

California Almond Stewardship Platform (CASP) Bee Friendly Farming Report



This confidential report was prepared for:

Name: Paul Kearley

Business: Paul Kearley

Address: 2442 E Tuolumne Rd, CA 95307-9623

Phone: (209) 417-2967

Email: pauljudyk@fire2wire.com

Assessment Year: 2023

Follow these steps to apply for Bee Friendly Farming certification through Pollinator Partnership.

Step 1. Generate and save this PDF report from CASP.

Step 2. Open the [BFF Application](#) and follow the steps.

The online application is managed by Pollinator Partnership and requires completion of the following sections:

START A NEW APPLICATION

OR CONTINUE AN EXISTING APPLICATION

CREATE AN ACCOUNT TO BEGIN

Create an Account
About Your Farm
Bee Forage and Habitat
Confirmation & Payment

- Create an account:

Name, Email, and Password.

- About Your Farm:

Farm name, Phone number, Set Primary Production to **Almonds, Total Farm and cropped acreage, physical address, and mailing addresses.** Under

Existing Certifications, choose

California Almond Stewardship Platform and browse to upload this PDF.

- Bee Forage and Habitat

Upload Pictures: Bee Forage, Water Source, Nesting Habitat.

Enter Acreage: Permanent and Total Habitat.

Upload Farm map: Upload a farm map file (PNG, PDF, shapefiles, KML/KMZ, etc.) that shows a clearly defined property line of the area being certified and draw and label each ecological infrastructure (temporary floral resources, permanent floral resources nesting habitat, water sources). Include acre counts for each delineated area. If you use the [CASP Map Center](#), you can use that to print a PDF.

Existing Certifications

Recent audit information from other qualifying certifications your farm holds can be submitted in place of the rest of this form. Qualifying certifications are listed in the dropdown box above. If you hold a certification that is not listed above, please contact isaac@pollinator.org for assistance.

California Almond Stewardship Platform

Existing Audit Files *

Files uploaded should not exceed 5mb all together.

Browse... No files selected.

Next

Save for later

- Confirmation and Payment

How you heard about BFF
Check the Confirmations
Optionally enter an Invoice or Coupon Codes
Set invoicing preference.

Submit the Application

Bee Friendly Farming Certification has five requirements:

1. Offer forage providing good nutrition for bees on at least 3% of land. Forage can be temporary, including crops and cover crops.
2. Provide bloom of different flowering plants throughout the growing season, especially in early spring and late autumn. There is no minimum land coverage for seasonal bloom.
3. If not inhibited by government mandated water restrictions, offer clean water for bees.
4. Provide habitat for nesting through features such as hedgerows, natural brush, or buffer strips.
5. Practice Integrated Pest Management (IPM); reduce or eliminate the use of chemicals.

Full confidentiality is maintained for all information provided and generated this report. Individual assessment results have not been shared with other individuals or organizations.

Go to <https://www.pollinator.org/bff/bff-us> to find out more about Pollinator Partnership.

This report shows your eligibility for Bee Friendly Farming based on CASP, however, Pollinator Partnership makes a final determination after the application is evaluated.

Summary

| Location | Acres | Eligibility Status | BFF 1 | BFF 2 | BFF 3 | BFF 4 | BFF 5 |
|------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 25308 Kearley-Moffett | 35 | Eligible | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Sum of Eligible Acres | 35 | | | | | | |

California Almond Stewardship Platform (CASP) Bee Friendly Farming Report

Paul Kearley pauljudyk@fire2wire.com

Business Name: **Paul Kearley** Business Unit Name: **Paul Kearley**

25308 Kearley-Moffett (35 Acres Stanislaus County) details part 1

Assessment Year: **2023** Status: **Eligible**

Criteria 1: Offer forage providing good nutrition for bees on at least 3% of land. Forage can be temporary, including crops and cover crops.

Evaluation: Yes

Question NS-30 regarding in orchard cover cropping or question BP-27 regarding adjacent vegetation/hedgerows or must be 'Yes' to meet BFF 1 (3% forage requirement).

| CASP Questions | Response |
|--|-----------|
| BP-23. Were hedgerows of flowering shrubs, such as coyote brush, maintained along at least some edges of the farm to provide alternative nutrition sources for managed and native pollinators and pest natural enemies? | No |
| BP-24. Was vegetation maintained on or adjacent to the farm that provided pollen and nectar sources for pollinator bees before and/or after almond bloom (includes nutritional ground cover)? | Yes |
| BP-25. Have natural habitat areas or set aside plantings with flowering plants and/or nesting habitat for managed and native pollinators been established or maintained in unfarmed areas on or within 2 miles of the orchard? | No |
| BP-26. Has cover crop recommended for providing forage to pollinators (e.g., mustards, clovers, vetch and/or wildflowers) been planted in an adjacent, neighboring field within 2 miles of the orchard? | No |
| BP-27. Was the combined acreage of hedgerows and other vegetation types, such as natural habitat areas, set aside plantings, and/or adjacent cover crops, equivalent to at least 3% of the orchard planted area? | Yes |
| NS-28. Was a cover crop (pre-existing or planted ground cover) intentionally grown between orchard rows? | Yes |
| NS-29. Was the ground cover purposely planted? | No |
| NS-30. Was the cover crop recommended for providing forage to pollinators (e.g., mustards, clovers, vetch and/or wildflowers)? | No Answer |

California Almond Stewardship Platform (CASP) Bee Friendly Farming Report

Paul Kearley pauljudyk@fire2wire.com

Business Name: **Paul Kearley** Business Unit Name: **Paul Kearley**

25308 Kearley-Moffett (35 Acres Stanislaus County) details part 2

Assessment Year: **2023** Status: **Eligible**

Criteria 2: Provide bloom from different flowering plants throughout the growing season, especially in early spring and late autumn. There is no minimum land coverage for seasonal bloom.

Evaluation: Yes

Question BP-23 on hedgerows or question BP-24 on adjacent vegetation must be 'Yes' to meet BFF 2 (bloom requirement)

| CASP Questions | Response |
|---|----------|
| BP-23. Were hedgerows of flowering shrubs, such as coyote brush, maintained along at least some edges of the farm to provide alternative nutrition sources for managed and native pollinators and pest natural enemies? | No |
| BP-24. Was vegetation maintained on or adjacent to the farm that provided pollen and nectar sources for pollinator bees before and/or after almond bloom (includes nutritional ground cover)? | Yes |

Criteria 3: If not inhibited by government mandated water restrictions, offer clean water for bees.

Evaluation: Yes

Question BP-18 regarding available water and question BP-19 (if applicable) must be 'Yes' to meet BFF 3 (clean water for bees).

| CASP Questions | Response |
|--|----------|
| BP-18. Was abundant potable water, free from contamination, provided for bees? | Yes |
| BP-19. Were water sources for pollinator bees covered before or replaced after pesticide applications? | Yes |

Criteria 4: Provide habitat for nesting through features such as hedgerows, natural brush, or buffer strips.

Evaluation: Yes

Question BP-23 on hedgerows or question BP-24 on adjacent vegetation must be 'Yes' to meet BFF 4 (habitat requirement).

| CASP Questions | Response |
|---|----------|
| BP-23. Were hedgerows of flowering shrubs, such as coyote brush, maintained along at least some edges of the farm to provide alternative nutrition sources for managed and native pollinators and pest natural enemies? | No |
| BP-24. Was vegetation maintained on or adjacent to the farm that provided pollen and nectar sources for pollinator bees before and/or after almond bloom (includes nutritional ground cover)? | Yes |

California Almond Stewardship Platform (CASP) Bee Friendly Farming Report

Paul Kearley pauljudyk@fire2wire.com

Business Name: **Paul Kearley** Business Unit Name: **Paul Kearley**

25308 Kearley-Moffett (35 Acres Stanislaus County) details part 3

Assessment Year: **2023** Status: **Eligible**

Criteria 5: Practice Integrated Pest Management (IPM); reduce or eliminate the use of chemicals.

Evaluation: Yes

The Bee Friendly Farming IPM requirement is evaluated using 5 IPM areas and 34 unique CASP questions. Each area is evaluated separately and all IPM areas must be yes to meet BFF 5 (practice IPM; reduce or eliminate the use of chemicals).

Criteria 5a: Monitoring/Identification

Evaluation: Yes

If one or more of the CASP questions PM-13, PM-78, or PM-84 is answered as 'Yes,' then 5a, the IPM monitoring/identification requirement is met.

| CASP Questions | Response |
|--|----------|
| PM-10. Was the orchard monitored by a licensed PCA for insects, mites, diseases and pest natural enemies (i.e., beneficials) at least once every two weeks during the growing season? (Diseases should be monitored weekly during bloom and spring.) | Yes |
| PM-13. Were scouting data, university guidelines, and practical experience used to design and implement management strategies for insects, mites, and diseases? | Yes |
| PM-78. To determine necessary fungicides, rates and timings, were disease symptoms monitored weekly prior to and during bloom, throughout spring, and until the weather was no longer conducive for disease development? | Yes |
| PM-84. Were weeds monitored at least twice a year and was monitoring information used for management decisions? Preferably, monitoring would occur during the fall after harvest and first rains (for winter annuals and perennials) and during late spring (summer annuals and perennials). | Yes |

California Almond Stewardship Platform (CASP) Bee Friendly Farming Report

Paul Kearley pauljudyk@fire2wire.com

Business Name: **Paul Kearley** Business Unit Name: **Paul Kearley**
25308 Kearley-Moffett (35 Acres Stanislaus County) details part 4

Assessment Year: **2023** Status: **Eligible**

Criteria 5b: Decision Making

Evaluation: Yes

If one or more of CASP questions PM-49, PM-51, PM-54, PM-56, PM-57, PM-64 or PM-86 is answered as 'Yes' then 5b, the IPM decision making requirement is met.

(If nothing was sprayed or required monitoring, demonstrated by responding 'No' to CASP questions PM-47, PM-53, PM-55, PM-62 and PM-84 then 5b could also be met.)

| CASP Questions | Response |
|--|-----------|
| PM-47. Was navel orangeworm (NOW) sprayed in the past year? | Yes |
| PM-49. Spring spray timing for NOW was based on egg traps and degree-day calculations. | Yes |
| PM-51. Hullsplit spray timing for NOW was based on egg traps and degree-day calculations. | No |
| PM-53. Was San Jose Scale (SJS) sprayed in the past year? | No |
| PM-54. Was San Jose Scale (SJS) monitored using pheromone traps and degree-day calculations? | No Answer |
| PM-55. Was Peach Twig Borer (PTB) sprayed in the past year (dormant, bloom or spring sprays)? | No |
| PM-56. Did shoot strike monitoring being in April to determine if the number of strikes reached a treatment threshold? (The threshold is generally four or more strikes per tree for mature orchards; threshold should be lower for second- and third-leaf orchards.) | No Answer |
| PM-57. Was Peach Twig Borer (PTB) monitored using pheromone traps and degree-day calculations? | No Answer |
| PM-62. Were mites sprayed in the past year? | Yes |
| PM-64. Were miticides only applied after mite populations exceeded an established threshold of 25 percent of leaves infested (if there were no natural enemies), or 40 percent of leaves infested (if natural enemies were present)? | No |
| PM-84. Were weeds monitored at least twice a year and was monitoring information used for management decisions? Preferably, monitoring would occur during the fall after harvest and first rains (for winter annuals and perennials) and during late spring (summer annuals and perennials). | Yes |
| PM-86. Did monitoring records include growth stages (seedling or mature) and potential herbicide resistance issues? | No |

California Almond Stewardship Platform (CASP) Bee Friendly Farming Report

Paul Kearley pauljudyk@fire2wire.com

Business Name: **Paul Kearley** Business Unit Name: **Paul Kearley**

25308 Kearley-Moffett (35 Acres Stanislaus County) details part 5

Assessment Year: **2023** Status: **Eligible**

Criteria 5c: Prevention

Evaluation: Yes

If two or more questions listed are answered 'Yes' then 5c, the IPM prevention requirement is met. (If all questions are 'Not Applicable,' then 5c could also be met.)

| CASP Questions | Response |
|--|----------|
| PM-42. To reduce outbreaks of NOW, were mummy nuts counted and removed, as needed, during the winter, so that less than two mummies per tree remained by February 1? (For the southern San Joaquin Valley and any almond orchard within 3 miles of pistachio orchards, this rate must be less than one mummy nut per tree). | Yes |
| PM-43. By March 1, were all mummy nuts on the ground destroyed (e.g., by mowing or discing)? | Yes |
| PM-45. Was a mating disruption program for navel orangeworm (NOW) used for this orchard? | No |
| PM-58. To reduce outbreaks of mites, was dust reduced on orchard roadways (e.g., via dust suppressants, oiling, watering, mulching, vegetative cover and/or driving slowly)? | Yes |
| PM-89. Was an integrated weed management strategy developed (e.g., involving multiple control tactics, and rotation of herbicides with different modes of action) that considered monitoring results, past treatments, herbicide resistance, regulations and physical characteristics of the orchard, and surrounding sensitive areas? | Yes |

California Almond Stewardship Platform (CASP) Bee Friendly Farming Report

Paul Kearley pauljudyk@fire2wire.com

Business Name: **Paul Kearley** Business Unit Name: **Paul Kearley**

25308 Kearley-Moffett (35 Acres Stanislaus County) details part 6

Assessment Year: **2023** Status: **Eligible**

Criteria 5d: Intervention

Evaluation: Yes

If five or more questions listed are answered 'Yes' then 5d, the IPM prevention requirement is met. (If all questions listed are 'Not Applicable' and question BP-15 is 'Yes' then 5d could also be met.)

| CASP Questions | Response |
|---|----------------|
| BP-11. Were arrangements made with the beekeeper about which pesticides could be applied if daytime applications were necessary while hives were present, and, if an application(s) was necessary, was the beekeeper provided with 48-hour advance notice? | Not applicable |
| BP-12. Was notification given to the person responsible for pesticide recommendations, as well as the applicator, which and when during the day, pesticides could be applied while hives were present? | Yes |
| BP-15. Did the operation ensure that pesticides with label cautions "highly toxic to bees," "toxic to bees," "residual times," or "extended residual toxicity" were not used during bloom? | Yes |
| BP-17. During bloom, were necessary fungicides (or Bacillus thuringiensis) applied in the late afternoon or evening when bees and pollen were not present? | Yes |
| PM-06. If effective alternatives existed, were broad-spectrum insecticides and acaricides (e.g., pyrethroids, organophosphates and carbamates), not used because of their potential negative effects on beneficial and non-target organisms? | Yes |
| PM-22. To minimize drift from inversions and wind, were air blast and/or aerial applications made only when winds were between 2 and 8 mph? | Yes |
| PM-36. Was spraying discontinued when winds blew in the direction of nearby waterways (e.g., creeks or irrigation canals) or other sensitive sites (e.g., residences, schools, pollinator and pest natural enemy habitat)? | Yes |
| PM-37. When operating air blast sprayers next to open or sensitive sites (e.g., aquatic areas, residences, schools, pollinator and pest natural enemy habitat), were the two rows directly adjacent to these sites sprayed on the outer side only (i.e., to direct spray into the orchard)? | Not applicable |

California Almond Stewardship Platform (CASP) Bee Friendly Farming Report

Paul Kearley pauljudyk@fire2wire.com

Business Name: **Paul Kearley** Business Unit Name: **Paul Kearley**

25308 Kearley-Moffett (35 Acres Stanislaus County) details part 7

Assessment Year: **2023** Status: **Eligible**

Criteria 5e: IPM Evaluation

Evaluation: Yes

If one or more questions listed are answered 'Yes' then 5e, the IPM evaluation requirement is met.

| CASP Questions | Response |
|--|----------|
| PM-10. Was the orchard monitored by a licensed PCA for insects, mites, diseases and pest natural enemies (i.e., beneficials) at least once every two weeks during the growing season? (Diseases should be monitored weekly during bloom and spring.) | Yes |
| PM-11. Were written or electronic scouting reports kept by or provided to the farm owner or staff to inform decision making? | Yes |
| PM-12. Was a year-end review of pest levels and trends completed to improve future decision-making? | Yes |
| PM-14. Were scouting efforts continued after the use of each pest control tactic to verify efficacy and/or resistance issues? | Yes |
| PM-16. At harvest, did farm staff or a PCA sample and analyze the nuts for types of nut rejects to determine the pest(s) causing the damage, the efficacy of the year's pest management program, and the plan for the next year? | Yes |

Criteria 5f: Resistance Management

Evaluation: Yes

If one or more questions listed are answered 'Yes' then 5f, the IPM resistance management requirement is met. (If all questions are 'Not Applicable,' then 5f could also be met.)

| CASP Questions | Response |
|--|----------|
| PM-08. In addition to following required practices on product labels, were mode-of-action group numbers for insecticides and acaricides (on labels or in UC Pest Management Guidelines) recorded and used to guide pesticide rotation/resistance decisions? | Yes |
| PM-80. In addition to required practices on product labels, was the most recent fungicide efficacy and resistance management information reviewed (e.g., UC Fungicide Efficacy and Treatment Timing tables) to guide active ingredient rotation/resistance management decisions? | Yes |
| PM-89. Was an integrated weed management strategy developed (e.g., involving multiple control tactics, and rotation of herbicides with different modes of action) that considered monitoring results, past treatments, herbicide resistance, regulations and physical characteristics of the orchard, and surrounding sensitive areas? | Yes |