SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER/SEALER
2014 ENFORCEMENT WORK PLAN

PESTICIDE USE ENFORCEMENT STAFF

Deputy Commissioner/Sealer – Allen Lampman (also the Deputy of the Weights & Measures, Fruit & Vegetable Standardization, Egg Quality, Direct Marketing and Organic Programs).
Supervisor – Tom Stevenson (also supervises the same additional programs).
Three full time PUE officers (with other duties on a limited basis) provide coverage and backup in other programs as needed. One is a new officer who is training and who has only passed the PUE State Exam in the last month. An additional officer is anticipated to be added to the PUE program in late spring of 2014. Two of the full-time PUE officers are fluent in Spanish. One is stationed in the Ontario field office and the other is in the San Bernardino main office.
The Deputy and Supervisor work out of the main office in San Bernardino.
An additional district officer who performed PUE work part time was located in Hesperia but has abruptly retired, leaving the position potentially vacant for quite a few months pending recruitment for a new hire.
One office assistant, whose program responsibility is primarily PUE.

The officers stationed in the County's valley area are assigned headquarters records inspections, application monitoring, and investigative responsibilities based on geographical divisions. In addition, all officers answer public information requests, proctor Private Applicator Exams and process/issue Restricted Materials Permits and OpID's. The officers also rotate and share responsibilities for giving the monthly outreach training class and administering the Structural Pest Control Registered Applicator's Examination. Because the officers in different districts have different work schedules (varying days off), there is opportunity for them to work occasionally in other PUE districts for coverage purposes.

The Deputy and Supervisor perform primarily management, administrative and supervisory duties, but will occasionally perform some inspection and investigative work. Officer training is provided by DPR, the Deputy and the Supervisor, both in the field and in the office. The Supervisor is still fairly new to the program and is receiving training from DPR as needed.

For 2013, total licensed man-hours expended were 6,941 (down from 7,945) and support hours expended were 1,899 (slightly raised from 1,812).

In 2013, San Bernardino County registered 187 agricultural pest control businesses (PCBs), down from 215, 68 pest control advisers (PCAs), up from 60, 6 farm labor contractors (FLCs), down from 9 and 674 structural pest control companies (SPCOs), up from 499. Registration is done on a calendar basis, starting in December of the previous year, with registration effective as of January 1st. Structural pest control companies licensed in both Branch 1 & Branches 2/3 are also required to register their branches separately; the fees are $25 and $10 respectively. The PCB registration fee is $75. Registration fees for Farm Labor Contractors, and Maintenance Gardeners have remained the same. This county is moving to a new online registration system through our county website for Pest Control Advisors or Pilots to register. There are so few of them that the time spent on registering them manually created an expense that could not be recouped by the $10/$5 fees that were being charged. As part of the new online system, the department will no longer charge a registration fee for these categories as the person registering will be responsible for entering their own data into the system.

RESTRICTED MATERIALS PERMITS (RMPs) & OPERATOR IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS (OP IDS)

PERMIT EVALUATION PROCESS

In 2013, there were 316 RMPs issued, comprised of 290 agricultural or "combo ag & non-ag", down from 310, and 26 non-agricultural permits, down from 29; 117 OpID's were also issued, down one from 118. During the same year, no agricultural permits were denied. About 50% of the RMPs were issued to pest control businesses with either an agricultural or maintenance gardener license. RMPs and OpID's can be issued in all three of the county's offices, San Bernardino, Ontario and Hesperia (by appt only). All offices have the capability to print 2014 RMPs and OpIDs using the statewide Cal Ag Permits program.

No RMPs have been issued for field fumigation since the fall 2009 season. In part, the decline in field fumigations was due to the general economy, loss of leased land in the Ontario/Chino area, and increased regulation of fumigants (specifically, larger buffer zone requirements). All corresponding DPR policies and regulations regarding permit conditions are followed during the issuance process. DPR has provided training to all of our staff on RMP issuance early in our permit issuance season, which begins around the first of December.

Pest Control Business RMPs are issued only to qualified applicators with proper categories who are employed by these pest control businesses, which in turn are currently registered with our department. The officer in the district must review all aspects of the previously issued permit and then makes any changes to the permit documents at the time of actual issuance to the permit holder based on needs and conditions. Pesticides, commodities, acreage, methods of treatment, notice of intent requirements, and permit conditions are all carefully discussed with the permittee at time of permit issuance to ensure completeness, accuracy, and an understanding of the requirements. Our continuing goal is to place more emphasis during the next permit issuance year

in ensuring that permit information is up-to-date and accurate. Again this year, if a restricted material currently on a permit has not been used for more than a year, we will be removing that restricted material and the business must request to re-add it if they wish to use it again in the future. Part of this process will include a storage site inspection to determine if any of the restricted material previously noted on the permit is still in possession of the permitee. If the permittee still has possession of any of the restricted materials that were removed from the permit, the amount of product will be recorded. If a new permit re-adding the product is not requested within the year, another storage site inspection will be performed to verify that the original amount of product in possession is still present at the location. If any of the products were used without a permit, enforcement action will be taken. We will also be looking more closely at adding new restricted materials to permits and will require an extensive review of alternative methods before allowing new materials to either be added or re-added to a permit.

A changed Aluminum Phosphide permit condition was introduced this year in an effort to make the permit conditions more closely align with the changed label. Additionally, we have added the San Bernardino County Schools Protection Ordinance as a permit condition for all production agriculture permits that allow treatment of sites that border a school.

All of the officers and the office assistant have received training in the CalAgPermits program and continue to gain experience and become more familiar and knowledgeable in the program, although there have been glitches. The vendor continues to work diligently to rectify problems as they are found. Additional training will, as always, be provided by the Deputy and Supervisor as needed.

Our goal of issuing highly accurate RMPs will be accomplished through in-house staff training. Multiple training sessions were held last year and more may be required this year in order for all officers to gain the ability to properly review and issue proper and correct RMPs. Any permit applicant wanting to perform field fumigation must specifically request the fumigant to be added to their RMP; this ensures that all qualifications are met and conditions are addressed. We were not able to complete, and are therefore continuing to work toward, our goal of adding a "Permit Checklist" to the review process which will allow us to look for and address specific environmental concerns on an individual permit basis. The RMP issuance process has been modified based on technological upgrading of the CalAgPermits program, and changes made by DPR will be incorporated in their future training to our staff.

Our county requires any operator involved in production agriculture with employees working as handlers or field workers to be certified as a private applicator in order to meet training qualifications, unless the employer hires a qualified trainer to perform the training. During 2013, 38 private applicators were certified (3 through continuing education) and 8 failed the written examination. In order for a RMP to be issued to a grower, that grower must be certified; otherwise, the grower must either authorize a certified person to sign the permit or an employee/family member must pass the PAC examination.

Currently, all registrations, either sent in the mail or delivered in person, are processed only in the main office located in San Bernardino, so that the fees can be collected and processed centrally. While district offices do not register businesses, they do issue RMPs and OP IDs to those applicants based within the particular district. Through the use of the CalAgPermits program, our RMP issuance capabilities have been broadened because now all of our offices can print RMPs. Our

permit application process includes visitation of the site prior to issuance of fumigant permits for agricultural commodity and field crops due to the nature of the Work Plan and Final Permit Conditions requirements. San Bernardino County issues multi-year RMPs to agricultural production businesses with perennial crops, but does not issue multi-year RMPs to agricultural pest control businesses as they must register annually. We find it less confusing to process the registrations at the same time we issue RMPs.

We have implemented a change in the way pest control businesses work under the permit of a grower/owner. All site permits must be signed by the actual grower/owner or their agent and must contain specific site ID information that will allow us to more accurately track pesticide useage through the Cal Ag program. Pest Control businesses may no longer list sites belonging to their clients on the pest control businesses permit. This will eliminate the error of having two different pest control businesses both spray the full yearly amount of any type of pesticide on the same property in the same year. We will be transitioning into using a modified APN parcel number for the site number on each permit soon in an even greater effort to track and maintain control over pesticide use on agricultural crops.

SITE MONITORING

Site maps are reviewed and updated continually as needed. If the site is not new, the officer must review all the maps with the permittee to see if any changes have occurred. We continue to require all permitees, including OpID's and schools to provide more detailed aerial site maps, such as those found on "Google Maps". These allow us to more clearly understand the surrounding land use of each site and enable us to better identify issues such as sensitive sites located next to agricultural production areas and the direction and impact of surface water runoff. If the officer is unfamiliar with the site or if other than minor changes have occurred, the officer used to visit the site to determine if any potential adverse effects may occur as a result of the proposed applications. A reduction in available department personnel beginning in 2012 resulted in a reduced ability to perform permit pre-site inspections and has forced us to rely more on map reviews only. Luckily, the accuracy of Google satellite maps has lessened the need for in person site evaluations to some extent (the maps may not always show very recent activities happening on neighboring properties), but if the site is unfamiliar, site evaluation is still done in the field by the officer. Permit conditions are also reviewed and modified according to any changes at the site(s), such as a change in the acreage, crops, or adjacent properties.

San Bernardino County requires a Notice of Intent to be submitted at least 24 hours prior to all applications of restricted pesticides. We have now had multiple Methyl Bromide (MBr) commodity fumigations on lumber for Phytosanitary Certificate issuance and are requiring a 72 hour NOI for all MBr commodity fumigations. These are permit conditions we document for every agricultural pest control business that performs applications, and these PCBs have mostly always fully cooperated. This makes us aware of every MBr application in the county, which increases our effectiveness at monitoring such applications, and enables us to respond quickly and effectively to questions and concerns from the public.

For all restricted pesticides, San Bernardino County received total of 1,022 Agricultural Notices of Intent during 2013. Our goal is to review close to 100% of these NOI's to ensure that permits listed on them are current and correct, sites are familiar and mapped, and any potential hazards are mitigated. Reviews are done both in the field and at the office. After the review, we then completed 101 Pre-Application Site Inspections during 2013, which is 9.8% of the total number of NOIs received. DPR requires counties to perform Pre-Ap Site Inspections on a minimum of 5% of the number of agricultural NOIs received.

We have always maintained a goal of 90-100% monitoring by the department, even if the application takes place on the weekend, of agricultural applications of fumigants (aluminum phosphide, methyl bromide, metam sodium and chloropicrin). They are normally given a very high inspection priority in an attempt to prevent any exposure and/or drift episodes from occurring. Since implementing this procedure several years ago, no episodes involving aluminum phosphide, methyl bromide or metam sodium have occurred, but we will have to modify this policy now that we have a very reduced staff and Methyl Bromide commodity fumigations seem to have the potential to be increasing at a rapid pace on the weekends.

In 2007, we implemented a policy of not issuing any RMPs for "shank-applied" chloropicrin, and we continue to follow this policy. The fumigant VOC regulations have had minimal effect in San Bernardino County because only the desert areas of the county would be impacted. The fields normally fumigated for pre-plant strawberries are located in the Chino/Ontario area, which is outside of the non-attainment area. No soil fumigations have occurred in our desert area for over 12 years and none have occurred in the Chino/Ontario for over four years. We require a 72-hour NOI prior to field fumigation and prior to commodity fumigation at grain mills to ensure that we can arrange an inspection.

Schools are considered very sensitive sites, so applications at or near schools are always given high priority. Soil fumigations near schools are only allowed when students are not present, such as on the weekends, and permit conditions (such as buffer zones and the required presence of an inspector) are strictly enforced. Several years ago we contacted every school district in the county to ensure awareness of pesticide use requirements. Surveillance around these sites has increased as our department has received a few complaints and inquiries from interest groups and concerned parents of students regarding pesticide use at schools and notification issues resulting from passage of the Healthy Schools Act and its later amendment to include pre-school facilities. On request from the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools regarding potential agricultural use pesticide effects next to a future school, we adopted local regulations dealing with pesticide notification, application methods and application timing issues at agricultural crop sites adjacent to schools (see the previously mentioned School Ordinance permit conditions above). This department will continue our goal to give high importance to the monitoring of pesticide applications made at or near schools. We have not had any pesticide-related incidents at our schools involving children since adopting these procedures. We take enforcement very seriously regarding any violations that occur at school settings, including issuing warning letters to different school districts regarding minor pesticide use violations and fining several school districts in the last few years.

COMPLIANCE MONITORING

INVESTIGATIONS

In the past, the department could receive around 20-35 complaints. About 25% would involve property loss, another 25% involve environmental effects, and the remainder would cover a range from licensing to odor to efficacy issues. About half of the complaints result in violations being found. In calendar year 2013, there was only one environmental effect investigation and only 7 miscellaneous "other" complaints.

During calendar year 2013, human effects investigations totaled 68; included in the total were 29 involving structural pesticides, 4 involving agricultural pesticides and 34 involving anti-microbials. The remaining one investigation was listed as "human effects - other." The Deputy and the Supervisor review each investigation independently for completeness and accuracy, and to ensure that appropriate enforcement/compliance action is taken. We maintain computerized logs for tracking complaint investigations and for tracking human effects investigations generated from Doctor's First Reports forwarded by DPR Worker Health & Safety and e-notices from the California Poison Control System, and client complaints. We have changed our policies as to how the investigations are handled, and in 2013, all investigations fell within the allotted DPR timeframes of each non-priority investigation being completed within two months of receipt and each priority investigation within one month of receipt. All of the Officers conduct their own investigations, with the assistance of the bilingual Officers when necessary.

All the Officers have received the DPR training on the Compendium Volume #5; they all attended Sampling, Respiratory requirements, Surface Water and Structural Trainings co-hosted by SPCB and DPR during 2013. The entire unit has attended DPR's training on Compendium #4 - Inspection Procedures.

Education of industry and the public is another of our goals when conducting investigations. We attempt to ensure that the regulated person/business/agency understands applicable pesticide-related requirements and emphasize that we are a proactive information resource. We stress label requirements to homeowners, and distribute DPR compliance information to them when appropriate. With investigations involving employer/employees, some of the information that may be distributed includes PSIS leaflets, copies of worker safety regulations, sample training program and training record and application record, and compliance pamphlets. We developed a leaflet for the restaurant industry to help explain pesticide use requirements which could be used by the San Bernardino County Food Service Division of the County Health Department during their routine sanitation inspections. Over the last few years we have had to propose civil penalties against some of the restaurant employers because employees suffered pesticide-use related illness/injuries due to violations involving training, personal protective equipment, and "use in conflict" issues. We have performed a few antimicrobial investigations at a large teaching hospital where we previously had multiple investigations, but due to contact with our department in the

earlier investigations, this hospital has developed an excellent pesticide safety training program and an excellent illness reporting system, often notifying our department immediately after occurrence of an incident, long before we receive a Doctor's First Report. Although this hospital continues to have an occasional illness/injury incident, they are working to increase their supervision program and help reduce the number of incidents. We are now having issues with multiple illness reports coming from the Chino Institution for Men & Women prisons.

We have begun using the new SAW database system to receive notifications by e-mail of some pesticide-related illnesses from the California Poison Control System. This new notification process has greatly improved our ability to start illness investigations more quickly. However, some of the doctors' initial reports are delayed by up to six months in reaching us and some reports are still being sent to us with no contact information, hindering our ability to perform the investigations quickly. The majority of these reports continue to involve pool chemicals or small children or adults being exposed to bleach products.

INSPECTIONS

The PUE Officers are fully licensed, trained, and performing inspections on their own. Total inspections for FY 10/11 were 1,087 and FY 11/12 inspections totaled 734 due to the lack of staff. Reduced staff also resulted in only 767 inspections in calendar year 2013. We were attempting to hire at least one additional officer in the coming year to help increase these numbers, but a recent abrupt retirement has reduced our staff even further.

This department has always fully cooperated with DPR in the area of oversight inspections and we look forward to and welcome DPR's involvement in the future. We view DPR as a resource to improve our inspection quality and techniques. During 2013, we were able to perform oversight inspections on a "mostly" monthly basis.

Appointments generally are not made to perform application inspections because it is important to observe the handlers working in their normal routine, without prior knowledge that someone will be observing. All of the application inspection forms are reviewed by the Supervisor to ensure completeness and to verify that the business is not performing pest control out of category or without being registered.

Headquarters and Business Records inspections can be scheduled because it is often difficult to meet the responsible person at their office, but officers have been instructed to perform these unannounced as well because the law requires that the businesses have all paperwork and records ready, up to date and available when we request them. The officers have been instructed to continue to inspect as many headquarters as possible, with emphasis being placed on the Agricultural Pest Control locations.

Landscape maintenance companies performing pest control without possessing an agricultural pest control business license continue to be a problem. These companies have a financial

advantage (money saved on licensing, registration and insurance) over licensed companies and from our experience have a much higher rate of worker safety violations. Our ongoing policy is to inspect every application involving a vehicle with pest control equipment where the vehicle is unmarked or the business name is not familiar to us. If a pesticide application is not taking place at the time of observation, we will still make contact with the business for the purpose of explaining regulations and the requirements for licensing and registration. We maintain a list of unlicensed businesses/individuals that we have contacted over the years. We again this year received some indirect assistance from Los Angeles County due to notices they sent out to all the C-27 (landscape contractors) licensees based in Los Angeles, Orange, and San Bernardino Counties. The notices explained the possible need for a Maintenance Gardener Pest Control Business License. Unfortunately, we have still found numerous C-27 companies in violation, resulting in Civil Penalty Actions being taken.

Through our own previous focused activity involving the structural fumigation certification phase and other counties' focused activities on the aeration phase, our department realized that significant safety shortcuts were being taken by Branch 1 structural fumigation licensees and companies. These shortcuts potentially impact the safety of the public and of the company employees. For these reasons, an enforcement presence will continue to be maintained at a high level in these two problem areas of structural fumigation. With the new CAP, it is difficult to perform just an aeration inspection because of the timing involved so we have been performing more certification inspections. The number of structural NOIs for 2013 was 3,020 which is an increase from 2012 when we received 2,790 and 2011 when we received 2,639. These numbers are still way down from the 2006 total of about 5,000 NOIs but as the housing market continues to rebound, the NOI's will keep increasing. We performed 161 structural fumigation inspections during FY 10/11, 305 inspections in calendar year 2012 and 190 inspections in 2013.

A continued goal for our county will be to place more emphasis on inspecting growers who apply their own pesticides as opposed to those who hire outside companies to apply pesticides for them. Additionally, we will continue to put more effort into Certified Producers for permits, grower ID's and inspection.

FY 10/11 AND CALENDAR YEARS 2012 & 2013 STATISTICS

On the agricultural pest control side, 90 of the 255 application inspections performed during FY 10/11 were on property operators, the remainder on pest control businesses. During calendar year 2012, 76 of the 203 application inspections were on property operators and in calendar year 2013, 59 of the 137 inspections were on property operators. This low number will be addressed in an attempt to increase our property operator inspections in the coming year.

The non-compliance rate has been high during monitoring of pest control businesses (70 out of the total 104 violations noted); this is because of the many unlicensed maintenance gardener pest control (landscape maintenance) businesses observed applying pesticides. The majority of the non-compliances continued to be related to worker safety, with failure to wear eye/hand protection and failure to post emergency medical care being the majority of the total non-

compliances. Most of the non-compliances for failure to wear eye/hand protection were documented during mix/loads and applications made from hand sprayers.

Additional inspections included:

Commodity Fumigation Inspections : In calendar year 2012, 12 Commodity Fumigation Inspections were performed with no non-compliances. Calendar year 2013 saw only 11 inspections, with four non-compliances. Commodity fumigations of grain mills with methyl bromide are almost always performed on Saturdays by the licensed pest control business and while we have always made every effort to inspect each fumigation, an increase in the number of fumigations of lumber required for the issuance of Phytosanitary certificates to Mexico has forced us to scale back this goal.

Field Worker Safety Inspections : 8 non-compliances were noted during 16 inspections performed in FY 10/11 (one inspection w/ 5 violations and two inspections with 3 violations each), 2 non-compliances were found during 4 inspections in 2012 and no violations were found during 8 inspections in 2013.

Headquarter/Employee Safety/Business Records Inspections: 15 non-compliances were noted during the 105 Headquarter/Employee Safety Inspections performed and one non-compliance was documented during the 43 Agricultural Business Records Inspections performed in FY 10/11. For calendar year 2012, there were 3 non-compliances during 55 Headquarter/Employee Safety Inspections and 23 non-compliances documented during 13 Agricultural Business Records Inspections. Calendar year 2013 saw 15 non-compliances during 76 Headquarter/Employee Safety Inspections and 11 non-compliances documented during 51 Agricultural Business Records Inspections.

Structural Fumigation Inspections totaled 161 with 8 non-compliances documented during FY 10/11, 148 Structural Fumigation Inspections with 4 non-compliances during calendar year 2012 and 190 Structural Fumigation Inspections with 14 non-compliances during calendar year 2013. When we perform fumigation inspections, the fumigant introduction phase is the area where the industry has historically followed regulations. Our presence during the introductory phase is a deterrent to the licensees from taking short cuts and committing violations, as we cannot document violations until fumigant has actually been released. For this reason, we see the vast majority of violations during the certification phase. Almost all of these violation incidents resulted in civil penalties being proposed because of the potential hazard to the employees of the fumigation company, the public, and the environment.

Branch 2 and 3 Structural Pest Control Inspections totaled 166 (150 and 16 respectively) Structural Pest Control Inspections in FY 10/11 with 39 non-compliances, 156 (151 and 5 respectively) Structural Pest Control Inspections with 25 non-compliances in 2012 and 67 Branch 2 only (no Branch 3) Structural Pest Control Inspections with 24 non-compliances in 2013. The number of non-compliances is primarily due to handlers failing to wear their personal protective equipment.

Structural Business Records Inspections were performed 21 times with 0 non-compliances and 12 Structural Headquarter/Employee Safety Inspections with 2 non-compliances were performed in calendar year 2012. 50 Structural Business Records Inspections with 9 non-compliances and 19

Structural Headquarter/Employee Safety Inspections with 6 non-compliances in calendar year 2013.

We continue to monitor all inspection and violation trends, keep abreast of any new regulations, and constantly reassess our county's staffing needs, priorities and unanticipated workloads so that we can perform an optimum number of high quality inspections.

ENFORCEMENT RESPONSE

When deciding whether a civil penalty should be proposed, we follow the Enforcement Response Regulations. The goal in the coming year is to have the vast majority of actions proposed within a one-month period following documentation of the violations, with a significant number being proposed within a few weeks of the violations. The decision to take enforcement action, the details (code sections and penalty amounts) of the action, and the written narrative was previously made only by the Deputy in the past, with final approval given by the Commissioner before each Notice of Proposed Action is sent out. The Supervisor has now been reviewing Violations as they are turned in and writing the Notice of Proposed Actions. The Deputy, within the month, either issues a Decision Report which is sent to DPR or proposes a Fine Action, with final approval by the Commissioner. NOPAs are drafted in a consistent manner and DPR Enforcement Response Regulations & Guidelines are followed. Compliance is the overall goal, and all enforcement options are considered.

First contact of an unlicensed agricultural pest control business is handled as discussed earlier in the Inspections section. When we discover agricultural pest control businesses performing work outside their license categories, a Cease and Desist Order is issued to those businesses. Additional information can be obtained from the Officers concerning their inspections; this helps in reaching enforcement decisions.

During FY 10/11, 92 (33 structural and 59 agricultural) civil penalties were proposed and three hearings were held. 52 civil penalties were proposed in FY 11/12, with the large majority of penalty actions for violations found in 2012 being deferred to 2013 due to lack of staffing. In 2013, 79 Notice of Proposed Actions (26 structural and 53 agricultural) were issued and only one hearing was held. The Hearing Officer for PUE actions previously alternated between the department's Assistant Commissioner and the Exclusion/Detection Deputy. In 2012 and 2013, due to staffing realignment and/or reduction, only the Assistant Agricultural Commissioner / Sealer could hear PUE cases as the Hearing Officer. The Advocate has traditionally only been the Deputy, but this will change to include the Supervisor occasionally as the PUE Deputy must also be the Advocate for all Weights & Measures cases as well.

Unlicensed businesses and individuals receive warning letters from us as a result of our pesticide dealer audits and telephone directory and on-line / newspaper reviews. Our policy for proposing civil penalties against unlicensed landscape maintenance companies that we inspect in the field is

that all companies will receive a fine for violations of FAC Section 11701 unless the landscape contractor (C-27) exemption applies. The fine is usually placed in Class B near the minimum amount unless the business has been previously warned or fined. Inspections that result in only a "single" worker safety violation are usually not assessed fines unless the company has been previously contacted by our department or the violations are significant and there is a high potential for health effects occurring.

The new CCR Sections 6128 and 6130 (Enforcement Response Regulations) went into effect in September 2011. The new regulations should decrease the number of Decision Reports written for Class "C" violations, the most minor category. The Deputy historically wrote all the Decision Reports as a matter of consistency and managerial control. In 2013, both the Deputy and the Supervisor were involved in writing Decision Reports. The DPR EBL will be notified immediately when any respondent has requested a hearing, both in agricultural and structural civil penalty cases. The EBL will also be notified at the time our department refers any cases to other agencies for enforcement action, such as licensing action or prosecution.

Collection of the fines has been a minor problem, with fines from unlicensed pest control (landscape maintenance) businesses being the most difficult to collect. These problem accounts have been turned over to County Collection, with limited success. In the future, these accounts may be filed with the Clerk of the Superior Court in order to obtain a Final Judgment.

San Bernardino County also maintains a regular contact with the local DPR Enforcement Branch and our assigned liaison in Anaheim for procedural guidance and situations unfamiliar to us. We also refer misbranding and unregistered pesticide issues to the DPR Product Compliance Branch.

BY: _____ **DATE:** **2/12/14**

Deputy Commissioner/Sealer