grower from Woodland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Glenda Jameson <Glenda.Jameson.699389022@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:47 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Glenda Jameson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from glenda.jameson.699389022@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Glenda and I am a grower from Turlock, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lisa Scherer <Lisa.Scherer.699450233@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:34 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lisa Scherer - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lisa.scherer.699450233@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Lisa and I am a grower from Napa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Maria Espino <Maria.Espino.712807334@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:29 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Maria Eapino- DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from maria.espino.712807334@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

Read last paragraph

My name is Maria Espino and I am a grower from Gridley, Butte county, CA., and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

Stop making city decisions for rural areas. With the complete disconnect from food to table by citizens it is stressing out the farm community because it needs to be farmers making decisions not based on fear. We have been farming for generations. No one is more concerned about land and use of chemicals more than us!

Maria Espino

CDPR dpr23003

From: Theo De Haan <Theo.DeHaan.699027319@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:28 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Theo De Haan - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from theo.dehaan.699027319@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Theo and I am a grower from Hanford, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Steve Prentice <Steve.Prentice.712807323@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:28 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Steve Prentice - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from steve.prentice.712807323@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Steve Prentice and I am a grower from the Chico area in Butte County California and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Warren Tufts <Warren.Tufts.699019581@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:27 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Warren Tufts - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from warren.tufts.699019581@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Warren and I am a grower from Winters, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Graf Robert <Graf.Robert.699447113@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:13 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Graf Robert - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from graf.robert.699447113@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Graf and I am a grower from Rancho Murieta, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kathy Avinelis <Kathy.Avinelis.699160312@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 10:48 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kathy Avinelis - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kathy.avinelis.699160312@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kathy and I am a grower from Kerman, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Schallberger <John.Schallberger.699196176@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 10:44 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Schallberger - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.schallberger.699196176@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Lantis <David.Lantis.699212223@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 10:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Lantis - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.lantis.699212223@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Corey Henderson <Corey.Henderson.712805695@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 10:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Corey Henderson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from corey.henderson.712805695@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Corey and I am a grower from Butte County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: James Strong <James.Strong.699457263@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 10:06 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: James Strong - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from james.strong.699457263@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is James Strong and I am a grower from Chico in Butte County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Susan Vanella <Susan.Vanella.712805310@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:48 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Susan Vanella - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from susan.vanella.712805310@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Susan and I am a grower from Chico, Butte County, CA and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dirk Van Konynenburg <Dirk.VanKonynenburg.699360063@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:40 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dirk Van Konynenburg - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dirk.vankonynenburg.699360063@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dirk and I am a grower from Hughson, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joseph Dutra <Joseph.Dutra.699658164@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:35 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Joseph Dutra - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joseph.dutra.699658164@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Joseph and I am a grower from Brentwood, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Larry Bradley <Larry.Bradley.699024500@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:28 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Larry Bradley - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from larry.bradley.699024500@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Larry and I am a grower from Durham, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Justin Leishman <Justin.Leishman.699020686@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:22 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Justin Leishman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from justin.leishman.699020686@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Justin and I am a grower from Gridley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Nick Bertagna <Nick.Bertagna.699234423@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:18 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Nick Bertagna - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from nick.bertagna.699234423@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Nick and I am a grower from Chico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Daniel Babshoff <Daniel.Babshoff.699162154@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:18 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Daniel Babshoff - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from daniel.babshoff.699162154@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Daniel and I am a grower from Kerman, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Christine Caprelian <Christine.Caprelian.699594225@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:05 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Christine Caprelian - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from christine.caprelian.699594225@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Christine and I am a grower from Sanger, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Charles Voss <Charles.Voss.699040668@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:02 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Charles Voss - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from charles.voss.699040668@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Charles and I am a grower from Turlock, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bill Munk <Bill.Munk.699163224@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:01 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bill Munk - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bill.munk.699163224@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bill and I am a grower from Napa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Rick Baglione <Rick.Baglione.699232465@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:56 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Rick Baglione - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from rick.baglione.699232465@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Rick and I am a grower from Escalon, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michele McManus <Michele.McManus.699023359@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:54 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michele McManus - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michele.mcmanus.699023359@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michele and I am a grower from Shafter, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Carol Scheiber <Carol.Scheiber.699085434@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:45 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Carol Scheiber - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from carol.scheiber.699085434@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Carol and I am a grower from Lincoln, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tom Orvis <Tom.Orvis.699024145@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:41 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tom Orvis - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tom.orvis.699024145@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tom and I am a grower from Oakdale, CA in Stanislaus County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Frank Van Der Linden <Frank.VanDerLinden.699161610@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:40 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from frank.vanderlinden.699161610@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Frank and I am a grower from Holtville, California in Imperil County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Roseanna Silva <Roseanna.Silva.699032817@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:28 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Roseanna Silva - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from roseanna.silva.699032817@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Roseanna and I am a grower from Tracy, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Renee Avilla <Renee.Avilla.699023188@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:22 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Renee Avilla - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from renee.avilla.699023188@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Renee and my family grows walnuts in Modesto (Stanislaus County). I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Heather DeBerry <Heather.DeBerry.699160562@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:12 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Heather DeBerry - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from heather.deberry.699160562@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Heather and I am a grower from Lower Lake, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Roger Staben <Roger.Staben.699309252@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:06 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Roger Staben - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from roger.staben.699309252@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Roger and I am a grower from Camarillo, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Darin Poston <Darin.Poston.699160982@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:02 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Darin Poston - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from darin.poston.699160982@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Darin and I am a grower from Tulare, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Cindy Bartle <Cindy.Bartle.699161324@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 7:50 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Cindy Bartle - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from cindy.bartle.699161324@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Cindy and I am a grower from Lakewood, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: James Pearson <James.Pearson.699301766@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:42 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from james.pearson.699301766@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is James. I am a grower from Yuba County, CA and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: MaryVictoria Taylor <MaryVictoria.Taylor.699595351@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:39 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: MaryVictoria Taylor - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from maryvictoria.taylor.699595351@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is MaryVictoria and I am a grower from Trabuco Canyon, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Louie Bandoni <Louie.Bandoni.699030052@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:27 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Louie Bandoni - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from louie.bandoni.699030052@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Louie and I am a grower from Merced, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dayna Ghirardelli <Dayna.Ghirardelli.699220154@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:23 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dayna Ghirardelli - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dayna.ghirardelli.699220154@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dayna and I am a grower from Petaluma, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jeff Moresco <Jeff.Moresco.699021847@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:03 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jeff Moresco - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jeff.moresco.699021847@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jeff and I am a grower from Colusa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ken Mitchell <Ken.Mitchell.699028309@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 5:32 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ken Mitchell - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ken.mitchell.699028309@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ken and I am a 5th generation grower from Elk Grove, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Edwin Woods <Edwin.Woods.699340785@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 4:35 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Edwin Woods - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from edwin.woods.699340785@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Edwin and I am a grower from Santa Maria, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lance Gunlund <Lance.Gunlund.699034513@p2a.co>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 4:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lance Gunlund - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lance.gunlund.699034513@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Lance and I am a grower from Kingsburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Monroe <John.Monroe.699027581@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 1, 2024 2:04 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.monroe.699027581@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Cupertino, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Katie Squire <Katie.Squire.699198189@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:53 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Katie Squire - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from katie.squire.699198189@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Katie and I am a grower from Coalinga, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Patrick Prudhel <Patrick.Prudhel.699038835@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:43 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Patrick Prudhel - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from patrick.prudhel.699038835@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Patrick and I am a grower from Lodi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Bognuda <John.Bognuda.699394622@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:51 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Bognuda - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.bognuda.699394622@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Santa Maria, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Miranda Driver <Miranda.Driver.699026864@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:48 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Miranda Driver - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from miranda.driver.699026864@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Miranda and I am a grower from Woodland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dominic Assali <Dominic.Assali.712572319@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:31 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dominic Assali - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dominic.assali.712572319@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dominic Assali and I am a grower from the town of ceres in Stanislaus county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Pat Burns <Pat.Burns.699073862@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:31 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Pat Burns - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from pat.burns.699073862@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Pat and I am a grower from Healdsburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gerald Schwartz <Gerald.Schwartz.699022779@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:22 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gerald Schwartz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gerald.schwartz.699022779@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gerald and I am a grower from Herald, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Valenti Aggio <Valenti.Aggio.699076171@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:17 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Valenti Aggio - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from valenti.aggio.699076171@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Valenti and I am a grower from Santa Rosa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Robert Norene <Robert.Norene.699370771@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:11 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Robert Norene - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from robert.norene.699370771@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Robert and I am a grower from Woodland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Alice Abatti <Alice.Abatti.699038880@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:05 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Alice Abatti - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from alice.abatti.699038880@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Alice and I am a grower from Imperial, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Daniel Clendenin <Daniel.Clendenin.699024430@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Daniel Clendenin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from daniel.clendenin.699024430@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Daniel and I am a grower from Merced, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Philip Wilson <Philip.Wilson.699121121@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:50 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Philip Wilson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from philip.wilson.699121121@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Philip and I am a grower from Chico, CA, Butte County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Mulrooney <John.Mulrooney.699347190@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:50 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Mulrooney - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.mulrooney.699347190@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Herald, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Randy Buckley <Randy.Buckley.699307900@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:50 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Randy Buckley - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from randy.buckley.699307900@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Randy and I am a grower from Modesto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kenneth Warren <Kenneth.Warren.699408285@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:44 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kenneth Warren - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kenneth.warren.699408285@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kenneth and I am a grower from Cayucos, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Hagata Ranch Hagata <HagataRanch.Hagata.699481855@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:43 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Hagata Ranch Hagata - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from hagataranch.hagata.699481855@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Hagata Ranch and I am a grower from Susanville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dhruv Khanna <Dhruv.Khanna.699037286@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:30 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dhruv Khanna - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dhruv.khanna.699037286@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dhruv and I am a grower from Palo Alto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mike Vereschagin <Mike.Vereschagin.699023941@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:29 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mike Vereschagin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mike.vereschagin.699023941@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mike and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jessica Helm <Jessica.Helm.699208911@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:23 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jessica Helm - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jessica.helm.699208911@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jessica and I am a grower from Exeter, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael Lowry <Michael.Lowry.699231442@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:20 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael Lowry - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.lowry.699231442@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Mountain Ranch, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: J Leavelle <J.Leavelle.699168708@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: J Leavelle - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from j.leavelle.699168708@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is J and I am a grower from Selma, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Albert Batteate <Albert.Batteate.699537474@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:06 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Albert Batteate - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from albert.batteate.699537474@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Albert and I am a grower from Livermore, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bruce Oosterkamp <Bruce.Oosterkamp.699372820@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 8:00 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bruce Oosterkamp - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bruce.oosterkamp.699372820@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bruce and I am a grower from Ripon, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Richard Swanson <Richard.Swanson.699417151@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:58 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Richard Swanson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from richard.swanson.699417151@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Richard and I am a grower from Delhi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Richard Nimphius <Richard.Nimphius.699320315@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:57 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Richard Nimphius - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from richard.nimphius.699320315@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Richard and I am a grower from Oakdale, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Carolyn Connelly <Carolyn.Connelly.699371351@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:57 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Carolyn Connelly - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from carolyn.connelly.699371351@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Carolyn and I am a grower from Esparto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Hermesh Sangha <Hermesh.Sangha.699225159@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:53 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Hermesh Sangha - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from hermesh.sangha.699225159@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Hermesh and I am a grower from Del Rey, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Montalvo Family Farm LLC Montalvo <MontalvoFamilyFarmLLC.Montalvo.699449057@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:52 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Montalvo Family Farm LLC Montalvo - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from montalvofamilyfarmllc.montalvo.699449057@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Montalvo Family Farm LLC and I am a grower from Cambria, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Evan Harrison <Evan.Harrison.699166227@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Evan Harrison - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from evan.harrison.699166227@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Evan and I am a grower from Gustine, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ernie Boesch <Ernie.Boesch.699290650@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:33 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ernie Boesch - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ernie.boesch.699290650@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ernie and I am a grower from Winton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bill Diedrich <Bill.Diedrich.699160777@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:31 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bill Diedrich - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bill.diedrich.699160777@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bill Diedrich and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Ferreira <John.Ferreira.699023996@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:31 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Ferreira - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.ferreira.699023996@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Juan Quintero <Juan.Quintero.699042604@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:29 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Juan Quintero - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from juan.quintero.699042604@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Juan and I am a grower from Salinas, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kathy Schmall <Kathy.Schmall.699070471@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:27 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kathy Schmall - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kathy.schmall.699070471@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kathy and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tom Moretti <Tom.Moretti.699316126@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:19 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tom Moretti - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tom.moretti.699316126@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tom and I am a grower from Napa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Darshan Basraon <Darshan.Basraon.699167375@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:15 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Darshan Basraon - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from darshan.basraon.699167375@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Darshan and I am a grower from Clovis, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Shirley Auza <Shirley.Auza.699117078@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:14 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Shirley Auza - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from shirley.auza.699117078@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Shirley and I am a grower from Brawley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Richard Reed <Richard.Reed.699442265@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:10 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Richard Reed - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from richard.reed.699442265@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Richard and I am a grower from Escondido, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Robert Dedlow <Robert.Dedlow.699120039@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:06 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Robert Dedlow - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from robert.dedlow.699120039@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Robert and I am a grower from La Crescenta-montrose, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: CHGADA Inc Carlin <CHGADAInc.Carlin.699030780@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 6:46 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: CHGADA Inc Carlin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from chgadainc.carlin.699030780@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My farm is CHGADA Inc and I am a grower from Gridley, CA located in Butte County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dennis Bowers <Dennis.Bowers.699043206@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 6:46 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dennis Bowers - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dennis.bowers.699043206@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dennis and I am a grower from Modesto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Frank Pitts <Frank.Pitts.699094845@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 6:39 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Frank Pitts - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from frank.pitts.699094845@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Frank and I am a grower from Riverdale, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Alvin Mendonca <Alvin.Mendonca.699233707@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 6:22 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Alvin Mendonca - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from alvin.mendonca.699233707@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Alvin and I am a grower from Chico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joe cebe <Joe.cebe.699120701@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 6:14 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Joe cebe - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joe.cebe.699120701@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Joe and I am a grower from Chico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: JS Johal & Sons Inc johal <JSJohalSonsInc.johal.699511646@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 6:10 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: JS Johal & Sons Inc johal - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jsjohalsonsync.johal.699511646@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is JS Johal & Sons Inc and I am a grower from Yuba City, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ellen Little <Ellen.Little.699209400@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:59 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ellen Little - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ellen.little.699209400@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ellen and I am a grower from Fair Oaks, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Brents Christmas Trees Hennefer <BrentsChristmasTrees.Hennefer.699448591@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:59 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Brents Christmas Trees Hennefer - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from brentschristmastrees.hennefer.699448591@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Brents Christmas Trees and I am a grower from Oakland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Robert Vandenberg <Robert.Vandenberg.699043488@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:57 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Robert Vandenberg - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from robert.vandenberg.699043488@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Robert and I am a grower from Dos Palos, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Grzanich Brothers Orchards GRZANICH
<GrzanichBrothersOrchards.GRZANICH.699231556@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:52 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Grzanich Brothers Orchards GRZANICH - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from grzanichbrothersorchards.grzanich.699231556@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Grzanich Brothers Orchards and I am a grower from Durham, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ryan Schohr <Ryan.Schohr.699029162@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:34 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ryan.schohr.699029162@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ryan Schohr and I am a grower from Chico, California and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Steven Emanuelli <Steven.Emanuelli.699325628@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:31 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Steven Emanuelli DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from steven.emanuelli.699325628@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is steven Emanuelli and I am a grower from Brawley, Ca in Imperial co. and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Richard Tillotson <Richard.Tillotson.699390537@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:19 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Richard Tillotson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from richard.tillotson.699390537@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Richard and I am a grower from Lake Elsinore, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Orna Kattan <Orna.Kattan.699166671@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:19 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Orna Kattan - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from orna.kattan.699166671@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Orna and I am a grower from Santa Clara, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ron Rubin <Ron.Rubin.712568459@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:18 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ron.rubin.712568459@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ron Rubin and I am a grower from Brawley, California and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ramsey Wood <Ramsey.Wood.699021723@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:15 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ramsey Wood - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ramsey.wood.699021723@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ramsey and I am a grower from Standish, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Eric Correia <Eric.Correia.699212655@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Eric Correia - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from eric.correia.699212655@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Eric and I am a grower from Tulare, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Linda Crockett <Linda.Crockett.699032624@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:06 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Linda Crockett - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from linda.crockett.699032624@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Linda and I am a grower from Smith River, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michele Tracy <Michele.Tracy.699533298@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:58 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michele Tracy - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michele.tracy.699533298@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michele and I am a resident from Nuevo, Riverside county, CA ,and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

CURRENT notification requirements are more than adequate to protect the public and workers. Most counties also have school specific buffers and spray restrictions near schools in session.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, frivolous lawsuits and pest outbreaks.

If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior would result and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Rod Chamberlain <Rod.Chamberlain.699242036@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:57 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Rod Chamberlain - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from rod.chamberlain.699242036@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Rod and I am a grower from Mecca, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joseph Valente <Joseph.Valente.699022007@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:57 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Joseph Valente - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joseph.valente.699022007@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Joseph and I am a grower from Lodi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Felipe Bolivar <Felipe.Bolivar.699020619@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:54 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Felipe Bolivar - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from felipe.bolivar.699020619@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Felipe and I am a grower from Santa Maria, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Schell Thompson <Schell.Thompson.699525038@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:54 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Schell Thompson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from schell.thompson.699525038@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is

Virgil L Thompson and I am a grower from Oakdale, CA Stanislaus County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Monty Hoggard <Monty.Hoggard.699168456@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:53 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Monty Hoggard - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from monty.hoggard.699168456@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Monty and I am a grower from Laton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Rod Parichan <Rod.Parichan.699297759@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:53 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Rod Parichan - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from rod.parichan.699297759@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Rod and I am a grower from San Joaquin, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lynn Miller <Lynn.Miller.699023417@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:50 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lynn Miller - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lynn.miller.699023417@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Lynn and I am a grower from Stockton, CA and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Chris Morgner <Chris.Morgner.699018579@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:47 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Chris Morgner - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from chris.morgner.699018579@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Chris and I am a grower from Merced, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bruce Fry <Bruce.Fry.699021131@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:47 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bruce Fry - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bruce.fry.699021131@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bruce and I am a grower from Acampo, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Matt Rolen <Matt.Rolen.712567993@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:47 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Matt Rolen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from matt.rolen.712567993@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Matt and I am a grower from Colusa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: James Finderup <James.Finderup.699043536@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:45 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: James Finderup - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from james.finderup.699043536@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is James and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Katie Earl <Katie.Earl.699120529@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:44 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Katie Earl - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from katie.earl.699120529@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Katie and I am a grower from Elk Grove, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Brittany Fagundes <Brittany.Fagundes.699212187@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Brittany Fagundes- DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from brittany.fagundes.699212187@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Brittany and I am a grower from Hanford, CA and Gridley, CA in both Butte & Kings Counties and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jena Francis <Jena.Francis.699558458@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:41 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jena Francis - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jena.francis.699558458@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jena and I am a grower from San Diego, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Ivancovich <John.Ivancovich.699442584@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:40 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Ivancovich - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.ivancovich.699442584@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from San Diego, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jim Borchard <Jim.Borchard.712567915@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:39 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jim Borchard - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jim.borchard.712567915@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jim Borchard, and I am a grower from Woodland in Yolo County, and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Linda Lyon <Linda.Lyon.699336131@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:35 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Linda Lyon - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from linda.lyon.699336131@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Linda and I am a grower from Grass Valley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Russell Sels <Russell.Sels.699027832@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:28 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Russell Sels - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from russell.sels.699027832@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Russell and I am a grower from Clarksburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Daniel Adams <Daniel.Adams.699025885@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:27 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Daniel Adams - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from daniel.adams.699025885@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Daniel and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Sheri Lester <Sheri.Lester.699072020@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:23 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Sheri Lester - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from sheri.lester.699072020@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Sheri and I am a grower from Winters, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Noel Ryan <Noel.Ryan.699553794@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:16 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Noel Ryan - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from noel.ryan.699553794@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Noel and I am a grower from Creston, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Meredith Bates <Meredith.Bates.699232999@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Meredith Bates - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from meredith.bates.699232999@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Meredith and I am a grower from Biggs, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mark Weber <Mark.Weber.699286983@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:04 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mark Weber - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mark.weber.699286983@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mark and I am a grower from Woodlake, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tricia Blattler <Tricia.Blattler.699034045@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tricia Blattler - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tricia.blattler.699034045@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tricia and I am a grower from Exeter, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jeff Troost <Jeff.Troost.699164145@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:00 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jeff Troost - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jeff.troost.699164145@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jeff and I am a grower from Chowchilla, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Helen Pearson <Helen.Pearson.699333617@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:57 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Helen Pearson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from helen.pearson.699333617@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Helen and I am a grower from Modesto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Katherine Mann <Katherine.Mann.699549980@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:54 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Katherine Mann - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from katherine.mann.699549980@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Katherine and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Daniel Hartwig <Daniel.Hartwig.699034535@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:53 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Daniel Hartwig - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from daniel.hartwig.699034535@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Daniel and I am a grower from Fresno County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jim Lugg <Jim.Lugg.699421419@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:50 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jim Lugg - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jim.lugg.699421419@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jim and I am a grower from Salinas, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kellie Neufeld <Kellie.Neufeld.699437725@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:49 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kellie Neufeld - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kellie.neufeld.699437725@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kellie and I am a grower from Exeter, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Harry Peck <Harry.Peck.699020835@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:49 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Harry Peck - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from harry.peck.699020835@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Harry and I am a grower from Tulare, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Amelia Sweeney <Amelia.Sweeney.699232181@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:44 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Amelia Sweeney - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from amelia.sweeney.699232181@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Amelia and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Fred Williamson <Fred.Williamson.699653604@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:37 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Fred Williamson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from fred.williamson.699653604@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Fred and I am a grower from Carlsbad, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Steven Paregien <Steven.Paregien.699039610@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:37 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Steven Paregien - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from steven.paregien.699039610@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Steven and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Don Menne <Don.Menne.699363716@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:36 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Don Menne - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from don.menne.699363716@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Don and I am a grower from Yreka, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Clare Dumoulin <Clare.Dumoulin.699406192@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:35 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Clare Dumoulin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from clare.dumoulin.699406192@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Clare and I am a grower from Shingletown, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Keri Paregien <Keri.Paregien.699064509@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:35 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Keri Paregien - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from keri.paregien.699064509@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Keri and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Taylor Serres <Taylor.Serres.699024839@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:34 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Taylor Serres - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from taylor.serres.699024839@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Taylor and I am a grower from Sonoma, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Regina Pozzi <Regina.Pozzi.699071483@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:33 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Regina Pozzi - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from regina.pozzi.699071483@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Regina and I am a grower from Point Reyes Station, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Carol Thong <Carol.Thong.699455784@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:28 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Carol Thong - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from carol.thong.699455784@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Carol and I am a grower from Santa Rosa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: peter Vella <peter.Vella.699631128@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:28 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Peter Vella - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from peter.vella.699631128@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Peter Vella and I am a grower from Modesto, Stanislaus County, California and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bryan Ashurst <Bryan.Ashurst.712555147@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:27 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bryan Ashurst - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bryan.ashurst.712555147@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bryan Ashurst and I am a beekeeper from Westmorland, CA in Imperial County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael Hat <Michael.Hat.699102491@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:25 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael Hat - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.hat.699102491@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Lakeport, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Romano <John.Romano.699641142@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:24 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Romano - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.romano.699641142@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Billiwhack Ranch LLC CORTEZ <BilliwhackRanchLLC.CORTEZ.699594986@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:20 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Billiwhack Ranch LLC CORTEZ - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from billiwhackranchllc.cortez.699594986@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Billiwhack Ranch LLC and I am a grower from Santa Paula, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dan Kemp <Dan.Kemp.699344814@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:17 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dan Kemp - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dan.kemp.699344814@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dan and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Karen Bloom <Karen.Bloom.699119888@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:13 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Karen Bloom - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from karen.bloom.699119888@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Karen and I am a grower from Anderson, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Matthew Caviglia <Matthew.Caviglia.699642699@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Matthew Caviglia - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from matthew.caviglia.699642699@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Matthew and I am a grower from Oroshi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tony Nunes <Tony.Nunes.699512523@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:07 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tony Nunes - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tony.nunes.699512523@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tony and I am a grower from Tulare, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Blue Mountain Minerals Teicheira <BlueMountainMinerals.Teicheira.699621115@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:05 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Blue Mountain Minerals Teicheira - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bluemountainminerals.teicheira.699621115@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Blue Mountain Minerals and I am a grower from Columbia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joseph Ferrari <Joseph.Ferrari.699408833@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:04 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Joseph Ferrari - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joseph.ferrari.699408833@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Joseph and I am a grower from Linden, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Eric Metz <Eric.Metz.699204768@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:03 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Eric Metz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from eric.metz.699204768@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Eric and I am a grower from Ramona, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kathleen Gunn <Kathleen.Gunn.699053298@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:00 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kathleen Gunn - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kathleen.gunn.699053298@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kathleen and I am a grower from Denair, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael Milovina <Michael.Milovina.699033830@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:59 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael Milovina - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.milovina.699033830@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Hopland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bernd Gehrke-Neumann <Bernd.GehrkeNeumann.699229095@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:55 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bernd Gehrke-Neumann - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bernd.gehrkeneumann.699229095@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bernd and I am a grower from Camino, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Van Ommering <David.VanOmmering.699374161@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:54 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Van Ommering - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.vanommering.699374161@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Lakeside, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: George Hollister <George.Hollister.699024156@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:50 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: George Hollister - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from george.hollister.699024156@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is George Hollister and I am a grower from Comptche, CA, Mendocino County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Pam Bacigalupi <Pam.Bacigalupi.699036731@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:50 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Pam Bacigalupi - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from pam.bacigalupi.699036731@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Pam and I am a grower from Healdsburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Shelbyanna Longstreth <Shelbyanna.Longstreth.699075454@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:46 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Shelbyanna Longstreth - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from shelbyanna.longstreth.699075454@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Shelbyanna and I am a grower from Escalon, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Pisoni Farms Lopez <PisoniFarms.Lopez.699444381@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:45 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Pisoni Farms Lopez - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from pisonifarms.lopez.699444381@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Pisoni Farms and I am a grower from Gonzales, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Peter Bradford <Peter.Bradford.699024602@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Peter Bradford - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from peter.bradford.699024602@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Peter and I am a grower from Boonville, CA, Mendocino County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kirsten Warren <Kirsten.Warren.699390069@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kirsten Warren - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kirsten.warren.699390069@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kirsten and I am a grower from Long Beach, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Tacherra <John.Tacherra.699165044@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:41 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Tacherra - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.tacherra.699165044@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Riverdale, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Craig Moiola <Craig.Moiola.699659917@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:41 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Craig Moiola - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from craig.moiola.699659917@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Craig Moiola and I am a grower from Brawley, CA. Imperial county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gina Dockstader <Gina.Dockstader.699516219@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:40 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gina Dockstader - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gina.dockstader.699516219@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gina and I am a grower from Calipatria_and_Imperial county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Reid Parichan <Reid.Parichan.699072371@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:39 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Reid Parichan - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from reid.parichan.699072371@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Reid and I am a grower from Madera, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joan Webster <Joan.Webster.699019411@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:39 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Joan Webster - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joan.webster.699019411@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Joan and I am a grower from Durham, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Driver <John.Driver.699470497@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:39 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Driver - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.driver.699470497@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Modesto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kurt Sheppard <Kurt.Sheppard.699220198@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:38 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kurt Sheppard - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kurt.sheppard.699220198@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kurt and I am a grower from Biggs, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Stephen Drummy <Stephen.Drummy.699029674@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:37 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Stephen Drummy - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from stephen.drummy.699029674@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Steve D. and I am an avocado grower from Goleta, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Baker <David.Baker.699295198@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:36 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Baker - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.baker.699295198@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Modesto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Helen White <Helen.White.699372717@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:36 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Helen White - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from helen.white.699372717@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Helen White. I am a grower from Ukiah, CA in Mendocino County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Pierre Menvielle <JohnPierre.Menvielle.699330486@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:32 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: @first_John Pierre Menvielle- DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Use of Restricted Material

EXTERNAL:

My name is @first_John Pierre name and I am a grower from Heber, CA Imperial County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Lundberg <David.Lundberg.699107771@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:30 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Lundberg - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.lundberg.699107771@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Chico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Renee Rianda <Renee.Rianda.699041501@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:30 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Renee Rianda - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from renee.rianda.699041501@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Renee and I am a grower from Greenfield, CA Monterey county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Stehly Stehly <Stehly.Stehly.699025750@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:29 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from stehly.stehly.699025750@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Al Stehly and I am a grower from Valley Center, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Barbara Hallmeyer <Barbara.Hallmeyer.699558824@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:29 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Barbara Hallmeyer - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from barbara.hallmeyer.699558824@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Barbara and I am a grower from Woodlake, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Eric Muller <Eric.Muller.699361382@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:23 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Eric Muller - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from eric.muller.699361382@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Eric and I am a grower from Denair, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Suzette Cook <Suzette.Cook.699072166@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:20 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Suzette Cook - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from suzette.cook.699072166@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Suzette and I am a grower from Santa Paula, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Willem Veenhoven <Willem.Veenhoven.699026294@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:20 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Willem Veenhoven - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from willem.veenhoven.699026294@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Willem and I am a grower from Bakersfield, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tanya Brouse <Tanya.Brouse.699214167@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:18 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tanya Brouse - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tanya.brouse.699214167@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tanya and I work in the agricultural industry in Butte County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Karen Bengard <Karen.Bengard.699231408@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:17 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Karen Bengard - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from karen.bengard.699231408@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Karen and I am a grower from Rancho Murieta, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tom Goldberg <Tom.Goldberg.699039789@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:16 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tom Goldberg - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tom.goldberg.699039789@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tom and I am a grower from Oxnard, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ed Bianchi <Ed.Bianchi.699235812@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:16 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ed Bianchi - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ed.bianchi.699235812@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ed and I am a grower from Linden, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Kamper <David.Kamper.699397863@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:15 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Kamper - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.kamper.699397863@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Manteca, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kenneth Thiesen <Kenneth.Thiesen.699559051@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:14 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kenneth Thiesen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kenneth.thiesen.699559051@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kenneth and I am a grower from Reedley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Frederick Montgomery <Frederick.Montgomery.699021120@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:11 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Frederick Montgomery - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from frederick.montgomery.699021120@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Frederick and I am a grower from Chico, CA in Butte county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: James Spinetta <James.Spinetta.699167295@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: James Spinetta - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from james.spinetta.699167295@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is James and I am a grower from El Dorado Hills, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Valerie Conger <Valerie.Conger.699020163@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:08 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Valerie Conger - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from valerie.conger.699020163@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Valerie and I am a grower from Sebastopol, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Roger Clow <Roger.Clow.699396908@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:08 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Roger Clow - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from roger.clow.699396908@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Roger and I am a grower from Santa Paula, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael Baty <Michael.Baty.699042875@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:08 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael Baty - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.baty.699042875@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Richard Conger <Richard.Conger.699039073@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:07 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Richard Conger - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from richard.conger.699039073@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Richard and I am a grower from Sebastopol, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Richard DeSousa <Richard.DeSousa.699177527@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:06 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Richard DeSousa - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from richard.desousa.699177527@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Richard and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Heston Nunes <Heston.Nunes.699031280@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:05 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Heston Nunes - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from heston.nunes.699031280@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Heston and I am a grower from Patterson, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Clifford Ronk <Clifford.Ronk.699030893@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:04 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Clifford Ronk - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from clifford.ronk.699030893@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Clifford and I am a grower from Woodlake, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lemuel Pearson <Lemuel.Pearson.699034659@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lemuel Pearson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lemuel.pearson.699034659@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Lemuel and I am a grower from Colusa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Donny Hopkins <Donny.Hopkins.712510370@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from donny.hopkins.712510370@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Donny Hopkins and I am a grower from Bakersfield California, Kern county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Pankey Farms Pankey <PankeyFarms.Pankey.699023907@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Pankey Farms Pankey - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from pankeyfarms.pankey.699023907@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Victor Pankey and I am a grower from Fallbrook, CA and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jonathan Rees <Jonathan.Rees.699655822@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jonathan Rees - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jonathan.rees.699655822@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jonathan and I am a grower from San Mateo, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jeff Lucero <Jeff.Lucero.699117147@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:01 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jeff Lucero - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jeff.lucero.699117147@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jeff and I am a grower from Santa Maria, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dennis Larson <Dennis.Larson.699396269@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 2:00 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dennis Larson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dennis.larson.699396269@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dennis and I am a grower from Denair, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: sandra tavares <sandra.tavares.699118035@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:58 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Sandra tavares - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from sandra.tavares.699118035@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is sandra and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Janet Kister <Janet.Kister.699158615@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:58 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Janet Kister - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from janet.kister.699158615@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Janet and I am a grower from Fallbrook, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Ruczak <John.Ruczak.699098393@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:56 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Ruczak - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.ruczak.699098393@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Fort Bragg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Steven Clark <Steven.Clark.699389669@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:54 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Steven Clark - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from steven.clark.699389669@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Steven and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Harold Lepelley <Harold.Lepelley.699234606@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:53 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Harold Lepelley - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from harold.lepelley.699234606@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Harold and I am a grower from Valley Springs, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Len Lindstrand <Len.Lindstrand.699027865@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:52 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Len Lindstrand - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from len.lindstrand.699027865@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Len and I am a grower from Redding, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Andy Rynsburger <Andy.Rynsburger.699235071@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:52 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Andy Rynsburger - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from andy.rynsburger.699235071@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Andy and I am a grower from Strathmore, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Justin Edson <Justin.Edson.712504544@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:51 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Justin Edson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from justin.edson.712504544@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Justin and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jace Baird <Jace.Baird.699019821@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:51 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jace Baird - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jace.baird.699019821@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jace and I am an insurance agent from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Steve Dutton <Steve.Dutton.699021255@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:49 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Steve Dutton - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from steve.dutton.699021255@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Steve and I am a grower from Sebastopol, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Haynes Precision Spreading Inc Haynes
<HaynesPrecisionSpreadingInc.Haynes.699032214@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:48 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Haynes Precision Spreading Inc Haynes - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from haynesprecisionspreadinginc.haynes.699032214@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Haynes Precision Spreading Inc and I am a grower from Chowchilla, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mark Osterkamp <Mark.Osterkamp.699117012@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:47 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mark Osterkamp - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mark.osterkamp.699117012@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mark and I am a grower from Brawley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joe Scoto <Joe.Scoto.699039892@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:45 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Joe Scoto - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joe.scoto.699039892@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Joe and I am a grower from Merced, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tom Gibbons <Tom.Gibbons.699019499@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:45 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tom Gibbons - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tom.gibbons.699019499@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tom and I am a grower from Santa Maria, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John garner <John.garner.699024533@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:44 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John garner - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.garner.699024533@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Colusa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Valley Well Drilling Mahil <ValleyWellDrilling.Mahil.699381386@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:43 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Valley Well Drilling Mahil - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from valleywelldrilling.mahil.699381386@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Valley Well Drilling and I am a grower from Madera, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gordon Heinrich <Gordon.Heinrich.699043627@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gordon Heinrich - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gordon.heinrich.699043627@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gordon Heinrich and I am a grower from Modesto Ca. Stanislaus Co. and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Robert Painter <Robert.Painter.699020107@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:38 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Robert Painter - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from robert.painter.699020107@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Robert and I am a grower from Sunol, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ron Wicker <Ron.Wicker.699019206@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:35 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ron Wicker - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ron.wicker.699019206@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ron and I am a grower from Rutherford, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Glen Martin <Glen.Martin.699562604@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:35 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Glen Martin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from glen.martin.699562604@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Glen and I am a grower from Porterville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Don Hordness <Don.Hordness.699020232@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:33 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Don Hordness - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from don.hordness.699020232@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Don and I am a grower from Gilroy, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Moiola Tom <Moiola.Tom.699535928@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:30 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Moiola Tom - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from moiola.tom.699535928@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Moiola and I am a grower from Brawley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Chris Taylor <Chris.Taylor.699041260@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:29 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Chris Taylor - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from chris.taylor.699041260@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Chris and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jacob Shepard <Jacob.Shepard.699535074@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:28 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jacob Shepard - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jacob.shepard.699535074@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jacob and I am a grower from Porterville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Shannon Wooten <Shannon.Wooten.699028662@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:28 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Shannon Wooten - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from shannon.wooten.699028662@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Shannon and I am a grower from Shingletown, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Shawna Matchett <Shawna.Matchett.699021836@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:23 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Shawna Matchett - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from shawna.matchett.699021836@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Shawna and I am a grower from Santa Maria, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ronald Farnham <Ronald.Farnham.699372739@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:21 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ronald Farnham - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ronald.farnham.699372739@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ronald and I am a grower from Esparto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Chris Ruddick <Chris.Ruddick.699029220@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:20 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Chris Ruddick - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from chris.ruddick.699029220@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Chris and I am a grower from Ukiah, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Myron Fortin <Myron.Fortin.699397168@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:18 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from myron.fortin.699397168@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is myron fortin and I am a grower from Holtville Ca and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Santokh Dhillon <Santokh.Dhillon.699215000@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:16 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Santokh Dhillon - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from santokh.dhillon.699215000@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Santokh and I am a grower from Sanger, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jamie Panziera <Jamie.Panziera.699258375@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:16 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jamie Panziera - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jamie.panziera.699258375@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jamie and I am a grower from Salinas, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Russel Efird <Russel.Efird.699023291@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:14 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Russel Efird - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from russel.efird.699023291@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Russel Efird and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Sharon Stokes <Sharon.Stokes.699025464@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:13 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Sharon Stokes - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from sharon.stokes.699025464@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Sharon and I am a grower from Lodi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Nagata Nagata <Nagata.Nagata.699027262@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:13 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Nagata Nagata - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from nagata.nagata.699027262@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Nagata and I am a grower from Oceanside, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Daniel Souza <Daniel.Souza.699301447@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Daniel Souza - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from daniel.souza.699301447@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Daniel and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Steve Garsino <Steve.Garsino.699027455@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Steve Garsino - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from steve.garsino.699027455@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Steve and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Sarbjit Johl <Sarbjit.Johl.699626575@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:08 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Sarbjit Johl - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from sarbjit.johl.699626575@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Sarbjit and I am a grower from Marysville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mark Eglington <Mark.Eglington.699158922@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:08 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mark Eglington - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mark.eglington.699158922@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mark and I am a grower from Desert Hot Springs, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Drucker <David.Drucker.699072268@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:08 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Drucker - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.drucker.699072268@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David Drucker from San Marcos, California. I am a PCA, and a QAL, and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joan Lewis <Joan.Lewis.699343152@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:08 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Joan Lewis - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joan.lewis.699343152@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Joan and I am a grower from Gilroy, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lutz Farms Inc Lutz <LutzFarmsInc.Lutz.699528521@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:06 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lutz Farms Inc Lutz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lutzfarmsinc.lutz.699528521@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Lutz Farms Inc and I am a grower from Kerman, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mike DeRee <Mike.DeRee.699034739@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:04 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mike DeRee - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mike.deree.699034739@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mike and I am a grower from Live Oak, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bill Jackson <Bill.Jackson.699021574@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:04 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bill Jackson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bill.jackson.699021574@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bill and I am a grower from Oakdale, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: G T Nelson <GT.Nelson.699112949@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:04 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: G T Nelson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gt.nelson.699112949@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is G T and I am a grower from Ukiah, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dale Guerra <Dale.Guerra.699232261@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:03 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dale Guerra - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dale.guerra.699232261@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dale and I am a grower from Morro Bay, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Armanino <John.Armanino.699296554@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Armanino - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.armanino.699296554@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mary Sankey <Mary.Sankey.699040372@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:01 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mary Sankey - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mary.sankey.699040372@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mary and I am a grower from Colusa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: J & J Farms Inc Jorgensen <JJFarmsInc.Jorgensen.699521250@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:00 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: J & J Farms Inc Jorgensen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jjfarmsinc.jorgensen.699521250@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is J & J Farms Inc and I am a grower from Manteca, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dawn McBride <Dawn.McBride.699245482@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:00 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dawn McBride - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dawn.mcbride.699245482@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dawn and I am a grower from Los Banos, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Myron Moreno <Myron.Moreno.699664845@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 1:00 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Myron Moreno - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from myron.moreno.699664845@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Myron and I am a grower from Pioneer, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael Goodner <Michael.Goodner.699027477@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:56 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael Goodner - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.goodner.699027477@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Burney, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Sheena Freeman <Sheena.Freeman.699214258@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:56 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Sheena Freeman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from sheena.freeman.699214258@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Sheena and I am a grower from Oroville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ashley Lima <Ashley.Lima.699026261@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:55 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ashley Lima - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ashley.lima.699026261@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ashley and I am a grower from Hilmar, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Cherokee Kelleher <Cherokee.Kelleher.699451746@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:55 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Cherokee Kelleher - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from cherokee.kelleher.699451746@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Cherokee and I am a grower from Yuba City, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David De Vuyst <David.DeVuyst.699318140@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:53 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David De Vuyst - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.devuyst.699318140@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Chino, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Frederick Drayer <Frederick.Drayer.699360303@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:52 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Frederick Drayer - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from frederick.drayer.699360303@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Frederick and I am a grower from Le Grand, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bob Uboldi <Bob.Uboldi.699077434@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:52 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bob Uboldi - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bob.uboldi.699077434@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bob and I am a grower from Kenwood, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gregory Berg <Gregory.Berg.699028935@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:49 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gregory Berg - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gregory.berg.699028935@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gregory and I am a grower from Kingsburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lance Reeves <Lance.Reeves.712468447@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:44 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lance Reeves - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lance.reeves.712468447@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Lance and I am a grower from Brawley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Rosa Peraro <Rosa.Peraro.699159956@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:43 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Rosa Peraro - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from rosa.peraro.699159956@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Rosa and I am a grower from Oceanside, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jake Reeves <Jake.Reeves.712467583@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jake Reeves - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jake.reeves.712467583@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jake and I am a grower from Brawley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lindauer VASEY <Lindauer.VASEY.699023952@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lindauer VASEY - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lindauer.vasey.699023952@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael Vasey and I am a grower from Red Bluff, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gorrill Ranch Enterprises Davis <GorrillRanchEnterprises.Davis.699402405@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:42 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gorrill Ranch Enterprises Davis - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gorrillranchenterprises.davis.699402405@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gorrill Ranch Enterprises and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: 4B'S Spraying Inc Brooks <4BSSprayingInc.Brooks.699022303@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:40 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: 4B'S Spraying Inc Brooks - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from 4bssprayinginc.brooks.699022303@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is 4B'S Spraying Inc and I am a grower and an applicator from Coalinga, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gino Pedretti III <Gino.PedrettiIII.699030096@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:39 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gino Pedretti III - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gino.pedrettiIII.699030096@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gino Pedretti and I am a grower from El Nido and state county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tom Dixon <Tom.Dixon.699043024@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:39 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tom Dixon - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tom.dixon.699043024@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tom and I am a grower from Chico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Darin Pantaleoni <Darin.Pantaleoni.699037413@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:38 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Darin Pantaleoni - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from darin.pantaleoni.699037413@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Darin and I am a grower from Gridley, CA in butte county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bob Frillman <Bob.Frillman.699329757@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:38 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bob Frillman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bob.frillman.699329757@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bob and I am a grower from Sunol, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Phillip Brumley <Phillip.Brumley.699018999@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:37 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Phillip Brumley - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from phillip.brumley.699018999@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Phillip and I am a grower from Escalon, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Barbee <John.Barbee.699230350@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:37 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Barbee - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.barbee.699230350@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Winters, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Melissa Hilvers <Melissa.Hilvers.699559574@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:34 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Melissa Hilvers - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from melissa.hilvers.699559574@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Melissa and I am a grower from Bakersfield, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Andy Vidak <Andy.Vidak.699318867@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:33 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Andy Vidak - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from andy.vidak.699318867@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Andy and I am a grower from Orosi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Brad Emery <Brad.Emery.699427803@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:33 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Brad Emery - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from brad.emery.699427803@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Brad and I am a grower from Live Oak, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Amanda Sailors <Amanda.Sailors.699041420@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:32 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Amanda Sailors - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from amanda.sailors.699041420@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Amanda and I am a grower from Galt, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: VanderStoel Vanderstoel <VanderStoel.Vanderstoel.699521717@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:32 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: VanderStoel Vanderstoel - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from vanderstoel.vanderstoel.699521717@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is VanderStoel and I am a grower from Waterford, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Morning Mist Farms Inc Mcfarlin <MorningMistFarmsInc.Mcfarlin.699022553@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:31 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Morning Mist Farms Inc Mcfarlin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from morningmistfarmsinc.mcfarlin.699022553@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Morning Mist Farms Inc and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Thomas Daniels <Thomas.Daniels.699338439@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:31 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Thomas Daniels - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from thomas.daniels.699338439@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Thomas Daniels and I am a grower from Holtville in Imperial o.and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gary Taylor <Gary.Taylor.699024010@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:30 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gary Taylor - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gary.taylor.699024010@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gary and I am a grower from Denair, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Darren Ysselstein <Darren.Ysselstein.699294529@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:29 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Darren Ysselstein - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from darren.ysselstein.699294529@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Darren and I am a grower from Imperial county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Zonneveld <John.Zonneveld.699029139@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:28 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Zonneveld - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.zonneveld.699029139@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Hanford, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Deniz <David.Deniz.699039563@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:28 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Deniz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.deniz.699039563@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Hilmar, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Arsen Alikian <Arsen.Alikian.699565333@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:27 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Arsen Alikian - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from arsen.alikian.699565333@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Arsen and I am a grower from Madera, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lisa Humphreys <Lisa.Humphreys.699211585@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:27 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Glenn County Farm Bureau - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lisa.humphreys.699211585@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

I represent Glenn County Farm Bureau and our over 500 farming and ranching families. We have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Carrie Vanella <Carrie.Vanella.699159627@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:27 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Carrie Vanella - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from carrie.vanella.699159627@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Carrie and I am a grower from Chico , CA in Butte county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Stanley Lester <Stanley.Lester.699026249@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:26 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Stanley Lester - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from stanley.lester.699026249@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Stanley and I am a grower from Winters, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael obanion <Michael.obanion.699161563@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:24 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael obanion - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.obanion.699161563@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Charles Dirkse <Charles.Dirkse.699085309@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:22 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Charles Dirkse - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from charles.dirkse.699085309@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Charles and I am a grower from Denair, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Brian Zahn <Brian.Zahn.699021244@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:21 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Brian Zahn - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from brian.zahn.699021244@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Brian and I am a grower from Simi Valley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Dennis Tarry <Dennis.Tarry.699428859@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:19 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Dennis Tarry - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from dennis.tarry.699428859@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Dennis and I am a grower from Hickman, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: James Vietheer <James.Vietheer.699120745@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:18 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: James Vietheer - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from james.vietheer.699120745@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is James and I am a grower from Wilton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Scott Van Der Kar <Scott.VanDerKar.699339613@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:17 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Scott Van Der Kar - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from scott.vanderkar.699339613@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Scott and I am a grower from Carpinteria, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Richmond <David.Richmond.699651715@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:16 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Richmond - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.richmond.699651715@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Hickman, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Russa Robinson <Russa.Robinson.699029630@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:15 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Russa Robinson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from russa.robison.699029630@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Russa and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Melonie Albino <Melonie.Albino.712458719@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:14 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Melonie Albino - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from melonie.albino.712458719@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Melonie and I am a grower from Waterford, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tony Machado <Tony.Machado.699293414@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:10 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tony Machado - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tony.machado.699293414@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tony and I am a grower from Turlock, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Marijke Lauwerijssen <Marijke.Lauwerijssen.712458640@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Marijke Lauwerijssen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from marijke.lauwerijssen.712458640@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Marijke and I am a grower from Colusa county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Grivey Orchards Inc GRIVEY <GriveyOrchardsInc.GRIVEY.699434470@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Grivey Orchards Inc GRIVEY - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from griveyorchardsinc.grivey.699434470@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Grivey Orchards Inc and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Chris Torres <Chris.Torres.699020517@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:09 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Chris Torres - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from chris.torres.699020517@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Chris and I am a grower from Colusa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Scott Larrabee <Scott.Larrabee.699029082@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:07 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Scott Larrabee - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from scott.larrabee.699029082@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Scott and I am a grower from Chico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Patrick Bert <Patrick.Bert.699403781@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:07 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Patrick Bert - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from patrick.bert.699403781@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Patrick and I am a grower from Modesto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Carla Heune <Carla.Heune.699183397@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:06 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Carla Heune - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from carla.heune.699183397@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Carla and I am a grower from Lodi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Craig Knight <Craig.Knight.699211654@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:05 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Craig Knight - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from craig.knight.699211654@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Craig and I am a grower from Glenn, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Sorenson <David.Sorenson.699062687@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:04 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Sorenson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.sorenson.699062687@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Carl Soares <Carl.Soares.699027514@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:03 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Carl Soares - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from carl.soares.699027514@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Carl and I am a grower from Tulare, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: James Booman <James.Booman.699097939@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 12:02 PM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: James Booman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from james.booman.699097939@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is James and I am a grower from Vista, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Clark Mizuno <Clark.Mizuno.699033351@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:59 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Clark Mizuno - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from clark.mizuno.699033351@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Clark and I am a grower from Tracy, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Nicolas Hernandez <Nicolas.Hernandez.699329052@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:58 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Nicolas Hernandez - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from nicolas.hernandez.699329052@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Nicolas and I am a grower from Geyserville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Azevedo <John.Azevedo.699030449@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:57 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Azevedo - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.azevedo.699030449@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Healdsburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Greg Sohnrey <Greg.Sohnrey.699032668@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:57 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Greg Sohnrey - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from greg.sohnrey.699032668@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Greg and I am a grower from Durham, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Connie Jerome <Connie.Jerome.699586588@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:56 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from connie.jerome.699586588@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Connie Jerome and I am a grower from Pleasant Grove, CA in Sutter County, I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Gail Nodder <Gail.Nodder.699654730@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:55 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Gail Nodder - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from gail.nodder.699654730@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Gail and I am a grower from Jackson, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Donald Wortley <Donald.Wortley.699030655@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:55 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Donald Wortley - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from donald.wortley.699030655@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Donald and I am a grower from Lodi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Miller Honey Farms Miller <MillerHoneyFarms.Miller.699611896@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:55 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Miller Honey Farms Miller - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from millerhoneyfarms.miller.699611896@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Miller Honey Farms and I am a grower from Newcastle, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Barr <David.Barr.699162143@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:55 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Barr - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.barr.699162143@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Durham, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Anna Dhaliwal <Anna.Dhaliwal.699177618@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:53 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Anna Dhaliwal - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from anna.dhaliwal.699177618@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Anna and I am a grower from Holtville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Patricia Raven <Patricia.Raven.699564207@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:53 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Patricia Raven - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from patricia.raven.699564207@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Patricia and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Joe Alamo <Joe.Alamo.699025044@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:51 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Joe Alamo - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from joe.alamo.699025044@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Joe and I am a grower from Turlock, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jeff Marchini <Jeff.Marchini.699020414@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:51 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jeff Marchini - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jeff.marchini.699020414@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jeff and I am a grower from Le Grand, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Pamela Hotz <Pamela.Hotz.699158568@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:50 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Pamela Hotz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from pamela.hotz.699158568@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Pam Hotz and I am from Sacramento county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Marshall Sorensen <Marshall.Sorensen.699426185@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:48 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Marshall Sorensen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from marshall.sorensen.699426185@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Marshall and I am a grower from Clovis, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael Yu <Michael.Yu.699035730@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:46 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael Yu - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.yu.699035730@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Irvine, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Paul Mirassou <Paul.Mirassou.699020744@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:45 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Paul Mirassou - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from paul.mirassou.699020744@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Paul and I am a grower from Paicines, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Caroline Luiz <Caroline.Luiz.699026283@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:44 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Caroline Luiz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from caroline.luiz.699026283@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Caroline and I am a grower from Fort Jones, CA in Siskiyou county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Kathleen Boze <Kathleen.Boze.699120404@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:44 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kathleen Boze - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kathleen.boze.699120404@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Kathleen and I am a grower from Catheys Valley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Robert Shinkle <Robert.Shinkle.699354851@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:42 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Robert Shinkle - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from robert.shinkle.699354851@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Robert and I am a grower from Mountain Ranch, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Nirmal Singh <Nirmal.Singh.699245186@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:42 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Nirmal Singh - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from nirmal.singh.699245186@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Nirmal and I am a grower from Selma, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jocelyn Anderson <Jocelyn.Anderson.699220405@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:42 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jocelyn Anderson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jocelyn.anderson.699220405@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jocelyn and I am a grower from Willows, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Wilson <David.Wilson.699028387@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:41 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Wilson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.wilson.699028387@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Napa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Philip Wagner <Philip.Wagner.699160152@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:40 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Philip Wagner - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from philip.wagner.699160152@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Philip and I am a grower from Denair, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Diane Rucker <Diane.Rucker.699025293@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:39 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Diane Rucker - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from diane.rucker.699025293@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Diane and I am a grower from Ukiah, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Martin Squires <Martin.Squires.699043672@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:39 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Martin Squires - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from martin.squires.699043672@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Martin and I am a grower from Hughson, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Chris Matthews <Chris.Matthews.699121256@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:39 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Chris Matthews - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from chris.matthews.699121256@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Chris and I am a grower from Watsonville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jay Gillette <Jay.Gillette.699560748@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:39 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jay Gillette - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jay.gillette.699560748@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jay and I am a grower from Dinuba, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Debora Totoonchie <Debora.Totoonchie.699120881@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:39 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Debora Totoonchie - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from debora.totoonchie.699120881@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Debora and I am a grower from Nevada City, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Stephen Meier <Stephen.Meier.699242172@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:39 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Stephen Meier - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from stephen.meier.699242172@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Stephen and I am a grower from Porterville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: James Orradre <James.Orradre.699042922@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:38 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: James Orradre - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from james.orradre.699042922@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is James and I am a grower from San Luis Obispo, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Susan Dunbar <Susan.Dunbar.699025124@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:37 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Susan Dunbar - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from susan.dunbar.699025124@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Susan and I am a grower from Lincoln, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tome Lima <Tome.Lima.699075498@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:37 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tome Lima - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tome.lima.699075498@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tome and I am a grower from Ballico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Don Wolford <Don.Wolford.699088142@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:37 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Don Wolford - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from don.wolford.699088142@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Don and I am a grower from Redding, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Buzz Uber <Buzz.Uber.699078710@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:37 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Buzz Uber - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from buzz.uber.699078710@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Buzz and I am a grower from Valley Center, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Allen Akkerman <Allen.Akkerman.699336288@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:36 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Allen Akkerman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from allen.akkerman.699336288@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Allen and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system. The proposed unwarranted regulation verges on over-regulation on an already over burdened regulated production industry that could well negatively affect a food supply, not only for California but for the nation.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Andrea Stretars <Andrea.Stretars.699045059@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:33 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from andrea.stretars.699045059@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Andrea and I am a grower from Plymouth, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Roger Root <Roger.Root.699369756@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:32 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Roger Root - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from roger.root.699369756@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Roger and I am a grower from Pine Grove, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Andrew Brown <Andrew.Brown.699158294@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:31 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Andrew Brown - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from andrew.brown.699158294@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Andrew and I am a grower from Orange Cove in northeastern Tulare County and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Matthew Hendrick <Matthew.Hendrick.699036504@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:30 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Matthew Hendrick - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from matthew.hendrick.699036504@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Matthew and I am a grower from Exeter, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lester Den Ouden <Lester.DenOuden.699042820@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:30 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lester Den Ouden - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lester.denouden.699042820@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Lester and I am a grower from Ripon, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Melissa Laney <Melissa.Laney.699250594@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:29 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Melissa Laney - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from melissa.laney.699250594@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Melissa and I am a grower from Live Oak, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bloomfield Vineyards Bloomfield <BloomfieldVineyards.Bloomfield.699664140@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:29 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bloomfield Vineyards Bloomfield - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bloomfieldvineyards.bloomfield.699664140@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bloomfield Vineyards and I am a grower from Brentwood, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Matthew Efird <Matthew.Efird.699034454@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:28 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Matthew Efird - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from matthew.efird.699034454@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Matthew and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Scott Hudson <Scott.Hudson.699046276@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:27 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Scott Hudson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from scott.hudson.699046276@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Scott and I am a grower from Hemet, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michele Lasgoity <Michele.Lasgoity.699036811@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:27 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michele Lasgoity - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michele.lasgoity.699036811@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michele and I am a grower from Madera, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Evan Benevento <Evan.Benevento.699653249@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:27 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Evan Benevento - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from evan.benevento.699653249@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Evan and I am a grower from Watsonville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Marie Schallberger <Marie.Schallberger.699238520@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:26 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Marie Schallberger - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from marie.schallberger.699238520@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Marie and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jennifer Beretta <Jennifer.Beretta.699036490@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:25 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jennifer Beretta - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jennifer.beretta.699036490@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jennifer and I am a grower from Santa Rosa, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael Weststeyn <Michael.Weststeyn.699300479@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:25 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael Weststeyn - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.weststeyn.699300479@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Ripon, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Hal Carlton <Hal.Carlton.699214759@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:25 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Hal Carlton - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from hal.carlton.699214759@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Hal and I am a grower from Denair, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Thomas Williams <Thomas.Williams.699424343@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:24 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Thomas Williams - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from thomas.williams.699424343@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tom Williams and I am a grower from Squaw Valley_and_CA Fresno county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Devin Aviles <Devin.Aviles.699120095@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:24 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Devin Aviles - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from devin.aviles.699120095@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Devin and I am a grower from Madera California and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jacquie Dyt <Jacquie.Dyt.699456989@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:23 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jacquie Dyt - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jacquie.dyt.699456989@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jacquie and I am a grower from Crows Landing, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Colleen Cecil <Colleen.Cecil.699023747@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:23 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Colleen Cecil - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from colleen.cecil.699023747@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Colleen and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Eric Huff <Eric.Huff.699354793@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:23 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Eric Huff - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from eric.huff.699354793@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Eric and I am a grower from Hilmar, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Erwin Paulson <Erwin.Paulson.699035057@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:23 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Erwin Paulson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from erwin.paulson.699035057@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Erwin and I am a grower from Valley Center, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Roderick Walker <Roderick.Walker.699029184@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:22 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Roderick Walker - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from roderick.walker.699029184@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Roderick and I am a grower from Waterford, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Caitlin Campdonico <Caitlin.Campdonico.699044708@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:22 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Caitlin Campdonico - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from caitlin.campdonico.699044708@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Caitlin and I am a grower from Sonora, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: JANE SCHENE <JANE.SCHENE.699549742@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:22 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: JANE SCHENE - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jane.schene.699549742@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is JANE and I am a grower from Modesto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mary Vanoni <Mary.Vanoni.699020265@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:20 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mary Vanoni - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mary.vanoni.699020265@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mary and I am a grower from Ventura, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jenifer Matos <Jenifer.Matos.699118752@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:20 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jenifer Matos - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jenifer.matos.699118752@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jenifer and I am a grower from Hilmar, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Baljit Boparai <Baljit.Boparai.699529316@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:20 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Baljit Boparai - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from baljit.boparai.699529316@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Baljit and I am a grower from Fowler, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mary Atchley <Mary.Atchley.699081500@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:20 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mary Atchley - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mary.atchley.699081500@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mary and I am a grower from Ventura, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Anna Genasci <Anna.Genasci.699071893@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:19 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Anna Genasci - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from anna.genasci.699071893@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Anna and I am a grower from Oakdale, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Roger Herrscher <Roger.Herrscher.699640323@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:18 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Roger Herrscher - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from roger.herrscher.699640323@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Roger and I am a grower from Temecula, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Scott Emanuelli <Scott.Emanuelli.699214602@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:18 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Scott Emanuelli - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from scott.emanuelli.699214602@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Scott and I am a grower from Brawley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Simpson <David.Simpson.699022520@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:17 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Simpson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.simpson.699022520@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Lodi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Michael Kawasaki <Michael.Kawasaki.699030256@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:16 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Michael Kawasaki - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from michael.kawasaki.699030256@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Michael and I am a grower from Biggs, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Robert Rodoni <Robert.Rodoni.699020367@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:16 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Robert Rodoni - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from robert.rodoni.699020367@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Robert and I am a grower from Aptos, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Aaron Fales <Aaron.Fales.699233558@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:15 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Aaron Fales - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from aaron.fales.699233558@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Aaron and I am a grower from Chico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Binder Bains <Binder.Bains.699374742@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:15 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Binder Bains - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from binder.bains.699374742@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Binder and I am a grower from Kerman, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ferdinando Muzzi <Ferdinando.Muzzi.699162520@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:15 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ferdinando Muzzi - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ferdinando.muzzi.699162520@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ferdinando and I am a grower from Santa Cruz, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Reitz Almond Harvesting Reitz <ReitzAlmondHarvesting.Reitz.699239930@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:14 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Reitz Almond Harvesting Reitz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from reitzalmondharvesting.reitz.699239930@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Reitz Almond Harvesting and I am a grower from Selma, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Zachary Bentz <Zachary.Bentz.699284026@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:14 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Zachary Bentz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from zachary.bentz.699284026@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Zachary and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Glenn Goold <Glenn.Goold.699377233@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:14 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Glenn Goold - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from glenn.goold.699377233@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Glenn and I am a grower from Stockton, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Nathan Kane <Nathan.Kane.699415013@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:14 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Nathan Kane - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from nathan.kane.699415013@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Nathan and I am a grower from Angwin, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Blake Hazen <Blake.Hazen.699216421@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:14 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Blake Hazen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from blake.hazen.699216421@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Blake and I am a grower from Lompoc, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: CalWise HR LLC Bentz <CalWiseHRLLC.Bentz.699661502@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:13 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: CalWise HR LLC Bentz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from calwisehrllc.bentz.699661502@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is CalWise HR LLC and I am a grower from Orland, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Amber Mcdowell <Amber.Mcdowell.699021437@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:13 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Amber Mcdowell - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from amber.mcdowell.699021437@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Amber and I am a grower from Walnut Grove, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Frost Pauli <Frost.Pauli.699028786@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Frost Pauli - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from frost.pauli.699028786@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Frost and I am a grower from Potter Valley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Robert Vogel <Robert.Vogel.699549229@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Robert Vogel - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from robert.vogel.699549229@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Robert and I am a grower from Walnut, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Chris Ward <Chris.Ward.699030198@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Chris Ward - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from chris.ward.699030198@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Chris and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Sharon Doshier <Sharon.Doshier.699041339@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Sharon Doshier - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from sharon.doshier.699041339@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Sharon and I am a grower from Madera, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Susan Hoek <Susan.Hoek.699024463@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:11 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Susan Hoek - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from susan.hoek.699024463@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Susan and I am a grower from Penn Valley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jeff Merwin <Jeff.Merwin.699027308@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:10 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jeff Merwin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jeff.merwin.699027308@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jeff and I am a grower from Clarksburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Eric Schmidt <Eric.Schmidt.699309844@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:10 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Eric Schmidt - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from eric.schmidt.699309844@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Eric and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: A & J Family Farms Inc Schneider <AJFamilyFarmsInc.Schneider.699023929@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:10 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: A & J Family Farms Inc Schneider - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ajfamilyfarmsinc.schneider.699023929@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is A & J Family Farms Inc and I am a grower from Chico, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: David Martin <David.Martin.699214931@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:09 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: David Martin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from david.martin.699214931@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is David and I am a grower from Los Molinos, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Norm Groot <Norm.Groot.699023963@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:09 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Norm Groot - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from norm.groot.699023963@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Norm and I am a grower from Salinas, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jill Hendrix <Jill.Hendrix.699441630@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:08 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jill Hendrix - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jill.hendrix.699441630@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jill and I am a grower from Vacaville, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jerry Rava <Jerry.Rava.699164942@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:08 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jerry Rava - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jerry.rava.699164942@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jerry and I am a grower from King City, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Andi Scroggins <Andi.Scroggins.699263817@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:08 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Andi Scroggins - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from andi.scroggins.699263817@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Andi and I am a grower from Atascadero, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mc Daniel Fruit Co McDaniel <McDanielFruitCo.McDaniel.699475436@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:07 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mc Daniel Fruit Co McDaniel - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mcdanielfruitco.mcdaniel.699475436@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mc Daniel Fruit Co and I am a grower from Encinitas, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Christine Kaplan <Christine.Kaplan.699064257@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:07 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Christine Kaplan - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from christine.kaplan.699064257@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Christine and I am a grower from Oakdale, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Trelawney Bullis <Trelawney.Bullis.699229563@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:07 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Trelawney Bullis - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from trelawney.bullis.699229563@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Trelawney and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Frank Carraro <Frank.Carraro.699549811@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:07 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Frank Carraro - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from frank.carraro.699549811@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Frank and I am a grower from Sonoma, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ojeda Industries Ojeda <OjedaIndustries.Ojeda.699065953@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:07 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ojeda Industries Ojeda - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ojedaindustries.ojeda.699065953@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ojeda Industries and I am a grower from Brawley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: George Tucker <George.Tucker.699323922@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:06 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from george.tucker.699323922@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is George, and I am a grower from Fresno County, and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Scott Swasey <Scott.Swasey.699443541@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:06 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Scott Swasey - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from scott.swasey.699443541@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Scott and I am a grower from Alturas, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: William Allen <William.Allen.699165647@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:06 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: William Allen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from william.allen.699165647@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is William and I am a grower from Sacramento, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Ruth Waltenspiel <Ruth.Waltenspiel.699424822@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:05 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Ruth Waltenspiel - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from ruth.waltenspiel.699424822@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Ruth and I am a grower from Healdsburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Paul Vermeulen <Paul.Vermeulen.699218946@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:05 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Paul Vermeulen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from paul.vermeulen.699218946@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Paul and I am a grower from Modesto, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Larry Johnson <Larry.Johnson.699119968@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:04 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Larry Johnson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from larry.johnson.699119968@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Larry and I am a grower from Los Banos, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Bruce Singh <Bruce.Singh.699535289@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:03 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Bruce Singh - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from bruce.singh.699535289@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Bruce and I am a grower from Brawley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Matthew Conant <Matthew.Conant.699026432@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:02 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Matthew Conant - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from matthew.conant.699026432@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Matthew and I am a grower from Rio Oso, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Sue Walker <Sue.Walker.699201505@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:02 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Sue Walker - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from sue.walker.699201505@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Sue and I am a grower from Sebastopol, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: K & S Walnuts koelewyn <KSWalnuts.koelewyn.699551861@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:02 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: K & S Walnuts koelewyn - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kswalnuts.koelewyn.699551861@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is K & S Walnuts and I am a grower from Sacramento, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Katy Evans <Katy.Evans.699050843@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:02 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Katy Evans - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from katy.evans.699050843@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Katy and I am a grower from Lower Lake, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mark Wilson <Mark.Wilson.699024511@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:02 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mark Wilson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mark.wilson.699024511@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mark and I am a grower from Clarksburg, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Andrea Seastrand <Andrea.Seastrand.699534518@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:01 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Andrea Seastrand - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from andrea.seastrand.699534518@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Andrea and I am a grower from Grover Beach, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: kurt Kautz <kurt.Kautz.699021200@advocatesmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:01 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Kurt Kautz - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from kurt.kautz.699021200@advocatesmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is kurt and I am a grower from Lodi, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Cathi Boze <Cathi.Boze.699041486@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:01 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Cathi Boze - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from cathi.boze.699041486@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Cathi and I am a grower from Catheys Valley, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Glen Foth <Glen.Foth.699561783@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:01 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from glen.foth.699561783@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Glen Foth and I am a grower from Kerman and Fresno county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Quality Well Drillers Inc. Silveira <QualityWellDrillersInc.Silveira.699656139@forgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:00 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Quality Well Drillers Inc. Silveira - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from qualitywelldrillersinc.silveira.699656139@forgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Quality Well Drillers Inc. and I am a grower from Atwater, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Goyenette <John.Goyenette.699213781@grassrootsmessage.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:00 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Goyenette - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.goyenette.699213781@grassrootsmessage.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Bakersfield, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Callie Martinez <Callie.Martinez.699070175@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:00 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Callie Martinez - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from callie.martinez.699070175@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Callie and I am a grower from Winters, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Lance Petersen <Lance.Petersen.699071096@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:00 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Lance Petersen - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from lance.petersen.699071096@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Lance and I am a grower from Fowler, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Mooradian Mooradian <Mooradian.Mooradian.699623834@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 11:00 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Mooradian Mooradian - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from mooradian.mooradian.699623834@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Mooradian and I am a grower from Fowler, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: John Ton <John.Ton.699120767@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:59 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: John Ton - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from john.ton.699120767@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is John and I am a grower from Hanford, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Matthew Thomson <Matthew.Thomson.699071713@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:59 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Matthew Thomson - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from matthew.thomson.699071713@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Matthew and I am a grower from Buttonwillow, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Julie Domingos <Julie.Domingos.699285697@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:59 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Julie Domingos - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from julie.domingos.699285697@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Julie and I am a grower from Paso Robles, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Olivia Guzman <Olivia.Guzman.699070437@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:59 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Olivia Guzman - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from olivia.guzman.699070437@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Olivia and I am a grower from Atwater, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jamie Reamer <Jamie.Reamer.699032225@advocacymessages.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:59 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jamie Reamer - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jamie.reamer.699032225@advocacymessages.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jamie, and I am a grower from Clarksburg, CA in Yolo county, and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system, too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Irish Knox <Irish.Knox.699233206@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:58 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Irish Knox - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from irish.knox.699233206@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Irish and I am a grower from Vina, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Tobias & Son Tobias <TobiasSon.Tobias.699502521@grsdelivery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:58 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Tobias & Son Tobias - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from tobiasson.tobias.699502521@grsdelivery.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Tobias & Son and I am a grower from Ventura, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Alexis Rudich <Alexis.Rudich.699045275@sendgrassroots.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:58 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Alexis Rudich - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from alexxis.rudich.699045275@sendgrassroots.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Alexis and I am a grower from Merced, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Diane Field <Diane.Field.699375479@advocatefor.me>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:58 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Diane Field - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from diane.field.699375479@advocatefor.me. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Diane and I am a grower from Visalia, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Jason Baldwin <Jason.Baldwin.699042579@p2a.co>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:58 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Jason Baldwin - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from jason.baldwin.699042579@p2a.co. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Jason and I am a grower from Fresno, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Vincent Coelho <Vincent.Coelho.699211632@yourconstituent.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:57 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Vincent Coelho - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from vincent.coelho.699211632@yourconstituent.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Vincent and I am a grower from Hanford, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.

CDPR dpr23003

From: Cal Bean And Grain Coop VanderFeer <CalBeanAndGrainCoop.VanderFeer.699057635@foradvocacy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 10:57 AM
To: CDPR dpr23003
Subject: Cal Bean And Grain Coop VanderFeer - DPR 23-003 Statewide Notification of Agricultural Use of Restricted Materials

You don't often get email from calbeanandgraincoop.vanderfeer.699057635@foradvocacy.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL:

My name is Cal Bean And Grain Coop and I am a grower from Tulare, CA county and I have critical concerns about the proposed NOI public system.

I believe in investing in safer pesticide products, and practices to safeguard growers, employees, and the public. But I also believe that California currently has the most transparent pesticide regulatory system in the world. Currently, the public can inquire at any California Agricultural Commissioner's office throughout California when a restricted use material will be applied in that respective county on any given day. The State and therefore the Department should feel confident in this system too.

I agree that it is very reasonable for notification to include active ingredients, permit and county number, application date range, and relevant label information but should not include, method of application, acres applied, or exact location.

Farmers and applicators who would be subject to notification are reasonably concerned that applicator-specific information could be found by activists to motivate protest events, on-farm trespass, and could encourage significant appeals of NOIs, leading to possible crop loss, and pest outbreaks. If DPR cannot scientifically validate what health protective behavior should result following notification, and if there is no difference in health impacts between an immediate neighbor and one mile away, then the risk of identifying site of application is too great.

Therefore, we encourage the regulations not specify acreage covered as we do believe that though there is no inclusion of address, in rural areas specifically, applicator specific information can be found. We also encourage the Department to consider the complications that may arise for the Agricultural Commissioner's Office, who will be responsible for dealing with concerns from all stakeholder groups.