

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
**Budget Change Proposal - Cover Sheet**  
 DF-46 (REV 08/15)

Fiscal Year 2016-2017	Business Unit BU_3930	Department <b>Department of Pesticide Regulation</b>	Priority No. FL 2
Budget Request Name 3930-400-BCP-BR-2016-MR		Program <b>3540_PESTICIDE PROGRAMS</b>	Subprogram <b>3540046_Monitoring and Surveillance</b> <b>3540055_Mitigation of Human Health Risk</b>

Budget Request Description  
 Expansion of Pesticide Air Monitoring Network

Budget Request Summary

This proposal is a request for total appropriations of \$2,338,000 in 2016-17 and \$1,558,000 in 2017-18 to expand and strengthen California's existing pesticide air monitoring network (AMN).

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) is requesting \$1,024,000 in 2016-17 and \$962,000 in 2017-18 from the Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund. Funding will be used to: (1) revise the site selection process to include the consideration of children's health (schools) and environmental justice (EJ) factors; (2) increase the number of communities being monitored from 6 to 8; (3) increase the number of pesticides and time periods monitored; and (4) conduct three intensive seasonal monitoring studies each year. This request includes \$62,000 for one-time purchases for DPR supplies, services, and equipment; a \$70,000 DPR contract for sampling remote site(s), a \$100,000 DPR contract to improve the sampling and laboratory methods, and a \$548,000 DPR contract with CDFA for additional laboratory analyses.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed
---	--

Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Department CIO	Date
<i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>		

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the Department of Technology, or previously by the Department of Finance.

<input type="checkbox"/> FSR <input type="checkbox"/> SPR	Project No.	Date:
---	-------------	-------

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?  Yes  No  
 Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.

Prepared By <i>Randy Segawa</i> Randy Segawa	Date 5-11-16	Reviewed By <i>Lu Saephahn</i> Lu Saephahn	Date 5-11-16
Department Director <i>Brian Leahy</i> Brian Leahy	Date 5/11/16	Agency Secretary <i>Matthew Rodriguez</i> Matthew Rodriguez	Date 5/12/16

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay  ITCU  FSCU  OSAE  CALSTARS  Dept. of Technology

BCP Type:  Policy  Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA Original Signed by <i>Ellen Moratti</i> PPBA	Date submitted to the Legislature <b>MAY 13 2016</b>
---	---

Fiscal Year 2016-2017	Business Unit 3900	Department <b>Air Resources Board</b>	Priority No. 6
Budget Request Name 3900-401-BCP-BR-2016-MR		Program <b>3505-STATIONARY SOURCE</b>	Subprogram <b>N/A</b>

Budget Request Description  
Expansion of Pesticide Air Monitoring Network

Budget Request Summary

The Air Resources Board is requesting \$1,314,000 in 2016-17 and \$596,000 in 2017-18 for a two year limited term. Of the 2016-17 requested funds, \$715,000 in one-time equipment purchases and \$136,000 in maintenance expenses will be funded by civil penalty revenues from the Air Pollution Control Fund. Of the 2017-18 requested funds, \$136,000 in maintenance expenses will be funded by civil penalty revenues from the Air Pollution Control Fund. The Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund will cover the remainder of the Air Resources Board's costs in 2016-17 (\$463,000) and 2017-2018 (\$460,000). The requested funds will be used to expand the current network of year-round pesticide air monitoring stations, enhance pesticide laboratory analysis capabilities, and resume seasonal ambient pesticide monitoring in environmental justice communities. This proposal includes provisional language specifying that Air Pollution Control Fund civil penalties can be used for the one-time equipment and maintenance costs.

Requires Legislation <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed	
Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.</i>	Department CIO	Date

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the Department of Technology, or previously by the Department of Finance.

FSR       SPR      Project No.      Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal?  Yes       No  
*Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.*

Prepared By Michael Benjamin <i>M Benjamin</i>	Date 5/13/16	Reviewed By Alice Stebbins <i>Alice Stebbins</i>	Date 5-12-16
Department Director Richard W. Corey <i>Alice Stebbins</i>	Date 5-12-16	Agency Secretary Matthew Rodriguez <i>M Rodriguez</i>	Date 5-13-16

**Department of Finance Use Only**

Additional Review:  Capital Outlay     ITCU     FSCU     OSAE     CALSTARS     Dept. of Technology

BCP Type:       Policy       Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Original Signed By: Ellen Moratti	Date submitted to the Legislature <b>MAY 13 2016</b>
------	--------------------------------------	---

## A. Budget Request Summary

This proposal is a request for total appropriations of \$2,338,000 in 2016-17 and \$1,558,000 in 2017-18 to expand and strengthen California's existing pesticide air monitoring network (AMN).

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) is requesting \$1,024,000 in 2016-17 and \$962,000 in 2017-18 from the DPR Fund. This proposal includes \$62,000 for one-time purchases for DPR supplies, services, and equipment; a \$70,000 DPR contract for sampling remote site(s), a \$100,000 DPR contract to improve the sampling and laboratory methods, and a \$548,000 DPR contract with CDFA for additional laboratory analyses.

The Air Resources Board (ARB) is requesting \$1,314,000 in 2016-17 and \$596,000 in 2017-18 for resources, equipment, and maintenance expenses. Of the 2016-17 requested funds, \$715,000 in one-time equipment purchases and \$136,000 in maintenance expenses will be funded by civil penalty revenues from the Air Pollution Control Fund. Of the 2017-18 requested funds, \$136,000 in maintenance expenses will be funded by civil penalty revenues from the Air Pollution Control Fund. The Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund will cover the remainder of the Air Resources Board's costs in 2016-17 (\$463,000) and 2017-2018 (\$460,000). The funding will be used to: (1) revise the site selection process to ensure the process considers children's health (schools) and environmental justice (EJ) factors; (2) increase the number of communities being monitored from 6 to 8; (3) increase the number of pesticides and time periods monitored; and (4) conduct three intensive seasonal monitoring studies each year. This proposal includes provisional language specifying that Air Pollution Control Fund civil penalties be used for the one-time equipment and maintenance costs (see Attachment C).

This proposal follows up and expands on the California Environmental Protection Agency's (Cal EPA) EJ Action Plan that directed DPR to conduct a pilot project focusing on airborne pesticide exposure to children in a Central Valley community. This proposal will make the DPR/ARB AMN even more comprehensive and allow DPR to evaluate the impact of pesticides in air on children's health and in EJ communities and address concerns expressed by the public.

## B. Background/History

### *Department of Pesticide Regulation*

In the late 1990s and early 2000, DPR and the University of California, Davis (UCD) developed a cost-effective multi-pesticide analytical method that allowed for analysis and detection of about 25 pesticides from a single sample for use in an 8-week monitoring study. In 2006, DPR used the same method to develop a one-year pilot study, as part of the Cal/EPA *Environmental Justice Action Plan* (2004), to optimize sample and analytical methods and evaluate the need for long-term monitoring. Results from this pilot study indicated a need for further evaluation of the lifetime exposure (*i.e.*, cancer risk) to 1,3-dichloropropene (1,3-D) and provided DPR the data and methodology necessary to develop a long-term AMN.

Due to this earlier work, DPR recognized the importance of, and need for, monitoring data to calculate sub-chronic and chronic exposures and to evaluate the potential for cancer risk for the general population. To address this need, DPR began its AMN in 2011. Since 2011 the AMN has provided data for about 32 pesticides and several breakdown products in three California communities: Salinas (Monterey County), Shafter (Kern County), and Ripon (San Joaquin County). The communities represent areas of highest agricultural use of some of the most potentially hazardous pesticides (*e.g.*, fumigants and organophosphates) in the State. However, only one of the community monitoring sites is located at a school.

With its existing AMN, DPR collects one set of 24-hour samples every week year-round at each of three monitoring sites (about 625 samples/year; 5,676 to 6,033 analyses / year), with each set consisting of four samples. One multi-residue sample relies on an analytical method developed by UCD for earlier studies and allows DPR to monitor for almost 30 of the higher-risk pesticides, such as organophosphates in a single sample. A second sample is for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) that includes the fumigants 1,3-dichloropropene (1,3-D) and methyl bromide. A third sample is collected for the fumigant chloropicrin. A fourth sample is collected for the fumigant methyl isothiocyanate (MITC). The results show that one site (Shafter) would exceed DPR's 1,3-D regulatory target level for long-term cancer risk if the detected concentrations were to continue for 70 years. Other pesticides approach, but do not exceed DPR's health screening levels.

### *Air Resources Board*

For more than twenty years, ARB has been assisting DPR with assessing risks associated with pesticide application through a combination of seasonal ambient monitoring studies, operation of year-round air monitoring stations, and related laboratory analysis of fumigant samples. This work was originally mandated as part of the toxic air contaminant (TAC) program pursuant to Food and Agricultural Code section 14022(c) which required ARB to document the level of airborne pesticide emissions when requested by DPR. The types of pesticide air monitoring

and lab analysis conducted by ARB have evolved over time as a function of DPR's changing programmatic priorities and depending upon ARB's available resources.

Between 2000 and 2009, ARB's assistance to DPR focused on conducting intensive short-term seasonal air monitoring field studies for pesticides that were identified as either candidate or actual TACs. These studies consisted of seasonal (eight to twelve weeks) ambient monitoring in six to eight communities and multiple day application-site monitoring in the immediate vicinity of specific pesticide applications in agricultural fields and orchards. The number and type of intensive seasonal studies conducted by ARB varied from year to year depending upon DPR's needs but generally included less than one intensive seasonal study and one to three application-site field assessments a year. Each intensive seasonal ambient study, which was typically eight to twelve weeks in duration, involved concurrent monitoring of a specific pesticide in anywhere from six to eight communities in the vicinity of areas of high-pesticide use. Seasonal air monitors were typically sited at schools or other locations near sensitive receptors and 24-hour samples were typically collected four days a week over the duration of the study. DPR has not requested any of these types of intensive seasonal studies since 2009.

In September 2010, DPR requested ARB to monitor for two fumigant pesticides [1,3-dichloropropene (1,3-D) and methyl bromide, which are also monitored for in the AMN] in Santa Maria (Santa Barbara County) and Ventura County (both high use areas for these pesticides), pursuant to Food and Agricultural Code section 14022(c). Although originally scheduled to end in 2011, ARB has continued and expanded this monitoring at DPR's request. ARB is currently monitoring for 1,3-D and methyl bromide year-round and monitoring for chloropicrin during the peak use season at three sites: an office building in Santa Maria, a school in Oxnard (Ventura County), and a school south of Watsonville (Monterey County). DPR requested chloropicrin monitoring to determine the effect of its new mitigation measures implemented in 2015.

*Monitoring Results*

The results show potential concerns for several pesticides. Two sites would exceed DPR's 1,3-D regulatory target level for long-term cancer risk if the detected concentrations were to continue for 70 years. Chloropicrin concentrations decreased between 2014 and 2015, but still exceeded DPR's health screening level at one site, triggering the need for additional evaluation. Chlorpyrifos and diazinon approach, but do not exceed DPR's health screening levels. The AMN provides important data about long-term exposure of the general population to these pesticides. However, the AMN provides limited information about other communities, seasonal exposures, exposure of children and other sensitive populations, and does not directly include EJ considerations into the community selection process.

**DPR Resource History  
Air Program  
(Dollars in thousands)**

<b>Program Budget</b>	<b>PY - 4</b>	<b>PY - 3</b>	<b>PY - 2</b>	<b>PY - 1</b>	<b>PY</b>
Authorized Expenditures	3,097	3,242	3,168	3,424	3,294
Actual Expenditures	2,814	2,985	2,855	3,304	3,141
Revenues					
Authorized Positions	16.4	16.3	16.3	17.0	16.0
Filled Positions	15.6	15.2	15.1	15.1	14.7
Vacancies	.8	1.1	1.2	1.9	1.3

**DPR Workload History  
(Hours required)**

<b>Workload Measure</b>	<b>PY - 4</b>	<b>PY - 3</b>	<b>PY - 2</b>	<b>PY - 1</b>	<b>PY</b>	<b>CY</b>
Community analysis	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site location and set up	0	0	0	0	0	0
General maintenance	690	690	690	690	690	690
Sampling	1,352	1,352	1,352	1,352	1,352	1,352
Data analysis and reporting	1,580	1,580	1,580	1,580	1,580	1,580

Total	3,622	3,622	3,622	3,622	3,622	3,622
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

**ARB Resource History**  
(Dollars in thousands)

Program Budget	PY - 4	PY - 3	PY - 2	PY - 1	PY
Authorized Expenditures	393	393	393	393	393
Actual Expenditures	393	393	393	393	393
Revenues	393	393	393	393	393
Authorized Positions	2	2	2	2	2
Filled Positions	2	2	2	2	2
Vacancies	0	0	0	0	0

**ARB Workload History**  
(Hours required)

Workload Measure	PY - 4	PY - 3	PY - 2	PY - 1	PY	CY
Application Site Selection	204	204	204	204	204	204
Site and Sampling Preparation	136	136	136	136	136	136
Field Sampling	781	781	781	781	781	781
Field Quality Control Checks	204	204	204	204	204	204
Lab Analyses	1,732	1,732	1,732	1,732	1,732	1,732
Data Compilation	272	272	272	272	272	272
Report Preparation	272	272	272	272	272	272

**C. State Level Considerations**

As mandated by state law (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2000 (SB 89); Chapter 830, Statutes of 2012 (SB 535)), CalEPA developed an EJ strategy to encourage meaningful public participation in environmental decision-making, integrate EJ into enforcement of environmental laws, improve research and data collection to address EJ issues, and facilitate effective cross-media coordination. State law requires Cal EPA to conduct its programs, policies, and activities that substantially affect human health or the environment in a manner that accounts for the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and income levels, including minority populations and low-income populations of the state.

At the agency level, CalEPA's Strategic Vision is "A California where pest management is fundamental to a healthy environment." This proposal revises and expands the AMN to better enable DPR to accomplish several goals of CalEPA's Strategic Vision: Goal 1—Protect people and the environment; and Goal 4—Ensure EJ.

In addition, the proposal supports an element of Goal 2 of the *Recommendations of the CalEPA Advisory Committee on Environmental Justice* (September 2003 Final Report, page 25) to reduce environmental risks to children in part by "identify(ing) the pollutants and pollution sources which present the highest risk to children, based on toxicity, proximity, persistence, or other factors."

DPR is the public agency responsible for protecting California and its residents from adverse human health and environmental effects caused by the use of pesticides. Its mission is to protect human health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use and by fostering reduced-risk pest management. Protecting the air we breathe is one of DPR's highest priorities, focusing not only on preventing health problems that can be caused by pesticide air toxins, but also on reducing pesticide emissions that contribute to air pollution [FAC sections 12824, 12825, and 14021 et seq.; Health and Safety Code sections 39650 et seq.; Federal Clean Air Act sections 107, 110, 113, and 174; and 40 Code of Federal Regulations 50].

In addition, DPR is committed to working with other government agencies, communities, advocacy groups, regulated industries, and other interested parties to ensure EJ. This proposal is consistent with DPR's *Strategic Plan* (2013). Data collected under this proposal will enable DPR to expand its air quality protection efforts (Goal 1, Objectives 1 and 2) and ensure EJ (Goal 4, Objective 1).

The proposal also supports ARB's Environmental Justice Policies and Actions (Policies), adopted in 2001, which establish a framework for incorporating environmental justice into ARB's programs consistent with the directives of state law. In particular, this proposal supports Goal 7 of ARB's EJ Policies which state that "it shall be the ARB's policy to support research and data collection needed to reduce cumulative emissions, exposure, and health risks, as appropriate, in all communities, especially low-income and minority communities."

The proposal is also in line with the mission of ARB's Monitoring and Laboratory Division which aims to support California's air quality management program by providing timely and accurate ambient and source level measures to define the nature, extent and trend of air quality in the state. This further supports ARB's overall mission to promote and protect public health, welfare and ecological resources through the effective and efficient reduction of air pollutants while recognizing and considering the effects of the economy of the state.

## D. Justification

Compared with adults, children are more susceptible to the effects of pesticide exposure. Because of the potential public health risks to children, the California Environmental Health Tracking program examined the use of pesticides near public schools in the top 15 counties by agricultural pesticide use in 2010. They found pesticides of public health concerns were applied within ¼ mile of approximately 900 schools in 15 counties. Their *Agricultural Pesticide Use Near Public Schools in California* (2014) report found, among other things, that:

- "The top 5% of schools with any pesticide use nearby (45 schools attended by over 35,000 students) had amounts of pesticides applied within ¼ mile ranging from 2,635 – 28,979 pounds."
- "Hispanic children were more likely to attend schools near the highest use of pesticides of public health concern."

Although the report indicates that children in schools near areas of high pesticide use may be exposed to pesticides in air, it also indicates that its results cannot be used to predict possible health impacts. Future air monitoring and exposure assessment efforts are needed to evaluate health impacts.

The results of current monitoring show a need to expand monitoring because detected concentrations for two pesticides exceed health screening levels or DPR's regulatory target concentrations. Other pesticides approach health screening levels, such as the organophosphates chlorpyrifos and diazinon. Additional monitoring sites would better characterize the variability in air concentrations and provide additional data to estimate air concentrations for areas not included in the current monitoring.

This proposal will enable DPR to fill these data gaps regarding schoolchildren's exposure to pesticides. It will also help DPR and ARB fulfill their EJ goals and objectives, as outlined in Cal/EPA's *Environmental Justice Strategy* and in DPR's *Strategic Plan*. By using existing long-term monitoring networks, DPR and ARB can accomplish the activities and meet the goals stated above.

This proposal requests resources and funding for two types of monitoring: (1) Air Monitoring Network: the year-round monitoring of several communities with high use of multiple pesticides and (2) intensive seasonal air monitoring: the monitoring of several communities in a high-use region during a high-use season for one to two pesticides.

### Current Air Monitoring Network

Currently, the AMN is a joint effort between DPR and ARB, with DPR currently monitoring on a year-round basis at three fixed sites for 32 pesticides and ARB monitoring on a year-round basis at three fixed sites for only volatile organic compounds (VOCs). ARB also conducts monitoring for chloropicrin on a seasonal-basis at its three fixed sites. The following chart compares DPR's and ARB's roles in the AMN.

### Current Air Monitoring Network

DPR responsible for	ARB responsible for
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community selection for 6 sites</li> <li>• Site selection and setup for 3 sites</li> <li>• Field sampling for 4 sites</li> <li>• Laboratory analysis for 32 pesticides (via a contract with the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA))                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Multi-residue samples for 3 sites</li> <li>○ VOC samples for 3 sites</li> <li>○ Chloropicrin samples for 3 sites</li> <li>○ MITC samples for 3 sites</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All data analysis, report writing, and presentation of results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site selection and setup for 3 sites</li> <li>• Field sampling for 2 sites                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Year-round sampling for VOCs</li> <li>○ Seasonal sampling for chloropicrin</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Laboratory analysis for 3 pesticides                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ VOC samples for 3 sites</li> <li>○ Chloropicrin samples for 3 sites (seasonal)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

### Current Intensive Seasonal Air Monitoring

Prior to the start of the AMN in 2011, DPR and ARB collaborated to conduct on average about one intensive short-term seasonal monitoring study each year. These seasonal monitoring studies consisted of concurrently monitoring for one to two pesticides, in six to eight communities of the highest use region, sampled four days each week, during the (eight to twelve week) peak use season. DPR and ARB had a similar division of work for these intensive seasonal studies, with DPR selecting the pesticides, regions, and time periods for monitoring, as well as conducting the health evaluation and data analysis. ARB conducted all of the field sampling and laboratory analysis and wrote a report of the monitoring results. DPR has not requested that ARB conduct any of these intensive seasonal air monitoring studies since 2009.

### Proposed Expansion

DPR and ARB propose to increase the number of communities monitored using year-round fixed sites from six to eight with all eight communities being monitored for 32 pesticides. DPR and ARB also propose to conduct three intensive short-term seasonal monitoring studies each year. To minimize travel-related expenses, ARB would be responsible for operating the five year-round pesticide air monitoring sites nearest existing ARB air monitoring facilities in Sacramento, Fresno, Bakersfield, El Monte, and Calexico. DPR would be responsible for operation of the three remaining year-round pesticide air monitoring sites. The proposed responsibilities for each agency are shown in the following charts.

### Proposed Air Monitoring Network

DPR responsible for	ARB responsible for
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community selection for 8 sites</li> <li>• Site selection and setup for 3 sites,</li> <li>• Field sampling for 3 sites,</li> <li>• Laboratory analysis (via a contract with CDFA) of                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Multi-residue samples for 8 sites</li> <li>○ Chloropicrin samples for 8 sites</li> <li>○ MITC samples for 8 sites</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All data analysis, report writing, and presentation of results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site selection and setup for 5 sites</li> <li>• Field sampling for 5 sites</li> <li>• Laboratory analysis of VOC samples for 8 sites</li> </ul>

### Proposed Intensive Seasonal Monitoring Studies

DPR responsible for	ARB responsible for
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pesticide selection for 3 studies</li> <li>• Region and season selection for 3 studies</li> <li>• Part of the report writing, all data analysis, and presentation of results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site selection and setup for 3 studies</li> <li>• Field sampling for 3 studies</li> <li>• Laboratory analysis for 3 studies</li> <li>• Part of the report writing</li> </ul>

The existing AMN conducts long-term monitoring for 32 pesticides and breakdown products that may impact human health of the general population. DPR selected communities based only on pesticide use. In addition, monitoring sites within communities were not necessarily located at schools where children spend much of their time.

In summary, this proposal recommends that DPR and ARB:

- revise its process to select communities to include EJ considerations,
- add two additional communities to the AMN,
- locate monitoring sites at as many schools as possible in the proposed AMN,
- increase the number of communities being monitored using year-round fixed sites from 6 to 8,
- complete 3 intensive, seasonal air monitoring studies each year, and
- increase the total number of communities being monitored for 32 pesticides from 3 to 8

DPR will evaluate 1,267 total communities statewide for pesticide use and EJ factors. Communities with the highest use of fumigants and/or organophosphates within five miles will have the highest priority for monitoring. DPR will also consider weather conditions, such as wind speed and direction in the community selection. Within the selected communities, monitoring sites will be located at schools or other public properties, near the edge of the communities and downwind of high use areas.

Selecting locations based on additional criteria (e.g., EJ criteria) and locating monitoring sites at schools will help DPR identify and address specific concerns raised by government and the public regarding children's health and pesticides in air. Long-term, ongoing monitoring by an expanded network of sampling stations provides this information. This proposal will also help DPR identify opportunities to reduce the health risk to EJ communities, while focusing on children's health. Data acquired from the expanded AMN will be used to achieve the goals listed earlier.

Current staffing levels and resources do not allow DPR and ARB to expand their existing long-term monitoring activities; therefore, DPR requests resources to support the workload activities of the AMN. In addition, DPR is requesting funds to contract analysis of additional samples by CDFA's Center for Analytical Chemistry. DPR also requests contract dollars to develop improved sampling and analytical methods. DPR also requests funds to contract the field sampling responsibilities for one to two sites if monitoring locations are selected at a distance from Sacramento that would require excessive travel and overtime for DPR personnel. These resources will be needed to conduct sampling, develop and validate additional sampling methods, and conduct laboratory and data analysis for the AMN.

ARB requests resources to support additional field monitoring activities and related laboratory analysis. ARB is also requesting funding to purchase new field sampling equipment for the three additional year-round sites, replace aging laboratory instrumentation, purchase ongoing field and laboratory supplies for year-round and seasonal sites, travel to the five year-round sites as well as the seasonal study sites, pay for overtime, and maintain instrumentation. ARB's requested funding is \$599,000 in 2016-17, \$596,000 in 2017-18, and \$715,000 in one-time funding for equipment purchases in 2016-17.

The DPR Fund will provide total funding of \$1,487,000 in 2016-17, and \$1,422,000 in 2017-18 for both agencies. The Air Pollution Control Fund will provide \$851,000 for ARB's equipment and maintenance expenses in 2016-17 and \$136,000 for maintenance expenses in 2017-18. The DPR Fund cannot sustain the costs of the expanded AMN on a permanent basis. Therefore, DPR and ARB are requesting limited-term funding to expand and strengthen the AMN. In 2018-19, the AMN will revert to its current level.

This proposal includes \$62,000 for one-time purchases for DPR supplies, services, and equipment; a \$70,000 DPR contract for sampling remote site(s), a \$100,000 DPR contract to improve the sampling and laboratory methods, a \$548,000 DPR contract with CDFA for additional laboratory analyses; and \$715,000 for one-time ARB equipment purchases, as detailed below.

- The DPR one-time supplies, services, and equipment are needed to setup relocated monitoring sites.
- As described below, DPR is responsible for sampling sites that are not near any DPR or ARB offices. Depending on the location of the communities selected, it may be less expensive to contract for sampling remote sites rather than paying salaries and travel expenses for DPR or ARB staff.

- The sampling methods need improvement to better characterize long-term air concentrations. Currently a single set of 24-hour samples is collected each week. This means that no monitoring occurs for six days each week. If the sampling methods can be revised so that a single sample period is two or more days, a better estimate of long-term concentrations can be obtained, with little or no increase in cost. The analytical methods also need improvement, particularly adding more pesticides of the greatest health concern to the multi-pesticide analytical method.
- DPR needs to amend its contract with CDFA for the additional sample analyses that would be required.
- ARB needs to replace aging laboratory instrumentation.

Once implemented, this proposal will enable DPR and ARB to conduct year-round monitoring in 8 communities and provide long-term exposure data on 32 pesticides. DPR will include EJ criteria in its process to choose the communities to be monitored. DPR and ARB will locate monitoring sites near schools and similar locations frequented by children to better characterize impacts on children's health. This monitoring will enable DPR and ARB to perform the following activities:

- Better evaluate exposures to pesticides to which children may have more sensitivity.
- Develop and validate additional methods used to estimate emissions and air concentrations from pesticide use and weather patterns.
- Determine if additional safeguards are needed to protect children and other sensitive populations from pesticide exposure; monitor effectiveness of such safeguards, if implemented.
- Determine if pesticides in air disproportionately impact low-income communities.
- Augment the monitoring DPR and the ARB currently conduct, which is used for the identification and mitigation of pesticides under DPR's TAC program to provide a more comprehensive estimate of exposure. (DPR's TAC program identifies pesticides that have or may have an impact on public health from inhalation exposure, and mitigates exposures when necessary.)

If DPR and ARB do not make these changes to their long-term monitoring, they will have limited monitoring data that specifically addresses children's exposure to pesticides in air, limited information about whether mitigation measures are necessary and limited data to allow DPR to evaluate effectiveness of any mitigation measures it may have to implement.

## **E. Outcomes and Accountability**

Approving this proposal will provide DPR and ARB the necessary resources and contract funds for laboratory sample analysis and monitoring to expand their AMN to better protect the health of all of California's residents, especially children and those in EJ communities. Providing funding for this proposal will allow DPR to fulfill its mandate to provide a comprehensive program for the continuous evaluation of all registered pesticides, incorporate EJ considerations, and focus on children's health. If this proposal were funded, DPR would continue to provide annual reports and public presentations to show air monitoring results, effectiveness of mitigation measures, and the need for new mitigation measures, as shown in the Projected Outcomes.

The proposed monitoring is similar in concept to other monitoring networks, such as DPR's statewide food residue monitoring, DPR's network of wells for monitoring pesticides in ground water, and ARB's network for monitoring nonpesticidal toxic air pollutants. The proposed expanded monitoring will fill a crucial gap in determining the risk of pesticides to children and communities of concern. Food, water, and air are the major ways people are exposed to pesticides. DPR and other agencies conduct continuous monitoring of food and water for pesticides. DPR and ARB are the only agencies that currently conduct continuous pesticide monitoring in air.

DPR is committed to accountability and believes that its stakeholders and the public are entitled to timely, accurate information on what California's pesticide regulatory programs accomplish, how well they work, and how much they cost to administer. To provide accountability, DPR uses a functional-based approach to operational planning and accounting. DPR has 11 major program functions that are meaningful to the Legislature, the public, and other stakeholders, and uses the flexibility of its accounting system to track costs and provide reports by function, as well as by branch.

**DPR Projected Outcomes (Hours required)**

<b>Workload Measure</b>	<b>CY</b>	<b>BY</b>	<b>BY+1</b>
Community analysis	0	255	255
Site selection and set up	0	1,020	1,020
General maintenance	690	0	0
Sampling	1,352	1,092	1,092
Data analysis and reporting	1,580	1,275	1,275
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,622</b>	<b>3,642</b>	<b>3,642</b>

**ARB's Projected Outcomes**

<b>Workload Measure</b>	<b>CY</b>	<b>BY</b>	<b>BY+1</b>
Site Selection	204	700	700
Site and Sampling Preparation	136	600	600
Field Sampling	781	3600	3600
Field Quality Control Checks	204	300	300
Lab Analyses	1732	3200	3200
Data Compilation	272	300	300
Report Preparation	272	300	300

**F. Analysis of All Feasible Alternatives**

- 1. Appropriate \$2.338 million in 2016-17 and \$1.558 million in 2017-18 for DPR and ARB to monitor a total of 8 communities for 32 pesticides and contract with CDFA and other organizations to conduct monitoring and improve monitoring methods.**

**Pro** - This alternative would provide funds, staffing, and contract dollars to expand the AMN from 6 to 8 year-round fixed sites, enhances the AMN for monitoring more pesticides, and revises the community selection process and monitoring sites to better address children's health and EJ considerations. This alternative would also provide the resumption of three intensive seasonal monitoring studies per year. DPR and ARB will provide checks on each other's monitoring programs, resulting in higher quality data. This alternative builds on longstanding ARB air monitoring and laboratory analysis expertise, both in operating year-round fixed sites and conducting intensive seasonal studies.

**Con** - This alternative relies on close coordination between DPR and ARB; however, the existing working relationship on the Air Monitoring Network and seasonal studies will decrease the potential for miscommunication and errors.

- 2. Maintain current program.** DPR and ARB would maintain their AMN at the current level.

**Pro** – Maintaining the current level of air monitoring activity will not require additional resources and will continue to provide an adequate amount of information to meet most program needs.

**Con** – If DPR's and ARB's air monitoring capability is not expanded beyond its current level, critical data gaps relating to children's health and EJ communities will not be filled. The air monitoring conducted by DPR and ARB will continue to provide data with which to estimate subchronic and chronic inhalation exposure to multiple pesticides only for the general population. DPR will be unable to determine if EJ communities have disproportionate exposure to pesticides in air.

- 3. Redirect DPR and ARB staff and contract funds.** DPR would redirect staff from its Ground Water and Surface Water programs in the Environmental Monitoring (EM) Branch and redirect contract funds for laboratory analysis

related to this proposal. ARB would redirect staff and resources from its Air Quality Surveillance Branch, Quality Management Branch, and Northern Laboratory Branch within the Monitoring and Laboratory Division (MLD).

**Pro** – DPR and ARB would be able to expand its long-term monitoring somewhat with some of the resulting benefits, described in the Justification.

**Con** – Redirection of staff would require reductions in other statutory DPR EM Branch program activities. EM is currently fulfilling its mandated programs. The Ground Water program has its own mandates to fulfill and the Surface Water program monitoring also fulfills DPR's mandate to continuously evaluate pesticides. Redirection of staff and contract funds from other EM Branch programs would result in reductions in the activities of those other critical programs that protect human health. In addition, if these funds were redirected they are not enough to fully provide the funds for this proposal. Redirection of ARB staff would require reductions in other statutory MLD program activities, resulting in potential legal liabilities due to noncompliance with federal and state monitoring requirements. MLD is currently fulfilling its mandated programs as efficiently as possible. Redirecting existing positions is not a viable solution as no air monitoring programs have terminated, or are scheduled to terminate in the foreseeable future. Stricter air quality standards, revised risk assessment guidance, and increased litigation requires greater efforts to collect high quality, legally defensible air quality data for state designations and other purposes.

#### **4. Use requested funding to outsource additional laboratory activities and monitoring to private consultants.**

DPR could contract with consultants outside DPR and state government to perform additional air monitoring, sample analysis, analytical methods development, and data evaluation.

**Pro** – Some consultants already employ scientists with the appropriate expertise who could perform the additional air monitoring. Private laboratories exist that could analyze samples.

**Con**—Consultants lack background knowledge of DPR's pesticide regulation and risk characterization process. Furthermore, salaries are often higher in the private sector, coupled with significant overhead; thus, the cost per product would be much higher. The sample analysis and analytical methods development are quite specialized and few, if any, private laboratories possess the requisite expertise to perform them. In addition, extensive DPR and ARB resources would still be required to review the consultants' work products. Finally, some state agencies (e.g., CDFA) hesitate to use private consultants because of credibility issues related to court standing. DPR and ARB have the credibility to diffuse legal challenges.

## **G. Implementation Plan**

### Timeline:

July 2016 – December 2016	Hire and train technical staff Reassess target pesticides and monitoring sites Establish new sites and select different pesticides, if necessary Contract with CDFA's Center for Analytical Chemistry to analyze samples; and another organization to develop analytical methods Contract with an organization to sample remote site(s) Purchase equipment Conduct first seasonal studies
Ongoing	Collect and analyze samples every week at eight network locations Track pesticide use trends and air concentrations based on use and weather patterns Continue to determine feasibility of using monitored pesticides as surrogates for other pesticides Evaluate exposure and risk of multiple pesticides to children and EJ communities Respond promptly to high concentrations, if necessary Provide a written report and communicate findings annually to all interested stakeholders Plan and conduct additional seasonal studies

## **H. Supplemental Information**

This proposal includes \$62,000 for one-time purchases for DPR supplies, services, and equipment; a \$70,000 DPR contract for sampling remote site(s), a \$100,000 DPR contract to improve the sampling and laboratory methods, a \$548,000 DPR contract with CDFA for additional laboratory analyses; and \$715,000 for one-time ARB equipment purchases.

DPR will conduct additional evaluations of the data from the expanded monitoring. The expanded monitoring will provide data for a more comprehensive analysis than possible with the current monitoring efforts. More robust statistical analyses and computer modeling should be possible with the additional data. DPR will expand its publication of the results to refereed journals and public outreach materials, in addition to its annual report.

## **I. Recommendation**

Approve Alternative 1. Implementing this alternative will enable DPR and ARB to revise and expand its AMN to provide the information to inform DPR's regulatory activities and effectively protect children's health and EJ communities.

<b>Air Resources Board</b>				<b>Attachment A</b>		
				<b>Workload Justification</b>		
<b>Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund</b>						
<b>Position Title:</b>		<b>Air Pollution Specialist</b>				
<b>Workload Measure</b>		<b>FY 2016-2017</b>		<b>FY 2017-18</b>		
<b>Description of task</b>	<b>Number of Times the task will be performed</b>	<b>Number of hours needed to complete task</b>	<b>Total number of annual hours</b>	<b>Number of times the task will be performed</b>	<b>Number of hours needed to complete task</b>	<b>Total number of annual hours</b>
Conduct search for suitable monitoring sites in communities in close proximity to pesticide use. Obtain approval from property managers to conduct monitoring. Coordinate the transport and installation of equipment.	5	40	200	0	0	0
Conduct weekly sampling, year round at 3 additional permanent network sites.	180	5	900	180	5	900
Conduct intensive sampling 4 times a week, for up to 12 weeks in communities near agricultural pesticide use.	12	40	480	12	40	480
Maintain and conduct quality management activities.	12	8	96	12	8	96
Prepare field/lab safety plans, conduct safety training, and mitigate safety issues.	4	40	160	4	40	160
Prepare Seasonal study reports and present findings	0	0	0	1	200	200
<b>Total Hours</b>			<b>1800</b>			<b>1800</b>

1.0 Position Equivalent = 1,800 hours  
Numbers are based on previous workload experience

<b>Air Resources Board</b>						<b>Attachment A</b>	
						<b>Workload Justification</b>	
<b>Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund</b>							
<b>Position Title:</b>		<b>Air Pollution Specialist</b>					
<b>Workload Measure</b>		<b>FY 2016-2017</b>			<b>FY 2017-18</b>		
<b>Description of task</b>	<b>Number of Times the task will be performed</b>	<b>Number of hours needed to complete task</b>	<b>Total number of annual hours</b>	<b>Number of times the task will be performed</b>	<b>Number of hours needed to complete task</b>	<b>Total number of annual hours</b>	
Conduct intensive sampling 4 times a week, for up to 12 weeks in communities near agricultural pesticide use.	24	40	960	24	40	960	
Prepare sampling protocols for each sampling study	3	80	240	3	80	240	
Prepare Seasonal study reports and present findings	3	200	600	3	200	600	
<b>Total Hours</b>			<b>1800</b>			<b>1800</b>	

*1.0 Position Equivalent = 1,800 hours  
Numbers are based on previous workload experience*

Department of Pesticide Regulation					Attachment B	
Workload Justification						
Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund						
Position Title:	(1.4) Senior Environmental Scientist					
Workload Measure	FY 2016-2017			FY 2017-18		
Description of task	Number of Times the task will be performed	Number of hours needed to complete task	Total number of annual hours	Number of times the task will be performed	Number of hours needed to complete task	Total number of annual hours
Data analysis and report write up.	1	510	510	1	340	340
Conduct analysis of potential season study locations based on pesticide use.	1	255	255	1	510	510
Seasonal study recommendation write-up	3	340	1,020	3	340	1,020
Seasonal study data analysis and report.	3	255	765	3	255	765
Total Hours			2,550			2,635

Department of Pesticide Regulation				Attachment B		
<b>Workload Justification</b>						
Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund						
Position Title:	(0.6) Scientific Aid					
Workload Measure	FY 2016-2017			FY 2017-18		
Description of task	Number of Times the task will be performed	Number of hours needed to complete task	Total number of annual hours	Number of times the task will be performed	Number of hours needed to complete task	Total number of annual hours
Conduct weekly sampling, year round at 3 air network sites.	52	16	832	52	16	1,080
Assist with maintenance of equipment	52	5	260	52	5	260
<b>Total Hours</b>			<b>1,092</b>			<b>1,092</b>

The budget bill language associated with this proposal is as follows:

Add the following provisions to Item 3900-001-0115:

1. The amount appropriated in this item includes revenues derived from the assessment of fines and penalties imposed as specified in Section 13332.18 of the Government Code.
2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amount appropriated in this item, \$851,000 shall be from penalty revenues that are subject to separate accounting in accordance with Health and Safety Code Sections 38580, 39674-39675, 42400-42410, 42420-42421, 43016, 43025-43031.5, 43154, 43211, and 43212. These funds shall be available for a one-time equipment purchase of air monitoring equipment and maintenance expenses of said equipment to assist the Department of Pesticide Regulation in their air monitoring network program.

# BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Air Monitoring Network Expansion

DP Name: 3900-401-BCP-DP-2016-MR

## Budget Request Summary

	FY16					
	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Salaries and Wages						
Earnings - Temporary Help	0	267	267	0	0	0
<b>Total Salaries and Wages</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$267</b>	<b>\$267</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Total Staff Benefits	0	124	124	0	0	0
<b>Total Personal Services</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$391</b>	<b>\$391</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Operating Expenses and Equipment						
5301 - General Expense	0	6	6	0	0	0
5302 - Printing	0	3	3	0	0	0
5304 - Communications	0	6	6	0	0	0
5320 - Travel: In-State	0	12	12	0	0	0
5322 - Training	0	3	3	0	0	0
5324 - Facilities Operation	0	30	30	0	0	0
5346 - Information Technology	0	12	9	0	0	0
539X - Other	0	851	136	0	0	0
<b>Total Operating Expenses and Equipment</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$923</b>	<b>\$205</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Budget Request</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,314</b>	<b>\$596</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Fund Summary

Fund Source - State Operations						
0106 - Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund	0	463	460	0	0	0
0115 - Air Pollution Control Fund	0	851	136	0	0	0
<b>Total State Operations Expenditures</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,314</b>	<b>\$596</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,314</b>	<b>\$596</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Program Summary

Program Funding						
3505 - Stationary Source	0	1,314	596	0	0	0
<b>Total All Programs</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,314</b>	<b>\$596</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Air Monitoring Network Expansion

DP Name: 3930-400-BCP-DP-2016-MR

## Budget Request Summary

	FY16					
	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Salaries and Wages						
Earnings - Temporary Help	0	133	133	0	0	0
<b>Total Salaries and Wages</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$133</b>	<b>\$133</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Total Staff Benefits	0	54	54	0	0	0
<b>Total Personal Services</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$187</b>	<b>\$187</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Operating Expenses and Equipment						
5301 - General Expense	0	4	4	0	0	0
5302 - Printing	0	2	2	0	0	0
5304 - Communications	0	4	4	0	0	0
5320 - Travel: In-State	0	25	25	0	0	0
5322 - Training	0	2	2	0	0	0
5324 - Facilities Operation	0	16	16	0	0	0
5340 - Consulting and Professional Services - Interdepartmental	0	683	683	0	0	0
5346 - Information Technology	0	6	4	0	0	0
5368 - Non-Capital Asset Purchases - Equipment	0	35	0	0	0	0
539X - Other	0	60	35	0	0	0
<b>Total Operating Expenses and Equipment</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$837</b>	<b>\$775</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Budget Request</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,024</b>	<b>\$962</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Fund Summary

Fund Source - State Operations						
0106 - Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund	0	1,024	962	0	0	0
<b>Total State Operations Expenditures</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,024</b>	<b>\$962</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,024</b>	<b>\$962</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Program Summary

Program Funding						
3540046 - Monitoring and Surveillance	0	495	482	0	0	0
3540055 - Mitigation of Human Health Risk	0	529	480	0	0	0
<b>Total All Programs</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,024</b>	<b>\$962</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Personal Services Details**

Salaries and Wages

**Total Salaries and Wages**

Staff Benefits

5150900 - Staff Benefits - Other

**Total Staff Benefits**

**Total Personal Services**

	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
<b>Total Salaries and Wages</b>	\$0	\$133	\$133	\$0	\$0	\$0
5150900 - Staff Benefits - Other	0	54	54	0	0	0
<b>Total Staff Benefits</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$54</b>	<b>\$54</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Personal Services</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$187</b>	<b>\$187</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Motor Vehicle Insurance Account Payment

DP Name: 3900-400-BCP-DP-2016-MR

## Budget Request Summary

	FY16					
	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Operating Expenses and Equipment						
54XX - Special Items of Expense	0	2,011	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Operating Expenses and Equipment</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Budget Request</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Fund Summary

Fund Source - State Operations						
0115 - Air Pollution Control Fund	0	2,011	0	0	0	0
<b>Total State Operations Expenditures</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Program Summary

Program Funding						
3500 - Mobile Source	0	2,011	0	0	0	0
<b>Total All Programs</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Motor Vehicle Insurance Account Payment

DP Name: 3900-400-BCP-DP-2016-MR

## Budget Request Summary

	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Operating Expenses and Equipment						
54XX - Special Items of Expense	0	2,011	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Operating Expenses and Equipment</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total Budget Request</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Fund Summary

Fund Source - State Operations						
0115 - Air Pollution Control Fund	0	2,011	0	0	0	0
<b>Total State Operations Expenditures</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Total All Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## Program Summary

Program Funding						
3500 - Mobile Source	0	2,011	0	0	0	0
<b>Total All Programs</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,011</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>