STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (REV. 12/2013)

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

DEPARTMENT NAME	CONTACT PERSON	EMAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER
Pesticide Regulation	Ken Everett	ken.everett@cdpr.ca.gov	916-324-3897

DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400	NOTICE FILE NUMBER
Closed Mixing Systems	Z

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

If any box in Items 1 a through g is checked, complete this Economic Impact Statement.
If box in Item 1.h. is checked, complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.

2. The Dept. of Pesticide Regulation (Agency/Department) estimates that the economic impact of this regulation (which includes the fiscal impact) is:

- [x] Below $10 million
- [ ] Between $10 and $25 million
- [ ] Between $25 and $50 million
- [ ] Over $50 million *[If the economic impact is over $50 million, agencies are required to submit a Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c)]*

3. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: 2,170

Describe the types of businesses (Include nonprofits): See attached

Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: 74%

4. Enter the number of businesses that will be created: 0 eliminated: 0

Explain: Proposing tiered mitigation scheme when closed mixing systems to provide safe working environment.

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

6. Enter the number of jobs created: 0 and eliminated: 0

Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacted: N/A

7. 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:

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

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? $ 1,208,907

   a. Initial costs for a small business: $ 344 (2014) Annual ongoing costs: $ 0 Years: 15

   b. Initial costs for a typical business: $ 344 (2014) Annual ongoing costs: $ 0 Years: 15

   c. Initial costs for an individual: $ Annual ongoing costs: $ 0 Years: N/A

   d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: N/A

2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of total costs for each industry:

   100 percent of agricultural commodity producers

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.* $

4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs? ☐ YES ☒ NO

   If YES, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: $

   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: See attachment

   Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: $ 0

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

1. Briefly summarize the benefits of the regulation, which may include among others, the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety and the State's environment: Persons who handle pesticides, primarily employees of agricultural businesses and farms, will benefit by using the tiered closed mixing systems from the potential hazards of pesticides.

2. Are the benefits the result of: ☐ specific statutory requirements, or ☒ goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority?

   Explain: DPR has broad authority to provide a safe work environment granted in the Food and Agricultural Code.

3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation over its lifetime? $ $ benefit not quantified

4. Briefly describe any expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California that would result from this regulation:

   New businesses could develop new closed mixing systems or current business may develop new closed mixing systems in addition to current inventory.

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: See attached

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

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

Regulation: Benefit: $ not quantified Cost: $ 1,208,907

Alternative 1: Benefit: $ not quantified Cost: $ 0

Alternative 2: Benefit: $ _____ Cost: $ _____

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: N/A

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: Changing to performance based requirement will result in improved industry compliance with the regulation.

E. MAJOR REGULATIONS *Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.*

California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) boards, offices and departments are required to submit the following (per Health and Safety Code section 57005). Otherwise, skip to E4.

1. Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business enterprises **exceed $10 million**? ☐ YES ☒ NO

If YES, complete E2. and E3
If NO, skip to E4

2. Briefly describe each alternative, or combination of alternatives, for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed:

Alternative 1: _____

Alternative 2: _____

(Attach additional pages for other alternatives)

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

Regulation: Total Cost $ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ _____

Alternative 1: Total Cost $ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ _____

Alternative 2: Total Cost $ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ _____

4. Will the regulation subject to OAL review have an estimated economic impact to business enterprises and individuals located in or doing business in California exceeding $50 million in any 12-month period between the date the major regulation is estimated to be filed with the Secretary of State through12 months after the major regulation is estimated to be fully implemented?

☐ YES ☒ NO

If YES, agencies are required to submit a Standardized Regulatory Impact Assessment (SRIA) as specified in Government Code Section 11346.3(c) and to include the SRIA in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

5. Briefly describe the following:

The increase or decrease of investment in the State: Investment in the State will increase due to the need for industry to purchase new closed mixing systems.

The incentive for innovation in products, materials or processes: Changing to a performance based requirement will allow industry to develop new products and designs.

The benefits of the regulations, including, but not limited to, benefits to the health, safety, and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment and quality of life, among any other benefits identified by the agency: see C.1. above

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 in the current State Fiscal Year which are reimbursable by the State. (Approximate) (Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).

$ _____

☐ a. Funding provided in _____

Budget Act of _____ or Chapter _____, Statutes of _____

☐ b. Funding will be requested in the Governor's Budget Act of _____

Fiscal Year: _____

☐ 2. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year which are NOT reimbursable by the State. (Approximate) (Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code).

$ _____

Check reason(s) this regulation is not reimbursable and provide the appropriate information:

☐ a. Implements the Federal mandate contained in _____

☐ b. Implements the court mandate set forth by the _____ Court.

Case of: _____ vs. _____

☐ c. Implements a mandate of the people of this State expressed in their approval of Proposition No. _____

Date of Election: _____

☐ d. Issued only in response to a specific request from affected local entity(s).

Local entity(s) affected: _____

_____

☐ e. Will be fully financed from the fees, revenue, etc. from: _____

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;

☐ g. Creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a new crime or infraction contained in _____

☐ 3. Annual Savings. (approximate)

$ _____

☒ 4. No additional costs or savings. This regulation makes only technical, non-substantive or clarifying changes to current law regulations.

☐ 5. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any local entity or program.

☐ 6. Other. Explain _____

_____

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

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 in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

$ _____

It is anticipated that State agencies will:

☐ a. Absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.

☐ b. Increase the currently authorized budget level for the _____ Fiscal Year

☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

$ _____

☒ 3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any State agency or program.

☐ 4. Other. Explain _____

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 in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

$ _____

☐ 2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)

$ _____

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

☐ 4. Other. Explain _____

FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE	DATE
	11/19/14

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 departments not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.

AGENCY SECRETARY	DATE
	12/11/14

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

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER	DATE

Attachment to STD 399 - Closed Mixing Systems

STD 399 Sections with additional explanation:

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A3. The regulations apply to the production of plant agricultural commodities and to those pest control businesses who apply pesticides to plant agricultural commodities.

.

B5. Currently, the U.S. EPA does not have regulations for closed mixing systems (CS), although certain pesticides require the use of CS by label requirements. This regulation is a modification to the current regulation which was originally placed in effect over 35 years ago to protect employees who mix and apply pesticides for the Agricultural Industry.

D1. Maintain current regulation. This alternative was rejected because data indicated that some employees were injured by the CS itself instead of the pesticide. As recently as 2011, growers were not able comply with the regulation due to the lack of CS commercially available for purchase or replacement parts for now obsolete closed mixing system devices. DPR needed to address these issues by allowing more flexibility in the regulation. The issue of potential inconsistent retail availability of commercial devices will be satisfied largely by adopting the "Tier II" design criteria. Under this proposal, most pesticides requiring the use of closed mix systems would be a Tier II device. Tier II devices are similar to those CS devices available in all other states. The proposal also requires that employees be provided clear written operating instructions. This should reduce the potential for injuries resulting from improper use of CS devices.