



California Regulatory Notice Register

REGISTER 2020, NUMBER 21-Z

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

MAY 22, 2020

GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Fish and Game Code Section 1653 Consistency Determination

Request for South Fork 10 Mile River Enhancement Project

Phase 1B, 1653-2020-053-001-R1, Mendocino County 763

PROPOSITION 65

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT

Proposition 65 Dibromoacetic Acid No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) 763

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT

Proposition 65 Dichloroacetic Acid No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) 767

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT

Proposition 65 Trichloroacetic Acid No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) 771

(Continued on next page)

*Time-
Dated
Material*

SUMMARY OF REGULATORY ACTIONS

Regulations filed with Secretary of State 775

The *California Regulatory Notice Register* is an official state publication of the Office of Administrative Law containing notices of proposed regulatory actions by state regulatory agencies to adopt, amend or repeal regulations contained in the California Code of Regulations. The effective period of a notice of proposed regulatory action by a state agency in the *California Regulatory Notice Register* shall not exceed one year [Government Code § 11346.4(b)]. It is suggested, therefore, that issues of the *California Regulatory Notice Register* be retained for a minimum of 18 months.

CALIFORNIA REGULATORY NOTICE REGISTER is published weekly by the Office of Administrative Law, 300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250, Sacramento, CA 95814-4339. The Register is printed by Barclays, a subsidiary of West, a Thomson Reuters Business, and is offered by subscription for \$205.00 (annual price). To order or make changes to current subscriptions, please call (800) 328-4880. The Register can also be accessed at <http://www.oal.ca.gov>.

Information contained in this document is published as received from agencies and is not edited by Thomson Reuters.

GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST

**DEPARTMENT OF
FISH AND WILDLIFE**

FISH AND GAME CODE
SECTION 1653 CONSISTENCY
DETERMINATION REQUEST FOR

South Fork 10 Mile River
Enhancement Project Phase 1B
(Tracking Number: 1653-2020-053-001-R1)
Mendocino County

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) received a Request to Approve on May 6, 2020, that The Nature Conservancy proposes to carry out a habitat restoration or enhancement project pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1653. The proposed project includes enhancements at four sites including: five engineered large wood structures and an off-channel seasonally flooded wetland to provide high-flow refugia and increase floodplain connection; three accelerated-recruitment large wood structures to provide habitat complexity; and a new side channel with four engineered large wood structures along its extent and an engineered log jam at its entrance to redirect flows from the active channel and to re-connect the historic floodplain. The proposed project will be carried out along the lower 1.7 miles of the South Fork Ten Mile River and includes its confluence with the Main Stem Ten Mile River. The proposed project is located near 31171 Camp 1 Ten Mile Road, Fort Bragg, Mendocino County, California.

On February 17, 2020, the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Water Board) received a Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the terms of, and obtain coverage under, the General 401 Water Quality Certification Order for Small Habitat Restoration Projects (General 401 Order) for the South Fork 10 Mile River Enhancement Project Phase 1B. The Regional Water Board determined that the Project, as described in the NOI, was categorically exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review (section 15333 — Small Habitat Restoration Projects) and met the eligibility requirements for coverage under the General 401 Order. The Regional Water Board issued a Notice of Applicability (WDID No.

1B20019WNME; ECM PIN No. CW-864879) for coverage under the General 401 Order on April 20, 2020.

The Nature Conservancy is requesting a determination that the project and associated documents are complete pursuant to Fish and Game Code section 1653 subdivision (d). If CDFW determines the project is complete, the District will not be required to obtain an incidental take permit under Fish and Game Code section 2081 subdivision (b) or a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement under Fish and Game Code section 1605 for the proposed project.

In accordance with Fish and Game Code section 1653 subdivision (e), if CDFW determines during the review, based on substantial evidence, that the request is not complete, The Nature Conservancy will have the opportunity to submit under Fish and Game Code section 1652.

PROPOSITION 65

**OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT**

**SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC
ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986**

**AMENDMENT TO SECTION 25705
SPECIFIC REGULATORY LEVELS POSING
NO SIGNIFICANT RISK:**

DIBROMOACETIC ACID

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) proposes to adopt a Proposition 65¹ No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) of 2.8 micrograms per day for dibromoacetic acid, by amending Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25705(b)².

PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS

Any written comments concerning this proposed action must be received by OEHHA by **July 7, 2020**, the designated close of the written comment period. All comments received will be posted on the OEHHA website at the close of the public comment period.

Because of limited in-office staffing during the COVID-19 emergency, OEHHA strongly recom-

¹ The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq., referred to herein as "Proposition 65" or "The Act."

² All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated.

mends that comments be submitted electronically through our website at <https://oehha.ca.gov/comments>. Comments submitted in paper form may still be mailed or faxed, but delays may occur if staff are unable to timely access them.

Mailing Address:

Ms. Esther Barajas–Ochoa
 Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
 P.O. Box 4010, MS–12–B
 Sacramento, California 95812–4010
 Fax: (916) 323.2265
 Street Address: 1001 I Street
 Sacramento, California 95814

Please be aware that OEHHA is subject to the California Public Records Act and other laws that require the release of certain information upon request. Comments on all regulatory and other actions are routinely posted on our website. By sending us your comments, you are waiving any right to privacy you may have in the information you provide. Individual commenters should advise OEHHA when submitting documents to request redaction of home address or personal telephone numbers. Names of commenters will not be redacted.

A public hearing on this proposed regulatory amendment will be scheduled on request. To request a hearing send an e–mail to Esther Barajas–Ochoa at esther.barajas-ochoa@oehha.ca.gov or to the address listed above by no later than **June 22, 2020**, which is 15 days before the close of the comment period. OEHHA will provide a notice of the hearing to the requester and interested parties on the Proposition 65 mailing list for regulatory public hearings. The notice will also be posted on the OEHHA website at least ten days before the public hearing date. The notice will provide the date, time, and location of the hearing.

CONTACT

Please direct inquiries concerning the proposed regulatory action described in this notice to Esther Barajas–Ochoa at esther.barajas-ochoa@oehha.ca.gov or by telephone at (916) 322–2068. Mario Fernandez is a back–up contact person for inquiries concerning processing of this action and is available at mario.fernandez@oehha.ca.gov or (916) 323–2635.

**INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT
 OVERVIEW**

Proposition 65 prohibits a person in the course of doing business from knowingly and intentionally exposing any individual to a chemical that has been listed as known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual³. The Act also prohibits a business from knowingly discharging a listed chemical into water or onto or into land where such chemical passes or probably will pass into any source of drinking water⁴.

For carcinogens, an exemption from the warning requirement is provided by the Act when the exposure for which the person is responsible can be demonstrated to produce no significant risk or when a discharge which otherwise complies with all applicable requirements would not cause any significant amount of the discharged or released chemical to enter any source of drinking water⁵. A determination that a level of exposure poses no significant risk may be made utilizing regulations adopted by OEHHA (Sections 25701–25721). Section 25701 describes alternative methods for making such a determination. Section 25703 sets forth the process for determining “no significant risk” levels for purposes of Proposition 65 and Section 25705 establishes those levels for certain listed chemicals.

Details on the basis for the proposed NSRL for dibromoacetic acid are provided in the Initial Statement of Reasons for this regulatory amendment, which is available on request from Esther Barajas–Ochoa and is posted on the OEHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

This proposed amendment to Section 25705 would add an NSRL for dibromoacetic acid by amending Section 25705(b) as follows (addition in underline):

*Chemical: **Dibromoacetic acid** — NSRL, in micrograms per day: **2.8***

To develop the proposed NSRL for dibromoacetic acid, OEHHA relied on the National Toxicology Program (NTP) report entitled “Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Dibromoacetic Acid (CAS No. 631–64–1) in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1 Mice (Drink-

³ Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.

⁴ Health and Safety Code section 25249.5.

⁵ Health and Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10.

ing Water Studies)⁶, Volume 101 in the series of International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, entitled “Some Chemicals Present in Industrial and Consumer Products, Food and Drinking-water”⁷, and additional publications on genotoxicity^{8,9,10,11,12,13}. The 2007 NTP report and the IARC monograph summarize the available data from rodent carcinogenicity studies, as well as other information relevant to the carcinogenic activity of dibromoacetic acid. Hu et al. (2017), Nelson et al. (2001), Stalter et al. (2016), Zhang et al. (2012; 2016), and Zuo et al. (2017) provide additional information on genotoxicity.

The NSRL for dibromoacetic acid is based upon the results of the most sensitive scientific study deemed to be of sufficient quality¹⁴.

Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulation

Some businesses may not be able to afford the expense of establishing an NSRL may be vulnerable to litigation for a failure to warn or for a prohibited discharge of the listed chemical. By providing an NSRL, this regulatory proposal spares businesses the expense of cal-

culating their own NSRL and may enable them to avoid litigation costs. In addition, the NSRL does not require, but may encourage, businesses to lower the amount of the listed chemical in their product to a level that does not cause a significant exposure, thereby providing a public health benefit to Californians. This in turn may reduce exposure to dibromoacetic acid and reduce resident, worker and environmental exposures to chemicals that cause cancer.

No Inconsistency or Incompatibility with Existing Regulations

After conducting an evaluation on any related regulations in this area, OEHHA has found that these are the only regulations dealing with Proposition 65 No Significant Risk Levels for this specific chemical. Therefore, OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The proposed regulation does not impose any mandatory requirements on businesses, state or local agencies and does not address compliance with any other law or regulation.

RESULTS OF ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (Gov. Code section 11346.3(b))

Impact on the Creation, Elimination, or Expansion of Jobs/Businesses in California

This regulatory proposal will not affect the creation or elimination of jobs within the State of California. Proposition 65 requires businesses with ten or more employees to provide warnings when they expose people to chemicals that are known to cause cancer. The law also prohibits the discharge of listed chemicals into sources of drinking water. Dibromoacetic acid is listed under Proposition 65; therefore, businesses that manufacture, distribute or sell products with dibromoacetic acid in the state must provide a warning if their product or activity exposes the public or employees to a significant amount of this chemical. Businesses are also prohibited from discharging significant amounts of this chemical into sources of drinking water. The regulatory proposal does not create additional compliance requirements, but instead provides a “safe harbor” value that aids businesses in determining whether a warning is required for a given exposure or a discharge is prohibited.

Because the proposed NSRL provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to the Act, but does not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses, OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulatory action will not have any impact on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses, or the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California.

⁶ National Toxicology Program (NTP 2007). Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Dibromoacetic Acid (CAS No. 631-64-1) in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1 Mice (Drinking Water Studies). NTP Technical Report Series No. 537. NIH Publication No. 07-4475. US Department of Health and Human Services, NTP, Research Triangle Park, NC. Available at https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/ntp/hdocs/It_rpts/tr537.pdf

⁷ International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC 2013). IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, Volume 101, Some Chemicals Present in Industrial and Consumer Products, Food and Drinking-water. IARC, World Health Organisation, Lyon France. Available from: <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol101/index.php>

⁸ Hu Y, Tan L, Zhang SH, et al. (2017). Detection of genotoxic effects of drinking water disinfection by-products using *Vicia faba* bioassay. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* 24(2): 1509-1517.

⁹ Nelson GM, Swank AE, Brooks LR, Bailey KC, George SE. (2001). Metabolism, microflora effects, and genotoxicity in haloacetic acid-treated cultures of rat cecal microbiota. *Toxicol Sci* 60(2): 232-241.

¹⁰ Zhang L, Xu L, Zeng Q, Zhang S, Xie H, Liu A, et al. (2012). Comparison of DNA damage in human-derived hepatoma line (HepG2) exposed to the fifteen drinking water disinfection byproducts using the single cell gel electrophoresis assay. *Mutat Res* 741(1-2): 89-94.

¹¹ Zhang S-h, Miao D-y, Tan L, Liu A-l, Lu W-q. (2016). Comparative cytotoxic and genotoxic potential of 13 drinking water disinfection by-products using a microplate-based cytotoxicity assay and a developed SOS/umu assay. *Mutagenesis* 31(1): 35-41.

¹² Stalter D, O'Malley E, von Gunten U, Escher BI. (2016). Fingerprinting the reactive toxicity pathways of 50 drinking water disinfection by-products. *Water Res* 91: 19-30.

¹³ Zuo YT, Hu Y, Lu WW, et al. (2017). Toxicity of 2,6-dichloro-1,4-benzoquinone and five regulated drinking water disinfection by-products for the *Caenorhabditis elegans* nematode. *J Hazard Mater* 321: 456-463.

¹⁴ Section 25703(a)(4).

Benefits of this regulation include sparing businesses the expense of calculating their own NSRL and possibly enabling them to reduce or avoid litigation costs. By providing an NSRL, it may encourage businesses to lower the amount of the listed chemical in their product to a level that does not cause a significant exposure, thereby providing a public health benefit to Californians. This in turn may reduce exposure to dibromoacetic acid and reduce resident, worker and environmental exposures to chemicals that cause cancer.

PEER REVIEW

This notice and the Initial Statement of Reasons are being provided to the OEHHA Science Advisory Board's Carcinogen Identification Committee for review and comment.

AUTHORITY

Health and Safety Code Section 25249.12.

REFERENCE

Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11.

IMPACT ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to local agencies or school districts¹⁵, OEHHA has determined the proposed regulatory action would not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts nor does it require reimbursement by the State pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code. OEHHA has also determined that no nondiscretionary costs or savings to local agencies or school districts will result from the proposed regulatory action.

COSTS OR SAVINGS TO STATE AGENCIES

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to any State agency, OEHHA has determined that no savings or increased costs to any State agency will result from the proposed regulatory action.

EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING TO THE STATE

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to any federal agency, OEHHA has determined that no costs or savings in federal funding to the State will result from the proposed regulatory action.

EFFECT ON HOUSING COSTS

OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulatory action will have no effect on housing costs because it provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to Proposition 65, but does not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses.

SIGNIFICANT STATEWIDE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT DIRECTLY AFFECTING BUSINESS, INCLUDING ABILITY TO COMPETE

Because the proposed regulatory level provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to Proposition 65, but do not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses, OEHHA has made an initial determination that the adoption of the regulation will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

COST IMPACTS ON REPRESENTATIVE PRIVATE PERSONS OR BUSINESSES

The proposed NSRL was developed to provide compliance assistance for these businesses in determining whether a warning is required or a discharge is prohibited. The NSRL provides a level of exposure at or below which a warning is not required and a discharge is not prohibited. Use of the NSRL is not mandatory. The implementing regulations allow a business to calculate its own level and provide guidance in order to assist businesses in doing so¹⁶. However, conducting such a process can be expensive and time consuming, and the resulting levels may not be defensible in an enforcement action. OEHHA is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulation will not impose any mandatory requirements on small business. Rather, the proposed NSRL will provide com-

¹⁵ See Health and Safety Code section 25249.11(b).

¹⁶ Title 27, Cal. Code of Regs., section 25701 et seq.

pliance assistance for small businesses subject to Proposition 65 because it will help them determine whether an exposure for which they are responsible is subject to the warning requirement or discharge prohibition of Proposition 65.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Government Code section 11346(a)(13) requires that OEHHA must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the OEHHA or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the OEHHA would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law than the proposal described in this notice.

AVAILABILITY OF STATEMENT OF REASONS AND TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS

OEHHA has prepared and has available for public review an Initial Statement of Reasons for the regulation, all the information upon which the regulation is based and the text of the regulation. These documents are posted on OEHHA’s website at www.oehha.ca.gov. Due to limited in-office staffing during the COVID-19 emergency, OEHHA strongly recommends that interested parties access these documents via its website. However, a copy of the Initial Statement of Reasons, the text of the regulation and the documents relied on to develop the proposed regulation are also available upon request from OEHHA at the address and telephone number indicated above.

AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

The full text of any regulation, which is changed or modified from the express terms of this proposed action, will be made available at least 15 days prior to the date on which OEHHA adopts the resulting regulation. Notice of the comment period on changed regulations and the full text will be mailed to individuals who testified or submitted written comments at the public hearing, if held, or whose comments were received by OEHHA during the public comment period, and anyone who requests notification from OEHHA of the availability of such changes. Copies of the notice and

the changed regulation will also be available on the OEHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

A copy of the Final Statement of Reasons for this regulatory action may be obtained, when it becomes available, from OEHHA at the address and telephone number indicated above, and on the OEHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT

SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986 PROPOSITION 65

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 25705 SPECIFIC REGULATORY LEVELS POSING NO SIGNIFICANT RISK:

DICHLOROACETIC ACID

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) proposes to adopt a Proposition 65¹ No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) of 17 micrograms per day for dichloroacetic acid, by amending Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25705(b)².

PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS

Any written comments concerning this proposed action must be received by OEHHA by **July 7, 2020**, the designated close of the written comment period. All comments received will be posted on the OEHHA website at the close of the public comment period.

Because of limited in-office staffing during the COVID-19 emergency, OEHHA strongly recommends that comments be submitted electronically through our website at <https://oehha.ca.gov/comments>. Comments submitted in paper form may still be mailed or faxed, but delays may occur if staff are unable to timely access them.

¹ The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq., referred to herein as “Proposition 65” or “The Act.”

² All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated.

Mailing Address:

Ms. Esther Barajas–Ochoa
 Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
 P.O. Box 4010, MS–12–B
 Sacramento, California 95812–4010
 Fax: (916) 323.2265
 Street Address: 1001 I Street
 Sacramento, California 95814

Please be aware that OEHHHA is subject to the California Public Records Act and other laws that require the release of certain information upon request. Comments on all regulatory and other actions are routinely posted on our website. By sending us your comments, you are waiving any right to privacy you may have in the information you provide. Individual commenters should advise OEHHHA when submitting documents to request redaction of home address or personal telephone numbers. Names of commenters will not be redacted.

A public hearing on this proposed regulatory amendment will be scheduled on request. To request a hearing send an e–mail to Esther Barajas–Ochoa at esther.barajas–ochoa@oehha.ca.gov or to the address listed above by no later than **June 22, 2020**, which is 15 days before the close of the comment period. OEHHHA will provide a notice of the hearing to the requester and interested parties on the Proposition 65 mailing list for regulatory public hearings. The notice will also be posted on the OEHHHA website at least ten days before the public hearing date. The notice will provide the date, time, and location of the hearing.

CONTACT

Please direct inquiries concerning the proposed regulatory action described in this notice to Esther Barajas–Ochoa at esther.barajas–ochoa@oehha.ca.gov or by telephone at (916) 322–2068. Mario Fernandez is a back–up contact person for inquiries concerning processing of this action and is available at mario.fernandez@oehha.ca.gov or (916) 323–2635.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT
 OVERVIEW

Proposition 65 prohibits a person in the course of doing business from knowingly and intentionally exposing any individual to a chemical that has been listed as known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual³. The Act also prohibits a business from

³ Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.

knowingly discharging a listed chemical into water or onto or into land where such chemical passes or probably will pass into any source of drinking water⁴.

For carcinogens, an exemption from the warning requirement is provided by the Act when the exposure for which the person is responsible can be demonstrated to produce no significant risk or when a discharge which otherwise complies with all applicable requirements would not cause any significant amount of the discharged or released chemical to enter any source of drinking water⁵. A determination that a level of exposure poses no significant risk may be made utilizing regulations adopted by OEHHHA (Sections 25701–25721). Section 25701 describes alternative methods for making such a determination. Section 25703 sets forth the process for determining “no significant risk” levels for purposes of Proposition 65 and Section 25705 establishes those levels for certain listed chemicals.

Details on the basis for the proposed NSRL for dichloroacetic acid are provided in the Initial Statement of Reasons for this regulatory amendment, which is available on request from Esther Barajas–Ochoa and is posted on the OEHHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

This proposed amendment to Section 25705 would add an NSRL for dichloroacetic acid by amending Section 25705(b) as follows (addition in underline):

*Chemical: **Dichloroacetic acid** — NSRL, in micrograms per day: 17*

To develop the proposed NSRL for dichloroacetic acid, OEHHHA relied on a study by DeAngelo *et al.* (1999)^{6,7}, a study by Bull *et al.* (2002)⁸, Volume 106 in the series of International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, entitled “Trichloroethylene, Tetrachloroethylene, and Some Other Chlorinated Agents”⁹, the National Toxicology Program (NTP) report entitled “Toxicology Studies of Bromodichloroacetic Acid (CAS No. 71133–14–7) in

⁴ Health and Safety Code section 25249.5.

⁵ Health and Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10.

⁶ DeAngelo AB, George MH, House DE (1999). Hepatocarcinogenicity in the male B6C3F1 mouse following a lifetime exposure to dichloroacetic acid in the drinking water. Dose–response determination and modes of action. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 58(8):485–507.

⁷ Individual animal survival and tumor data provided by Dr. DeAngelo, December 2007.

⁸ Bull RJ, Orner GA, Cheng RS, Stillwell L, Stauber AJ, Sasser LB, Lingohr MK, Thrall BD (2002). Contribution of dichloroacetate and trichloroacetate to liver tumor induction in mice by trichloroethylene. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol* 182(1):55–65.

⁹ International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC 2014). IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, Volume 106, **Trichloroethylene, Tetrachloroethylene, and Some Other Chlorinated Agents**. IARC, World Health Organization, Lyon, France. Available from: <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol106/index.php>.

F344/N Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice and Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Bromodichloroacetic Acid in F344/NTac Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice (Drinking Water Studies)¹⁰, and additional genotoxicity studies^{11,12,13,14,15,16,17}. The 2014 IARC Monograph summarizes the available data from rodent carcinogenicity studies, as well as other information relevant to the carcinogenic activity of dichloroacetic acid. The 2015 NTP report primarily discusses toxicological effects of bromodichloroacetic acid, but also summarizes genotoxic information on dichloroacetic acid, a metabolite of bromodichloroacetic acid. Zhang et al. (2016), Hu et al. (2017), Varshney et al. (2013), Hassoun et al. (2014), Ono et al. (1991), Stalter et al. (2016), and Hassoun and Dey (2008) provide additional information on genotoxicity. The NSRL for dichloroacetic acid is based upon the results of the most sensitive scientific study deemed to be of sufficient quality¹⁸.

Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulation

Some businesses may not be able to afford the expense of establishing an NSRL may be vulnerable to litigation for a failure to warn or for a prohibited discharge

of the listed chemical. By providing an NSRL, this regulatory proposal spares businesses the expense of calculating their own NSRL and may enable them to avoid litigation costs. In addition, the NSRL does not require, but may encourage, businesses to lower the amount of the listed chemical in their product to a level that does not cause a significant exposure, thereby providing a public health benefit to Californians. This in turn may reduce exposure to dichloroacetic acid and reduce resident, worker and environmental exposures to chemicals that cause cancer.

No Inconsistency or Incompatibility with Existing Regulations

After conducting an evaluation on any related regulations in this area, OEHHA has found that these are the only regulations dealing with Proposition 65 No Significant Risk Levels for this specific chemical. Therefore, OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The proposed regulation does not impose any mandatory requirements on businesses, state or local agencies and does not address compliance with any other law or regulation.

RESULTS OF ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (Gov. Code section 11346.3(b))

Impact on the Creation, Elimination, or Expansion of Jobs/Businesses in California

This regulatory proposal will not affect the creation or elimination of jobs within the State of California. Proposition 65 requires businesses with ten or more employees to provide warnings when they expose people to chemicals that are known to cause cancer. The law also prohibits the discharge of listed chemicals into sources of drinking water. Dichloroacetic acid is listed under Proposition 65; therefore, businesses that manufacture, distribute or sell products with dichloroacetic acid in the state must provide a warning if their product or activity exposes the public or employees to significant amount of this chemical. Businesses are also prohibited from discharging significant amounts of this chemical into sources of drinking water. The regulatory proposal does not create additional compliance requirements, but instead provides a “safe harbor” value that aids businesses in determining whether a warning is required for a given exposure or a discharge is prohibited.

Because the proposed NSRL provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to the Act, but does not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses, OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulatory action will not have any impact on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses, or the expansion

¹⁰ National Toxicology Program (NTP 2015). Toxicology Studies of Bromodichloroacetic Acid (CAS No. 71133-14-7) in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice and Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Bromodichloroacetic Acid in F344/NTac Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice (Drinking Water Studies). NTP Technical Report Series No. 583. US Department of Health and Human Services, NTP, Research Triangle Park, NC.

¹¹ Zhang SH, Miao DY, Tan L, Liu AL, Lu WQ (2016). Comparative cytotoxic and genotoxic potential of 13 drinking water disinfection by-products using a microplate-based cytotoxicity assay and a developed SOS/umu assay. *Mutagenesis*. 31(1):35-41.

¹² Hu Y, Tan L, Zhang SH, Zuo YT, Han X, Liu N, Lu WQ, Liu AL (2017). Detection of genotoxic effects of drinking water disinfection by-products using *Vicia faba* bioassay. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int*. 2016 Oct 26. [Epub ahead of print]

¹³ Varshney M, Chandra A, Chauhan LK, Goel SK (2013). Micronucleus induction by oxidative metabolites of trichloroethylene in cultured human peripheral blood lymphocytes: a comparative genotoxicity study. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int*. 20 (12): 8709-16.

¹⁴ Hassoun E, Cearfoss J, Mamada S, Al-Hassan N, Brown M, Heimberger K, Liu MC (2014). The effects of mixtures of dichloroacetate and trichloroacetate on induction of oxidative stress in livers of mice after subchronic exposure. *J Toxicol Environ Health A*. 77(6):313-23.

¹⁵ Ono Y, Somiya I, Kawamura M (1991). The evaluation of genotoxicity using DNA repairing test for chemicals produced in chlorination and ozonation processes. *Water Science and Technology* 23(1-3): 329-338.

¹⁶ Stalter D, O'Malley E, von Gunten U, Escher BI. (2016). Fingerprinting the reactive toxicity pathways of 50 drinking water disinfection by-products. *Water Res* 91: 19-30.

¹⁷ Hassoun EA, Dey S. (2008). Dichloroacetate- and trichloroacetate-induced phagocytic activation and production of oxidative stress in the hepatic tissues of mice after acute exposure. *J Biochem Mol Toxicol* 22(1): 27-34.

¹⁸ Section 25703(a)(4).

of businesses currently doing business within the State of California.

Benefits of this regulation include sparing businesses the expense of calculating their own NSRL and possibly enabling them to reduce or avoid litigation costs. By providing an NSRL, it may encourage businesses to lower the amount of the listed chemical in their product to a level that does not cause a significant exposure, thereby providing a public health benefit to Californians. This in turn may reduce exposure to dichloroacetic acid and reduce resident, worker and environmental exposures to chemicals that cause cancer.

PEER REVIEW

This notice and the Initial Statement of Reasons are being provided to the OEHHA Science Advisory Board's Carcinogen Identification Committee for review and comment.

AUTHORITY

Health and Safety Code Section 25249.12.

REFERENCE

Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11.

IMPACT ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to local agencies or school districts¹⁹, OEHHA has determined the proposed regulatory action would not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts nor does it require reimbursement by the State pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code. OEHHA has also determined that no nondiscretionary costs or savings to local agencies or school districts will result from the proposed regulatory action.

COSTS OR SAVINGS TO STATE AGENCIES

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to any State agency, OEHHA has determined that no savings or increased costs to any State agency will result from the proposed regulatory action.

EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING TO THE STATE

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to any federal agency, OEHHA has determined that no costs or savings in federal funding to the State will result from the proposed regulatory action.

EFFECT ON HOUSING COSTS

OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulatory action will have no effect on housing costs because it provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to Proposition 65, but does not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses.

SIGNIFICANT STATEWIDE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT DIRECTLY AFFECTING BUSINESS, INCLUDING ABILITY TO COMPETE

Because the proposed regulatory level provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to Proposition 65, but do not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses, OEHHA has made an initial determination that the adoption of the regulation will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

COST IMPACTS ON REPRESENTATIVE PRIVATE PERSONS OR BUSINESSES

The proposed NSRL was developed to provide compliance assistance for these businesses in determining whether a warning is required or a discharge is prohibited. The NSRL provides a level of exposure at or below which a warning is not required and a discharge is not prohibited. Use of the NSRL is not mandatory. The implementing regulations allow a business to calculate its own level and provide guidance in order to assist businesses in doing so²⁰. However, conducting such a process can be expensive and time consuming, and the resulting levels may not be defensible in an enforcement action. OEHHA is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulation will not impose any mandatory requirements on small business. Rather, the proposed NSRL will provide com-

¹⁹ See Health and Safety Code section 25249.11(b).

²⁰ Title 27, Cal. Code of Regs., section 25701 et seq.

pliance assistance for small businesses subject to Proposition 65 because it will help them determine whether an exposure for which they are responsible is subject to the warning requirement or discharge prohibition of Proposition 65.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Government Code section 11346(a)(13) requires that OEHHA must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the OEHHA or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the OEHHA would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law than the proposal described in this notice.

AVAILABILITY OF STATEMENT OF REASONS AND TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS

OEHHA has prepared and has available for public review an Initial Statement of Reasons for the regulation, all the information upon which the regulation is based and the text of the regulation. These documents are posted on OEHHA’s website at www.oehha.ca.gov. Due to limited in-office staffing during the COVID-19 emergency, OEHHA strongly recommends that interested parties access these documents via its website. A copy of the Initial Statement of Reasons, the text of the regulation and the documents relied on to develop the proposed regulation are also available upon request from OEHHA at the address and telephone number indicated above.

AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

The full text of any regulation, which is changed or modified from the express terms of this proposed action, will be made available at least 15 days prior to the date on which OEHHA adopts the resulting regulation. Notice of the comment period on changed regulations and the full text will be mailed to individuals who testified or submitted written comments at the public hearing, if held, or whose comments were received by OEHHA during the public comment period, and anyone who requests notification from OEHHA of the availability of such changes. Copies of the notice and

the changed regulation will also be available on the OEHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

A copy of the Final Statement of Reasons for this regulatory action may be obtained, when it becomes available, from OEHHA at the address and telephone number indicated above, and on the OEHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986**

**AMENDMENT TO SECTION 25705
SPECIFIC REGULATORY LEVELS POSING NO SIGNIFICANT RISK:**

TRICHLOROACETIC ACID

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) proposes to adopt a Proposition 65¹ No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) of 9.9 micrograms per day for trichloroacetic acid, by amending Title 27, California Code of Regulations, section 25705(b)².

PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS

Any written comments concerning this proposed action must be received by OEHHA by **July 7, 2020**, the designated close of the written comment period. All comments received will be posted on the OEHHA website at the close of the public comment period.

Because of limited in-office staffing during the COVID-19 emergency, OEHHA strongly recommends that comments be submitted electronically through our website at <https://oehha.ca.gov/comments>. Comments submitted in paper form may still be mailed or faxed, but delays may occur if staff are unable to timely access them.

¹ The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, codified at Health and Safety Code section 25249.5 et seq., referred to herein as “Proposition 65” or “The Act.”

² All further regulatory references are to sections of Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations unless otherwise indicated.

Mailing Address:

Ms. Esther Barajas–Ochoa
 Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
 P.O. Box 4010, MS–12–B
 Sacramento, California 95812–4010
 Fax: (916) 323.2265
 Street Address: 1001 I Street
 Sacramento, California 95814

Please be aware that OEHHA is subject to the California Public Records Act and other laws that require the release of certain information upon request. Comments on all regulatory and other actions are routinely posted on our website. By sending us your comments, you are waiving any right to privacy you may have in the information you provide. Individual commenters should advise OEHHA when submitting documents to request redaction of home address or personal telephone numbers. Names of commenters will not be redacted.

A public hearing on this proposed regulatory amendment will be scheduled on request. To request a hearing send an e–mail to Esther Barajas–Ochoa at esther.barajas-ochoa@oehha.ca.gov or to the address listed above by no later than **June 22, 2020**, which is 15 days before the close of the comment period. OEHHA will provide a notice of the hearing to the requester and interested parties on the Proposition 65 mailing list for regulatory public hearings. The notice will also be posted on the OEHHA website at least ten days before the public hearing date. The notice will provide the date, time, and location of the hearing.

CONTACT

Please direct inquiries concerning the proposed regulatory action described in this notice to Esther Barajas–Ochoa at esther.barajas-ochoa@oehha.ca.gov or by telephone at (916) 322–2068. Mario Fernandez is a back–up contact person for inquiries concerning processing of this action and is available at mario.fernandez@oehha.ca.gov or (916) 323–2635.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT
 OVERVIEW

Proposition 65 prohibits a person in the course of doing business from knowingly and intentionally exposing any individual to a chemical that has been listed as known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual³. The Act also prohibits a business from

³ Health and Safety Code section 25249.6.

knowingly discharging a listed chemical into water or onto or into land where such chemical passes or probably will pass into any source of drinking water⁴.

For carcinogens, an exemption from the warning requirement is provided by the Act when the exposure for which the person is responsible can be demonstrated to produce no significant risk or when a discharge which otherwise complies with all applicable requirements would not cause any significant amount of the discharged or released chemical to enter any source of drinking water⁵. A determination that a level of exposure poses no significant risk may be made utilizing regulations adopted by OEHHA (Sections 25701–25721). Section 25701 describes alternative methods for making such a determination. Section 25703 sets forth the process for determining “no significant risk” levels for purposes of Proposition 65 and Section 25705 establishes those levels for certain listed chemicals.

Details on the basis for the proposed NSRL for trichloroacetic acid are provided in the Initial Statement of Reasons for this regulatory amendment, which is available on request from Esther Barajas–Ochoa and is posted on the OEHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

This proposed amendment to Section 25705 would add an NSRL for trichloroacetic acid by amending Section 25705(b) as follows (addition in underline):

*Chemical: **Trichloroacetic acid** — NSRL, in micrograms per day: **9.9***

To develop the proposed NSRL for trichloroacetic acid, OEHHA relied on two studies by DeAngelo *et al.* (2008)^{6,7}, a study by Bull *et al.* (2002)⁸, Volume 106 in the series of International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, entitled “**Trichloroethylene, Tetrachloroethylene, and Some Other Chlorinated Agents**”⁹, the National Toxicology Program (NTP) report entitled “Toxicology Studies of Bromodichloroacetic Acid (CAS No. 71133–14–7) in

⁴ Health and Safety Code section 25249.5.

⁵ Health and Safety Code sections 25249.9 and 25249.10.

⁶ DeAngelo AB, Daniel FB, Wong DM, George MH (2008). The induction of hepatocellular neoplasia by trichloroacetic acid administered in the drinking water of the male B6C3F1 mouse. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 71(16):1056–68.

⁷ Individual animal survival and tumor data provided by the study authors were obtained from the US EPA in August 2016 (104–week study) and January 2017 (60–week study).

⁸ Bull RJ, Orner GA, Cheng RS, Stillwell L, Stauber AJ, Sasser LB, Lingohr MK, Thrall BD (2002). Contribution of dichloroacetate and trichloroacetate to liver tumor induction in mice by trichloroethylene. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol* 182(1):55–65.

⁹ International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC 2014). IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans, Volume 106, **Trichloroethylene, Tetrachloroethylene, and Some Other Chlorinated Agents**. IARC, World Health Organization, Lyon, France. Available from: <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol106/index.php>.

F344/N Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice and Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Bromodichloroacetic Acid in F344/NTac Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice (Drinking Water Studies)¹⁰, 11 additional genotoxicity studies^{11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21}, and two reviews^{22,23}. The 2014 IARC Monograph summarizes the available data from rodent carcinogenicity studies,

¹⁰ National Toxicology Program (NTP 2015). Toxicology Studies of Bromodichloroacetic Acid (CAS No. 71133-14-7) in F344/N Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice and Toxicology and Carcinogenesis Studies of Bromodichloroacetic Acid in F344/NTac Rats and B6C3F1/N Mice (Drinking Water Studies). NTP Technical Report Series No. 583. US Department of Health and Human Services, NTP, Research Triangle Park, NC.

¹¹ Anderson KJ, Leighty EG, Takahashi MT (1972). Evaluation of Herbicides for Possible Mutagenic Properties. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 20(3), pp 649-656.

¹² Zhang SH, Miao DY, Tan L, Liu AL, Lu WQ (2016). Comparative cytotoxic and genotoxic potential of 13 drinking water disinfection by-products using a microplate-based cytotoxicity assay and a developed SOS/umu assay. *Mutagenesis.* 31(1):35-41.

¹³ Hu Y, Tan L, Zhang SH, Zuo YT, Han X, Liu N, et al. (2017). Detection of genotoxic effects of drinking water disinfection by-products using *Vicia faba* bioassay. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int.* 24(2):1509-1517.

¹⁴ Varshney M, Chandra A, Chauhan LK, Goel SK (2013). Micronucleus induction by oxidative metabolites of trichloroethylene in cultured human peripheral blood lymphocytes: a comparative genotoxicity study. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int.* 20:8709-8716.

¹⁵ Varshney M, Chandra A, Chauhan LK, Goel SK (2014). In vitro cytogenetic assessment of trichloroacetic acid in human peripheral blood lymphocytes. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int.* 21(2):843-50.

¹⁶ Hassoun E, Cearfoss J, Mamada S, Al-Hassan N, Brown M, Heimberger K, Liu MC (2014). The effects of mixtures of dichloroacetate and trichloroacetate on induction of oxidative stress in livers of mice after subchronic exposure. *J Toxicol Environ Health A.* 77(6):313-23.

¹⁷ Stalter D, O'Malley E, von Gunten U, Escher BI. (2016). Fingerprinting the reactive toxicity pathways of 50 drinking water disinfection by-products. *Water Res* 91: 19-30.

¹⁸ Kurinnyi A. (1984). Cytogenetic activity of the herbicide sodium trichloroacetate. *TSitologia i genetika* 18(4): 318-319.

¹⁹ Zuo YT, Hu Y, Lu WW, et al. (2017). Toxicity of 2,6-dichloro-1,4-benzoquinone and five regulated drinking water disinfection by-products for the *Caenorhabditis elegans* nematode. *J Hazard Mater* 321: 456-463.

²⁰ Ono Y, Somiya I, Kawamura M (1991). The evaluation of genotoxicity using DNA repairing test for chemicals produced in chlorination and ozonation processes. *Water Science and technology* 23(1-3): 329-338.

²¹ Hassoun EA, Dey S (2008). Dichloroacetate- and trichloroacetate-induced phagocytic activation and production of oxidative stress in the hepatic tissues of mice after acute exposure. *J Biochem Mol Toxicol* 22(1): 27-34.

²² National Research Council (NRC 1987). Chemistry and toxicity of selected disinfectants and by-products. Drinking water and health: disinfectants and disinfectant by-products 7: 133-143, 182-133.

²³ Daniel F, Meier J, Deangelo A. (1993). Advances in research on carcinogenic and genotoxic by-products of chlorine disinfection: chlorinated hydroxyfuranones and chlorinated acetic acids. *Annali dell'Istituto superiore di sanita* 29(2): 279-291.

as well as other information relevant to the carcinogenic activity of trichloroacetic acid. The 2015 NTP report primarily discusses toxicological effects of bromodichloroacetic acid, but also summarizes genotoxic information on dichloroacetic acid, a metabolite of trichloroacetic acid. Anderson et al. (1972), Zhang et al. (2016), Hu et al. (2017), Varshney et al. (2013; 2014), Hassoun et al. (2014), Stalter et al. (2016), Kurinnyi (1984), Zuo et al. (2017), Ono et al. (1991), Hassoun and Dey (2008), NRC (1987), and Daniel et al. (1993) provide additional information on genotoxicity.

Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulation

Some businesses may not be able to afford the expense of establishing an NSRL may be vulnerable to litigation for a failure to warn or for a prohibited discharge of the listed chemical. By providing an NSRL, this regulatory proposal spares businesses the expense of calculating their own NSRL and may enable them to avoid litigation costs. In addition, the NSRL does not require, but may encourage, businesses to lower the amount of the listed chemical in their product to a level that does not cause a significant exposure, thereby providing a public health benefit to Californians. This in turn may reduce exposure to trichloroacetic acid and reduce resident, worker and environmental exposures to chemicals that cause cancer.

No Inconsistency or Incompatibility with Existing Regulations

After conducting an evaluation on any related regulations in this area, OEHHA has found that these are the only regulations dealing with Proposition 65 No Significant Risk Levels for this specific chemical. Therefore, OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. The proposed regulation does not impose any mandatory requirements on businesses, state or local agencies and does not address compliance with any other law or regulation.

RESULTS OF ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (Gov. Code section 11346.3(b))

Impact on the Creation, Elimination, or Expansion of Jobs/Businesses in California

This regulatory proposal will not affect the creation or elimination of jobs within the State of California. Proposition 65 requires businesses with ten or more employees to provide warnings when they expose people to chemicals that are known to cause cancer. The law also prohibits the discharge of listed chemicals into sources of drinking water. Trichloroacetic acid is listed under Proposition 65; therefore, businesses that manufacture, distribute or sell products with trichloroacetic acid in the state must provide a warning if their product

or activity exposes the public or employees to significant amount of this chemical. Businesses are also prohibited from discharging significant amounts of this chemical into sources of drinking water. The regulatory proposal does not create additional compliance requirements, but instead provides a “safe harbor” value that aids businesses in determining whether a warning is required for a given exposure or a discharge is prohibited.

Because the proposed NSRL provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to the Act, but does not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses, OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulatory action will not have any impact on the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses, or the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California.

Benefits of this regulation include sparing businesses the expense of calculating their own NSRL and possibly enabling them to reduce or avoid litigation costs. By providing an NSRL, it may encourage businesses to lower the amount of the listed chemical in their product to a level that does not cause a significant exposure, thereby providing a public health benefit to Californians. This in turn may reduce exposure to trichloroacetic acid and reduce resident, worker and environmental exposures to chemicals that cause cancer.

PEER REVIEW

This notice and the Initial Statement of Reasons are being provided to the OEHHA Science Advisory Board’s Carcinogen Identification Committee for review and comment.

AUTHORITY

Health and Safety Code Section 25249.12.

REFERENCE

Health and Safety Code Sections 25249.5, 25249.6, 25249.9, 25249.10 and 25249.11.

IMPACT ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to local agencies or school districts²⁴, OEHHA has determined the proposed regulatory action would not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts nor does it require reimbursement by the State pursuant to Part 7

(commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code. OEHHA has also determined that no nondiscretionary costs or savings to local agencies or school districts will result from the proposed regulatory action.

COSTS OR SAVINGS TO STATE AGENCIES

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to any State agency, OEHHA has determined that no savings or increased costs to any State agency will result from the proposed regulatory action.

EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING TO THE STATE

Because Proposition 65 does not apply to any federal agency, OEHHA has determined that no costs or savings in federal funding to the State will result from the proposed regulatory action.

EFFECT ON HOUSING COSTS

OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulatory action will have no effect on housing costs because it provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to Proposition 65, but does not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses.

SIGNIFICANT STATEWIDE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT DIRECTLY AFFECTING BUSINESS, INCLUDING ABILITY TO COMPETE

Because the proposed regulatory level provides compliance assistance to businesses subject to Proposition 65, but do not impose any mandatory requirements on those businesses, OEHHA has made an initial determination that the adoption of the regulation will not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

COST IMPACTS ON REPRESENTATIVE PRIVATE PERSONS OR BUSINESSES

The proposed NSRL was developed to provide compliance assistance for these businesses in determining whether a warning is required or a discharge is prohibited. The NSRL provides a level of exposure at or below which a warning is not required and a discharge is not prohibited. Use of the NSRL is not mandatory. The implementing regulations allow a business to calculate its own level and provide guidance in order to assist busi-

²⁴ See Health and Safety Code section 25249.11(b).

nesses in doing so²⁵. However, conducting such a process can be expensive and time consuming, and the resulting levels may not be defensible in an enforcement action. OEHHA is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

OEHHA has determined that the proposed regulation will not impose any mandatory requirements on small business. Rather, the proposed NSRL will provide compliance assistance for small businesses subject to Proposition 65 because it will help them determine whether an exposure for which they are responsible is subject to the warning requirement or discharge prohibition of Proposition 65.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Government Code section 11346(a)(13) requires that OEHHA must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the OEHHA or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the OEHHA would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law than the proposal described in this notice.

AVAILABILITY OF STATEMENT OF REASONS AND TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS

OEHHA has prepared and has available for public review an Initial Statement of Reasons for the regulation, all the information upon which the regulation is based and the text of the regulation. These documents are posted on OEHHA’s website at www.oehha.ca.gov. Due to limited in-office staffing during the COVID-19 emergency, OEHHA strongly recommends that interested parties access these documents via its website. However, a copy of the Initial Statement of Reasons, the text of the regulation and the documents relied on to de-

²⁵Title 27, Cal. Code of Regs., section 25701 et seq.

velop the proposed regulation are also available upon request from OEHHA at the address and telephone number indicated above.

AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

The full text of any regulation, which is changed or modified from the express terms of this proposed action, will be made available at least 15 days prior to the date on which OEHHA adopts the resulting regulation. These documents are posted on OEHHA’s website at www.oehha.ca.gov. Due to limited in-office staffing during the COVID-19 emergency, OEHHA strongly recommends that interested parties access these documents via its website. However, a Notice of the comment period on changed regulations and the full text will be mailed to individuals who testified or submitted written comments at the public hearing, if held, or whose comments were received by OEHHA during the public comment period, and anyone who requests notification from OEHHA of the availability of such changes. Copies of the notice and the changed regulation will also be available on the OEHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

A copy of the Final Statement of Reasons for this regulatory action may be obtained, when it becomes available, from OEHHA at the address and telephone number indicated above, and on the OEHHA website at www.oehha.ca.gov.

SUMMARY OF REGULATORY ACTIONS

REGULATIONS FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE

This Summary of Regulatory Actions lists regulations filed with the Secretary of State on the dates indicated. Copies of the regulations may be obtained by contacting the agency or from the Secretary of State, Archives, 1020 O Street, Sacramento, CA 95814, (916) 653-7715. Please have the agency name and the date filed (see below) when making a request.

File# 2020-0430-02
CALIFORNIA HEALTH BENEFIT EXCHANGE
Hardship and Religious Conscience Exemptions
Process

This emergency rulemaking action by the California Health Benefit Exchange readopts OAL File No. 2019-0927-05E that established the application process, eligibility and redetermination standards, and verification process for hardship and religious conscience exemptions.

Title 10
ADOPT: 6910, 6912, 6914, 6916, 6918, 6920, 6922
Filed 05/11/2020
Effective 05/11/2020
Agency Contact:
Faviola Ramirez-Adams (916) 228-8668

File# 2020-0408-02
DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
Peach Mosaic Disease Interior and Exterior Quarantine

This action repeals regulations concerning the exterior and interior quarantine of articles and commodities which may carry peach mosaic and any virus capable of causing symptoms identical to those of peach mosaic disease.

Title 3
REPEAL: 3262, 3400
Filed 05/06/2020
Effective 07/01/2020
Agency Contact: Karen Olmstead (916) 403-6879

File# 2020-0319-01
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES
Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Fiscal
Regulations

This action adopts a framework for counties, as defined, that receive Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) funds, to allocate, transfer, expend, and report the use of these funds, including provisions governing the reversion of funds to the state as a result of a county's failure to spend MHSA funds within specified time periods.

Title 9
ADOPT: 3200.022, 3200.025, 3200.079, 3200.181,
3200.195, 3200.197, 3200.213, 3200.227,
3200.244, 3200.252, 3200.254.1, 3200.257,
3200.258, 3200.323, 3420, 3420.10, 3420.15,
3420.20, 3420.30, 3420.35, 3420.40, 3420.45,
3420.50, 3420.55, 3420.60, 3420.65, 3510.005,
3510.030
AMEND: 3200.080, 3200.110, 3200.251,
3200.260, 3510
Filed 05/06/2020
Effective 07/01/2020
Agency Contact: Greg Rodriguez (916) 440-7766

File# 2020-0319-02
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES
Narcotic Treatment Program

This rulemaking action regarding narcotic treatment programs (NTPs) streamlines the process for licensed patient capacity change requests and calculating related license and application fees, creates Office-Based Narcotic Treatment Networks (OBNTNs) to expand NTP services and availability of medication units to rural communities, and establishes requirements for NTPs treating patients with buprenorphine and buprenorphine combination products.

Title 9
ADOPT: 10021, 10036, 10037, 10386
AMEND: 10000, 10010, 10020, 10025, 10030,
10035, 10040, 10045, 10055, 10056, 10057, 10060,
10095, 10125, 10130, 10145, 10160, 10165, 10190,
10195, 10240, 10260, 10270, 10280, 10315, 10320,
10330, 10345, 10355, 10360, 10365, 10370, 10375,
10380, 10385, 10410, 10425
REPEAL: 10015, 10340
Filed 05/07/2020
Effective 07/01/2020
Agency Contact: Kenneisha Moore (916) 345-8403

File# 2020-0403-02

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Health and Therapeutic Medical Physicist
Authorization

In this action, the Department of Public Health establishes the qualifications, authorization, and renewal processes, including new application and renewal fees and continuing education requirements, for persons who perform therapeutic X-ray system output calibrations and radiation protection surveys of therapeutic X-ray installations. The action also establishes the process for previously authorized persons to remain authorized and specifies the standards for limiting, revoking, and suspending authorization.

Title 17

ADOPT: 30313.05, 30313.07, 30313.09, 30313.10,
30313.15, 30313.20, 30313.25, 30313.30,
30313.40, 30313.45, 30313.50

AMEND: 30306, 30307, 30312, 30313

Filed 05/06/2020

Effective 10/01/2020

Agency Contact: Dawn Basciano (916) 440-7367

**PRIOR REGULATORY
DECISIONS AND CCR
CHANGES FILED WITH THE
SECRETARY OF STATE**

A quarterly index of regulatory decisions by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) is provided in the California Regulatory Notice Register in the volume published by the second Friday in January, April, July, and October following the end of the preceding quarter. For additional information on actions taken by OAL, please visit www.oal.ca.gov.