San Diego County

Work Plan

Pesticide Regulation Program

2015 and 2016

Work Plan
Pesticide Regulation Program
2015 and 2016

Introduction

San Diego County is unique in many ways:

- The County covers a geographic area of 4,200 square miles with a 2010 population of 3.1 million residents.
- Varied topography creates a wide fluctuation of microclimates resulting in nearly 30 different types of vegetation communities. This diversity allows San Diego County growers to produce more than 200 different agricultural commodities - from strawberries along the coast, to apples in the mountain areas, and citrus in the desert.
- The County has the 5th highest population among counties in the United States and the 19th largest agricultural economy in the United States (U.S).
- The County produces the highest dollar value per acre (more than $450,000/acre) crop of any county in California.
- Our farmers rank number one in both California and the nation in the production value of nursery and floriculture.
- Statewide, the County is in the top five counties for production of nursery products, flowers & foliage, tomatoes (fresh market), lemons, avocados, eggs (chicken), mushrooms, and grapefruit.
- Our farmers produce more than 40 crops which are valued in excess of $1 million dollars each.
- The County has approximately 5,700 farms, more than any other county in the (U.S) with the median size being just four acres. This abundance of small farms is unique to San Diego and results in ag-urban interface issues that underscore the need for vigilance on behalf of the County Agricultural Commissioner (CAC) to ensure safe pesticide use in compliance with laws and regulations.

Thousands of fieldworkers are employed in San Diego County year-round. Fieldworker health and safety are a priority for the Pesticide Regulation Program (PRP), with the program conducting annual fieldworker training over the last 20 years. The training program has a reputation for excellence as demonstrated by repeated requests from another county and the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) in 2014 for PRP to conduct fieldworker training in that county.

San Diego County has a large structural pest control industry. Nearly 400 structural pest control businesses (PCBs) are registered in the County. Of those, 32 PCBs performed nearly 19,000 structural fumigations in 2013, an increase of almost 20% over the last six years.

In addition, San Diego County has a significant landscape maintenance pest control industry with approximately 110 registered maintenance gardener PCBs. More than 200 agricultural PCBs conduct applications in a variety of settings from landscapes to lakes. The structural and landscape maintenance industries account for the majority of urban pesticide applications, excluding antimicrobial use and applications by homeowners.

Program Resources

PROGRAM STAFF

PRP is one of the programs within the San Diego County Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures (AWM). PRP staff is comprised of:

- 11 full-time Agricultural/Standards Inspectors at 100%
- 2 full-time Agricultural/Standards Inspectors at 66%
- 2 Supervising Agricultural/Standards Inspectors at 100%
- 1 Supervising Agricultural/Standards Inspector at 83%
- 2 Office Assistants at 100%
- 2 Office Assistants at 98%
- 1 Deputy Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer at 98%

Three of the 13 inspectors have greater than 10 years of pesticide enforcement experience, six have up to 10 years of experience, and four have less than one year experience. Seven of the 13 inspectors are bilingual.

Two inspectors from the Plant Health and Pest Prevention division, with previous PRP experience, provide cross-division support by conducting pesticide related inspections for PRP during their off season, enhancing the oversight of PRP and providing added resources.

PRP staff is distributed primarily by geographic area, but also work on specific programmatic functions. All inspectors perform agricultural, non-agricultural and structural regulatory activities. They are equipped with smartphones, cameras, mobile computers, portable printers, document scanners, GPS units, personal safety equipment, and vehicles to conduct their field work. Seven inspectors are headquartered at our San Diego office; six are headquartered at the North County office, with three of the six inspectors participating in the County's Government Without Walls program (GWOW). This program maximizes the use of mobile technology and nontraditional work settings to reduce costs and improve operational efficiency.

The PRP division also houses the Hazardous Materials Inventory program. This program operates in conjunction with the Department of Environmental Health's (DEH) Hazardous Materials Division and provides additional opportunity for PRP inspectors to interface with the agricultural community on pesticide and chemical safety. Two PRP inspectors spend about one third of their time each conducting Hazardous Materials Inventory inspections and related activities.

San Diego County uses a web-based data management system, Accela Business Case Management System. PRP has integrated Accela into all aspects of its compliance monitoring and enforcement response activities: registration, inspection, investigation, enforcement response determination, Enforcement/Compliance Action Summary, and Notices of Proposed Action processing. This effort results in real time tracking of data and trend analysis. It also significantly improves operational effectiveness and efficiency.

CORE PROGRAM AREAS

1. Restricted Materials Permitting

a. Current Status

i. In 2013, PRP issued 305 Restricted Materials Permits (RMPs). Over the last several years, the number of RMPs issued in San Diego County has

declined by 70% (from 1,000 to the current 305). PRP staff continues to work to reduce the number of restricted materials permitted by reviewing RMPs annually, discussing with growers their need for certain pesticides, and promoting consideration of possible alternatives to reduce the use of restricted materials. This interaction, combined with the availability of no-restricted pesticides, has led to an overall decrease in the number of restricted materials used. The majority of permits were issued for one to three pesticides. In 2013, 79% of RMPs were agricultural and 21% were non-agricultural.

ii. PRP has recently revised its Notice of Intent (NOI) business practices. PRP staff were trained in the revised business practices and are issuing RMPs in accordance with approved business practice:

   1. Ensuring NOIs for rodenticide baiting are time and site specific per Title 3 of the California Code of Regulations section 6434.
   2. Addressing field fumigation NOIs with a separate, more detailed, business practice and allowing only members of the specially trained Field Fumigation Team to review and approve NOIs for field fumigations.

iii. PRP has also recently revised its soil fumigant permit process. The Field Fumigation Team trained in using the new management plans and will implement the revised plans at the beginning of the 2015 soil fumigation season in February.

iv. Recognizing the value of unique agricultural site evaluations, PRP currently conducts Pre-Application Site Evaluations of 5% of all agricultural use NOIs per Title 3 of California Code of Regulations section 6436.

v. Due to adverse effects on non-target wildlife, the second generation anticoagulant rodenticides (SGARs) were recently designated as California restricted materials that require a permit for their use. PRP staff has been educating SGAR users and following up on reported use to ensure that those using SGARs are in compliance with the new regulations. Since the new regulations went into effect on July 1, 2014, 172 businesses reported use of SGARs to the CAC.

vi. Due to documented exposure cases, ambient and off-site levels of chlorpyrifos in the air, and off-site runoff in surface water, DPR has determined the active ingredient chlorpyrifos to be designated a California restricted material requiring a permit when labeled for use in the production of an agricultural commodity. The new designation is anticipated to go into effect in 2015. From 2007 to 2013, the amount of chlorpyrifos product used in San Diego County dropped 32%. In 2014, 58 businesses in the County reported the use of chlorpyrifos.

vii. Abamectin is a federally restricted use pesticide that does not require a permit for use in California. However, the San Diego CAC has required a conditional use permit for aerial applications since 2005. The CAC is in process of reevaluating this requirement. The reevaluation is expected to be concluded during the time frame of this work plan.

viii. PRP issues five commodity fumigation permits each year. Two staff

member are assigned as the commodity fumigation leads and they ensure that all pesticide and air quality requirements are met through all phases of the process.

ix. PRP staff encouraged growers and businesses to use online reporting via the CalAgPermits System (CAPS). In 2014, San Diego County surpassed the halfway mark with 51% of all growers and businesses self-reporting pesticide use online.

b. Planned Improvements

i. Implement a policy to issue restricted material permits for soil fumigant use in consideration of the potential environmental impacts and in accordance with the Department of Pesticide Regulation Pesticide Use Enforcement Program Standards Compendium Environmental Impact Report Functional Equivalency Evaluation Requirements.

ii. Continue to train and closely monitor the Field Fumigation Team to ensure continued conformance to DPR and CAC permit conditions and approved business practices.

iii. Continuous training of staff for efficiencies related to CAPS. In 2015, a CAPS/Accela interface will be completed allowing PRP Accela Operator Identification (OPID) database to download CAPS information on a weekly basis. Updated site information in Accela will auto-populate site related fields for conducting Monitoring, Pre-Application Site Evaluation, Field Fumigation, and Fieldworker Safety inspections. Benefits of automation:

1. Elimination of time consuming manual search of CAPS and hand entering site specific information into Accela.
2. Mailing addresses, phone numbers, and other business information will be updated for easy contact reference and to auto-populate Accela Mobile Office inspections reports.
3. Increase inspection report information accuracy.
4. Ability to customize OPID report in Accela to print out individual OPIDs on demand. Report includes information on using on-line use reporting and other information not present on the CAPS generated OPIDs.
5. Ability to batch-print all OPIDs at the end of the year using Accela. If a company is deleted or inactivated in CAPS, they will automatically be given an inactive status in Accela.
6. Ability to run various real time queries in Accela using the most current information.

c. Goals and Projected Deliverables

i. Ensure that all PRP inspectors are trained in the revised RMP/NOI business practices.

ii. Follow revised RMP/NOI business practices including all required documentation when issuing permits or evaluating NOIs.

iii. Field Fumigation Team will review soil fumigant permit process prior to issuance of RMPs.

iv. Field Fumigation Team will follow the revised field fumigation NOI business

practice.

v. Continue training for members of Field Fumigation Team to ensure uniformity with other CACs doing a high volume of field fumigation inspections and DPR recommended permit conditions. Continue to send Field Fumigation Team inspectors to the Central Coast Pesticide Use Enforcement Roundtable.

vi. Evaluate no less than 5% of the sites identified in agricultural RMPs and document evaluation on Pre-Application Site Evaluation forms. To address areas with potentially greater hazards or potential for complaints, priority will be given to evaluating sites where field fumigations and aerial applications will be conducted. Priority will also be given to applications at sensitive sites.

vii. Ensure that all rodenticide RMPs conform to regulations and DPR guidance in regards to requiring NOIs to be time and site specific.

viii. Inspect 10% of businesses with RMPs for SGARs. Provide information regarding SGAR regulations during inspections. Conduct follow up with businesses found to be out of compliance with SGAR regulations in an effort to ensure compliance.

ix. Facilitate the transition of chlorpyrifos to a California restricted material requiring a RMP for use when producing an agricultural commodity by:

1. Conducting outreach to growers and businesses on the new restricted status and requirements.
2. Encouraging growers/businesses to consider alternatives to chlorpyrifos to meet their pest control needs.
3. Monitor those using chlorpyrifos in production agriculture have a RMP and comply with permit conditions.

x. Conduct a site evaluation or a monitoring inspection with each non-agricultural RMP holder annually.

d. **Measures of Success**

i. Minimize the impact of the use of restricted materials to the public, pesticide applicators, fieldworkers, and the environment.

ii. Trained PRP inspection staff employing revised business practices for RMPs and NOIs in conformance with regulations, department conditions, and DPR guidance.

iii. Trained Field Fumigation Team employing revised business practices in conformance with DPR guidance and other CACs conducting a high volume of field fumigation inspections.

iv. Rodenticide RMPs/NOIs in compliance with regulations, department conditions, and DPR guidance.

v. SGARs used in compliance with all regulations and permit conditions.

vi. Chlorpyrifos permitees are informed of the new requirements regarding the use and reporting of the material. All chlorpyrifos use in compliance with regulations and permit conditions.

2. Compliance Monitoring

a. Current Status

i. PRP conducted an average of 1,230 regulatory inspections in 2012 & 2013. Of those inspections, 59% were agricultural and 41% were structural. From year-to-year the number of inspections may fluctuate depending on the number of public complaints, pesticide illness incident investigations, quarantines, or other factors such as workload reprioritization, funding adjustments, or emergency projects.

ii. The criteria for prioritization of inspections will be reviewed with inspection staff during staff meetings. When conducting inspections, higher priority is given to inspections based on the following criteria:

1. Applications using more toxic materials, more hazardous formulations, fumigants, and restricted materials.
2. Sensitive sites/surrounding areas and applications where there is a greater potential for worker and public exposure and environmental impacts.
3. Unlicensed/unregistered companies and individuals.
4. Companies and individuals with a history of non-compliance.
5. Applications that have historically resulted in complaints.
6. More problematic methods of application (aerial, fumigation, and power spraying).
7. A higher number of employees engaged in pesticide work activities (handlers and fieldworkers).

iii. Inspectors record their findings in the "as found condition." All inspection criteria marked as a non-compliance receive appropriate compliance or enforcement actions as required by the Enforcement Response Regulations [3CCR sections 6128-6131] (violation notice, warning letter, civil penalty, or referral to the district attorney, city attorney or state agencies).

iv. San Diego County has been participating in the Structural Fumigation Enforcement Program (SFEP) since January 2009. This program requires structural fumigators to pay a fee per completed fumigation to participating CACs. The CAC must in turn use the funds for structural fumigation (Branch 1) inspections, undercover surveillance, and enforcement activities. AB 1177 authorized an increase in the fee from $5 to $8 on January 1, 2014. The chaptered bill also reauthorized the SFEP until January 1, 2018.

v. As part of the SFEP, San Diego County meets quarterly with the Pest Control Operators of California (PCOC) Structural Fumigation Enforcement Committee (SFEC) to report out on the SFEP supported activities and dialog about compliance monitoring and enforcement activities. In an effort to improve communication and collaboration, the four CACs participating in the SFEP began meeting on a quarterly basis in 2014.

vi. In 2012 and 2013, PRP conducted an average of 386 complete, partial, and undercover Branch 1 fumigation inspections, constituting a 2.1% inspection rate for the average of 18,306 completed structural fumigations within the same time period.

vii. San Diego County has an active, ongoing undercover structural fumigation inspection program. PRP conducts 40 undercover inspections annually with the highest priority given to companies with a history of non-compliance. The SFEC supports the undercover program as an effective means of monitoring Branch 1 compliance with laws and regulations.

viii. In 2014, PRP increased the total percent of structural fumigation inspections from 2% to 3%.

ix. In 2012, DPR adopted regulations to reduce potential runoff of surface water contamination from non-agricultural applications of specified pyrethroid products. The regulations affect the use of 17 pyrethroid insecticides when applied in outdoor non-agricultural settings including structural, residential, industrial, and institutional sites by persons performing pest control for hire. San Diego County strived to promote improved water quality and enforcement of this regulation. PRP focused on reducing pyrethroid surface water contamination by identifying businesses using pyrethroids, exceeding the goal of inspecting 10% of those businesses, and providing information on surface water regulations and following up with those businesses found to be out of compliance. In 2013,

1. 288 businesses were identified as using pyrethroids.
2. 32% (93 of 288) of identified businesses were inspected.
3. 99.9% were in compliance with surface water regulations.

x. PRP monitors pesticide applications that have historically received or may receive public complaints. The County of San Diego Vector Control District uses larvicide to reduce mosquito populations to prevent outbreaks of vector borne illnesses such as West Nile Virus. These applications are conducted by a helicopter pest control business to water bodies in urban areas throughout the county. These high visibility applications have historically resulted in complaints. In 2013, PRP monitored seven aerial larvicide applications.

b. Planned Improvements

i. Use statistical analysis to identify trends in non-compliances and focus inspection activity in non-compliance areas.

ii. Reach out to dealers and businesses, educating them on records compliance in an effort to improve inspection compliance rate.

iii. Inspection staff will add section 6970 of Title 3 of the California Code of Regulations, referencing pyrethroid regulations, to the requirements listed in the Pesticide Use Monitoring Inspections Report and Structural Use Monitoring Inspection Report to indicate that the use of pyrethroids was evaluated.

c. Goals and Projected Deliverables

i. Conduct approximately 1,000 inspections annually with growers, PCBs, fieldworkers, pesticide dealers, and pest control advisors. Priorities will be fumigation inspections and applications using restricted use pesticides, Danger (highest toxicity) labels, chlorpyrifos, SGARs, pyrethroid pesticides, and businesses with employees.

ii. Conduct follow up inspections on all non-compliances when applicable.

iii. Inspect 3% of structural fumigations (Branch 1) to reflect continued regulatory focus. Fumigation inspections will include complete and undercover inspections with priority given to companies with a history of non-compliance.

iv. Identify businesses that utilize chlorpyrifos, SGARs and specified pyrethroid pesticide products through RMPs or pesticide use reports. Inspect 10% of those businesses identified to document compliance with permit conditions and regulations. Provide information regarding requirements during inspections. Conduct follow up with businesses found to be out of compliance in an effort to improve compliance.

v. Inspect all businesses that use organophosphates and carbamates for compliance with the medical supervision requirements of Title 3 of the California Code of Regulations section 6728.

vi. Monitor high visibility aerial larvicide applications that have historically resulted in complaints. PRP staff will conduct at least 15 inspections of these applications to assure public health and safety.

vii. Assign inspector workload goals based on the inspector's work area characteristics and workload activities such as number and types of restricted materials permits, number and type of PCBs, PRP goals and responsibilities, and hazardous materials inventory goals. Inspectors may need to conduct cross-program inspection activities throughout the year. Inspection goals will also reflect the County of San Diego's Strategic Initiatives for safe communities and sustainable environments.

viii. Each supervisor will conduct a monthly field oversight ride-along with their inspectors to ensure appropriate procedures and policies are followed.

ix. Facilitate up to two monthly DPR Enforcement Branch Liaison (EBL) oversight inspections with different inspectors to monitor regulatory activities are conducted according to DPR's standards and guidance.

d. Measures of Success

i. Maintain an effective pesticide monitoring system that promotes the safe and legal use of pesticides in San Diego County to support a thriving agricultural community, healthy residents, and a balanced environment.

ii. Complete and thorough inspections with violations documented with sufficient evidence to address follow up non-compliance activities.

iii. Follow up inspections conducted on all non-compliances when applicable.

iv. All non-compliances noted when conducting inspections or investigations are recorded in the "as found condition." The inspection form with the appropriate notation serves as the violation notice.

v. Licensed businesses found in non-compliance understand the need for compliance and come into conformance with pesticide laws and regulations.

3. Investigation Response and Reporting

a. Current Status

i. There are approximately 147 investigations conducted annually. These investigations are initiated by external stakeholders, such as DPR and Poison

Control, and the public. Incidents may include alleged pesticide exposures or illnesses and complaints of misuse.

ii. Currently, PRP is completing 95% of pesticide illness investigations within 120 days.

iii. PRP responds to all pesticide-related complaints received by our program. Public complaints are often concerning Branch 1 or 2 applications or allegations of a neighbor's misuse of pesticides affecting the complainant's health or property. In 2013, PRP investigated 106 complaints.

iv. Illness referrals received from DPR and Poison Control are often related to the use of antimicrobial products (disinfectants and sanitizers). Antimicrobial referrals comprise approximately 26% of our annual investigations.

v. Priority episode investigations are given focused attention and handled in accordance with DPR guidance. In 2013, PRP handled five priority episode investigations.

vi. In June 2014, PRP automated the complaint process and investigative reports to ensure timely response to public concerns and reported illnesses. Instead of paper reports and evidence packets moving from in box to in box, the process is now handled through Accela and no longer requires the use of paper forms. Once the investigation process is initiated, the inspector is electronically made aware of when his/her input is required. The supervisors and deputy review the reports and evidence electronically. Deputy approval of the investigation is indicated electronically, as well. Investigations can be accessed by CAC staff via the web anytime from anywhere.

b. Planned Improvements

i. With efficiencies gained from automation, PRP is looking to increase the percentage of pesticide illness and complaint investigative reports completed within 120 days of incident notification.

ii. PRP will look at trending of pesticide illness and complaint investigative reports to identify outreach needs.

c. Goals and Projected Deliverables

i. Pesticide investigations are important in determining whether a pesticide use activity is in compliance with pesticide laws and regulations, and in providing information to DPR on labeling issues, reentry intervals, rates of pesticide use, etc. In order for DPR to make exposure determinations, investigative reports will:

1. Provide enough information for the reviewer to identify where problems may be reoccurring.
2. Be conducted promptly and submitted in a timely manner.
3. Be complete and include labels, exposure information, and violations found.
4. Include evidence when violations are found necessary to proceed with enforcement response.

ii. Maintain timely response to pesticide illness incident referrals received from DPR and Poison Control by submitting illness investigative reports to DPR

within 120 days of episode notification or the reasons why the guideline cannot be met will be documented and provided.

iii. Collaborate with DPR to ensure priority investigations receive focused attention and are done according to procedure and timeframe by submitting the priority investigative reports to DPR within 45 days of completing the investigation.

iv. The reporting of public complaints will be welcomed and made accessible to the public and industry members via outreach, the PRP webpage on AWM's website and through open lines of communication for optimal interagency cooperation. All public pesticide-related complaints will be investigated.

v. Provide outreach based on identified trends in illness and complaint investigations.

d. Measures of Success

i. Quality investigative reports produced in a timely manner that meets DPR guidelines.

ii. Complete investigative reports with well documented evidence for violations found, resulting in appropriate compliance and/or enforcement action.

iii. All public complaints of pesticide exposure, illness, and misuse responded to in a timely manner.

iv. Investigate all referrals, whether reported to AWM directly or brought to AWM's attention through other means, San Diego County DEH Hazardous Materials division's weekly incident reports, or media reports.

4. Enforcement Response

Food and Agricultural Code section 12999.5 authorizes the commissioner to issue agricultural civil penalty actions. Business and Professions Code section 8617 also authorizes the commissioner to propose structural civil penalties. Violations are classified according to the Food and Agricultural Code, Business and Professions Code, and Titles 3 and 16 of the California Code of Regulations. PRP has a goal of proposing all Notices of Proposed Action (NOPAs) within 60 days from the date the violation is determined.

a. Current Status

i. In 2014, PRP closed 57 civil penalty cases of which 10 requested hearings. Nine of the NOPAs were upheld in the hearing decisions and one was appealed to the DPR. All penalties were upheld.

ii. When a violation is documented, the commissioner's Enforcement Response Determination (ERD) process is initiated to uniformly apply the Enforcement Response Regulations (ERR). The process includes a detailed review of the inspector's findings documented in the inspection and investigative report with relevant evidence collected to ensure the violation is properly supported. The resulting compliance and/or enforcement action aligns with DPR's interpretation of the ERR and allows the commissioner applicable discretion as necessary. The ERD process is used to analyze trends and determine areas of non-compliance needing additional regulatory focus.

iii. Warning letters are a compliance action used to document violations without imposing a monetary fine. Warning letters are issued when there has been a

Class B/Moderate or a Class C/Minor violation and there is no recent history of violations. San Diego County issued 91 Warning Letters in 2014.

iv. PRP regularly confers with our Enforcement Branch Liaison and others in DPR on cases to assist with achieving appropriate and consistent enforcement.

b. Planned Improvements

i. An automated Warning Letter is planned for implementation in 2015. Automating the Warning Letter will reduce time in preparation and increase consistency and timeliness while still providing the recipient with notice of their violation and potential consequences of future violations.

ii. In 2015/2016, PRP is looking to develop an Accela auto-generated NOPA for the most simple, straight forward violations such as late business registration. Auto-generated NOPAs will reduce the cost of preparing a NOPA by reducing the amount of hours collectively spent generating, processing, and approving each NOPA while increasing consistency and timeliness.

c. Goals and Projected Deliverables

i. Take appropriate compliance and/or enforcement actions according to the ERR with documented consideration of the individual circumstances for each case within identified timeframes.

ii. In the case of certain priority investigation, provide an opportunity to the District Attorney, City Attorney, or Circuit Prosecutor to participate in the investigation and/or pursue a civil or criminal action when a violation may have occurred.

iii. Continue to refine and streamline internal procedures for processing enforcement actions within the resources of the department, preparing Notices of Proposed Actions, evidence packets, and identifying responsible parties within 60 days of the date the violation was determined.

iv. Facilitate DPR review of NOPAs involving incidents that meet the human health Priority Episode criteria and any violations that had substantial adverse effect to human health prior to being signed by the CAC.

v. Notify the DPR EBL of any structural or agricultural enforcement cases referred to outside agencies, such as the Structural Pest Control Board for licensing action or to the city/district attorney for prosecution, in a timely manner. Submit referrals of structural companies with a history of chronic non-compliances to the Structural Pest Control Board for licensing actions.

d. Measures of Success

i. ERR applied uniformly in a fair, effective and timely manner to all compliance and enforcement actions.

ii. NOPAs processed and issued within 60 days of the determination of the violation.

iii. All NOPAs upheld in hearing decisions and on appeals.

PRIORITIES AND OTHER PESTICIDE REGULATORY ACTIVITIES

5. Enforcement Staff Training

a. Current Status

i. San Diego County and PRP have experienced many staff changes in the past couple of years. Out of 13 inspectors, four have joined PRP within the last year, one supervisor has less than one year with the division.

ii. AWM recognizes the importance and necessity for a highly knowledgeable and trained staff. Training is performed on several levels. DPR and other state trainings are utilized when available. The deputy and supervisors regularly train and update inspectors on specific aspects of pesticide regulation.

iii. DPR provides local training, review, evaluation, feedback and guidance through EBL. The EBL reviews permits, investigation reports and inspections for accuracy and completeness and conducts regular ride-along oversight inspections with inspectors.

iv. Specific focus is placed on training in core responsibilities, such as permit issuance, inspections and investigations as outlined in the DPR *Pesticide Use Enforcement Program Standards Compendium:*

1. Volume 3, Restricted Materials and Permitting,
2. Volume 4, Inspection Procedures, and
3. Volume 5, Investigation Procedures

v. In 2013 and 2014, DPR's EBL conducted a series of monthly trainings with PRP inspection staff on Investigation Procedures (2013) and Inspection Procedures (2014).

vi. PRP staff also recently participated in Investigative Training (2014), one-day Structural Training (2013), and Restricted Materials and Permitting (2014). In addition, seven of the newer employees took part in the three-day Structural Regulatory Training (2014).

vii. Training also extended to reaching across cultural barriers in the "Breaking Barriers" training which San Diego County hosted and to driving safely in "Coaching the Experienced Driver" attended by all PRP staff (both in 2014).

viii. In 2013 and 2014, PRP inspectors were part of a groundbreaking Basic Inspector Academy created by AWM that focused on imparting inspection skills and professionalism to incoming inspectors. This course was adopted and expanded by the County of San Diego's Land Use and Environmental Group's Workforce Development Team to become the "You"niversity Inspector Series.

b. Planned Improvement

i. Focus on providing training that will broaden and deepen the knowledge and experience of the newer inspectors, in addition to specialized training for the more experienced inspectors.

ii. Continue development of the Basic Inspector Academy to fine tune the curriculum to deliver optimal results.

c. **Goals and Projected Deliverables**

i. Provide a minimum of six enforcement trainings annually, focusing on pesticide regulation activities, such as permit issuance, investigative procedures, residue sampling, inspection procedures, and civil administrative hearings.

ii. Facilitate DPR provided training when available.

1. Host regional DPR Apiary Inspectors Training in early 2015.

iii. Participation in Cal/EPA Basic Inspector Academy for newer inspection staff to ensure consistent, effective, and coordinated compliance and enforcement.

iv. Provide regular hands-on opportunities and coaching feedback as learning approaches.

d. **Measures of Success**

i. A highly trained, accurate, consistent and efficient work force.

ii. Consistently professional responses to complainant and industry concerns.

iii. Inspections and investigations conducted in a professional, consistent, and timely manner.

iv. Engaged and inquisitive employees who are seeking opportunities to deepen and apply their knowledge and skills.

v. An experienced workforce that is able to mentor and train new employees.

6. **Outreach**

Outreach to the regulated community provides a proactive method of disseminating information about requirements to growers, applicators, fieldworkers, structural and agricultural businesses, and other operations that use pesticides. Outreach is also done to connect with the public in an effort to educate about pesticide and antimicrobial safety.

a. **Current Status**

i. Supervisors and inspectors participate in providing presentations to diverse groups of pesticide users. They also disseminated pesticide and antimicrobial information from exhibit booths at public events, and even providing radio interviews in Spanish in an effort to reach out to maintenance gardeners who use pesticides.

ii. In 2013, 31 outreach events were conducted involving over 1,000 attendees, including Target Specialty, San Diego Botanic Garden's Insect Festival, Tijuana River Valley Community Garden, Helix Water District, San Diego Beekeeping Society, County of San Diego Girls' Detention Facility, and San Diego Golf Course Superintendents' Conference. Topics included surface water regulations, CAPS, personal protective equipment, pesticide laws and regulations, proper pesticide storage, pesticide-related illnesses/injuries, and how to avoid illnesses/injuries with antimicrobial pesticides used on the job.

iii. Outreach has been consistently conducted to promote the use of CAPS for pesticide use reporting. One-on-one outreach has helped to answer questions and guide users to a successful CAPS experience. To date in 2014, CAPS outreach has been conducted with 177 growers, 38 non-production agricultural users, 30 agricultural PCBs, 30 structural PCBs, and

15 dual licensed businesses for a total of 290 contacts.

iv. San Diego's CAC is one of two in California that holds quarterly outreach meetings with Branch 1 fumigation companies and product representatives operating in the county. Topics are varied with two way discussion involving enforcement issues and general concerns of the CAC and industry.

v. PRP also participates in the monthly meetings of the San Diego PCOC, giving regular updates and information, in addition to providing enforcement-related presentations.

vi. In 2014, two articles involving pesticide-related topics were composed by PRP staff and published in the San Diego Farm Bureau Newsletter.

b. Planned Improvements

i. San Diego County is developing a countywide marketing campaign to raise awareness of and increase participation in county sustainability and pollution prevention programs so every person considers and makes informed decisions about their effects on the environment. AWM will be contributing to this countywide goal in promoting and conducting agricultural pesticide container recycling events in an effort to divert these materials from landfills.

ii. Outreach to maintenance gardeners who use pesticides will continue to be a focus for PRP. San Diego County is being considered for a pilot program of maintenance gardener testing being proctored by the CAC instead of DPR. We want to conduct additional outreach to increase the percentage of licensed maintenance gardeners if funding is available.

c. Goals and Projected Deliverables

i. Conduct at least 10 targeted outreach activities annually.

ii. Conduct a minimum of two fieldworker training sessions in Spanish utilizing bilingual staff annually.

iii. Continue with quarterly San Diego Fumigation meetings as a discussion forum for industry and PRP.

iv. Submit at least one article addressing compliance issues or regulatory updates to professional trade journals or other publications annually.

v. Include compliance information on various topics in the registration renewals mailed at the end of each year to growers, pest control businesses, pest control advisors, and farm labor contractors.

vi. Provide compliance assistance to individuals and groups making quarantine compliance treatments. During eradication projects, attend public meetings as needed to provide information about pesticide application requirements and perform monitoring as appropriate to ensure compliance.

vii. Promote the use of technology such as CAPS to maximize resources and increase efficiency and effectiveness.

viii. Conduct two agricultural pesticide container recycling events in 2015.

d. Measures of Success

i. Relevant and engaging outreach presentations that address significant pesticide-related issues.

ii. An informed community in regards to safe antimicrobial and pesticide use.

iii. The health of people and the environment safeguarded by PRP promotion of the safe and legal use of pesticides.

iv. Reduction of agricultural pesticide containers in landfills.

ADDITIONAL PESTICIDE REGULATORY ACTIVITIES

- Assist DPR in taking produce out of the channels of trade when found to have illegal pesticides residues or residue levels in excess of established pesticide tolerances.
- Work collaboratively with the Regional Water Quality Control Board and AWM's Agricultural Water Quality (AWQ) Program on issues pertaining to pesticides and water quality.
- Educate industry and enforce chloropicrin mitigation measures when implemented by DPR.
- Report to DPR complaints or reports of loss related to bee kills associated with alleged pesticide applications.
    - This will take on new significance with the pending approval of a Beekeeping Proposal by the County Board of Supervisors in 2015. The Proposal promotes beekeeping while protecting public safety. The Bee Ordinance is being revised to reflect these changes.
- Ensure that PRP responds in a timely, efficient, and effective manner to major pesticide-related incidents by developing protocols to follow in the event of a pesticide emergency. PRP will work with Sheriff, Fire, DEH Hazardous Materials division, DPR, and industry stakeholders to develop a plan to follow when responding to major pesticide-related incidents.
- Continue to participate on the Environmental Task Force.

Work Plan Duration

San Diego County PRP will revise its work plan biennially.

Work Plan
Pesticide Regulation Program
2015 & 2016

California Department of Pesticide Regulation
&
San Diego County
Department of Agriculture, Weights & Measures

Department of Pesticide Regulation

Name: Jahan Motakef

Signature: Jahan M Motakef

Title: Environmental Program Manager I

Date: March 5, 2015.

San Diego Department of Agriculture, Weights & Measures

Name: Ha Dang

Signature: Dang

Title: County Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer

Date: 3-5-15