

Performance Evaluation of the [County Name] County Agricultural Commissioner Pesticide Use Enforcement Program

Blue text – information, example, to be added, or option (e.g., meet/not meet) to be chosen by author

This report provides a performance evaluation of the [County Name] County Agricultural Commissioner's (CAC) pesticide use enforcement (PUE) program for the calendar year(s) (CY) [Insert Year]. The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) conducts these evaluations at least once every three years, as required by 3 CCR section 6394. The report evaluates the performance of goals identified in the CAC's enforcement work plan as well as the program's adherence to DPR standards in the Pesticide Use Enforcement Standards Compendium <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/enforce/compend.htm>

I. Summary Report of Core Program. This section identifies the evaluation findings.

A) Restricted Materials Permitting:

The restricted materials permitting program was found to **meet / not meet** DPR standards and work plan goals.

B) Compliance Monitoring:

The compliance monitoring program was found to **meet / not meet** DPR standards and work plan goals.

C) Enforcement Response:

The enforcement response program was found to **meet / not meet** DPR standards and work plan goals.

D) Summary Statement:

II. Evaluation of Core Program Effectiveness and Work Plan Goals

A) Restricted Materials Permitting:

- 1) Permit Issuance. The [County Name] CAC permit issuance procedures and performance were evaluated through observation, records review, and interviews of relevant staff and were found to **conform / not conform** to DPR standards and expectations, including the determination of whether feasible alternatives existed or were required. The [Insert Number] biologist(s) that issue permits possess "Pesticide Regulations" and "Investigation and Environmental Monitoring" licenses.

**Performance Evaluation of the [County Name] County Agricultural Commissioner
Pesticide Use Enforcement Program**

Blue text – information, example, to be added, or option (e.g., meet/not meet) to be chosen by author

Table 1. Permits and Operator IDs, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	Restricted Materials Agricultural Permits	Non-agricultural Permits	Operator IDs

- 2) Site Evaluation. The [County Name] CAC site evaluation procedures were evaluated through records review and interviews of relevant staff, and were found to **conform / not conform** to DPR standards and expectations.

The permits and Notices of Intent (NOI):

Table 2. NOIs and Pre-application Inspections, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	NOIs Received	Pre-Application Inspections	Percent Pre-Application Monitored

The [County Name] CAC conducted pre-application inspections on [Insert Number] % of their [Insert Number] agricultural NOIs during CY [Insert Year], and on [Insert Number] % of their [Insert Number] agricultural NOIs during CY [Insert Year]. Note: 3 CCR section 6436 requires monitoring of at least 5% of the NOIs.

B) Compliance Monitoring:

- 1) Inspections.

Performance Evaluation of the [County Name] County Agricultural Commissioner Pesticide Use Enforcement Program

Blue text – information, example, to be added, or option (e.g., meet/not meet) to be chosen by author

The county CAC inspection procedures were evaluated through DPR oversight inspections and records review and found to **conform / not conform** to DPR standards and expectations. The [Insert Number] biologist(s) that possess “Pesticide Regulation” and “Investigation and Environmental Monitoring” licenses perform inspections. Inspections are performed according to DPR policies and procedures.

Inspections performed by the CAC were found to:

Table 3. Inspections, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	Agricultural & Non-Agricultural	Structural

2) Investigations.

The [County Name] CAC investigation procedures and performance were evaluated through observation, records review, and interviews of relevant staff, and were found to **conform / not conform** to DPR standards and expectations. The CAC refers and/or notifies DPR and other agencies as required. Investigations are submitted on approved forms and in the approved format. The investigations document violations and the CAC collects evidence according to DPR standards.

Table 4. Investigations, by Calendar Year*

Calendar Year	Incidents/ Investigations Initiated	Investigations Completed

*Note that the number initiated and completed may refer to different time periods

C) Enforcement Response:

1) Compliance Actions.

The [County Name] CAC enforcement responses were evaluated

Performance Evaluation of the [County Name] County Agricultural Commissioner Pesticide Use Enforcement Program

Blue text – information, example, to be added, or option (e.g., meet/not meet) to be chosen by author

through observation, records review, and interviews of relevant staff, and were found to **conform / not conform** to DPR standards and expectations.

The CAC’s enforcement response was found to have:

Table 5. Enforcement Responses, by Calendar Year

Calendar Year	Completed Agricultural Civil Penalties	Completed Structural Civil Penalties	Compliance Actions	Decision Reports

2) Enforcement Actions.

The [County Name] CAC enforcement responses were evaluated through observation, records review, and interviews of relevant staff, and were found to **conform / not conform** to DPR standards and expectations.

The CAC’s enforcement response was found to have:

III. Recommended Corrective Actions on Core Program Areas, when Required

DPR and [County Name] CAC have jointly identified these corrective actions:

This issue will be addressed by:

IV. Non-Core and Other Pesticide Regulatory Activities

V. Priorities and Other Pesticide Regulatory Activities
