
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Senator Blakespear, Chair

2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 2477
Author: Chen
Version: 4/8/2026
Urgency: No
Consultant: Taylor McKie

Hearing Date: 6/24/2026
Fiscal: Yes

SUBJECT: Structural pest control

DIGEST: This bill authorizes an unlicensed individual employed by a structural pest control company to apply pesticides under the supervision of a licensed field representative or operator, as defined, on and after January 1, 2028.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Authorizes the state’s pesticide regulatory program and mandates the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) to, among other things, provide for the proper, safe, and efficient use of pesticides essential for the production of food and fiber, for the protection of public health and safety, for the protection of the environment from environmentally harmful pesticides, and to assure agricultural and pest control workers safe working conditions where pesticides are present by prohibiting, regulating, or otherwise ensuring proper stewardship of those pesticides. (Food and Agriculture Code (FAC) §§ 11401, et seq.)
- 2) Establishes within the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) the Structural Pest Control Board (SPCB), which is vested with the power to, and is required to, administer structural pest control and establishes as the intent of the Legislature that the primary mission of the SPCB is consumer protection. (Business and Professions Code (BPC) § 8520; BPC § 8520.2)
- 3) Defines “structural pest control,” with respect to household pests and wood destroying pests or organisms, or other pests that may invade households or other structures, including railroad cars, ships, docks, trucks, airplanes, or the contents thereof, the engaging in, offering to engage in, advertising for, soliciting, or the performance of, any of the following:
 - a) Identification of infestations or infections;

- b) The making of an inspection or inspections for the purpose of identifying or attempting to identify infestations or infections of household or other structures by those pests or organisms;
 - c) The making of inspection reports, recommendations, estimates, and bids, whether oral or written, with respect to those infestations or infections; and
 - d) The making of contracts, or the submitting of bids for, or the performance of any work including the making of structural repairs or replacements, or the use of pesticides, or mechanical devices for the purpose of eliminating, exterminating, controlling or preventing infestations or infections of those pests or organisms. (BPC § 8505)
- 4) Establishes the following three classifications for purposes of delimiting the type and character of structural pest control work authorized by licensure:
- a) “Branch 1 – Fumigation,” defined as the practice relating to the control of household and wood-destroying pests or organisms by fumigation with poisonous or lethal gases.
 - b) “Branch 2 – General pest,” defined as the practice relating to the control of household pests, excluding fumigation with poisonous or lethal gases, and
 - c) “Branch 3 – Termite,” defined as the practice relating to the control of wood-destroying pests or organisms by the use of insecticides, or structural repairs and corrections, excluding fumigation with poisonous or lethal gases. (BPC § 8560(b))
- 5) Defines “structural pest control applicator” as any individual who is licensed by the SPCB to apply pesticides in Branch 2 or Branch 3 on behalf of a registered company. (BPC § 8507.1)
- 6) Specifies that a structural pest control applicator shall not contract for pest control work or perform pest control work on their own behalf. (BPC § 8507.1(a)(2))
- 7) Establishes that protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the SPCB in exercising its licensing, regulatory, and disciplinary functions. Establishes that whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount. (BPC § 8520.1)
- 8) Prohibits an unlicensed individual in the employ of a registered company from applying any pesticides included in Branch 2 or Branch 3, with the exception

of an authorization for an individual to apply pesticides for the purposes of training under the direct supervision of a licensed field representative or operator employed by the company, for 90 days from the date of employment. Further specifies that this direct supervision means in the presence of the licensed field representative or operator at all times, and prohibits the 90-day time period from being extended. (BPC § 8551.5)

- 9) Establishes that any individual 18 years of age or older may apply for licensure as a structural pest control applicator, subject to passage of a written examination that tests sufficient knowledge in pesticide equipment, pesticide mixing and formulation, pesticide application procedures and pesticide label directions for purposes of Branch 2 and Branch 3 services. (BPC § 8564.5)
- 10) Requires every company that engages in the practice of structural pest control, as a sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, or other organization or any combination thereof, to be registered with the SPCB. (BPC § 8610)
- 11) Requires the SPCB to designate DPR as its agent to oversee the CAC structural pesticide use regulatory work. Requires the SPCB and DPR to jointly develop a training program specifically relating to the various aspects of structural pest control and train all County Agricultural Commissioners and other personnel involved in structural pest control investigations and enforcement. (BPC § 8616)
- 12) Provides that the Legislature finds and declares that it is the joint responsibility of the Department of Food and Agriculture, the CAC under the direction and supervision of the director of DPR, and the SPCB to regulate the activities of structural pest control licensees. Provides that the SPCB has responsibility for licensing persons and companies engaged in structural pest control work. Provides that DPR has primary responsibility for enforcing pesticide laws and regulations. (FAC § 5201)
- 13) Authorizes the director of DPR to adopt regulations to carry out the structural pest control provisions of the FAC. Requires the director to consult with the SPCB when developing regulations that pertain to the use of pesticides by structural pest control licensees. (FAC § 15203)

This bill:

- 1) Defines “direct supervision” to mean the direction of actions authorized by these provisions by a licensed operator or field representative who shall be physically present on location and immediately available to intervene.

- 2) Defines “supervision” to mean either direct supervision or the direction of actions authorized by these provisions by a licensed operator or field representative who is immediately available to the unlicensed individual during pesticide application, either by being physically present at the site or through audio and video communication with access to the customer's relevant information and the ability to intervene by directing onsite personnel.
- 3) Authorizes an unlicensed individual employed by a registered company who has applied for a structural pest control applicator examination in Branch 2 or Branch 3 to apply pesticides included in Branch 2 or Branch 3 under the supervision of a licensed operator or field representative for a period of up to 60 days, commencing upon Live Scan approval, as described, if all of the following conditions are met:
 - a) The unlicensed individual has submitted a complete structural pest control applicator examination application to the SPCB, with specified evidence;
 - b) The unlicensed individual has completed a minimum of 80 hours of documented, in-person training in pesticide application under the direct supervision of a licensed operator or field representative; and
 - c) The unlicensed individual has submitted fingerprint identification to, and completed a background investigation with, the board.
- 4) Requires the supervising licensee to maintain documentation demonstrating compliance with the conditions that authorize an unlicensed individual to apply pesticides, as described, under supervision of a licensed operator or field representative.
- 5) Requires that the authorization period of 60 days:
 - a) Be granted once per individual;
 - b) Commence upon Live Scan approval;
 - c) Not be renewed or granted again, as described; and
 - d) Terminate upon license issuance, application denial, or expiration of the 60-day period, whichever occurs first.
- 6) Prohibits the authorization period of 60 days from overlapping with or extending any training or supervision period associated with the 90-day period of direct supervision, as described.
- 7) Authorizes an unlicensed individual to begin operating under the supervision of a licensed operator or field representative for the authorization period of 60 days prior to completing the 90-day period of direct supervision.

- 8) Removes eligibility of the unlicensed individual to operate under direct supervision for the 90-day period and forfeits any remaining time under the 90-day period upon commencement of the authorization period of 60 days.
- 9) Makes these provisions operative on January 1, 2028.
- 10) Makes related findings and declarations.

Background

- 1) *Regulating structural pest control.* Structural pest control is the control of household and wood-destroying pests and organisms which may invade households or structures, including railroad cars, ships, docks, trucks, airplanes, or the contents thereof. Practicing structural pest control involves engaging in, advertising for, soliciting, or the performance of various activities, including the identification of infestations or infections, inspections, generating inspection reports or contracts (including recommendations, estimates, and bids), or the application of pesticides, insecticides, rodenticides, fumigants, or other substances or devices that eliminate, exterminate, control or prevent infestations or infections.

DPR, which is housed in CalEPA, is vested with the primary authority to regulate and enforce pesticide laws in California. DPR oversees the CAC structural pesticide use regulatory work, including inspections, investigations, and related enforcement activities. The SPCB, which is housed in the Department of Consumer Affairs, administers the licensing of structural pest control applicators, field representatives, structural pest control operators and registered companies. Both SPCB and DPR contract with CACs to monitor structural pest control activities and pesticide use at the local level. CACs conduct local enforcement of pesticide laws and perform inspections and investigations related to pesticide use, including structural applications.

- 2) *Structural pest control licensing.* There are three types of structural pest control licenses administered by the SPCB: applicator, field representative, and operator licenses. Each license may be issued under the following three branches that delimit the type and character of work in practicing pest control:
 - a) Branch 1 – Fumigation: The practice relating to the control of household and wood-destroying pests or organisms by fumigation with poisonous or lethal gases;
 - b) Branch 2 – General Pest: The practice relating to the control of household pests, excluding fumigation with poisonous or lethal gases; and

- c) Branch 3 – Termite: The practice relating to the control of wood-destroying pests or organisms by the use of insecticides, or structural repairs and corrections, excluding fumigation with poisonous or lethal gases.

This bill implicates unlicensed individuals that are in the process of obtaining an applicator license. Licensed applicators apply pesticides for the purpose of eliminating, exterminating, controlling or preventing infestation or infections of pests or organisms on behalf of a registered structural pest control company. Licensed applicators are only authorized to apply pesticides in Branch 2 or Branch 3. This license is entry-level and many people begin working in the structural pest control industry as an applicator, although it is not required before becoming licensed as a field representative. Licensed applicators are prohibited from conducting the work that falls primarily under the purview of field representatives and operators, such as contracting for pest control work or performing pest control work on their own behalf.

- 3) *A long road to licensing.* To become a licensed applicator, prospective licensees must submit an application for examination through the SPCB online licensing system and pay a \$60 application fee. Once approved by the SPCB, the prospective licensee would schedule the applicator examination within six months of approval date. SPCB contracts with PSI Exams to administer the licensure examination. Through the examination, prospective licensees must demonstrate sufficient knowledge of pesticide equipment, pesticide mixing and formulation, pesticide application procedures, and pesticide label directions. Once they pass the exam, prospective licensees must complete a Live Scan fingerprinting and background check, submit an applicator license application, submit information to their employer, upload the completed Live Scan, and pay a \$35 license fee.

This process can feel quite lengthy to employers and prospective licensee in need of employment. Processing examination applications through the SPCB can take at least two weeks, plus any lag time on the applicant's part. Because the examination is conducted with a third-party contractor that may have scheduling limitations, scheduling and completing an exam may take around two months. Following passage of the exam, processing license applications through the SPCB can take at least another two weeks and physical licenses typically arrive in 2-4 weeks, though licensed applicators can begin work as soon as their license number is issued.

In total, this process may take at least three months, which may inconvenience smaller businesses with limited resources and prospective licensees in need of work. While there is a legal pathway for prospective licensees to perform work

under direct supervision, the current authorization presents challenges, particularly for small businesses.

- 4) *Unlicensed supervision.* Unlicensed individuals that have been employed by a registered structural pest control company are authorized by law to apply pesticides for the purposes of training and under the direct supervision of a licensed field representative or operator of the company. Direct supervision means that the licensed field representative or operator is physically present and immediately available to intervene. This authorization is only valid for a 90-day time period, which was extended from 30 days by SB 1244 (Lieu, Chapter 560, Statutes of 2014).

This bill expands the authorization for an unlicensed individual to apply pesticides under supervision, as defined, if certain conditions are met. AB 2477 delineates between “direct supervision” and “supervision”, as supervision can be conducted either by being physically present or through audio and video communication and “the ability to intervene by directing onsite personnel”. If the unlicensed individual has submitted an applicator examination application to the SPCB, completed at least 80 hours of in-person training under direct supervision, submitted fingerprint identification to the SPCB, and completed a background check, then the unlicensed individual would be authorized to apply pesticides under virtual supervision for a time period that does not exceed 60 days.

Additionally, this bill prohibits this 60-day unlicensed practice under supervision from conflicting with the 90-day unlicensed practice under direct supervision. If practice under the 60-day supervised period occurs, then any remaining time within the 90-day direct supervised period would be forfeited.

Comments

- 1) *Purpose of Bill.* According to the author, “AB 2477 will provide a limited, carefully structured pathway for newly hired pest control employees to perform supervised pest control applications for a narrow provisional period, helping small pest control businesses maintain operations while new employees complete the state licensing process. This bill will ensure that our state’s small pest control businesses onboard new workers and maintain service capacity in an efficient manner.”
- 2) *Current limitations of unlicensed practice.* With the current law, unlicensed individuals are able to obtain up to about three months of training under direct supervision of a licensed field representative or operator. This authorization

allows the prospective licensee to gain hands-on experience and stay employed while awaiting the approval of applications or examination. For smaller businesses, which may consist of five or fewer employees and make up 75% of structural pest control businesses according to the sponsors, the framework of this authorization can present a challenge. Businesses may not have enough licensed and authorized personnel to accompany unlicensed individuals for this practice, and if they do, businesses may experience cost pressures when dispatching pairs of personnel for one job.

By allowing virtual supervision, if certain conditions are satisfied, businesses would be relieved of any cost pressures associated with personnel constraints while allotting time for hands-on experience and employment for unlicensed individuals undergoing the licensing process.

- 3) *Picking a pathway.* With licensing time delays as a key factor that influences this need, it is worth noting that the authorization proposed by this bill could potentially shorten the amount of time available to a prospective licensee to gain hands-on experience and earn income. Current law allows for a 90-day training period under direct, in-person supervision, which is about the duration of the licensing process. This bill would allow an equivalent of 10 days of training under direct, in-person supervision (80-hour minimum training requirement), followed by 60 days of unlicensed practice with virtual supervision. At the commencement of any activity that involves virtual supervision, the 90-day training period would be forfeited, so at most, 20 days would be lost.

The trade-offs presented to structural pest control companies with the two authorization pathways include: 1) expending additional resources by dispatching a licensed supervisor to accompany the unlicensed trainee to their benefit of 20 additional days of hands-on experience; or 2) conserving resources at the expense of 20 days less of hands-on experience. The question becomes what companies may value more and whether those additional 20 days enhance the training of the prospective licensee. It could be argued that there is little incentive for companies to select the current 90-day authorization pathway, potentially making it obsolete. This is an important consideration given that more companies may take advantage of this new 60-day authorization pathway, leading to an increase in unlicensed practice without direct supervision. Because it is extremely important that pesticide application work is properly conducted and in a manner that protects public health and safety, careful policy design around this 60-day authorization is essential.

- 4) *Avoiding de facto applicators.* In order to qualify for the proposed 60-day authorization pathway that allows for virtual supervision, the unlicensed individual must do all of the following:
 - 1) Submit a complete structural pest control applicator examination application;
 - 2) Complete a minimum of 80 hours of documented, in-person training in pesticide application under direct supervision; and
 - 3) Submit fingerprint identification and a completed background check to the SPCB.

The author and sponsors have indicated that these conditions provide sufficient guardrails to ensure that virtual supervision would be safe. Given that these provisions would not apply to the application of restricted use pesticides, which requires a license or direct supervision, due to federal preemption and that 80 hours of training under direct supervision must occur, the sponsors do not see a need to have a supervisor physically present for the tasks they anticipate prospective licensees to conduct. Additionally, the sponsors indicated that the work that would be conducted under virtual supervision is simple in nature. In their experience, many prospective licensees have demonstrated an understanding of the work after a few days of practice under direct supervision.

The proposed authorization does defeat the purpose and intent of the existing 90-day training period under direct supervision. An individual could complete 80 hours of training under direct, in-person supervision, which is equivalently 10 days out of the current 90-day authorization period, then receive virtual supervision after submitting an examination *application* and completing a background check.

This then calls to question the nature of virtual supervision. Would a supervisor be immediately available virtually only if the applicator uses their best judgement to discern when they need support to make a call? Or would a supervisor remain available on the handheld device throughout the duration of the work? The sponsors have indicated it would likely be the former to align with current unlicensed practice in agricultural settings and if support is not sought when necessary, or negligence on behalf of a licensed supervisor occurs, then an unlicensed individual would act as a *de facto* applicator without the required license.

There is also a possibility that an unlicensed individual practicing under this 60-day authorization could fail their licensing exam. The most recent reported data indicates an average failure rate of 40% for the applicator written exam

from 2018-2022.¹ In fiscal year 2021/2022, there were 2,739 candidates that took the exam and the fail rate was 35%, therefore over 950 individuals failed the exam. Under the provisions of this bill, those 950 individuals would have been authorized to apply pesticides unlicensed and without direct supervision.

Although the bill does terminate the proposed 60-day authorization after failure of an exam, for one unlicensed individual, that termination could come two months and over a hundred homes too late (potentially thousands of homes each year with the average number of exam applicants). Anecdotally, the failure rate may not correlate with the ability to safely and properly apply a pesticide, as additional factors such as language barriers and education levels may come into play. However, the exam does set a baseline for competency to perform licensed activities, including mixing and formulating pesticides, proper application, and understanding label directions and restrictions.

It is extremely important that pesticide application work is properly conducted and in a manner that protects public health and safety. Improper use or application of pesticides can cause serious harm to the applicator or those that would be potentially exposed. With structural pest control, excessive pesticide application or deviating from label instructions in homes could put those that dwell there at risk, including infants and young children.^{2,3} These populations are especially vulnerable due to their small body-weights, developing immune systems; and immediate exposure routes with close contact to the floor and hand to mouth behavior.^{2,4,5} Research has shown that children exposed to pesticides at home have experienced acute toxic effects on their respiratory, gastrointestinal, nervous, and endocrine systems, and experience higher rates of cancer.²

With consideration of the hazards structural pesticide application pose to sensitive populations, in order to provide a pathway for virtual supervision, the training provided prior to the proposed authorization ought to follow a standard that ensures unlicensed individuals can demonstrate an appropriate level of competency. While the standard may be suited for the work that is typically expected for entry-level trainees, which may deviate from the standard for applicator examinations, it would set a consistent baseline for companies to start from.

¹ Structural Pest Control Board. (2022). Sunset Review Report 2022.

² Sarwar, M., et. al. (2015). Indoor risks of pesticide uses are significantly linked to hazards of the family members.

³ Oudejans, L., et. al. (2020). Remediating Indoor Pesticide Contamination from Improper Pest Control Treatments: Persistence and Decontamination Studies.

⁴ Landrigan, P.J., et. al. (1999). Pesticides and inner-city children: exposures, risks, and prevention.

⁵ Mott, L., et. al. (1997). Our Children At Risk.

- 5) *A framework for training.* The sponsors have indicated that AB 2477's proposed framework to allow unlicensed individuals to apply structural pesticides is inspired by a similar system that is in place for applying pesticides in an agricultural setting. However, in the case of unlicensed practice in agricultural settings, the prerequisite training has stringent requirements in regulation to ensure pesticide application is safely conducted. Allowing unlicensed individuals to apply pesticides without such training requirements, as AB 2477 currently proposes, could create undue risk of inappropriate application and unsafe exposure.

In agricultural settings, unlicensed 'handlers' that have been trained, pursuant to 3 CCR § 6724, may handle and apply pesticides that are not restricted materials in a field without direct supervision. Employers are prohibited from allowing or directing any employee to handle pesticides unless the employee has been trained as a handler and training must be completed before the employee is allowed to handle pesticides (3 CCR § 6764(b)(15); 3 CCR § 6724(d)). State regulations require employers to have a written training program that addresses specified subjects, including, but not limited to understanding product labeling, applicator responsibilities and requirements for safety and related procedures, appropriate use of personal protective equipment, hazards of pesticides, decontamination procedures, hazard communication, and hazards to vulnerable populations, for each pesticide or pesticide group.

These regulations provide structure and consistency in training unlicensed individuals in agricultural settings while ensuring a level of competency. AB 2477 does not specify training requirements, and the 80-hour minimum requirement may be considered arbitrary. It is also worth noting that applying pesticides in agricultural settings comes with a different set of risks compared to that of a structural setting, which includes dwellings and implications for the vulnerable populations that live there.

The SPCB could create a regulatory framework for training unlicensed individuals for structural pest control applications that reflects existing regulations for agricultural handler training to provide more structure and consistency, as well as ensures that pesticide application is conducted in a manner that protects public health and safety.

The author and sponsors of the bill have indicated that requiring SPCB to undergo regulations would place a large regulatory burden upon SPCB and desire to avoid such impacts. With the author and sponsor's additional proposed guardrails, as described in *comment 6*, the statute could outline

general requirements for training unlicensed individuals and regulations could be authorized, if considered necessary. ***The author and committee may wish to consider specifying general training requirements to align with current training requirements for unlicensed agricultural handlers and authorizing SPCB to further specify training requirements in pesticide application through regulation.***

- 6) *Comments from the Senate Committee on Business, Professions, and Economic Development.* This bill was heard in the Senate Committee on Business, Professions, and Economic Development on June 15, 2026. Commitments were made based on the comments raised in the committee analysis. Below are the comments discussed in the committee analysis for the Senate Committee on Business, Professions, and Economic Development and the amendments offered by the author's office in response to some of those comments:
- a) *Senate BPC Comment 1: "Training standards.* As drafted, this bill requires an individual who will be authorized to provide branch 2 and 3 applicator services without the required license if they first have acquired 80 hours of documented in-person training under the direct supervision of a licensed operator or field representative. However, this bill currently lacks any specificity regarding what should be included in those 80 hours of training. *Given that unlicensed applicators will be eligible to provide services without on-site direct supervision, moving forward, the bill should provide greater specificity on what standards should be included in this pathway to licensure."*
 - b) *Senate BPC Comment 2: "What is the Board's Oversight of Unlicensed Trainees?"* Although this bill is not establishing a new license, it will require the Board to be responsible for additional workload. This bill requires that individuals eligible to work under the provisions of this bill meet certain standards: including training, live scan and examination authorization, but there is not a process for the Board to approve, verify or have any knowledge of those authorized to provide unlicensed services pursuant to the provisions of this bill. *Moving forward, the bill should clarify authority for the Board in this space and ensure the Board has the appropriate statutory provisions in place to promulgate necessary regulations."*
 - c) *Senate BPC Comment 3: "Crossover with the Current Training Authorization.* Under current law, an unlicensed individual employed by a registered company, is prohibited from applying pesticides included in Branch 2 or Branch 3 except the unlicensed person is permitted for 90 days

from the date of employment, apply pesticides under direct supervision for training purposes. The difference between the current 90-day training period in current law, and the provision of this bill is that the unlicensed person as proposed in this bill must first obtain 80 hours of training, pass a background check by the Board, and have completed an application for education-and the unlicensed person may provide services without direct supervision. *As currently drafted, this bill tries to ensure that the current unlicensed 90-day training and the unlicensed applicator practice authorized by this bill do not conflict, but as currently drafted, this bill may be confusing for employers and future applicants. Moving forward, unnecessary code references should be removed.*”

- d) *Author requested amendments.* In response to some of the concerns raised above and by this analysis, the author has proposed the following amendments to be taken up by this committee:
- i) Define and limit the authority for unlicensed individuals to practice under supervision in outdoor applications only;
 - ii) Further specify training methods to be included in the 80-hour training requirement;
 - iii) Add four hours of SPCB-approved pesticide focused education;
 - iv) Require recordkeeping and detailed documentation of training conduct; and
 - v) Require notice to SPCB and CACs of unlicensed work under this authorization;

The author and committee may wish to consider adopting the above author requested amendments to narrow the locations that an unlicensed individual can practice, further specify training requirements, and increase oversight of the proposed authorization.

- 7) *Committee amendments. Staff recommends the committee adopt the bolded amendments contained in comment 5 & 6 above.*

DOUBLE REFERRAL:

This measure was heard in Senate Committee on Business, Professions and Economic Development on June 15, 2026, and passed out of committee with a vote of 11-0.

Related/Prior Legislation

AB 307 (Chen, Chapter 82, Statutes of 2023) extended the sunset on the Structural Fumigation Enforcement Program (SFEP) fumigation in Los Angeles, Orange, and Santa Clara Counties from January 1, 2024, to January 1, 2029. This bill was the most recent of many over the previous 30 years that extended and updated the SFEP.

SB 813 (Roth, Chapter 507, Statutes of 2023) extended the sunset date for the SPCB to January 1, 2028, and enacted various changes based on the SPCB's sunset review process.

AB 1480 (Quirk, Chapter 152, Statutes of 2017) authorized the Director of DPR to levy a civil penalty against a person who commits fraudulent activity related to the pesticide applicator licensing process.

SB 1244 (Lieu, Chapter 560, Statutes of 2014) extended the authorization for an unlicensed individual to apply pesticides under direct supervision from 30 days to 90 days, amongst other related provisions.

AB 1053 (Tucker, Chapter 393, Statutes of 1993) established the SFEP, including establishing a two-year pilot project in Los Angeles County to perform structural fumigation inspections and enforcement activities; requiring DPR to contract with Los Angeles County for this purpose; establishing a \$5 fee on each fumigation in the county to fund enforcement activities; and authorizing up to five percent of the revenue to be used for DPR or CAC administrative expenses.

SOURCE: California Pest Management Association

SUPPORT:

None received

OPPOSITION:

None received