DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BUSINESS, CONSUMER SERVICES, AND HOUSING AGENCY . GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD — ADMINISTRATION UNIT 2005 EVERGREEN STREET, STE. 1500 SACRAMENTO, CA 95815 P 916-561-8700 | F 916-263-2469 | www.pestboard.ca.gov



BOARD MEETING

NOTICE and AGENDA

Wednesday, March 25, 2015 1:00 P.M. Thursday, March 26, 2015 8:00 A.M. Department of Consumer Affairs
Hearing Room
2005 Evergreen Street
Sacramento, CA 95815

Contact Person: Susan Saylor (916) 561-8700

AGENDA

The public may provide comment on any issue before the Board at the time the agenda item is discussed.

Wednesday - 1:00 P.M.

- Roll Call / Establishment of Quorum
- II. Flag Salute / Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Petition for Reinstatement
 Ricardo A. Winkler FR 37722 Branch 3
- IV. Closed Session Pursuant to subdivision (c) (3) of Section 11126 of the Government Code, the Board will meet in closed session to consider proposed disciplinary actions, stipulated settlements, and petitions for modification / termination of probation and reinstatement

Return to Open Session

V. Adjournment

Thursday - 8:00 A.M. Resume Open Session

- VI. Statement in recognition, in appreciation and in memory of Darrell Ennes
- VII. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda

 The Board may not discuss or take action on any matter raised during this public

comment section that is not included on this agenda, except to decide whether to place the matter on the agenda of a future meeting. [Government Code Sections 11125, 11125.7(a)]

- VIII. Approval of the Minutes from the January 14 & 15, 2015 Board Meeting
- IX. Executive Officer's Report
 - Licensing and Enforcement Survey Results and Statistics
 - Staffing Changes
 - WDO Statistics
 - Computer Based Testing (CBT) Update
 - Update on Applicator's Expiration Date of June 30
- X. Discussion, Consideration and request for further Board Guidance to the Continuing Education (CE) Integrated Pest Management Review Committee regarding previously recommended changes and/or any other changes to the current CE regulations
- XI. Presentation and Consideration of Structural Pest Control Board Logo
- XII. Presentation and Consideration of Strategic Plan
- XIII. Discussion and Consideration of Potential Regulatory Change to Require All Current Licensees Who Have Not Previously Been Fingerprinted to be Fingerprinted Upon License Renewal
- XIV. Pre-treatment Committee Update
- XV. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration of Proposed Recommended Changes to the Board's Disciplinary Guidelines
- XVI. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Examination Study Guides

The meeting may be cancelled or changed without notice. For verification, please check the Board's website at www.pestboard.ca.gov or call 916-561-8700. Action may be taken on any item on the agenda. Any item may be taken out of order to accommodate speakers and/or to maintain a quorum. Meetings of the Structural Pest Control Board are open to the public except when specifically noticed otherwise in accordance with the Open Meeting Act. The public may take appropriate opportunities to comment on any issue before the Board at the time the item is heard, but the President may, at his discretion, apportion available time among those who wish to speak. If you are presenting information to the Board, please provide 13 copies of your testimony for the Board Members and staff. Copying equipment is not available at the meeting location.

The meeting is accessible to the physically disabled. A person who needs a disability-related accommodation or modification in order to participate in the meeting may make a request by contacting the Structural Pest Control Board at (916) 561-8700 or email pestboard@dca.ca.gov or send a written request to the Structural Pest Control Board, 2005 Evergreen Street, Suite 1500, Sacramento, CA 95815. Providing your request at least five (5) business days before the meeting will help to ensure availability of the requested accommodation.

This agenda can be found on the Structural Pest Control Board's Website at: www.pestboard.ca.gov

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD

January 14 & 15, 2015

The meeting was held on January 14 and 15, 2015 at the Harbor Island Hilton, Skyline Room, 1960 Harbor Island Drive, San Diego, California.

Board Members Present:

Dave Tamayo, President Curtis Good, Vice President Ronna Brand Mike Duran Cliff Utley

Board Staff Present:

Robert Lucas, Assistant Executive Officer
Kathy Boyle, Chief Enforcement Officer
Ron Moss, Board Specialist
David Skelton, Administrative Analyst

Departmental Staff Present:

Kurt Heppler, Legal Counsel Frederic Chan-You, Legal Counsel

Wednesday, January 14, 2015

ROLL CALL / ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

Ms. Saylor read roll call at 1:13 P.M.

Board members Tamayo, Good, Brand, Duran and Utley were present.

Board members Naresh Duggal and Marisa Quiroz were absent.

Quorum established.

PETITION FOR MODIFICATION / TERMINATION OF PROBATION CESAR G. SILVANO – OPR 11237 BRANCH 3

Administrative Law Judge Susan Boyle sat with the Board to hear the Petition for Modification of Probation for Cesar Silvano, Operator License Number 11237. The petitioner was informed that he would be notified by the mail of the Board's decision.

<u>PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT</u> <u>JOSE G. RAMIREZ – FR 42769 BRANCH 1</u>

Petitioner Jose Ramirez, Field Representative License Number 42769, was not present for the hearing. The petitioner will be notified by mail of the Board's decision.

PETITION FOR REINSTATEMENT BARRY R. HERRON – RA 50560 BRANCHES 2 & 3

Administrative Law Judge Susan Boyle sat with the Board to hear the Petition for Reinstatement for Barry R. Herron, Applicator License Number 50560. The petitioner was informed that he would be notified by the mail of the Board's decision.

CLOSED SESSION

Pursuant to subdivision (c) (3) of section 11126 of the Government Code, the Board met in closed session to consider proposed disciplinary actions, stipulated settlements, and petitions for modification / termination of probation and reinstatements.

CLOSED SESSION

The Board convened in closed session pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1) to discuss the evaluation of the Executive Officer.

Return to Open Session

<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

The meeting adjourned for the day at 5:45 P.M.

Thursday, January 15, 2015

ROLL CALL / ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

Ms. Saylor read roll call at 8:00 A.M.

Board members Tamayo, Good, Brand, Duran and Utley were present.

Board members Naresh Duggal and Marisa Quiroz were absent.

Quorum established.

FLAG SALUTE / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Tamayo led everyone in the flag salute and recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments for items not on the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 16 & 17, 2014 BOARD MEETING

Mr. Utley moved and Mr. Duran seconded to approve the minutes of the October 16 & 17, 2014 Board Meeting. Passed unanimously. (AYES: TAMAYO, GOOD, BRAND, DURAN, UTLEY. NOES: NONE. ABSTENTIONS: NONE.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Ms. Saylor reported to the Board on Licensing and Enforcement Survey Results and Statistics, Staffing Changes, WDO Statistics, Computer Based Testing, and the Applicator's Expiration Date of June 30.

Mike Katz, Western Exterminator Company, stated that the passing rate for the Field Representative Examination seemed low and asked what was being done to address it.

Ms. Saylor stated that recently the passing rate has improved but that more exam construction workshops will be held and that a new Field Representative Examination will be put into use in March.

Darrell Ennes, Terminix, asked what the target passing rate is.

Ms. Saylor stated that the target passing rate is anywhere from 30% to 80%.

Ms. Saylor stated that Kathy Boyle has fully assumed her position as the Board's Chief Enforcement Officer and that Noelle Chesley, the Board's Cashiering Technician has accepted an outside position and will be leaving the Board Friday, January 16, 2015. Ms. Saylor further stated that the Board has already begun advertising for Ms. Chesley's position.

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF ACT REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY CHANGES TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTIONS 8506.2, 8508, 8513, 8516, 8519, 8519.5, 8550, 8551, 8552, 8553, 8555, 8611, 8613, 8616.9, 8663, 8698.3 AND CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS SECTIONS 1911, 1970.4, AND DELETION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 8516.5

Bob Gordon, Chairman, SPCB Act Review Committee, presented the Act Review Committee's recommendations for statutory and regulatory changes.

Mr. Tamayo asked if the recommended changes to B&P Code Section 8516(b) purposefully used the word "owner" as opposed to the term "property owner."

Mr. Gordon stated that one of the Committee's goals was for the Act to use consistent language and that if the Board wished it could amend the Committee's recommendations in any manner it deemed appropriate.

Mr. Heppler asked if the Committee's recommendations for change to B&P Code Section 8555 were made at the suggestion of Kyle Muteff, the Board's former legal counsel.

Mr. Gordon stated that the Committee's recommendations for change to B&P Code Section 8555 were made at the suggestion of Kyle Muteff, the Board's former legal counsel.

Mr. Gordon's stated that the Committee's next order of business will be to create definitions.

Lee Whitmore asked why B&P Code Section 8663 was not included in the recommendations being presented at this meeting.

Ms. Saylor stated that B&P Code Section 8663 was not included in the recommendations being presented today because a staff error had omitted a portion of the language the Committee had recommended for change.

Mr. Utley moved and Ms. Brand seconded to approve the recommendations of the Act Review Committee as included in the Board Materials and to authorize Ms. Saylor to find a legislative author to enact those changes and to make any minor changes deemed necessary in conjunction with Mr. Heppler and Mr. Chan-You. Passed unanimously. (AYES: TAMAYO, GOOD, BRAND, DURAN, UTLEY. NOES: NONE. ABSTENTIONS: NONE.)

Mr. Good moved and Mr. Utley seconded to authorize staff to begin the rulemaking process for the regulatory changes recommended by the Act Review Committee as shown in the Board Materials. Passed unanimously. (AYES: TAMAYO, GOOD, BRAND, DURAN, UTLEY. NOES: NONE. ABSTENTIONS: NONE.)

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION (CE) INTEGTRATED PEST MANAGEMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO CURRENT CE REGULATIONS

Darren Van Steenwyk, Chairman, SPCB CE IPM Review Committee, presented the recommendations of the CE IPM Review Committee to the Board.

The Board and members of the public extensively discussed the recommendations made by the CE IPM Review Committee specifically focusing on the following subjects –

- The discrepancy in the recommended CE requirements between Branch 1 and Branch 3 licensees.
- The lack of an hour requirement breakdown for individuals who hold an Applicator license in addition to another license.
- The need for an emphasis on Branch 3 training in the continuing education system.
- The reduction of hours in the Laws and Regulations continuing education category.
- The justification for an increase in the total continuing education hour requirement.
- The need for consumers to be educated in addition to licenses in order for IPM to be implemented effectively.
- The elimination of a Branch specific technical requirement in continuing education.
- The separation of IPM from Application & Intervention

Mr. Duran moved and Mr. Utley seconded to direct the CE IPM Review Committee to continue their work while incorporating the areas of focus identified at today's meeting. Passed unanimously. (AYES: TAMAYO, GOOD, BRAND, DURAN, UTLEY. NOES: NONE. ABSTENTIONS: NONE.)

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE BOARD'S DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES

Mr. Heppler advised the Board that any changes to the Board's disciplinary guidelines would require a regulatory change.

The Board considered the recommended changes to its disciplinary guidelines and along with Mr. Heppler discussed potential additional changes that would provide more specific guidance on appropriate disciplinary action for a given set of circumstances.

Mr. Good moved and Mr. Utley seconded to direct staff to work with legal counsel on further amending the Board's disciplinary guidelines and to bring back a more comprehensive recommendation to a future Board Meeting. Passed unanimously. (AYES: TAMAYO, GOOD, BRAND, DURAN, UTLEY. NOES: NONE. ABSTENTIONS: NONE.)

DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL REGULATORY CHANGE TO REQUIRE ALL CURRENT LICENSEES WHO HAVE NOT PREVIOUSLY BEEN FINGERPRINTED TO BE FINGERPRINTED UPON LICENSE RENEWAL

Ms. Saylor stated that staff identified approximately 5,000 licensees who were licensed prior to July 1, 2004 and had therefore never been fingerprinted and that the proposed regulatory addition would require those who had never been fingerprinted to do so as a condition of license renewal.

Mr. Heppler stated that a requirement of this type is not without precedent and that other programs within the Department of Consumer Affairs have similar regulation in place.

Mr. Heppler stated that the proposed regulatory action would only require that applicants for renewal of licensure who had never been fingerprinted to do so and that the decision to pursue disciplinary action as a result of the information the Board receives from the fingerprint requirement would be at the discretion of Ms. Saylor.

Mr. Duran moved and Mr. Good seconded to direct staff to begin the rulemaking process to implement a requirement that all licensees who have not been fingerprinted to do so as a condition of license renewal. Passed unanimously. (AYES: TAMAYO, GOOD, BRAND, DURAN, UTLEY. NOES: NONE. ABSTENTIONS: NONE.)

PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN

The Board considered the Strategic Plan prepared by the Department of Consumer Affairs SOLID team.

Mr. Heppler suggested a minor change to include the information that the Board moved to Department of Pesticide Regulation and then moved back to Department of Consumer Affairs.

Mr. Good suggested that the Pest Control Operators of California (PCOC) should be mentioned in the section that discusses Assembly Bill 2382 which created the Structural Pest Control Act and Structural Pest Control Board.

The Board asked staff to make minor changes to the Strategic Plan and for it to be brought back at the March 25 & 26, 2015 Board Meeting for approval.

PRESENTATION AND CONSIDERATION OF STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD LOGO

The Board was presented with 8 options to choose from to be the new Structural Pest Control Board logo.

The Board asked to be presented with more options at the March 25 & 26, 2015 meeting and specifically an option that incorporated curved symmetry in the lettering and the structure depicted in the logo.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING EXAMINATION STUDY GUIDES

Martyn Hopper, PCOC, stated that his organization would be happy to work with any interested parties on the creation of examination study guides.

Dr. Andrew Sutherland, UCIPM, stated that UCIPM would also like to participate in the process of creating examination study guides.

Mr. Heppler suggested the Board hold an interested parties meeting on the subject of examination study guides in order to determine what role the Board and other entities could possibly play in their creation.

Mr. Utley moved and Mr. Good seconded to direct staff to work on the creation of examination study guides with PCOC and any other interested parties. Passed unanimously. (AYES: TAMAYO, GOOD, BRAND, DURAN, UTLEY. NOES: NONE. ABSTENTIONS: NONE.)

PRE-TREATMENT COMMITTEE UPDATE

Ms. Saylor stated that she was still looking for industry members to serve on the Pre-Treatment Committee and asked PCOC if they could help in the search.

Martyn Hopper, PCOC stated that he would be happy to help find industry members to serve on the Pre-Treatment Committee.

Mr. Tamayo stated that he asked Eric Paulsen, Chairman, SPCB Pre-Treatment Committee to hold the first Pre-Treatment Committee Meeting prior to the end of February and that hopefully some industry members will agree to participate once the process begins.

BOARD MEETING CALENDAR

The next 3 meetings were previously scheduled for March 25 & 26, 2015 in Sacramento, July 22 & 23, 2015 in San Diego, and October 7 & 8, 2015 in Sacramento.

The following meeting was scheduled for January 13 & 14, 2016 in San Diego.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

The following items were identified as future agenda items -

- The recommendations of the CE IPM Review Committee
- The recommendations for the amendment of the Board's Disciplinary Guidelines
- The approval of the Board's Strategic Plan and Logo
- Recommendations for the creation of examination study guides

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:17 A.M.

Dave Tamayo, Board President	Date

LICENSING UNIT SURVEY RESULTS

March 25 & 26, 2015 - SPCB Meeting December 26, 2014 - March 10, 2015

Response cards are sent to licensees, registered companies, and applicants receiving the following services: Licensure, Renewal of License, Upgrade/Downgrade License, Change of Qualifying Manager, Bond/Insurance, Company Registration, Transfer of Employment, Change of Address, and Examination. 252 survey cards were mailed during this reporting period. 37 responses were received.

Question	Yes	No	N/A
1 Was staff courteous?	97%	0%	3%
2 Did staff understand your question?	97%	0%	3%
3 Did staff clearly answer your question?	94%	2%	2%
4 Did staff promptly return your telephone call?	54%	8%	38%
5 Did staff efficiently and promptly handle your transaction?	91%	7%	2%
6 How long did it take to complete its action on your file?* (Average) 12 d	ays	

^{*}There were 17 responses for question six. The answers ranged from 1 day to 40 days.

Company Registration – 12 days average (5 responses)

Operator License – No responses

Field Representative License – 27 days (2 responses)

Applicator License – 7 days average (1 response)

Transfer of Employment – No responses

Change of Address - No responses

Bond/Insurance - No responses

Change of Qualifying Manager – No responses

Examination – 9 days average (9 responses)

Comments:

- The exam place is a very good area for testing, thank you.
- The delay was on us not Frank. He was wonderful.
- Staff and Board is prompt and efficient. Thank you.
- Frank Munoz was courteous and super helpful. Very nice guy.

- Thank you!
- Highly recommend hiring more staff in your company registration department.
 Need to return calls promptly.
- We have worked with Frank Munoz in the past and have always found him helpful, knowledgeable and professional.
- Would like a faster notification of clearance to the take the test.
- Frank Munoz and Elizabeth Chervenak are the best! They are the "A" team. They were very helpful with getting my Operators license. Prompt call backs and proper work follow up. Thanks.
- It takes too long to get actual license once you pass the test. Should be given temporary license until you get real one in the mail or on the computer.
- The facility was nice and the staff was very friendly. I could not expect more.
- I am really pleased.
- Everyone was very pleasant and efficient.

COMPLAINT HANDLING SURVEY

March 25 & 26, 2015 - SPCB Meeting December 26, 2014 - March 10, 2015

Results from survey cards sent to consumers and companies for closed complaints/cases.

8 responses were received from consumers

	Question	Yes	No	N/R
1	Was our representative courteous?	8_	0	0
2	Do you feel the representative understood your problem?	8	0	0
3	Did our representative fully explain our role and jurisdiction over your problem?	8	0	0
4	Did our representative deal with your problem in a fair and reasonable manner?	5	2	1
5	Were you satisfied with the results?	8	0	0
6	If you experience structural pest control problems in the future, would you contact the Board?	8	0	0
7	Will you recommend our serves to others?	8	0	0
8	How long did it take the Board to complete its action on your problem?*(Average)	14 days		

^{*}There were 5 survey responses from question number 8. The answers ranged from 6 days to 36 days.

6 responses were received from companies

	Question	Yes	No	N/R
1	Was our representative courteous?	5	0	1
2	Do you feel the representative understood the aspects of the case?	5	0	1
3	Did our representative deal with the case in a fair and reasonable manner?	5	0	1
4	Were you given adequate time to resolve the consumer complaint?	5	0	1
5	Were you satisfied with the results?	5	0_	1

COMPLAINT SURVEY RESPONSES March 25 & 26, 2015 - SPCB Meeting

14-461	Company	No Comment
15-76	Company	No Comment
15-78	Company	Thank you for all your help.
15-147	Consumer	Very pleases with how my case was handled to begin with the first person that answered the telephone. She made me aware that I should fax rather than mail my documentation because of the deadline. I wish I had asked for her name.
15-225	Consumer	I cannot express my gratitude in how this case was handled. I would never have been settled with my pursuit for justice alone. Thank you.
15-243	Consumer	The Specialist was very friendly, full of stories and advice, the kind of guy you'd invite over to the weekend barbecue.
15-247	Company	Awesome, thank you!
15-247	Consumer	No Comment
15-272	Company	No Comment
15-278	Consumer	No Comment
15-286	Consumer	Board completed the issue in a very good time.
15-287	Consumer	Did not know about the Board prior to my case, but I amglad they exist. Keep up the good work.
15-287	Company	Case did not require and inspection, thank you.
15-339	Consumer	Thank you for your help! My problem likely would not have been resolved without your intervention.

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD			FISCAL YEAR		
STATISTICS FOR FEBRUARY 2015 Page 1 of 2	2014	2014/2015		/2014	
		Year		Year	
EXAMINATION	Monthly	To Date	Monthly	To Date	
Field Representatives Scheduled	470	3,290	718	3,897	
Field Representatives Examined	293	2,344	583	3,135	
Field Representatives Passed	73	485	134	725	
Field Representatives Failed	220	1,859	449	2,410	
		····			
Operators Scheduled	37	312	67	426	
Operators Examined	24	275	62	383	
Operators Passed		119	27	162	
Operators Failed	5	156	35	221	
A sault potous Turasiand	126	4.000	00.5		
Applicators Examined Applicators Passed	133	1,330	295	1,895	
Applicators Failed	50	598		917	
Applicators Falled	83	732	169	978	
Field Representatives Passing Rate	750/	010/	23%	0007	
Operator Passing Rate	25% 79%	21%	The second secon	23%	
Applicators Passing Rate			44%	42%	
720pheacots 1 assing Nacc	38%	45%	4370	48%	
LICENSING					
Field Representative Licenses Issued	60	376	63	478	
Operator Licenses Issued	13	78	14	119	
Company Registrations Issued	18	145	19	168	
Branch Office Registrations Issued	3	17	4	36	
Change of Registered Company Officers	2	21	1	23	
Change Of Qualifying Manager	8	57	12	<u>23</u> 89	
Applicator Licenses Issued	29	652	96	808	
Duplicate Licenses Issued	103	653	87	609	
Upgrade Present License	19	101	13	119	
Change of Status Processed	26	198		249	
Address Change	67	913	THE OWNER OF THE OWNER OF THE OWNER, THE OWN	1,106	
Address Change (Principal Office)	17			170	
Address Change (Branch Office)	5			9	
Transfer of Employment Processed	98			1,006	
Change of Name	0	Company of the last of the las		10	
Change of Registered Company Name	1	6		4	
License Histories Prepared	20			143	
Down Grade Present License	53			259	
LICENSES/REGISTRATIONS IN EFFECT					
Field Representative		10,316		10,058	
Operator		4,020		3,669	
Company Registration		2,957		2,770	
Branch Office		437	**************************************	442	
Licensed Applicator		6,168		5,206	
LICENSES/REGISTRATIONS ON PROBATION					
Companies		23		18	
Licensees		97		85	

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD STATISTICS FOR FEBRUARY 2015 Page 2 of 2	1	YEAR	FISCAL YEAR 2013/2014		
STATE OF THE PROPERTY AND TAGE DOLL	2014/2015 Year		201		
LICENSES RENEWED	Monthly		Monthly	Year	
Operator	1710111111	155		To Date	
Field Representative	<u></u>	906		175	
Applicator	10	362	45	405	
Applicator	10	302	47	317	
LICENSES/ REGISTRATIONS CANCELED					
Operator	2	211	3	171	
Field Representative	11	843		1,010	
Company Registration	46	132	10	92	
Branch Office	2	25	0	22	
Applicator	98			611	
LICENSES DENIED					
Licenses	0	9	3	13	
	<u>_</u>			13	
INVESTIGATIVE FINES PROCESSED					
Fines Processed	\$0	\$104	\$0	\$120	
Penalty Assessment	\$0			\$2,582	
Pesticide Fines	\$8,640			\$61,255	
STAMPS SOLD					
Pesticide	5,590	45,860	5,150	45,660	
TYPE					
WDO					
Filing	0	0	0	0	
SEARCHES MADE					
Public	77	551	108	645	
Complaints	38			385	
BOND & INSURANCE					
Bonds Processed	10	734	260	426	
Insurance Processed	250			J	
Restoration Bonds Processed	0			-,	
Suspension Orders	73	The second secon		218	
Cancellations Processed	70			335	
Change of Bond/Insurance	15	****			
CONTINUING EDUCATION EXAMS					
Field Representative Examined	. 0	0	1	1	
Field Representative Passed	0		The second live of the least of		
Field Representative Failed	0		-{		
Operator Examined			1		
Operator Passed	0			 	
Operator Failed	0	_			
opolition Pariod			V		
Applicator Examined	C		0		
Applicator Passed	C		The second secon		
Applicator Failed	C		The second second second		

WDO ACTIVITIES FILED

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7	
	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	MO. AVG
July	99,163	116,972	110,432	123,958	122,803	113,991
August	104,141	124,622	110,534	116,087	112,400	113,470
September	87,158	117,013	103,223	129,161	116,100	110,596
October	113,586	120,171	120,645	117,714	123,250	119,352
November	90,626	110,723	102,655	103,787	94,750	101,729
December	81,140	91,644	88,935	101,132	95,373	91,121
January	77,774	84,492	94,775	92,959	88,247	86,842
February	83,071	95,226	98,208	88,870	97,884	91,970
March	109,522	108,429	114,785	109,979		112,632
April	117,107	118,528	121,802	122,692		120,854
May	120,792	111,594	115,207	114,956	igaa / raya/	115,841
June	118,929	113,080	116,313	117,773		119,946
FY Total	1,203,009	1,312,494	1,297,514	1,339,068	850,807	1,220,129
AVG PER MO.	100,251	109,375	108,126	111,589	106,351	



February 11, 2015

Susan Saylor Structural Pest Control Board 2005 Evergreen Street, Ste. 1500 Sacramento, CA 95815

Dear Mrs. Saylor,

I am writing to you because of a concern over the process of licensing of new employees. In particular at the applicator level. In the past this was a very workable entry level way to get new employees started in to our company. Now, the system is slower and less affordable to bring in new staff outside of the industry. The price does not bother me, I always thought it was not enough to cover cost, but the delays are not affordable.

I understand in the past that the board had to rent a testing location to administer the test. That would limit how often you can offer the test. With the new testing locations, I would think it is possible to test as often as there is space for the applicant. By delaying how often the test can be given is a huge cost to the company trying to employ the applicant. The average pay for a new technician is \$2,000 to \$2,500 per month. In restricting the test to once a month, the cost can add up quickly. With the passing rate as low as it has been, a company can invest \$4,000 to \$10,000 before they can even produce a single dollar for the company. This can stunt the growth of a company. Also, the terminating of a bad employee could be delayed on the fear of being able to replace that employee with a higher standard person. Additionally, good employees would be let go if they don't pass right away because of the economics of running the company. It is my hope the board can review this policy right away and make the changes that will allow us to continue as we have in the past.

With the new testing locations, I am happy that we have more security over the test process. The delays of making new tests are costly. Not only for the board but, also for the companies in a holding status for new employees. The travel and convenience of taking the test, will be greatly improved. For the companies in the central valley, it was

out of the way before. Thank you for that improvement. I have not been to the new testing locations but, it sounds like it is more practical for the average applicant.

My only other concern, is the validity of entry level applicator test questions. I have heard that Ag related question are on the test. Also, questions that are ambiguous or not clearly definable for a good answer. I cannot verify this claim, but would appreciate if you will look into the complaints that I am hearing about.

I thank you for your help and consideration on these issues. I feel the board does a great job in keeping this industry in good standing with the public. That help everyone to continue the service our communities.

Sincerely,

Saylor, Susan@DCA

From:

Sent:

Monday, March 02, 2015 11:53 AM

To:

Saylor, Susan@DCA

Cc:

Curtis Good

Subject:

Certified Applicator and Br. II Field Representative exam scheduling issues

Dear Susan,

I hope that this email finds you well. I am sorry to have to bother you with some issues we are having regarding the testing centers for applicator licenses.

We have been told by Kibby Robinson at the Structural Pest Control Board that there is now a 30 day waiting period for re-testing on the applicator exam. This was not the case with the written exam as employees were able to take the test again in just a few days. This waiting period will have a huge impact on our ability to employ and license individuals needed for seasonal work.

The processing of test application and licensing paperwork is taking a long time to get through the Board's process. We are waiting at least two weeks for authorization to take both Field Rep and Applicators exams. Sometimes this is longer. Additionally, once an exam has been passed, the waiting period for the license to be issued is 20-30 days typically. This all adds up to a lot of time.

Finally, the number of seats available at testing centers has been very limited. This is especially the case during spring and early summer when demand is high. We have waited as many as 30 days for an available seat at a testing center and have had employees drive from San Diego to Imperial County for an available seat.

All of these issues are affecting our employees and their ability to advance in our industry.

We appreciate all that you do to help our industry and look forward to working with you on helping make this better and easier for everyone to use.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

×

Avg Processing Time (days)

	RA	FR
Exam Application from Being Received to Being Cashiered	4.27	3.57
Exam Application From Being Cashiered to Eligibility Being Sent to PSI	2.33	1.80
Exam App Total Processing (Received to Eligibility Sent to PSI)	6.60	5.37
From Becoming Eligible w/ PSI to Day Candidate Called PSI to Schedule	8.73	17.20
From Date Candidate Called PSI to Actual Exam Date	9.20	17.07
License Application from Being Received to Being Cashiered	4.20	3.60
License Application from Being Cashiered to License Being Issued	2.07	12.67
(Or Fingerprints Received to License Being Issued)		
(Or Crim History / Deficiency Cleared to License Being Issued)		
License App Total Processing (Received to License Being Issued)	6.27	16.27

ı	Examination	Release Date	Passing Rate	# of Examinees	# of Repeat Examinees	
. !		相關關鍵。為自由				
ļ	FR1	3/17/2014	35%	78	32	
	FR2%	EE6/4/2015EE	17751147864	24 14 8 49 Sales	(1947-1947) 28 (1947-1949)	
	FR3	3/1/2015	63%	30	10	
ı			a Philippi August 13.		As a point the cities this are to	
ŀ	OPR1	3/17/2014	27%	34	14	
	-OPR2	4/1/2015	73%	40 45726	Section 13 and 13 and 15 and 1	
. 1	OPR3	1/1/2015	67%	21	10	
	RA	3/1/2015	57%	63	2	
	ere it in the same of					



STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD – ADMINISTRATION UNIT 2005 Evergreen Street, Ste. 1500 P 916-561-8700 | F 916-263-2469 | www.pestboard.ca.gov



MEMORANDUM

DATE	March 12, 2015
то	Board Members
FROM	Susan Saylor, Executive Officer Structural Pest Control Board
SUBJECT	AGENDA ITEM X – CE IPM COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

At the January 14 & 15, 2015 Meeting, during the Board's discussion of the CE IPM Review Committee's recommendations it was noted by a Board Member that the chart illustrating the new CE requirements did not include all possible license combinations.

Enclosed is a revised chart illustrating all possible license combinations and what the corresponding CE requirements would be with the proposed changes.

License combinations that have been added are indicated by asterisk.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD CE IPM REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Committee recommends to the Structural Pest Control Board -

- The creation of 3 new continuing education categories, to replace the existing categories, to be named - Laws & Regulations (L&R), Application & Intervention (A&I), and Integrated Pest Management (IPM).
- Changing the continuing education requirement for Applicators to 3 hours of Laws & Regulations,
 10 hours of Application & Intervention, and 3 hours of Integrated Pest Management.
- Changing the continuing education requirement for Branch 2 and Branch 3 Field Representatives and Operators to 3 hours of Laws & Regulations, 5 hours of Application & Intervention, and 12 hours of Integrated Pest Management.
- Changing the continuing education requirement for Branch 1 Field Representatives and Operators to 3 hours of Laws & Regulations and 13 hours of Application & Intervention.
- That if a license is held in multiple branches the licensee shall complete the larger requirement in each continuing education category that corresponds to the branches in which they are licensed (see grid below).
- That audits on continuing education courses and providers are increased and to make any statutory or regulatory changes that are needed to fund the increase.

CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS BY LICENSE TYPE (PER 3-YEAR RENEWAL CYCLE)

License Type	L&R	A & I	IPM	Total
Branch 2 & 3 Applicator	3	10	3	16
Branch 1 Fr	3	13	0	16
Branch 2 Fr	3	5	12	20
Branch 3 Fr	3	5	12	20
* Branch 1 Fr & Branch 2 & 3 Applicator	3	13	3	19
* Branch 1 Fr & Branch 2	3	13	3	19
Applicator * Branch 1 Fr & Branch 3	3	13	3	19
Applicator				
Branch 1 & 2 Fr	3	13	12	28
Branch 1 & 3 Fr	3	13	12	28
Branch 2 & 3 Fr	3	5	12	20
* Branch 1 & 2 Fr & Branch 3 Applicator	3	13	12	28
* Branch 1 & 3 Fr & Branch 2 Applicator	3	13	12	28
Branch 1, 2 & 3 Fr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 2 Fr & Branch 3 Applicator	3	10	12	25
* Branch 3 Fr & Branch 2 Applicator	3	10	12	25
Branch 1 Opr	3	13	0	16
Branch 2 Opr	3	5	12	20
Branch 3 Opr	3	5	12	20
Branch 1 & 2 Opr	3	13	12	28
Branch 1 & 3 Opr	3	13	12	28
Branch 2 & 3 Opr	3	5	12	20
Branch 1, 2 & 3 Opr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 1 Opr & Branch 2				
& 3 Applicator	3	13	3	19
* Branch 1 Opr & Branch 2 Applicator	3	13	2	40
* Branch 1 Opr & Branch 3		13	3	19
Applicator	3	13	3	19
* Branch 1 Opr & Branch 2 Fr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 1 Opr & Branch 3	 	1-13	12	20
Fr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 1 Opr & Branch 2 & 3 Fr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 2 Opr & Branch 3 Applicator	3			
- Aphilicator	<u> </u>	10	12	25

License Type	L&R	A & I	IPM	Total
* Branch 2 Opr & Branch 1				
Fr & Branch 3 Applicator	3	13	12	28
* Branch 1 & 2 Opr & Branch	3	13	12	28
3 Fr	ა	13	12	28
* Branch 1 & 3 Opr & Branch	3	13	12	28
2 Fr	<u> </u>	10	12	20
* Branch 2 & 3 Opr & Branch	3	13	12	28
1 Fr	٠	10	12	20
* Branch 1 & 2 Opr & Branch	3	13	12	28
3 Applicator		10	12	20
* Branch 1 & 3 Opr & Branch	3	13	12	28
2 Applicator		10	12.	20
* Branch 1 Opr & Branch 2	3	13	12	28
Fr & Branch 3 Applicator			1 &-	20
* Branch 1 Opr & Branch 3	3	13	12	28
Fr & Branch 2 Applicator			14	20
* Branch 2 Opr & Branch 1		:		
Fr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 2 Opr & Branch 1 &				
3 Fr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 2 Opr & Branch 3	_			
Fr	3	5	12	20
* Branch 3 Opr & Branch 2				
Applicator	3	10	12	25
* Branch 3 Opr & Branch 2		100		
Applicator & Branch 1 Fr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 3 Opr & Branch 1		4.0	40	•
Fr	3	13	12	28
* Branch 3 Opr & Branch 2		_	40	40
Fr	3	5	12	20
* Branch 3 Opr & Branch 1 &		40	40	
3 Fr	3	13	12	28

^{*} Denotes section added by Board Member suggestion

CATEGORIES OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

Laws & Regulations

All classes must cite the authority / law that the topic relates to (e.g. Business & Professions Code Section, California Code of Regulations Section, Food & Agricultural Code Section)

- Existing or New Laws and Regulations
- Structural Pest Control Act
- DPR Requirements
- CAC Requirements
- OSHA Requirements

Integrated Pest Management

IPM here is defined as:

"Structural integrated pest management (IPM) means a systematic decision making approach to managing pests, which focuses on long-term prevention or suppression with minimal impact on human health, property, the environment, and non-target organisms. Structural IPM incorporates all reasonable measures to prevent pest problems by properly identifying pests, monitoring population dynamics, and using behavioral, physical, biological or chemical pest population control measures to reduce pests to acceptable levels." (Taken from CCR 1984)

This excerpt has given the committee a working definition of IPM with details that further clarify the topics that would qualify for the IPM category in continuing education.

All classes must include posting and reading of IPM definition in CCR 1984. Introduction of class must discuss how this topic fits into the IPM category rather than Application and Intervention.

- Identification and Biology
- Damage and Thresholds
- Monitoring (How, What to Use, What to Look For, Reporting).
- Prevention (Long Term and Short Term, Including Pest Prevention by Design in Building and Construction.
- Entomology and Other Related Fields to the Branch Licenses
- Selection of Intervention (What was Chosen and Why)
- Management Process
- Possible Evaluation of the Selected Intervention

Application & Intervention

Application and Intervention and defined as:

"If a pesticide application or other intervention is determined to be necessary, the selection and application of the intervention shall be performed in a manner that minimizes risk to people, property, the environment, and non-target organisms, while providing effective pest management.

(b) For the purpose of this section, intervention means an action, device, product or practice that is intended for the prevention, control, management, elimination or abatement of a pest." (Taken from CCR 1984)

This excerpt has given the committee direction what the topics would be most relevant to Applicators while also being compliant with the limitation of the Applicator's license.

All classes must include posting and reading of IPM definition in CCR 1984. Introduction of class must discuss how this topic fits into the Application and Intervention category rather than IPM.

- Application of Pesticides
- Proper Use and Manner
- Calibration and Maintenance
- Use Rates or Volumes Applied
- Human Health Impacts to Misapplication
- Labels (How to Read Labels for the Products the Technician Uses)
- Worker Safety, Including Respirators, Ladders, and Fit Tests
- Environmental Impacts to Misapplication
- Water Quality
- Endangered Species
- Record Keeping (Documentation, State Mandated Forms, Treatment Records)
- Nonchemical Practices (Safety & Effective Implementation of Exclusion, Heat Treatment, Removal)

New Options

Please keep in mind that colors may shift when printed, but colors and fonts can be altered and adjusted









Original Options Presented at January Meeting



Old Option #1



Old Option #2













2015-2018

Structural Pest Control Board

Strategic Plan

Approved:

TABLE OF CONTENTS2
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT3
ABOUT THE BOARD4
2007 STRATEGIC PLAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS5
MISSION 8
VISION 8
VALUES 8
STRATEGIC GOALS9
GOAL 1: LICENSING, EXAMINATIONS, AND CONTINUING EDUCATION. 10
GOAL 2: ENFORCEMENT11
GOAL 3: LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND POLICY 12
GOAL 4: OUTREACH
GOAL 5: ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS 14
STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS 15

Message from the President



On behalf of the California Structural Pest Control Board (SPCB), I'm pleased to present our updated strategic plan. This plan benefited from the thoughtful input and discussion of board members, staff, and industry. It was created to provide a framework and identify priorities for SPCB's efforts over the next few years to modernize operations and adapt to an evolving pest control industry.

This document is the road map toward our vision of SPCB being a national leader, by achieving the highest standards of consumer protection, and promoting a high degree of professionalism in the State's structural pest control industry.

Dave Tamayo, President California Structural Pest Control Board In 1935, in response to lobbying by what was then known as the California Pest Control Association and which later became the Pest Control Operators of California, Assembly Bill 2382, "An act to regulate the practice of structural pest control; to create the Structural Pest Control Board; to provide for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in such practice, and for the protection of the public in the practice of structural pest control", was passed by the California State Legislature. The bill was signed by the Governor on July 20, 1935 and became law on September 15, 1935.

The Structural Pest Control Board is composed of seven members of which, by law, four are public members, and three are members of the pest control industry. The Governor appoints two public members and three licensed industry members. The Senate Rules Committee and the Speaker of the Assembly each appoint one public member. Board Members may serve up to two four-year terms.

The Board, under jurisdiction of the DCA, was transferred via legislation to the jurisdiction of the Department of Pesticide Regulation, operative October 23, 2009 (ABX4, 20, Strickland and Huber, 2009). The Board returned to the DCA effective July 1, 2013, under the Governor's 2011-2012 Reorganization Plan No. 2 and AB 1317 (Frazier, 2013).

2007 Strategic Plan Bromphichmenta

Examination Subversion – In February 2013 the Board learned that its examinations were compromised. The Board worked with the Division of Investigation (DOI) to investigate and prepare evidence against those involved in compromising the examination. The investigation resulted in two individuals being arrested and later convicted on two counts of burglary for helping people cheat on not just the Board's examinations, but several state licensing examinations. One of these individuals was sentenced to 30 days of jail and ordered to pay restitution to the state agencies involved to a sum of \$400,000. The interference with the subversion of the examination was crucial to the integrity of the Board's examinations and hence, the protection of consumers.

Examination Development – In 2013, the Board contracted with The Department of Consumer Affairs' Office of Professional Examination Services to write current and relevant examinations for all of its licenses. Having current examinations is important to consumer protection in that people coming into the industry have the necessary skills and knowledge to perform the work in which they are being licensed to perform while implementing the most recently acknowledged practices.

Implementation of Computer Based Testing (CBT) — In February 2014 the Board implemented CBT which has been a long standing desire of the industry and Board alike. CBT improves examination accessibility since the candidate can schedule themselves at their convenience and in one of 17 locations throughout the state, or 22 additional locations throughout the country. Previously, the exams were given only once a month and only available at two locations in the state. CBT also provides for better examination security and reduced the risk of examinations being compromised. The Board is contracted with an outside vendor who administers several state licensing and other examinations and exercises much better security precautions than were previously available.

Development of an Act Review Committee – In 2011, the Board appointed an Act Review Committee to review the Structural Pest Control Act for relevance and consistency. This committee has met almost every month since and has made several recommendations for updates to the Act. Some of these recommendations have already been approved by the Board, passed legislation, and become effective.

Utilizing Modern Technologies – In January 2011 the Board began maintaining an email notification subscription listing where interested parties can subscribe to and receive all of the Board meeting agendas, approved minutes, regulation changes, and other mailings that are otherwise only mailed from the Board. In October 2014 the Board began posting meeting materials on the Web site and webcasting Board meetings. These utilizations of modern technology greatly improve the ability of the industry and other interested parties to stay informed on current issues and recent changes.

Increasing Consumer Protection by Increasing Bond and Insurance Requirements – Senate Bill 662 passed in October 2013 significantly increasing the Board's bond and insurance requirements. Increased bond and insurance requirements ensures better consumer protection and makes companies more liable for their work.

Consumer Savings - In the 2013/2014 fiscal year alone, the Board collected over \$39,000 in cost recovery and restitution to consumers. Consumers saved approximately \$82,000 through the Board's mediations and investigations programs.

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) — In 2007 the Board developed an IPM Task Force, whose intent was to define IPM. In 2008 a definition of IPM was passed into regulation and in 2009 IPM was added as a requirement of pre-licensure training and as a continuing education requirement for all licensees. Including IPM education as initial pre-licensure training and continuing education requirements is important because it makes the licensee more aware of non-chemical approaches and strategies to prevent and minimize pests while creating a minimal impact on human health, property, the environment and non-target organisms.

Chief Enforcement Officer – In 2008, a Budget Change Proposal was approved for a new Chief Enforcement Officer position at the Staff Services Manager I (SSMI) level to address the coordination of the Board's statewide regulatory enforcement program activities. In FY 2003-04, the Board's Deputy Chief Enforcement position, that performed the above-mentioned activities, was abolished via Control Section 4.10. Approval of the Budget Change Proposal allowed the Board to recruit an SSMI to once again head enforcement activities.

Addressing Unlicensed Activity and the Underground Economy – In 2013, the Board began partnering with the Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, and sibling agencies to counteract the negative effects of the underground economy. The Board endeavors to initiate proactive investigations, as opposed to only the traditional reactive investigations, that would not solely be based on administrative or criminal sanctions.

Mitsim

To protect the general welfare of Californians and the environment by promoting outreach, education, and regulation of the structural pest management profession.

Mistro

The Structural Pest Control Board will strive to be the national regulatory leader of pest management.

No have

Consumer Protection

We make effective and informed decisions in the best interest, and for the safety of Californians.

Efficiency

We diligently identify the best ways to deliver high-quality services with the most efficient use of our resources.

Professionalism

We ensure that qualified, proficient, and skilled staff provides services to the State of California.

Integrity

We are committed to honesty, ethical conduct, and responsibility.

1 LICENSING, EXAMINATIONS, AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

The Board promotes licensing standards to protect consumers and allow reasonable access to the profession. Additionally, the Board oversees and approves continuing education and examination standards to ensure excellence in practice and promote public safety.

2 ENFORCEMENT

The Board protects the health and safety of consumers through the enforcement of the laws and regulations governing the practice of structural pest control.

3 LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND POLICY

The Board pursues statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures that strengthen and support the Board's mandate and mission.

4 OUTREACH

The Board informs consumers, licensees, and stakeholders about the practice and regulation of the profession.

5 ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The Board standard is to build an excellent organization through proper Board governance, effective leadership, and responsible management.

GOAL 1: LICENSING, EXAMINATIONS, AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

The Board promotes licensing standards to protect consumers and allow reasonable access to the profession. Additionally, the Board oversees and approves continuing education and examination standards to ensure excellence in practice and promote public safety.

- 1.1 Evaluate continuing education provider qualifications and criteria to strengthen the approval process.
- 1.2 Review and refine the licensing and renewal processes to increase licensees' level of compliance.
- 1.3 Review and analyze exam questions and current reference materials to develop study guides and materials that focus on essential occupational principles and practices.
- 1.4 Evaluate continuing education categories and hourly requirements, with emphasis on core competencies.
- 1.5 Increase continuing education course field audits to ensure standards are met and proper training is received.

GOAL 2: ENFORCEMENT

The Board protects the health and safety of consumers through the enforcement of the laws and regulations governing the practice of structural pest control.

- 2.1 Increase proactive enforcement to effectively reduce the frequency of unlawful pest control services.
- 2.2 Implement enhancements to Board response and coordination with local governments and other partners on fumigation emergencies and where multiple (serious level) pest control violations exist.
- 2.3 Seek statutory authority to automatically suspend or, with cause, revoke any license or registration based on non-compliance of citation.
- 2.4 Seek statutory authority to automatically suspend any license or registration based on an owner's or licensee's failure to satisfy court judgments, arbitration awards, tax liens and other lawfully imposed sanctions related to the pest control profession.
- 2.5 Seek statutory authority to require any person listed on the principle registration or branch office registration to take continuing education or board-approved courses as a condition of a board-issued citation.
- 2.6 Seek statutory authority to deny the renewal of a license based on an owner's or licensee's failure to comply with any provision of the Structural Pest Control Act. (I.e. failure to: post a restoration bond, complete continuing education courses, or comply with an order of abatement).

GOAL 3: LEGISLATION, REGULATIONS, AND POLICY

The Board pursues statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures that strengthen and support the Board's mandate and mission.

- 3.1 Establish a committee to research pre and post licensing requirements and consider developing or amending those requirements to ensure all those practicing structural pest control are properly regulated.
- 3.2 Evaluate and forecast current fee structure to ensure fees support the operational needs of the Board.
- 3.3 Research, review, and make recommendations regarding the roles and responsibilities of a qualifying manager and branch office supervisor and accordingly pursue statutory and/or regulatory changes.
- 3.4 Pursue regulatory changes to include new and/or updated provisions for all Board forms based on priority and operational need.
- 3.5 Explore alternatives to foster improved communication with other agencies and the legislature to improve timely tracking of sensitive or competing legislation.

GOAL 4: OUTREACH

The Board informs consumers, licensees, and stakeholders about the practice and regulation of the profession.

- 4.1 Develop an outreach plan to create awareness of the Board's mission and function, using a variety of proven methods.
- 4.2 Develop strategy to educate licensees and consumers on the new web access tools that will be available through BreEZe.
- 4.3 Partner with the Department of Consumer Affairs and other agencies to leverage outreach efforts.
- 4.4 Promote the Structural Pest Control Board's web-based license status lookup tool though public and private partnerships.
- 4.5 Establish alliances with continuing education providers so that they may educate and inform licensees about how to avoid the most common enforcement violations.

GOAL 5: ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The Board standard is to build an excellent organization through proper Board governance, effective leadership, and responsible management.

- 5.1 Review and consolidate Board member orientation materials and training that is specific to the SPCB and industry with emphasis on policies, procedures, responsibilities, and functions of the Board.
- 5.2 Continue to monitor staffing levels to achieve Board's mandated goals and objectives in the areas of enforcement and continuing education, and pursue budgetary authority to support Board operations.
- 5.3 Research ways to use technology to increase operational efficiencies and effectiveness.
- 5.4 Analyze pay and classification structure of staff to ensure it aligns with the Board's recruitment and retention plan and pursue resources, as appropriate, to meet those needs.

Strategic Planning Process

To understand the environment in which the SPCB operates and to identify factors that could impact the SPCB's success, the California Department of Consumer Affairs' SOLID unit conducted an environmental scan of the internal and external environments by collecting information through the following methods:

- An online survey sent to 5,000 stakeholders, comprised of industry professionals, professional associations, continuing education providers, and others who expressed interest in the strategic direction of the SPCB.
- A staff focus group on September 11, 2014, in which eight Board staff members participated.
- An online survey sent to field staff, in which five members responded.
- Telephone interviews with Board members in August and September 2014.

The most significant themes and trends identified from the environmental scan were discussed by the SPCB executive team and Board during a strategic planning session facilitated by SOLID on October 15, 2014. This information guided the SPCB in the development of its mission, vision, and values while directing the SPCB in the formulation of its strategic goals and objectives as outlined in the 2015 – 2018 Structural Pest Control Board Strategic Plan.

Structural Pest Control Board

2005 Evergreen Street, Ste. 1500 Sacramento, CA 95815 Phone: (916) 561-8700

Fax: (916) 263-2469

Prepared by:



Department of Consumer Affairs 1747 N. Market Blvd., Suite 270 Sacramento, CA 95834

This strategic plan is based on stakeholder information and discussions facilitated by SOLID for the California Structural Pest Control Board in August and September 2014. Subsequent amendments may have been made after Board adoption of this plan.





STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD – ADMINISTRATION UNIT 2005 Evergreen Street, Ste. 1500 P 916-561-8700 | F 916-263-2469 | www.pestboard.ca.gov



MEMORANDUM

DATE	March 9, 2015
то	Board Members
FROM	Susan Saylor, Executive Officer Structural Pest Control Board
SUBJECT	AGENDA ITEM XIII – LICENSE RENEWAL FINGERPRINT REQUIREMENT

At the January 14 & 15, 2015 Meeting, the Board voted to begin the rulemaking process to create regulation that would require all licensees who have never been fingerprinted to do so as a condition of license renewal.

Enclosed for your consideration is the proposed language staff has prepared to meet that goal.

TITLE 16. STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD LICENSE RENEWAL FINGERPRINT REQUIREMENT

Proposed Language

§ 1960. License Renewal Fingerprint Requirement

All licensees applying for a license renewal must submit a set of fingerprints for the purpose of conducting a criminal history record check as a condition for license renewal. Applications for license renewal will be deemed incomplete and not eligible for renewal if a set of fingerprints is not included with the application. This section applies to licensees whose license expires on or after June 30, 2016. This section does not apply to licensees who already have submitted a set of fingerprints for the purpose of conducting a criminal history record check.

<u>Authority Cited: Section 8525, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 144, Business and Professions Code.</u>



STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD – ADMINISTRATION UNIT 2005 Evergreen Street, Ste. 1500 P 916-561-8700 | F 916-263-2469 | www.pestboard.ca.gov



MEMORANDUM

DATE	March 10, 2015
то	Board Members
FROM	Susan Saylor, Executive Officer Structural Pest Control Board
SUBJECT	AGENDA ITEM XV – PROPOSED DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINE CHANGES

At the January 14 & 15, 2015 Meeting, the Board voted to direct staff to work in conjunction with legal counsel to further amend the Disciplinary Guidelines to provide more specific guidance on the appropriate level of discipline for a given violation.

Enclosed for your consideration are the proposed changes to the Board's Disciplinary Guidelines.

A MANUAL OF
DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES
AND
MODEL DISCIPLINARY ORDERS

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
20195

STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD 2005 EVERGREEN STREET, SUITE 1500 SACRAMENTO, CA 95815 (916) 561-8700

INDEX

Introduction5			
Penalty	/ Guidelines	6	
Busines	ss and Professions Code Section	6	
8635	Disregard of Specifications		
8636	Violation of Law		
8637	Misrepresentation	6	
8638	Violation of Contracts.		
8639	Aiding and Abetting		
8640	Real Estate Rebates		
8641	Violation of Chapter and Rules		
8642	Fraud		
8643	Negligent Handling / Use of Poisons		
8644	Misrepresentation After Inspection		
8645	Impersonation		
8646	Disregard of Laws		
8646.5	Cease and Desist		
8647	Violation of Laws Re Insecticides.		
8648	False Advertising		
8649	Conviction / Evidence	7	
8650	Name and Location as Licensed		
8651	Performing / Soliciting Beyond Scope of License	7	
8652	Failure to Make and Keep Records		
8653	Withholding Payment		
8654	Association of Suspended Operator		
8655	Charge Substantially Related		
8657	Appointment of Receiver		
Violatio	n of Probation	7	
Factors	in Aggravation and Mitigation and in Extenuation to be Considered for Disciplinary		
Cases.		8	
Standa	rd Terms and Conditions of Probation	8	
Optiona	al Terms and Conditions of Probation	8	
	Decision		
	enalty in Lieu of Actual Suspension		
MODE	L DISCIPLINARY ORDERS	9	
Model I	Number		
	ocation – Single Cause		
	ocation – Multiple Causes		
3. Suspension – Single Cause			

4. 9	Suspension – Multiple Causes (Run Concurrently)	9
5. 8	Suspension – Multiple Causes (Run Consecutively)	10
6. \$	Standard Stay Order	10
7. F	Probation	. 10
	STANDARD CONDITIONS	
8.	Obey All Laws	10
9.	Quarterly Reports	10
10.	Tolling of Probation	10
	Notice to Employers	
12.	Notice to Employees	11
	Posted Notice of Suspension	
	Completion of Probation	
15.	Violation of Probation	11
	OPTIONAL CONDITIONS	
16.	Actual Suspension	11
17.	Continuing Education Course – Branch 1	11
18.	Continuing Education Course – Branch 2	12
19.	Continuing Education Course – Branch 3	12
20.	Random Inspections.	12
	Inspection Fees	
22.	Reimbursement to Consumer	12
23,	Prohibited From Serving as Officer, Director, Associate,	
	Partner, or Qualifying Manager	
	No Interest In Any Registered Company	
	Take and Pass Licensure Examinations	12
26.	Cross Reference – Business and Professions Code Sections to Business and	
	Professions Code Section Establishing Grounds for Disciplinary Action	13
27.	Cross Reference – California Code of Regulations Sections to Business and	
	Professions Code Section Establishing Grounds for Disciplinary Action	14

. . . .

1

DISCIPLINARY GUIDELINES

INTRODUCTION

To establish-consistency in In reaching a decision on a disciplinary penalties for similar offenses, action under the Administrative Procedure Act (Government Code Section 11400 et seq), the Structural Pest Control Board establishes these and the Administrative Law Judge shall consider the uniform disciplinary guidelines as set forth herein.

The Board recognizes that these penalties terms of discipline and conditions of probation are merely guidelines and that the Board and the aAdministrative ILaw jJudges must be free to exercise their discretion in such cases. However, the Board desires that these deviation from such guidelines be followed to the extent possible and requests that the administrative law judge-hearing the case include some explanation of any is appropriate only when facts of the case warrant such a departure or omissions from the guidelines. As such, any departure from these guidelines should be explained and noted fully in the proposed decision or disciplinary order so that the circumstances can be better understood by the Board during its review of the case for ultimate action.

The Board desires that matters in extenuation or mitigation, as well as those in aggravation, be fully considered and noted in the proposed decision <u>or disciplinary order</u>. Of primary importance is the effect of the licensee's <u>or fregistrant's conductfaction</u> had or can have on the public as consumers.

PENALTY GUIDELINES

Violation	Minimum Penalty	Optional Probation Conditions	Maximum Penalty
Section 8635 Disregard of Specifications	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	22, 23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8636 Violation of Laws	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	22, 23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8637	Revocation and		Revocation and
Misrepresentation	Optional Condition 24		Optional Condition 24
Section 8638 Violation of Contracts	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8639 Aiding and Abetting	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8640	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
Real Estate Rebates	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8641 Violation of Chapter and Rules	Suspension, Stayed, 3 Years Probation	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25	Revocation and Optional Condition 24
Section 8642	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25	Revocation and
Fraud	3 Years Probation		Optional Condition 24
Section 8643 Negligent Handling or Use of Poisonous Agent	Revocation, Stayed	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21, 23, 25	Revocation and Optional Condition 24
Section 8644 Misrepresentation After Inspection	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	22, 23, 25	Optional Condition 24
Section 8645	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 20, 21, 23	Revocation and
Impersonation	3 Years Probation		Optional Condition 24
Section 8646	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
Disregard of Laws	3 Years Probation	23, 25	Optional Condition 24
Section 8646.5	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
Cease & Desist	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24

Violation	Minimum Penalty	Optional Probation Conditions	Maximum Penalty
Section 8647 Violation of Laws as to Insecticides	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8648	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 23	Revocation and
False Advertising	3 Years Probation		Optional Condition 24
Section 8649	Revocation, Stayed,	16, 20, 21, 23	Revocation and
Conviction, Evidence	3 Years Probation		Optional Condition 24
Section 8650 Name and Location as Licensed	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8651 Performing or Soliciting Beyond Scope of License	Revocation, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8652 Failure to Make and Keep All Reports	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8653 Withholding Payment	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8654 Prohibition Against Association of Suspended Operator	Suspension, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8655 Charge Substantially Related	Revocation, Stayed,	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21,	Revocation and
	3 Years Probation	23	Optional Condition 24
Section 8657 Appointment of Receiver	Suspension, Stayed, 3 Years Probation	16, 17/18/19, 20, 23	Revocation and Optional Condition 24
Section 8666 Excessive Work	Revocation, Stayed 3 Years Probation	16, 17/18/19, 20, 21 23, 25	Revocation and Optional Condition 24
Violation of Probation	Extend Probation with Appropriate New Conditions		Revoke Probation and Impose Stayed Penalty

FACTORS IN AGGRAVATION AND MITIGATION AND IN EXTENUATION TO BE CONSIDERED FOR DISCIPLINARY CASES

In determining whether the minimum, maximum, or an intermediate penalty <u>revocation</u>, <u>suspension</u>, <u>or probation</u> is to be imposed in a given <u>disciplinary</u> case, factors such as the following should be considered:

- 1. Actual or potential harm to the public.
- 2. Actual or potential harm to any consumer.
- 3. Prior disciplinary record.
- 4. Number and / or variety of current violations.
- 5. Mitigation evidence.
- 6. In case of a criminal conviction, compliance with terms of sentence.
- 7.—Overall criminal record.
- 8. Whether the conduct was knowing, willful, reckless or inadvertent.
- 9.—The financial benefit to the respondent.
- 10. Evidence that the unlawful act was part of a pattern of practice.
- 11. Currently on probation.

I) Factors in Aggravation

- a. The public or any consumer was harmed by the improper or criminal act under consideration.
- b. The improper or criminal act under consideration presented potential harm to the public or any consumer.
- c. Respondent has a prior record of citations and/or disciplinary actions in this state or elsewhere.
- d. There are other violations pending disciplinary action in this state or other iurisdiction.
- e. The improper or criminal act was knowing, willful, reckless, negligent, or a result of incompetence.
- f. The respondent benefitted financially or otherwise from the improper or criminal act.
- <u>q.</u> The improper or criminal act was part of a pattern of practice.
- <u>h.</u> Respondent is currently on administrative probation or on criminal probation or parole for criminal acts regardless of jurisdiction.
- i. The improper or criminal act under consideration was serious in nature and severity.
- j. The improper or criminal act was recent.
- k. Respondent has a lengthy and/or serious criminal record.
- 1. A short length of time has passed since the commission of the improper or criminal act, entry in his or her criminal record or release from custody, probation or parole.
- m. Respondent failed to comply with the terms of his or her criminal sentence or administrative probation under a different act not under consideration.
- n. The improper or criminal act involved fraud, misrepresentation and/or dishonesty.

II. Factors in Mitigation

- <u>a.</u> Respondent voluntarily completed restitution to the consumer and/or fixed the problem.
- <u>b.</u> Respondent voluntarily participated and completed training, counseling or rehabilitation programs.
- c. Respondent has no prior disciplinary actions.
- d. The improper or criminal act was not part of a pattern of practice.
- e. Respondent has taken substantial measures to prevent the occurrence of the improper or criminal act in the future.
- <u>f.</u> The improper or criminal act was inadvertent and was neither willful, reckless, negligent or a result of incompetence.
- g. The public or consumer was not harmed.
- h. The improper or criminal act did not present a potential harm to the public or consumer.
- i. The respondent did not benefit financially from the improper or criminal act.
- j. Significant amount of time has passed since the commission of the improper or criminal act, entry in his or her criminal record or release from custody, probation or parole.
- k. Respondent does not have a prior criminal record.
- I. If applicable, evidence of expungement proceedings or dismissal pursuant to Section 1203.4, 1203.4a, or 1203.41 of the Penal Code.
- m. Other relevant evidence of rehabilitation.

III. Matters in Extenuation

- a. Circumstances deemed to be beyond the respondent's direction or control.
 - b. Satisfactory progress in court-mandated treatment, training, counseling or rehabilitation programs or participation in similar programs.
 - c. Evidence of stable or ongoing employment.
 - d. Subsequent, relevant schooling or education.
 - e. Degree of knowledge and/or participation in the crime or act constituting discipline.
- f. Participation in community service and demonstration of satisfactory progress.

The Board does not intend that any one of the above factors be required to justify the minimum or maximum penalty as opposed to an intermediate one. degree of discipline to be imposed.

STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

The standard terms of probation generally appearing in every case are:

- A. Obey all laws [8] *
- B. File quarterly reports [9]
- C. Tolling of probation if respondent moves out of state [10]

- D. Notice to employers [11]
- E. Notice to employees [12]
- F. Posting of suspension sign [13]
- G. Violation of probation [14]
- H. Completion of probation [15]

OPTIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF PROBATION

- A. Actual suspension of license / registration certificate [16]
- B. Completion of continuing education course appropriate Branch 1 [17], Branch 2 [18], or Branch 3 [19]
- C. Reimbursement to the Board for random inspections [20]
- D. Payment of inspection fee [21]
- E. Restitution to consumer [22]
- F. Prohibition from serving as officer, director, associate, partner or qualifying manager [23]
- G. No ownership of registered company [24]
- H. Take and pass licensure examination [25]

DEFAULT DECISION

The disciplinary penalty in a default decision is revocation.

CIVIL PENALTY IN LIEU OF SUSPENSION

The Board has the authority to assess a civil penalty in lieu of actual suspension as follows:

- (a) not more than \$5,000 for an actual suspension of 1 to 19 days
- (b) not more than \$10,000 for an actual suspension of 20 to 45 days

The respondent may express a preference for paying a civil penalty in lieu of actual suspension, but the Board is not bound by any expression of preference.

If such preference is expressed, it should be included in the proposed decision.

MODEL DISCIPLINARY ORDERS

MODEL NUMBERS

[1] Revocation

(Ex. Operator's / Field Representative's) License / Company Registration Certificate No. (Ex. OPR 1234) issued to Respondent (Ex. John Doe) is revoked.

[2] Revocation - Multiple Causes

(Ex. Operator's / Field Representative's) License / Company Registration Certificate No. (Ex. OPR 1234) issued to respondent (Ex. John Doe) is revoked pursuant to Determination of Issues (Ex. I, II, and III) separately and for all of them.

[3] Suspension - Single Cause

(Ex. Operator's / Field Representative's) License / Company Registration Certificate No. (Ex. OPR 1234) issued to Respondent (Ex. John Doe) is suspended (Ex. Thirty (30) days)

[4] Suspension – Multiple Causes (run concurrently)

(Ex. Operator's / Field Representative's) License / Company Registration Certificate No. (Ex. OPR 1234) issued to respondent (Ex. John Doe) is suspended for (Ex. Thirty (30) days) pursuant to Determination of Issues (Ex. I, II, and III) separately and for all of them. All suspensions shall run concurrently.

[5] Suspension – Multiple Causes (run consecutively)

(Ex. Operator's / Field Representative's) License / Company Registration Certificate No. (Ex. OPR 1234) issued to respondent (Ex. John Doe) is suspended (Ex. Thirty (30) days) pursuant to Determination of Issues (Ex. I, II, and III) and (Ex. Sixty (60) days) pursuant to Determination of Issues (Ex. IV and V). These suspensions shall run consecutively, for a total period of (Ex. Ninety (90) days).

[6] Standard Stay Order

However, (revocation / suspension) is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for (Ex. three (3) years) upon the following terms and conditions:

[7] Probation

Respondent is placed on probation for a period of three (3) years.

STANDARD CONDITIONS

[8] Obey All Laws

Respondent shall obey all laws and rules and relating to the practice of structural pest control.

[9] Quarterly Reports

Respondent shall file quarterly reports with the Board during the period of probation.

[10] Tolling of Probation

Should respondent leave California to reside outside the state, respondent must notify the Board in writing of the dates of departure and return. Periods of residency or practice outside the state shall not apply to reduction of the probationary period.

[11] Notice to Employers

Respondent shall notify all present and prospective employers of the decision in case No. (Ex. 91-01) and the terms, conditions and restriction imposed on respondent by said decision. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, and within 15 days of respondent undertaking new employment, respondent shall cause his / her employer to report to the Board in writing acknowledging the employer has read the decision in case No. (Ex. 90-01).

[12] Notice to Employees

Respondent shall, upon or before the effective date of this decision, post or circulate a notice to all employees involved in structural pest control operations which accurately recites the terms and conditions of probation. Respondent shall be responsible for said notice being immediately available to said employees. "Employees" as used in this provision includes all full-time, part-time, temporary and relief employees and independent contractors employed or hired at any time during probation.

[13] Posted Notice of Suspension

Respondent structural pest control company shall prominently post a suspension notice provided by the Board of the Board's order of suspension at its principal office and each of its branch offices in a place conspicuous and readable to the public. Said notice shall remain so posted during the entire period of actual suspension.

[14] Completion of Probation

Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's license/certificate will be fully restored.

[15] Violation of Probation

Should respondent violate probation in any respect, the Board, after giving respondent notice and an opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order which was stayed. If a petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the Board shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.

OPTIONAL CONDITIONS

[16] Actual Suspension

(Ex. Operator's/Field Representative's) License/Company Registration No. (Ex. OPR 1234) issued to (Ex. John Doe) serves an actual suspension of (Ex. ten (10) days).

[17] Continuing Education Course - Branch 1

Respondent (Ex. John Doe) shall complete a continuing education course for pest control in Branch 1 (fumigation) within eighteen (18) months of the effective date of this decision.

[18] Continuing Education Course - Branch 2

Respondent (Ex. John Doe) shall complete a continuing education course for pest control in Branch 2 (general pest) within eighteen (18) months of the effective date of this decision.

[19] Continuing Education Course – Branch 3

Respondent (Ex. John Doe) shall complete a continuing education course for pest control in Branch 3 (wood destroying pests and organisms) within eighteen (18) months of the effective date of this decision.

[20] Random Inspections

Respondent shall reimburse the Board for (Ex. one (1)) random inspection per (Ex. quarter) by Board specialists during the period of probation not to exceed \$125 per inspection.

[21] Inspection Fees

Respondent shall pay to the registrar, or designee, an inspection fee of (Ex. \$50) within thirty (30) days from the effective date of this decision.

[22] Reimbursement to Consumer

Respondent shall submit proof to the registrar that restitution in the amount of (Ex. \$8,000) has been made to (Ex. John Smith) within (Ex. thirty (30) days) of the effective date of the decision.

[23] Prohibited from Serving as Officer, Director, Associate, Partner, or Qualifying Manager

Respondent is prohibited from serving as an officer, director, associate, partner, qualifying manager or branch office manager of any registered company during the period that discipline is imposed on (Ex. Operator's/Field Representative's) License No. (Ex. OPR 1234).

[24] No Interest In Any Registered Company

Respondent shall not have any legal or beneficial interest in any company currently or hereinafter registered by the Board.

[25] Take and Pass Licensure Examinations

Within (Ex. six (6) months), respondent shall take and pass the (Ex. Operator's/Field Representative's) examination currently required of new applicants for (Ex. Operator's/Field Representative's) license. The examination shall be taken on regularly scheduled dates. Respondent shall pay the established examination fee

CROSS REFERENCE BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE (B&P) SECTIONS TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION ESTABLISHING GROUNDS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

VIOLATION OF B&P CODE SECTION	GROUNDS FOR DISCIPLINE UNDER B&P CODE SECTION
8505	8651
<u>8505.1</u>	<u>8646</u>
8505.2	8646
8505.3	8646
8505.4	8646
8505.5	8646
8505.6	8646
8505.7	8646
8505.8	8646
8505.9	8646
8505.10	8646
8505.11	8646
8505.12	8646
8505.13	8646
8505.14	8646
8505.15	8646
8505.16	8646
<u>8505.17</u>	<u>8646</u>
8506(c)	8641
<u>8506.1</u>	<u>8641</u>
8506.2	8641
8507	8651
<u>8507.1</u>	<u>8651</u>
<u>8509</u>	<u>8641</u>
8513	8641
8514	8641
<u>8514.5</u>	<u>8641</u>
8516	8641
8516.1	8641
8516.2	8641 .
8516.5	8641
8517	8641
8518	8641
8519	<u>8641,</u> 8644
<u>8519.5</u>	<u>8646</u>
8538	8646
<u>8550</u>	<u>8641, 8646, 8648, 8651</u>
<u>8551</u>	<u>8646</u>

8551.5 8552 8553 8554 8567 8567 8571 8593 8610 8611 8612 8613 8619 8622 8635 8636 8637 8638 8639 8640 8641 8642 8643 8644 8645 8646 8647 8648 8649 8650 8651 8652 8653 8657 8666 8690 8691 8695	8641, 8646.	8641, 8646 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641, 8650 8641, 8651 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641 8641
8690		<u>8641</u>
8697		<u>8641</u>
8697.4		
		8641
<u>8698.1</u>		<u>8641</u>

CROSS REFERENCE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS (CCR) SECTIONS TO BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION ESTABLISHING GROUNDS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION

VIOLATION OF CCR SECTION	GROUNDS FOR DISCIPLINE UNDER B&P CODE
1911	8641
1912	8650
<u>1913</u>	<u>8641, 8650</u>
1914	8650
1916	8641
1917	8650
<u>1918</u>	<u>8641</u>
1937	8641
<u>1937.12</u>	<u>8641</u>
1937.13	8641
1937.14	8635, 8636
1937.16	8641
<u>1937.17</u>	<u>8641</u>
1970(a)(b)	8652
1970.3	8646
1970.4(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)	8646
<u>1970.5</u>	<u>8646</u>
<u>1970.6</u>	<u>8646</u>
1971(a)(1)(A)(B)(C)	8646
1971(a)(1)(b)	<u>8646,</u> 8647
1971(a)(2)	<u>8646,</u> 8647
<u>1973</u>	<u>8646</u>
<u>1974</u>	<u>8646</u>
1983	8643, 8647
1990	8641
1991	8641
1992	8641
1993	8641
<u>1993.1</u>	<u>8641</u>
1994	8641
1996	8641
1996.1	8641
<u>1996.2</u>	<u>8641</u>
<u>1996.3</u>	<u>8641</u>
1998	8641
1998(f)	8652
<u>1999.5</u>	<u>8641</u>