

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet
 DF-46 (REV 10/20)

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|--|
| Fiscal Year 2022-23 | Business Unit 3930 | Department Department of Pesticide Regulation | Priority No. |
| Budget Request Name 3930-005-BCP-2022-GB | | Program 3540 - Pesticide Programs | Subprogram 3540082 - Enforcement |

Budget Request Description
 Pesticide Use Enforcement Program

Budget Request Summary

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) requests \$882,000 DPR Fund and 3.0 permanent positions in 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25 and \$582,000 DPR Fund in 2025-26 and ongoing to investigate and develop pesticide residue and use enforcement cases. This request includes \$300,000 annually for three years for DPR to hire the Attorney General's Office to represent DPR in civil and criminal pesticide use enforcement actions.

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| Requires Legislation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed Food and Agricultural Code sections 12581; 12996; 12998; 12999.4; 12999.5; and 12999.6. | |
| Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i> | Department CIO N/A | Date N/A |

For IT requests, specify the project number, the most recent project approval document (FSR, SPR, S1BA, S2AA, S3SD, S4PRA), and the approval date.

Project No. N/A **Project Approval Document:** N/A

Approval Date: N/A

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal? Yes No
Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Prepared By Daniel Rubin | Date 1/10/2022 | Reviewed By Maria Bueb | Date 1/10/2022 |
| Department Director Julie Henderson | Date 1/10/2022 | Agency Secretary Jared Blumenfeld | Date 1/10/2022 |

Department of Finance Use Only

Additional Review: Capital Outlay ITCU FSCU OSAE Dept. of Technology

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| PPBA Becca Moore | Date submitted to the Legislature 1/10/2022 |
|----------------------------|---|

A. Budget Request Summary

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) requests \$882,000 DPR Fund and 3.0 permanent positions in 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25 and \$582,000 DPR Fund in 2025-26 and ongoing to investigate and develop pesticide residue and use enforcement cases. This request includes \$300,000 annually for three years for DPR to hire the Attorney General's Office (AGO) to represent DPR in civil and criminal pesticide use enforcement actions.

B. Background/History

DPR is responsible for protecting human health and the environment for all Californians by regulating pesticide sales and use and by fostering reduced-risk pest management. In furtherance of this mission, DPR has adopted a comprehensive science-based regulatory system and is advancing the transition to lower risk sustainable pest management systems. Robust enforcement of these regulatory requirements is critical to protecting public health—particularly the health of Californians living in communities overburdened by pollution—and the environment. Improvements to California's pesticide use enforcement response are necessary to deter illegal pesticide use and strengthen local implementation of statewide pesticide use enforcement priorities.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) delegated pesticide use enforcement primacy in California to the State. California's primacy remains in effect unless the US EPA determines that the state is not adequately enforcing pesticide use requirements. California statute divides responsibility for pesticide use enforcement between state and local authorities. County Agricultural Commissioners (CACs) and their staff of approximately 400 inspectors and biologists operate locally across 58 counties to regulate and maintain high compliance of pesticide use. CACs have various regulatory tools at their disposal to bring growers and pesticide users into compliance including applying permit conditions on certain pesticide applications. In certain instances, these regulatory tools may not be enough and additional pesticide use enforcement actions can be brought under criminal, civil, or administrative authority.

Pesticide Use Enforcement

Division 7 of the Food and Agricultural Code and implementing regulations include legal requirements governing the use of pesticides in California. This includes the prohibition on using pesticides in conflict with the registered label, restrictions on pesticide drift, and worker protection requirements. CACs have sole administrative enforcement authority for pesticide use violations, while DPR provides oversight and guidance to CACs. Currently, DPR does not have administrative enforcement authority over pesticide use requirements. DPR previously had such authority for certain pesticide use violations, however, that authority expired in 2006. CAC administrative penalties are governed by DPR's enforcement response regulations which categorize violations according to level of severity. The maximum administrative penalty has been statutorily capped for more than 25 years at \$5,000.

Pesticide use violations are also subject to civil and criminal enforcement by local District Attorneys, DPR, and the AGO in its independent capacity. Civil penalties are generally capped at \$10,000 per violation but can be increased to \$25,000 per violation for intentional or repeated violations. Criminal penalties are up to \$50,000 per violation and imprisonment.

In addition to civil penalty liability, DPR licensees who violate pesticide use requirements are subject to license discipline. These actions are formal proceedings under the Administrative Procedures Act (APA) and are presented before an administrative law judge at the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). Following a formal hearing, the administrative law judge will

Analysis of Problem

issue a proposed decision for the Director's approval. DPR has imposed license discipline through settlement agreements outside of the OAH process in several recent cases.

Multi-jurisdictional cases, or cases involving repeat offenders or egregious circumstances require escalating action by DPR. In 2020, DPR hired the Attorney General's Office (AGO) to initiate civil and licensing actions against an aerial pesticide applicator with an extensive history of non-compliance in multiple counties. CACs had previously found the applicator administratively liable and levied penalties on nine separate occasions. Despite these findings and penalty assessments, two different and recent county investigations found the company to have violated DPR's pesticide use laws resulting in multiple priority-level drift incidents. As such, administrative enforcement by CACs was ineffective in obtaining compliance and DPR referred the case to AGO in order to impose progressive enforcement. Prior to this case, DPR had not directly taken a pesticide use enforcement action in nearly 20 years, and does not have dedicated funding for this activity.

See "Supplemental Information" for a reference chart with existing administrative, civil, and criminal penalty authorities and amounts.

Pesticide Residue Monitoring

DPR administers a statewide pesticide residue monitoring program to verify that fresh produce does not carry illegal quantities of pesticide residue. Under this program, DPR monitors for fresh produce with illegal pesticide residue, quarantines and removes illegal produce from the channels of trade, issues letters of non-compliance, conducts compliance interviews, and enforces laws against the packing, sale, and shipment of contaminated produce. Additionally, DPR quarantines produce that is suspected of containing illegal pesticide residue and its movement may expose consumers to illegal, harmful produce. Enforcement staff have found that a disproportionate amount of illegal pesticide residues are detected on produce consumed disproportionately by low-income and immigrant communities. Over the last several years, DPR has observed an increasing number of regulated entities that disregard public health by: a) failing to provide enforcement staff with requested produce sales and distribution information concerning produce contaminated with illegal pesticides in a timely manner; and b) disturbing and/or moving quarantined produce in violation of state law. In order for DPR to remove pesticide-contaminated produce before it reaches consumers, regulated entities must provide timely sales and distribution information.

Under current law, DPR does not have explicit authority to require that entities provide sale and distribution information, to levy administrative penalties for the failure to produce such records, or to administratively enforce quarantine orders, other than through costly and resource-intensive court proceedings.

DPR Oversight of County Pesticide Use Enforcement Programs

While the CACs conduct nearly all pesticide use enforcement through wide-ranging compliance efforts, DPR is responsible for overall statewide enforcement and has a statutory oversight role to oversee the adequacy of local programs. DPR has broad authority to regulate CAC enforcement actions, and requires each CAC to submit enforcement work plans to DPR that serve as the basis for regular performance evaluations. DPR also has authority to issue recommendations and instructions to the CACs, and regularly provides training to CACs; reviews investigations, charging documents, and other enforcement materials; issues enforcement guidance documents; and assists CAC in hearing preparation.

Analysis of Problem

Resource History – Enforcement Program (State Operations) (Dollars in thousands)

| Program Budget | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | 2021-22* |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Authorized Expenditures | \$10,252 | \$11,803 | \$10,919 | \$11,630 | \$14,377 | \$11,083 |
| Actual Expenditures | \$10,434 | \$9,846 | \$8,990 | \$9,756 | \$11,100 | \$11,083 |
| Revenues | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Authorized Positions | 52.8 | 50.9 | 47.4 | 48.0 | 60.7 | 60.1 |
| Filled Positions | 51.8 | 48.8 | 45.7 | 48.0 | 61.0 | 60.1 |
| Vacancies | 1.0 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 0.0 | -0.3 | 0.0 |

*Estimated

Note: Negative vacancies reflects temporary help resources.

Workload History

| Workload Measure | PY – 4 | PY – 3 | PY – 2 | PY-1 | PY | CY |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| Licensing Cases (including settlements) | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 2 |
| Residue Enforcement Cases | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| AGO Client Cases | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Referrals for AGO/US EPA Independent Actions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Review of CAC Charging Documents / CAC Hearing Assistance | 8 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 19 | 4 |
| Monitor & Track licensed violators during probation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Illegal residue case review | 75 | 73 | 63 | 86 | 62 | 63 |
| Compliance interviews | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Repeat Residue Offender Case Development | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

C. State Level Consideration

DPR's mission is to protect human health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use. As a part of its mission, DPR is accelerating the transition to safer, more sustainable pest management.

Analysis of Problem

This proposal supports several DPR Strategic Planning Goals:

- Goal 1, to protect people and the environment. DPR has developed a robust regulatory system with a comprehensive set of protections including those applicable to workers, members of the public, pollinators, surface and groundwater, neighboring crops, and wildlife. Strengthening the pesticide use enforcement program through additional state action will deter violations of these important protections.
- Goal 3, to enforce and achieve compliance. As detailed below, DPR proposes to strengthen California's pesticide use enforcement program through additional state enforcement that will address structural limitations in the county response, incorporate a critical element of progressive enforcement, and implement statewide enforcement priorities and goals.
- Goal 4, to ensure environmental justice. DPR will be better positioned to implement statewide enforcement priorities, including the consideration of equity and environmental justice in enforcement decision-making. Specifically, DPR could strategically target inspections and conduct enforcement in disproportionately burdened and vulnerable communities and further highlight enforcement work as a part of broader community engagement efforts.

D. Justification

In order to enhance the state pesticide use enforcement program, DPR is proposing the following:

- Strengthen enforcement and penalty authority for pesticide residue and use programs;
- Develop and bring state administrative enforcement actions via licensee disciplinary proceedings and/or administrative civil penalty actions;
- Refer cases and provide legal and technical support to AGO and/or US EPA Region 9; and
- Make sure state level enforcement priorities are adequately implemented at the local level.

Strengthen Enforcement and Penalty Authority and Develop Administrative Actions

While the CAC administrative enforcement system is appropriate for the vast majority of pesticide use enforcement cases, structural dynamics create challenges for the enforcement program overall. First, the statutory cap on penalties is relatively low compared to other environmental programs. For example, the California Air Resources Board is authorized to levy up to \$37,500 for administrative violations of its laws. US EPA is authorized to levy penalties of nearly \$9,000 for federal violations of pesticide use requirements. By contrast, CACs' low penalty authority of not more than \$5,000 per violation and recoveries may limit the deterrent effect of enforcement actions and have been regularly noted by US EPA. Second, and relatedly, due to the low statutory penalty cap, CACs are limited in terms of progressive enforcement. In the enforcement action that DPR recently initiated, CACs had previously found the applicator in violation of drift and worker protection laws and had levied penalties on nine separate occasions. In other words, the company was apparently able to absorb the penalties and continue operating without adjusting its practices to come into compliance with pesticide use requirements. Third, due to staffing limitations, county agricultural biologists must act in a prosecutorial capacity despite lacking formal legal training or certification. In cases involving sophisticated, well-funded respondents that hire legal counsel, this may create a significant power imbalance. Fourth, CAC jurisdiction is confined to individual counties, and

Analysis of Problem

counties are unable to take into consideration a company's enforcement history in neighboring counties.

Additional DPR involvement in pesticide use enforcement cases would strengthen overall statewide enforcement by addressing many of these issues. With the resources requested in this proposal, DPR will have adequate staff with the legal and scientific expertise necessary to bring high profile or complicated cases, the ability to address cases with multi-jurisdictional violations, and stronger enforcement authorities (e.g. licensing discipline).

Refer Cases to AGO/US EPA Region 9

DPR has authority to refer cases to US EPA Region 9 and to the AGO for client and independent claims. AGO action is a critical enforcement tool that should be available in cases where the facts justify action beyond the typical administrative enforcement response.

In certain instances, it is appropriate for DPR to hire the AGO to bring cases in a client capacity. In client actions, DPR maintains control of case strategy and decision-making, including settlement, as well as public communications and messaging about the action, so that the action achieves DPR and CalEPA enforcement objectives.

However, both the AGO and US EPA Region 9 may independently bring pesticide use enforcement cases upon referral. There are several potential benefits to such referrals. First, the AGO and US EPA have relatively high penalty authorities that can strengthen the enforcement response. The AGO can imprison violators and levy penalties of up to \$25,000 civilly and \$50,000 criminally for each pesticide use violation. US EPA can levy penalties of nearly \$9,000 for federal violations of pesticide use requirements. Second, while in certain instances, it is most appropriate for DPR to hire AGO in a client capacity, DPR has limited resources to cover AGO bills. It is important to note that DPR would not be required to pay legal fees for independent AGO and US EPA actions, but even so, DPR legal and enforcement staff time would likely be necessary in a technical support capacity.

Implement State Level Enforcement Priorities Adequately at the Local Level

DPR is committed to implementing important state policy priorities at the county level. This includes principles of equity and environmental justice, consistent with Governor Newsom's goals for "California for All." Additionally, DPR's role in maintaining the adequacy of statewide enforcement is critical to the good standing of California's enforcement primacy. Failure to adequately enforce pesticide requirements can result in federal action against state primacy. DPR therefore must oversee important state and federal enforcement priorities as they are effectively implemented at the county-level. For example, in September 2021, CalEPA and US EPA executed a memorandum of understanding regarding enforcement and compliance assurance in disproportionately burdened and vulnerable communities to be implemented at the federal, state, and local levels.

Increasingly, implementation of statewide enforcement priorities has been complicated by competing local county priorities. In addition to the federal primacy issue, these situations can lead to political and legal state-local conflicts. In order to avoid potential primacy and state-local conflicts, additional funding is necessary to: (1) assist in reviewing CAC enforcement materials and hosting CAC trainings; and (2) coordinate with CACs and oversee local programs to assure that state enforcement priorities are properly implemented.

To implement these enforcement enhancements, this request includes funding for 1 Staff Attorney and 2 Senior Environmental Scientists (Specialist).

Analysis of Problem

Staff Attorney

The new Staff Attorney will be responsible for managing DPR enforcement efforts by either bringing administrative actions (either administrative civil penalty or licensing disciplinary cases) or coordinating referrals to AGO or US EPA Region 9. This includes reviewing CAC investigations for completeness and developing the administrative record; drafting and filing the accusation and other administrative motions; conducting settlement negotiations; preparing for and representing DPR in the appropriate hearings; and handling appeals.

The Staff Attorney would also be responsible for proper oversight of CAC programs to implement state level enforcement priorities adequately in the local programs. This includes participation in CAC trainings, review of enforcement materials, and assistance in hearing preparation. The Staff Attorney would participate in performance evaluation reviews, drafting of enforcement guidance documents, and coordination with CACs.

Senior Environmental Scientists (Specialist)

Two Senior Environmental Scientists (Specialist) are needed in DPR's enforcement branch to support case building activities, coordinate with CAC investigative staff or perform direct investigatory functions, act as expert witnesses, and to oversee potential probationary terms resulting from licensing actions and oversee the compliance and enforcement residue database.

These positions will also work in conjunction with the staff attorney to identify and develop licensing action cases for repeat use violators; monitor and track licensed violators during probation; track the terms of the probation period and notify the staff attorney if they are not followed; and keep a database of the terms of the probation period to monitor compliance. These staff will act as subject matter experts on case and investigatory development and represent the department as expert witnesses in their area of expertise.

These positions will also allow DPR to be more responsive in pursuing actions against cases of illegal pesticide residue on produce. These positions will perform comprehensive review of illegal pesticide residue investigations, identify patterns of illegal behaviors, and develop cases for referral to the Office of Legal Affairs for enforcement action. They will assist with compliance interviews, write letters of compliance agreement based on agreed upon activities as they relate to the actions pursued, maintain the tracking database for repeat offenders, and monitor and track compliance with the agreed upon terms.

Finally, these positions will assist county personnel with compliance assistance on any of their enforcement actions and will compile data for the Compliance and Enforcement Trend Analysis Program from multiple sources, such as the Pesticide Regulatory Activities Monthly Report (PRAMR), pesticide use report, and inspection tracking databases.

Additional Funding for AGO Fees for Enforcement Cases

DPR also requests temporary support of \$300,000 from the DPR Fund annually for three years (2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25) to support client case referral to the AGO. The AGO currently estimates fees for a pesticide drift enforcement case will range from \$552,400 to \$688,800, with potential civil penalty recovery of up to \$330,000. DPR plans to refer, on average, one pesticide use enforcement case of this type every other year.

Trailer Bill Language

In addition to utilizing the existing enforcement tools discussed above, DPR requests trailer bill language so that the requested resources can be most effectively deployed to gain higher compliance with DPR's regulatory requirements and local implementation of statewide

Analysis of Problem

pesticide use enforcement priorities. These changes to the FAC will modernize the pesticide use enforcement system, much of which has gone unchanged for decades, and would more effectively deter violations of DPR's regulatory protections. Changes include adding DPR administrative penalty authority, increasing statutory penalty caps, and improving pesticide residue enforcement. The draft trailer bill language will be available on the Department of Finance's website.

E. Outcomes and Accountability

The requested positions, statutory authority, and funding will allow DPR to robustly implement its mission to protect the environment and public health for all Californians. Specifically, DPR intends to track its success through the outcomes listed below.

Projected Outcomes

| Workload Measure | CY | BY | BY+1 | BY+2 | BY+3 | BY+4 |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| PUE Admin Actions | 0 | .5 | .5 | .5 | .5 | .5 |
| Licensing Cases (including settlements) | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Residue ENF Cases | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| AGO Client Cases | 1 | .5 | .5 | .5 | 0 | 0 |
| Referrals for AGO/US EPA Independent Actions | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Monitor & Track licensed violators during probation | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Compliance assistance w CAC's on enforcement actions | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Increase pesticide use enforcement cases w/ DPR authority | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Illegal residue case review | 100 | 150 | 150 | 150 | 175 | 175 |
| Compliance interviews | 6 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Repeat Residue Offender Case Development | 3 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

F. Analysis of All Feasible Alternatives

Alternative 1: Approve \$882,000 DPR Fund in 2022-23, 2023-24, and 2024-25 and \$582,000 DPR Fund beginning in 2025-26 and ongoing for 3.0 permanent positions and temporary resources

Analysis of Problem

to hire the AGO to represent DPR in civil and criminal pesticide use enforcement actions, as well as associated trailer bill language.

Pro: This alternative would maximize the deployment of DPR resources by expanding DPR administrative enforcement authority and increasing penalty caps, thereby heightening the deterrent effect of DPR actions. It will also provide an opportunity for DPR to more fully recoup any funds expended on civil or criminal referrals to the AGO or resources expended on administrative civil penalty actions.

Con: This alternative requires ongoing resources from the DPR Fund.

Alternative 2: Approve \$582,000 DPR Fund for 1 new Staff Attorney and 2 Senior Environmental Scientists (Specialist).

Pro: This alternative would allow DPR to take direct administrative enforcement actions while minimizing the impact to the DPR Fund.

Con: This alternative requires resources from the DPR Fund. DPR would only be budgeted for administrative enforcement (license disciplinary actions and oversight and guidance of CAC actions) and would be unable to pay for referrals of more serious cases—including those involving instances of intentional misconduct, fraud, or other egregious conduct—to the AGO or take its own administrative civil penalty actions.

Alternate 3: Do not provide additional resources.

Pro: This alternative requires no additional resources from the DPR Fund.

Con: This alternative would hinder DPR's ability to enforce against pesticide residue and use violations, thereby limiting the deterrent effect of DPR actions.

G. Implementation Plan

DPR plans to prepare hiring paperwork for all three positions in spring 2022, pending budget approval in summer, with hiring completed in July/August 2022.

H. Supplemental Information

1. Criminal Penalties.

| Description | FAC section | Current Penalty |
|--|-------------|--|
| Violations of FAC Div. 6 | 11891 | \$500 - \$5,000 10 days – 6 months imprisonment |
| Violations of FAC Div. 7 (misdemeanor) | 12996(a) | \$500 - \$5,000 \$1,000 - \$10,000 (repeat violations) Up to 6 months imprisonment |
| Violations of FAC Div. 7 (intentional/hazard creation) | 12996(b) | \$5,000 - \$50,000 Up to 1 year imprisonment |

2. Civil Penalties.

| Description | FAC section | Current Penalty |
|--------------------------|-------------|---|
| Violations of FAC Div. 6 | 11893 | \$1,000 - \$10,000 |
| Violations of FAC Div. 7 | 12998 | \$1,000 - \$10,000 \$5,000 - \$25,000 (repeat and hazard creation) |

3. Administrative Penalties.

| Description | FAC section | Current Penalty |
|----------------------------|-------------|--|
| CAC: all admin enforcement | 12999.5 | Up to \$1,000 or \$5,000 for Class A violation |

Analysis of Problem

| Description | FAC section | Current Penalty |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| DPR: admin use enforcement | 12999.6 | N/A |
| DPR: all other admin enforcement | 12999.4 | Up to \$5,000 |

See proposed Trailer Bill Language on the Department of Finance website for further details.

I. Recommendation

DPR recommends approval of Alternative 1.

BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Enforcement Enhancements

BR Name: 3930-005-BCP-2022-GB

Budget Request Summary

Personal Services

| Personal Services | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Positions - Permanent | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Total Positions | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Earnings - Permanent | 0 | 326 | 326 | 326 | 326 | 326 |
| Total Salaries and Wages | \$0 | \$326 | \$326 | \$326 | \$326 | \$326 |
| Total Staff Benefits | 0 | 190 | 190 | 190 | 190 | 190 |
| Total Personal Services | \$0 | \$516 | \$516 | \$516 | \$516 | \$516 |

Operating Expenses and Equipment

| Operating Expenses and Equipment | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 5301 - General Expense | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 5302 - Printing | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 5304 - Communications | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 5320 - Travel: In-State | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 5322 - Training | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 5324 - Facilities Operation | 0 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 | 36 |
| 5340 - Consulting and Professional Services - Interdepartmental | 0 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| 5346 - Information Technology | 0 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Total Operating Expenses and Equipment | \$0 | \$366 | \$366 | \$366 | \$66 | \$66 |

Total Budget Request

| Total Budget Request | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Total Budget Request | \$0 | \$882 | \$882 | \$882 | \$582 | \$582 |

Analysis of Problem

Fund Summary

Fund Source

| Fund Source | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| State Operations - 0106 - Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund | 0 | 882 | 882 | 882 | 582 | 582 |
| Total State Operations Expenditures | \$0 | \$882 | \$882 | \$882 | \$582 | \$582 |
| Total All Funds | \$0 | \$882 | \$882 | \$882 | \$582 | \$582 |

Program Summary

Program Funding

| Program Funding | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 3540082 - Enforcement | 0 | 882 | 882 | 882 | 582 | 582 |
| Total All Programs | \$0 | \$882 | \$882 | \$882 | \$582 | \$582 |

Analysis of Problem

Personal Services Details

Positions

| Positions | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0765 - Sr Envirnal Scientist (Spec) | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| 5778 - Atty | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Total Positions | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |

Salaries and Wages

| Salaries and Wages | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0765 - Sr Envirnal Scientist (Spec) | 0 | 198 | 198 | 198 | 198 | 198 |
| 5778 - Atty | 0 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 | 128 |
| Total Salaries and Wages | \$0 | \$326 | \$326 | \$326 | \$326 | \$326 |

Staff Benefits

| Staff Benefits | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 5150900 - Staff Benefits - Other | 0 | 190 | 190 | 190 | 190 | 190 |
| Total Staff Benefits | \$0 | \$190 | \$190 | \$190 | \$190 | \$190 |

Total Personal Services

| Total Personal Services | FY21-22 Current Year | FY22-23 Budget Year | FY23-24 BY+1 | FY24-25 BY+2 | FY25-26 BY+3 | FY26-27 BY+4 |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Total Personal Services | \$0 | \$516 | \$516 | \$516 | \$516 | \$516 |