ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACTS (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.)

1. Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate whether this regulation:

- [x] a. Impacts businesses and/or employees
- [x] b. Impacts small businesses
- [ ] c. Impacts jobs or occupations
- [ ] d. Impacts California competitiveness
- [x] e. Imposes reporting requirements
- [ ] f. Imposes prescriptive instead of performance
- [x] g. Impacts individuals
- [ ] h. None of the above (Explain below. Complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.)

(if any box in items 1 a through g is checked, complete this Economic Impact Statement.)

2. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: -2,800 Describe the types of businesses (include nonprofits); primarily small dairy and poultry facilities and small food-handling establishments not already hiring pest control businesses. Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: 95

3. Enter the number of businesses that will be created: ____________________________ eliminated: ____________________________

Explain: ____________________________

4. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts: [x] Statewide [ ] Local or regional (List areas):

5. Enter the number of jobs created: 0 or eliminated: 0 Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacted: ____________________________

6. Will the regulation affect the ability of California businesses to compete with other states by making it more costly to produce goods or services here?

- [ ] Yes [x] No If yes, explain briefly: ____________________________

B. ESTIMATED COSTS (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.)

1. What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime? $9 million

a. Initial costs for a small business: $118,150

b. Initial costs for a typical business: $negligible

c. Initial costs for an individual: $negligible

d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: ____________________________

Annual ongoing costs: $118,150

Annual ongoing costs: $negligible

Annual ongoing costs: $negligible

Years: life

Years: life

Years: life
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2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of total costs for each industry: Poultry/dairy & other livestock 50 percent, food establishments 50 percent.

3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements. (Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted): $ 100

4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs? □ Yes □ No If yes, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: and the number of units: ____________________________

5. Are there comparable Federal regulations? □ Yes □ No Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal regulations: These regulations meet federal goals stated in the 2010 Risk Mitigation Decision for rodenticides enforceable.

Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: $ ____________

C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS (Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.)

1. Briefly summarize the benefits that may result from this regulation and who will benefit: Enhanced protection of California wildlife by ensuring that these rodenticides, which have a potential to accumulate in rodents and cause adverse impacts to predators, are purchased and used by certified pesticide applicators who have the knowledge and skills to use the products.

2. Are the benefits the result of: □ specific statutory requirements, or □ goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority? Explain: Food and Agricultural Code 14004.5 and 14005

3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation over its lifetime? $ unquantified

D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.)

1. List alternatives considered and describe them below. If no alternatives were considered, explain why not: Indoor use-only designation considered in 2005, but determined unfeasible due to food industry standards. There are no other alternatives to achieve the same level of environmental protection and maintain the availability of these rodenticides for critical public health uses.

2. Summarize the total statewide costs and benefits from this regulation and each alternative considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation:</th>
<th>Benefit: $</th>
<th>Cost: $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1:</td>
<td>unquantified</td>
<td>9 M (lifetime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: Benefits are realized through increased protection of California wildlife. The cost of these benefits cannot be quantified.

4. Rulemaking law requires agencies to consider performance standards as an alternative, if a regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or equipment, or prescribes specific actions or procedures. Were performance standards considered to lower compliance costs? □ Yes □ No Explain: The use of second generation anticoagulant rodenticides is voluntary. There are alternative rodenticide products.

E. MAJOR REGULATIONS (include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.) Cal/EEPA boards, offices, and departments are subject to the following additional requirements per Health and Safety Code section 57005.
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1. Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business enterprises exceed $10 million? □ Yes ☑ No (If No, skip the rest of this section.)

2. Briefly describe each equally as an effective alternative, or combination of alternatives, for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed:
   Alternative 1: ____________________________________________
   Alternative 2: ____________________________________________

3. For the regulation, and each alternative just described, enter the estimated total cost and overall cost-effectiveness ratio:

   Regulation: $ ___________________________ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ ___________________________
   Alternative 1: $ ___________________________ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ ___________________________
   Alternative 2: $ ___________________________ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ ___________________________

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 6 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

   □ 1. Additional expenditures of approximately $ ___________________________ in the current State Fiscal Year which are reimbursable by the State pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code. Funding for this reimbursement:

   □ a. is provided in ___________________________ Budget Act of ___________________________ or Chapter ___________________________ Statutes of ___________________________.

   □ b. will be requested in the ___________________________ Governor's Budget for appropriation in Budget Act of ___________________________.

   □ 2. Additional expenditures of approximately $ ___________________________ in the current State Fiscal Year which are not reimbursable by the State pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code because this regulation:

   □ a. implements the Federal mandate contained in ___________________________.

   □ b. implements the court mandate set forth by the ___________________________ court in the case of ___________________________ vs. ___________________________.

   □ c. implements a mandate of the people of this State expressed in their approval of Proposition No. ___________________________ at the ___________________________ election;

   □ d. is issued only in response to a specific request from the ___________________________ , which is/are the only local entity(s) affected;

   □ e. will be fully financed from the ___________________________ authorized by Section ___________________________ of the ___________________________ Code;

   □ f. provides for savings to each affected unit of local government which will, at a minimum, offset any additional costs to each such unit;

   □ g. creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a new crime or infraction contained in ___________________________.

   □ 3. Savings of approximately $ ___________________________ annually.

   □ 4. No additional costs or savings because this regulation makes only technical, non-substantive or clarifying changes to current law regulations.
5. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any local entity or program.

6. Other. CAC offices will be the local agencies responsible for enforcing the proposed regulations. DPR anticipates no fiscal impact to these agencies. DPR negotiates an annual workplan with the CAC's for enforcement activities.

B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

1. Additional expenditures of approximately $______________ in the current State Fiscal Year. It is anticipated that State agencies will:
   a. be able to absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.
   b. request an increase in the currently authorized budget level for the ________________ fiscal year.

2. Savings of approximately $______________ in the current State Fiscal Year.

3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any State agency or program.

4. Other.

C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

1. Additional expenditures of approximately $______________ in the current State Fiscal Year.

2. Savings of approximately $______________ in the current State Fiscal Year.

3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.

4. Other.

FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE

AGENCY SECRETARY 1
APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE

PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE 2
APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE

DATE 7/2/13

DATE 7/8/13

1. The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD.399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6601-6616, and understands the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or department not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.

2. Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD.399.