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	Vaneet Aggarwal	vaneet.aggarwal@cdpr.c[redacted]	916-445-5393

DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400	NOTICE FILE NUMBER
Ground Water Protection	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 Department 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: 31

Describe the types of businesses (Include nonprofits): Growers of agricultural products that use pesticides listed in section 6800(a)

Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: 100%

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

Explain: N/A

5. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts:
- [ ] Statewide
- [X] Local or regional (List areas): See attached.

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:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (REV. 12/2013)

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? $ 51,464

   a. Initial costs for a small business: $364 Annual ongoing costs: $ 356 Years: 5

   b. Initial costs for a typical business: $364 Annual ongoing costs: $ 356 Years: 5

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

   d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: Estimated $1.41 per acre ongoing compliance and mitigation costs see attached

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

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: Food and Agricultural Code sections 13141-13152 mandate DPR to prevent further pesticide pollution of the ground water aquifers of this state.

   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: Protection of ground water from future pesticide contamination from agricultural use of pesticides, thus preventing pesticide pollution of California's ground water aquifers that may be used to supply drinking water. Beneficiaries will be the citizens of California.

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

   Explain: FAC sections 13141-13152, and 13145(d) in particular, require DPR mitigation of pesticide groundwater contamination

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

4. Briefly describe any expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California that would result from this regulation: none expected as a result of regulation.

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: Prohibit use of these pesticide in the proposed 121 sections with pesticide detections. This would not be consistent with existing mitigation measures and more restrictive than necessary to protect ground water.

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

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

Regulation: Benefit: $ not quantified Cost: $ 51,464

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

Alternative 2: Benefit: $ not quantified Cost: $ not quantified

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: none

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 proposed regulation would identify sensitive areas where pesticide users would have compliance options and can adopt alternative measures approved by DPR to provide equivalent protection of ground water.

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:

The incentive for innovation in products, materials or processes:

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:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (REV. 12/2013)

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).

$ 18,288

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: Highway Users Tax Account in the Transportation Tax Fund

Authorized by Section: 2101 of the Streets and Highways 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 _____

_____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (REV. 12/2013)

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
LC for	3-25-19

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
Jw Bonnie	3.28.19

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
Matt Almy	5/10/19

Economic and Fiscal Impact Statement (Std. 399)
Ground Water Protection Areas (DPR 18-001) - Attachment

A. 5. Estimated Private Sector Cost Impacts

Butte, Colusa, Contra Costa, Fresno, Glenn, Kern, Kings, Los Angeles, Madera, Merced, Monterey, San Joaquin, Solano, Stanislaus, and Tulare counties.

B. 1. Estimated Costs

$11,281 first year
40,183 (discounted cost of the next four years using a discount rate each year of 3.75%)
$51,464 lifetime costs

1.d. $11,043 / 7,828 acres = $1.41 compliance cost per acre