GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

California Regulatory Notice Register

REGISTER 2026, NUMBER 38–Z PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW SEPTEMBER 18, 2026

PROPOSED ACTION ON REGULATIONS

(Continued on next page)

***Time–
Dated
Material***

GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST

RULEMAKING PETITION DECISION

SUMMARY OF REGULATORY ACTIONS

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 $409.00 (annual price). To order or make changes to current subscriptions, please call (800) 328–4880. The Register can also be accessed at **https://oal.ca.gov**.

PROPOSED ACTION ON REGULATIONS

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

TITLE 2. INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

ADOPT CONFLICT–OF–INTEREST CODE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the California Interagency Council on Homelessness, pursuant to the authority vested in it by section 87300 of the Government Code, proposes its conflict–of–interest code. A comment period has been established commencing on September 18, 2026 and closing on November 2, 2026.

The California Interagency Council on Homelessness proposes to adopt its conflict–of–interest code to include employee positions that involve the making or participation in the making of decisions that may foreseeably have a material effect on any financial interest, as set forth in subdivision (a) of section 87302 of the Government Code. A written explanation of why each position was selected and the reasons for the disclosure categories is available.

The California Interagency Council on Homelessness (Cal ICH) leads the state's broader vision for greater statewide leadership and coordination around its response to the homelessness crisis, with a mission to develop policies and identify resources, benefits, and services to prevent and work toward ending homelessness in California. Additionally, Cal ICH oversees the implementation of Housing First policies, guidelines, and regulations to reduce the prevalence and duration of homelessness in California.

Copies of the proposed code are available and may be requested from the Contact Person set forth below.

Any interested person may submit written statements, arguments, or comments relating to the proposed code by submitting them in writing no later than *November 2, 2026*, or at the conclusion of the public hearing, if requested, whichever comes later, to the Contact Person set forth below.

At this time, no public hearing has been scheduled concerning the proposed amendments. If any interested person or the person's representative requests a public hearing, he or she must do so no later than October 18, 2026 by contacting the Contact Person set forth below.

The California Interagency Council on Homelessness has determined that the proposed code:

1. Impose no mandate on local agencies or school districts.
2. Impose no costs or savings on any state agency.
3. Impose no costs on any local agency or school district that are required to be reimbursed under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.
4. Will not result in any nondiscretionary costs or savings to local agencies.
5. Will not result in any costs or savings in federal funding to the state.
6. Will not have any potential cost impact on private persons, businesses or small businesses.

All inquiries should be directed to:

Laurance Lee
651 Bannon Street, Suite 1500,
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 701–3027
Laurance.lee@calich.ca.gov

TITLE 2. FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fair Political Practices Commission, pursuant to the authority vested in it by Sections 82011, 87303, and 87304 of the Government Code to review proposed conflict–of–interest codes, will review the proposed/amended conflict–of–interest codes of the following:

CONFLICT–OF–INTEREST CODES

AMENDMENT

MULTI–COUNTY: Anderson–Cottonwood Irrigation District

A written comment period has been established commencing on September 18, 2026, and closing on November 2, 2026. Written comments should be directed to the Fair Political Practices Commission, Attention: Maia Kocinsky–Kirkham, 1102 Q Street, Suite 3050, Sacramento, California 95811.

At the end of the 45–day comment period, the proposed conflict–of–interest code will be submitted to the Commission's Executive Director for their review, unless any interested person or their duly authorized representative requests, no later than 15 days prior to the close of the written comment period, a public hearing before the full Commission. If a public hearing is requested, the proposed code will be submitted to the Commission for review.

The Executive Director of the Commission will review the above–referenced conflict–of–interest code, proposed pursuant to Government Code Section 87300, which designate, pursuant to Government Code Section 87302, employees who must disclose certain investments, interests in real property and income.

The Executive Director of the Commission, upon their own motion or at the request of any interested person, will approve, or revise and approve, or return the proposed code to the agency for revision and re–submission within 60 days without further notice.

Any interested person may present statements, arguments, or comments, in writing to the Executive Director of the Commission, relative to review of the proposed conflict–of–interest code. Any written comments must be received no later than November 2, 2026. If a public hearing is to be held, oral comments may be presented to the Commission at the hearing.

COST TO LOCAL AGENCIES

There shall be no reimbursement for any new or increased costs to local government which may result from compliance with these codes because these are not new programs mandated on local agencies by the codes since the requirements described herein were mandated by the Political Reform Act of 1974. Therefore, they are not "costs mandated by the state" as defined in Government Code Section 17514.

EFFECT ON HOUSING
COSTS AND BUSINESSES

Compliance with the codes has no potential effect on housing costs or on private persons, businesses, or small businesses.

AUTHORITY

Government Code Sections 82011, 87303 and 87304 provide that the Fair Political Practices Commission as the code–reviewing body for the above conflict–of–interest codes shall approve codes as submitted, revise the proposed code, and approve it as revised, or return the proposed code for revision and re–submission.

REFERENCE

Government Code Sections 87300 and 87306 provide that agencies shall adopt and promulgate conflict–of–interest codes pursuant to the Political Reform Act and amend their codes when change is necessitated by changed circumstances.

CONTACT

Any inquiries concerning the proposed conflict–of–interest code should be made to Maia Kocinsky–Kirkham, Fair Political Practices Commission, 1102 Q Street, Suite 3050, Sacramento, California 95811, or email mkocinsky–kirkham@fppc.ca.gov.

AVAILABILITY OF PROPOSED
CONFLICT–OF–INTEREST CODES

Copies of the proposed conflict–of–interest codes may be obtained from the Commission offices or the respective agency. Requests for copies from the Commission should be made to Maia Kocinsky–Kirkham, Fair Political Practices Commission, 1102 Q Street, Suite 3050, Sacramento, California 95811, or email mkocinsky–kirkham@fppc.ca.gov.

TITLE 3. DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

PESTICIDE DECONTAMINATION SITES

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) proposes to amend Title 3, California Code of Regulations (3 CCR) sections 6720, 6724, 6732, 6734, 6738.4, 6771, and 6793. The pesticide regulatory program activities affected by the proposal are those pertaining to pesticide worker safety. In summary, the proposed action will amend decontamination requirements for employees handling pesticides, improve eyewash regulation compliance, and clarify language between sections that mention eyewash equipment or decontamination supplies. This proposed action will require that employees who mix and load pesticides having a high potential for eye injury have access to an eyewash station that meets the requirements found in the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Z358.1–2014 standard. Additionally, it will require that all employees, who handle products that require protective eyewear on their labeling, have access to a personal eyewash unit containing at least one pint of eyewash fluid. It will require employers of employees handling pesticides for uses other than the commercial or research production of an agricultural plant commodity to provide a decontamination site within 100 feet of the mixing/loading site or fumigation site for employees, regardless of the pesticide signal word. The proposed action will also clarify language pertaining to decontamination equipment, remove duplicative requirements, and ensure standardization. Lastly, the proposed action will clarify a personal protective equipment (PPE) exemption that applies when handling liquid fumigants.

SUBMITTAL OF COMMENTS

Any interested person may present comments in writing about the proposed action to the agency contact person named below. Written comments must be received no later than November 2, 2026. Comments regarding this proposed action may also be transmitted via SmartComment online public comment portal at <https://cdpr.commentinput.com?id=kft3RANb5> or via email at <dpr26005@cdpr.ca.gov>.

Please note that under the California Public Records Act (Government Code section 7920.000 et seq.), your written and oral comments, attachments, and any associated contact information (e.g., your address, phone number, or email address) become part of the public record and can be released to the public upon request. You do not have to provide contact information when submitting a comment using the SmartComment portal.

A public hearing is not scheduled. However, one will be scheduled if any interested person submits a written request to DPR no later than 15 days prior to the close of the written comment period.[1]

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

DPR has determined that the proposed regulatory action does affect small businesses.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

DPR's mission is to protect public health and the environment by fostering sustainable pest management and regulating pesticides. DPR regulates pesticide product evaluation and registration, statewide licensing of commercial and private pesticide applicators, pest control businesses, dealers, and advisers, conducts environmental monitoring, and pesticide residue testing of fresh produce. This statutory scheme is set forth primarily in Food and Agricultural Code (FAC) Divisions 6 and 7.

FAC sections 12980 and 12981 specifically require that DPR adopt regulations to ensure safe working conditions for persons handling pesticides and working in and about pesticide–treated areas. DPR's current regulatory requirements for decontamination are designed to reduce the risk of pesticide exposure and injuries among employees who handle pesticides and other workers who may be exposed to pesticides in treated areas.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) acts under the authority and mandate of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. U.S. EPA protects agricultural workers and agricultural pesticide handlers from exposure to pesticides through the Worker Protection Standard (WPS), which is in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR), part 170, Agricultural WPS. In 2015, U.S. EPA updated the WPS to further reduce agricultural worker and agricultural pesticide handler exposure to pesticides. To ensure DPR's existing worker safety regulations remained consistent with the revised federal WPS, DPR adopted and amended certain regulations in 3 CCR. These regulations became effective on January 2, 2017, and included modifications to decontamination requirements for pesticide handlers and added prescriptive requirements for eyewash facilities (3 CCR section 6734).

Under existing law, DPR has established requirements to ensure and protect the safety of workers who handle, store, or transport pesticides, or may be exposed by working in areas treated with pesticides (3 CCR section 6700 et seq.). Existing regulations recognize compliance with applicable 8 CCR regulations (3 CCR section 6720), requires employers to provide handler training (3 CCR section 6724), require employers to provide change areas (3 CCR section 6732), and decontamination facilities to these workers (3 CCR section 6734), establish PPE exemptions (3 CCR section 6738.4) and requirements for early entry of a treated field (3 CCR section 6771), and provide safety use requirements for handlers working with minimal exposure pesticides (3 CCR section 6793). Section 6734(b)(6) requires employers of employees handling pesticides for production agriculture uses to provide an eyewash station that meets prescriptive requirements if the product labeling requires protective eyewear or if a closed mixing system is used. In section 6734(c), employers are required to provide a decontamination site within 100 feet of the mixing/loading site if the pesticide label bears a signal word (indicating the level of toxicity) of "DANGER" and "WARNING" for employees handling pesticides for uses other than the commercial or research production of an agricultural plant commodity.

The proposed regulations modify current requirements in ways that will improve worker protections. Specifically, the proposed regulations will require eyewash stations that bear compliance with the ANSI Z358.1–2014 standard if the pesticide product labeling requires employees who are mixing or loading pesticides or handling a liquid fumigant to wear protective eyewear, or if employees are using a closed system. In addition, eyewash station requirements will be relo-

[1] If you have special accommodation or language needs, please include this in your request for a public hearing. TTY/TDD speech–to–speech users may dial 7–1–1 for the California Relay Service.

cated from section 6734(b) to section 6734(a) so that they will apply to all employees handling pesticides and not just employees handling pesticides for production agriculture uses when an eyewash station is required, and decontamination site requirements will be expanded to apply to pesticide uses other than those for the commercial or research production of an agricultural commodity, including, but not limited to, structural pest control, landscape maintenance, applications to rights–of–way, vertebrate pest control, and fumigation of food and non–food commodities, regardless of signal word. Additionally, it will require that all employees, who handle products that require protective eyewear on their labeling, have access to a personal eyewash unit meeting the requirements of section 6 of ANSI Z358.1–1981. The proposed regulations also make a number of editorial changes intended to clarify the meaning of the regulatory text, remove redundancies, add consistency, and improve enforceability. Additionally, the proposed action incorporates some terms and standards from the ANSI standard into the proposed regulations, including what qualifies as eyewash fluid. As a result of the proposed amendments to section 6734, section 6720(c), which recognizes compliance with applicable sections in 8 CCR, under the authority of the California Department of Industrial Relations (DIR), as compliant with 3 CCR pesticide worker safety requirements, will be modified to add the equivalent 8 CCR regulation for emergency eyewash requirements (8 CCR section 5162). Section 6724 will also clarify handler training topics and conform with 8 CCR. Additionally, as a result of proposed amendments to section 6734, cross–references in section 6732 will be updated accordingly, section 6771 will be reworded to align with proposed changes to section 6734 and the ANSI standard, and a duplicative requirement concerning washing facilities will be removed from section 6793(b). Lastly, the proposed action will clarify that the PPE exemption in section 6738.4 applies when handling liquid fumigants.

The proposed regulations will benefit employees who handle pesticides. This proposal will result in more worker protection from potential exposure to pesticides, including pesticides that could cause eye injury. The federal WPS requirements for eye decontamination that were incorporated into 3 CCR in 2017 will be enhanced by requiring equipment that meets the ANSI Z358.1 standard. Eyewash equipment required by the current regulation omits an essential safety feature of an ANSI Z358.1–2014–compliant eyewash station: once activated, the eyewash station must be able to perform without the use of the operator's hands. This function is necessary so that the operator can use their hands to hold their eyes open while flushing. The equipment required by the proposed regulation provides additional worker protection measures including hands–free operation. Additionally, requiring an ANSI Z358.1–2014–compliant eyewash station will help enforce the safety and welfare of pesticide workers by way of standardization. Employees who mix and load pesticides for uses other than the commercial or research production of an agricultural plant commodity will benefit from these regulations by having access to a decontamination site, regardless of the signal word of the pesticide in use. The ability to routinely decontaminate and change clothes after handling pesticides serves to minimize potential pesticide exposure. Additionally, the ability to decontaminate in the event of an emergency or accidental exposure can also decrease the severity of injuries and illnesses of these workers should they be exposed.

During the process of developing these proposed regulations, DPR conducted a search of any similar regulations on this topic and has concluded that these proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. Although DPR and Department of Industrial Relations' (DIR's) Division of Occupational Safety and Health both have regulatory mandates to protect workers from health and safety hazards in workplaces, DPR enforces pesticide laws in workplaces where pesticides are used.

Incorporated by Reference Document:

American National Standards Institute Z358.1–1981.

COLLABORATION WITH OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH HAZARD ASSESSMENT (OEHHA) PURSUANT TO FAC SECTIONS 12980 AND 12981

3 CCR sections 6720, 6724, 6732, 6734, 6738.4, 6771, and 6793 are regulations relating to pesticide worker safety. Therefore, DPR and the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) jointly and mutually developed the proposed regulations as specified in FAC sections 12980 and 12981. DPR and OEHHA have set forth the rulemaking process used to meet these statutory requirements in a Memorandum of Agreement dated August 13, 2008.

CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

DPR consulted with the California Department of Food and Agriculture during the development of the text of the proposed regulations, as specified in FAC section 11454 and the January 15, 2019, Memorandum of Agreement developed per FAC section 11454.2.

DPR consulted with the University of California and the California Department of Industrial Relations.

DPR has also consulted with California's county agricultural commissioners, and the California Structural Pest Control Board.

IMPACT ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

DPR determined that the proposed regulatory action does not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts. DPR also determined that there are no costs to any local agency or school district requiring reimbursement pursuant to Government Code section 17500 et seq.

OTHER NONDISCRETIONARY COST OR SAVINGS IMPOSED UPON LOCAL AGENCIES

DPR has determined that some nondiscretionary costs or savings imposed upon local agencies or school districts may result from the proposed regulatory action. DPR estimates that local agencies or districts, and school districts as well as State departments, the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), which are discussed in the following section, will be affected by one or more portions of this rulemaking. The five primary factors impacting local and state agencies or districts are: 1) administrative learning, 2) decontamination sites, 3) soap and paper towels, 4) ANSI–compliant eyewash station, and 5) personal eyewash units. Based on school site pesticide use data, some school districts and local agencies currently apply pesticide products that would necessitate the availability of an eyewash station and/or the availability of a decontamination site under the proposed regulations. If these school districts and local agencies continue to use these pesticide products, there may be costs related to the purchase of an ANSI Z358.1–compliant eyewash station, including eyewash fluid, or decontamination site supplies. In some cases, alternative pesticide products and/or revised pest management practices may negate the need for the procurement of an eyewash station or decontamination supplies.

The average one–time cost for local agencies or districts and school districts to spend time understanding the new regulations and take corrective actions is estimated to be $134 per agency or district. Decontamination site supplies, including soap and paper towels, cost $165 per site. The average initial cost per agency or district is $495. Additionally, if all decontamination supplies are replaced annually, with the exception of water containers, DPR estimates an equal cost of $65.68 per decontamination site per year, or an average of $197 per agency or district. On average, the cost of an ANSI Z358.1–compliant eyewash station is $338. Regarding eyewash fluid, costs may be negligible if using potable water or may be an average of $94 annually if using buffered saline solution. The assumption is that they will choose to use potable water, therefore the cost of preserved buffer saline solution is negligible. DPR anticipates employers will purchase a personal ANSI–compliant eyewash unit filled with buffered saline solution, which costs approximately $14 on average. For local agencies or districts and school districts, DPR estimates the first–year total cost to be $766,949 with subsequent years incurring an annual cost of $237,379. Over the regulatory lifetime of five years of these regulations, mitigation and other regulatory costs are anticipated to be $1,716,465.

Based on school site pesticide use data, DPR estimates that the mitigation and other regulatory costs of the proposed regulations will initially cost $391,526 for all school districts, with a subsequent annual cost of $125,855. Over the five–year lifetime of these regulations, mitigation and other regulatory costs are anticipated to be $894,946 for all school districts. Based on local agency pesticide use data, DPR estimates that the mitigation and other regulatory costs of the proposed regulations will initially be $375,423 for all local agencies with subsequent years incurring an annual cost of $111,524. Over the five–year lifetime of these regulations, mitigation and other regulatory costs are anticipated to be $821,519 for all local agencies.

COSTS OR SAVINGS TO STATE AGENCIES

DPR anticipates some increased costs to state agencies will result from the proposed regulatory action. As mentioned above, there are five primary factors impacting the state: 1) administrative learning, 2) decontamination sites, 3) soap and paper towels, 4) ANSI–compliant eyewash station, and 5) personal eyewash units. A total of 12 state agencies along with UC and CSU are estimated to currently use pesticide products that would necessitate the availability of an ANSI Z358.1–compliant eyewash station, decontamination site supplies, administrative learning, or personal eyewash units under the proposed regulations. The average cost of each of these factors is the same as described in the previous section. Based on state agency pesticide use data, DPR estimates that the mitigation and other regulatory costs of the proposed regulations will initially be $110,120 for all state agencies, with a subsequent annual cost of $39,358. Over the five–year lifetime of these regulations, mitigation and other regulatory costs are anticipated to be $267,552.

EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING TO THE STATE

DPR determined that no costs or savings in federal funding to the state will result from the proposed action.

EFFECT ON HOUSING COSTS

DPR made an initial determination that the proposed action will have no effect on housing costs.

SIGNIFICANT STATEWIDE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT DIRECTLY AFFECTING BUSINESSES

DPR made an initial determination that adoption of this 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

In reasonable compliance with the proposed regulations, agricultural and non–agricultural businesses will be impacted by the proposed rulemaking. The types of businesses DPR anticipates being impacted include agricultural and non–agricultural applicators of pesticides, and/or businesses employing workers that handle pesticides. Agricultural business impacted by the proposed regulations will need to update knowledge and training and purchase ANSI–compliant eyewash stations. Training is anticipated to be a one–time cost of $108, ANSI–compliant eyewash stations are anticipated to be a one–time cost ranging from $265–2470, and eyewash station refills are anticipated to cost $80 annually per station. For agricultural businesses, the estimated total initial direct impact is $8,803,391, with subsequent years incurring an annual cost of $1,065,920. Non–agricultural businesses will be impacted by five primary factors: 1) administrative learning, 2) decontamination sites, 3) soap and paper towels, 4) ANSI–compliant eyewash stations, and 5) personal eyewash units. With the exception of administrative learning that is expected to cost $92 per business, the average per unit cost of each of these factors is the same as described in the "OTHER NONDISCRETIONARY COST OR SAVINGS IMPOSED UPON LOCAL AGENCIES" section. DPR estimates the total initial direct impact to be $3.81 million, with subsequent years incurring an annual cost of $1.35 million. Overall, the initial cost per business is estimated to be $469–557, with recurring annual cost impacts of $57–205. The total initial direct cost to businesses is estimated to be $12,609,207, with subsequent years incurring an annual total cost of $2,415,698. Using the Department of Finance's 2x multiplier to account for indirect costs, the total initial cost to businesses is estimated to be $25,218,414. Assuming a lifespan of five years, the total direct economic impact of this rulemaking is $22,271,999. Using the Department of Finance's 2x multiplier to account for indirect costs, the total statewide cost over the 5–year lifetime of the regulation is estimated to be $44,543,998.

RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

Impact on the Creation, Elimination, or Expansion of Jobs/Businesses: DPR determined it is not likely the proposed regulatory action will impact the creation or elimination of jobs, the creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing or the expansion of businesses currently doing business with the State of California. This action clarifies the existing eyewash equipment requirement, aligns existing regulations with accepted standards and regulations that are currently in place for other similar industries, aligns decontamination site requirements for all pesticide handling scenarios, and clarifies an exemption for PPE use. The decontamination facility expansion is expected to cost $495 or less for most businesses that use pesticides for purposes other than the commercial or research production of an agricultural plant commodity and is therefore not expected to affect creation, elimination, or expansion of jobs/businesses.

The Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment: The proposed regulations will benefit employees who handle pesticides and result in more stringent regulations to protect workers from potential exposure to pesticides, including pesticides that can cause eye injury. The proposed regulations will enhance the 2015 federal WPS requirements for eye decontamination that were incorporated into 3 CCR in 2017 by requiring eyewash equipment that meets the ANSI Z358.1–2014 standard. Equipment meeting this standard provides additional worker protection measures including continuous performance of the equipment with no additional worker activity. Additionally, standardizing eyewash equipment will help ensure the safety and welfare of pesticide workers. Employees who mix and load pesticides labeled with the signal word "CAUTION" or with no signal word for uses other than the commercial or research production of an agricultural plant commodity will benefit from these regulations by having access to a decontamination site. The ability to routinely decontaminate and change clothes after handling pesticides serves to minimize potential pesticide exposure. Additionally, the ability to decontaminate in the event of an emergency or accidental exposure can also decrease the severity of injuries and illnesses of these workers should they be exposed. The proposed regulations will not affect the health and welfare of California residents or the state's environment.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

DPR must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the agency, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the agency, 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 regulatory action, or would be more cost–effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of the law. Listening to concerns from multiple stakeholders, DPR has incorporated a targeted tiered approach for eyewash decontamination equipment based on the product signal word. The adoption of these regulations will bring California worker safety regulations into alignment with DIR's eyewash regulations in 8 CCR section 5162, which requires an ANSI Z358.1 eyewash station, while maintaining equivalency with the federal WPS (40 CFR, part 170). Additionally, the proposed changes to decontamination facility requirements for uses other than the commercial or research production of an agricultural plant commodity will provide increased worker protection that is not found in other laws or regulations. This action also clarifies the existing eyewash equipment requirement and clarifies an exemption for PPE use.

DPR explored two alternatives for the proposed regulations. These alternatives similarly address the intent of the proposed regulation but are estimated to have higher economic impacts. DPR rejected the two alternatives after determining they created an excessive economic and enforcement burden.

AUTHORITY

This regulatory action is taken pursuant to the authority vested by FAC sections 11456 and 12981.

REFERENCE

This regulatory action is to implement, interpret, or make specific FAC sections 11501, 12973, 12980, and 12981.

AVAILABILITY OF STATEMENT OF REASONS AND TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS

DPR prepared an Initial Statement of Reasons and is making available the express terms of the proposed action, all of the information upon which the proposal is based, and a rulemaking file. A copy of the Initial Statement of Reasons and the proposed text of the regulations may be obtained from the agency contact person named in this notice. The information upon which DPR relied in preparing this proposal and the rulemaking file are available for review at the address specified below.

AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

After the close of the comment period, DPR may make the regulations permanent if they remain substantially the same as described in the Informative Digest. If DPR does make substantial changes to the regulations, the modified text will be made available for at least 15 days prior to adoption. Requests for the modified text should be addressed to the agency contact person named in this notice. DPR will accept written comments on any changes for 15 days after the modified text is made available.

AGENCY CONTACT

Written comments about the proposed regulatory action; requests for a copy of the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the proposed text of the regulations; and inquiries regarding the rulemaking file may be directed to:

Lauren Otani, Regulations Coordinator
Department of Pesticide Regulation
1001 I Street, P.O. Box 4015
Sacramento, California 95812–4015
916–445–5781

Note: In the event the contact person is unavailable, questions on the substance of the proposed regulatory action may be directed to the following back–up person at the same address as noted below:

Michel Oriel, Environmental Program Manager I
Worker Health and Safety Branch
916–324–8845

This Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the proposed text of the regulations are also available on DPR's Internet Home Page <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov>. Upon request, the documents can be made available in another language, or an alternate form as a disability–related accommodation.

AVAILABILITY OF FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Following its preparation, a copy of the Final Statement of Reasons mandated by Government Code section 11346.9(a) may be obtained from the contact person named above. In addition, the Final Statement of Reasons will be posted on DPR's Internet Home Page and accessed at <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov>.

TITLE 8. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

TNC DRIVERS LABOR RELATIONS ACT

The Public Employment Relations Board (PERB or Board) proposes to adopt and amend the regulations described below after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations regarding the proposed action.

PROPOSED REGULATORY ACTION

The Board proposes to adopt proposed new sections 32042, 32043, 32710, 110100, 110120, 110147, 110164, 110200, 110210, 110220, 110300, 110350, 110400, 110410, 110420, 110430, 110435, 110440, 110445, 110450, 110460, 110470, 110520, 110525, 110530, 110540, 110550, 110620, 110630, 110640, and 110650; and amend sections 32092, 32110, 32115, 32120, 32135, 32140, 32150, 32155, 32325, 32380, 32615, 32661, and 32700.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Board has not scheduled a public hearing for this proposed action. However, a hearing will be held if a written request is received from any interested person or their authorized representative. Such requests must be submitted no later than 15 days before the close of the written comment period to:

Sara Kang Rhee, Senior Regional Attorney
Public Employment Relations Board
Los Angeles Regional Office
425 W. Broadway, Suite 400
Glendale, CA 91204

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD

Any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, may submit written comments relevant to the proposed regulatory action to the Board. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile (FAX) at (916) 327–6377 or by email to sara.kang@perb.ca.gov. The written comment period closes on November 3, 2026, which is 46 days after the publication of this notice. The Board will only consider comments received at the Board offices by that date and time. Submit written comments to:

Sara Kang Rhee, Senior Regional Attorney
Public Employment Relations Board
Los Angeles Regional Office
425 W. Broadway, Suite 400
Glendale, CA 91204

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

A. Authority

The Board is vested with the authority to determine questions concerning employee or worker representation and to adopt such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and to effectuate the purposes and policies of the labor relations statutes within its jurisdiction, pursuant to the following statutory authority: Business and Professions Code sections 7470.4(b) and 7470.4(c); Government Code sections 3509(a), 3513(h), 3524.52(a), 3541.3(g), 3551(a), 3555.5(c), 3563(f), 3599.52(a), 71639.1(b) and 71825(b); Public Utilities Code sections 28849(b), 40122.1(a), 98160.5(b), 98162.5, 99561(f), 100301, 100309(b), 102399(b) and 102403; and Welfare and Institutions Code section 10421(e).

B. Reference

The proposed regulations and amended regulations below reference the following:

Business and Professions Code sections 7470, 7470.1, 7470.2, 7470.2(k), 7470.3(a), 7470.4(b), 7470.4(c), 7470.4(d), 7470.5(c), 7470.6, 7470.6(b), 7470.7, 7470.8, 7470.8(a)(1), 7470.8(b), 7470.8(b)(2), 7470.8(c), 7470.8(d), 7470.8(d)(1)(B), 7470.8(e)(2), 7470.9(c), 7470.9(e)(2), 7470.14(c), 7470.14(d)(1), 7470.14(d)(4), 7470.14(e)(2), 7470.14(e)(3)(B), 7470.14(e)(3)(H), 7470.14(e)(3)(I), 7470.14(e)(3)(J), 7470.15(c)(4), 7470.15(c)(6), 7470.17, 7470.18 and 7470.18(c);

Government Code sections 3502.5, 3505.4, 3505.8, 3506.5, 3509, 3509.5, 3513, 3513(h), 3514.5, 3514.5(c), 3515.7, 3515.7(d), 3519, 3519.5, 3520, 3520.5, 3523, 3524, 3524.50, 3524.52(a), 3524.55, 3524.55(c), 3524.59, 3524.71, 3524.72, 3524.73, 3524.74, 3524.78, 3541.3, 3541.3(c), 3541.3(d), 3541.3(f), 3541.3(g), 3541.3(h), 3541.3(i), 3541.3(k), 3541.3(l), 3541.3(m), 3541.3(n), 3541.5, 3541.5(c), 3542, 3543.5, 3543.6, 3544, 3544.1, 3544.3, 3544.5, 3544.7, 3546, 3546.5, 3547, 3547.5, 3551(a), 3555.5(c), 3558.8, 3563, 3563(g), 3563(j), 3563(m), 3563.2, 3563.3, 3564, 3571, 3571.1, 3571.3, 3573, 3574, 3575, 3576, 3577, 3584, 3585.5, 3587, 3589, 3595, 3599.52, 3599.52(a), 3599.52(d), 3599.55, 3599.55(c), 3599.56, 3599.69, 3599.70, 3599.71, 3599.72, 3601, 71632.5, 71639.1, 71639.4, 71807, 71814, 71825 and 71825.1;

Public Utilities Code sections 25052, 28849(b), 28850, 28851, 28858, 28859, 28860(b), 30751, 30756, 40120, 40122, 40122.1, 40122.1(a), 50121, 70122, 90300, 95651, 98160.5(b), 98162.5, 99561, 99561(c), 99561(e), 99561(f), 99561(g), 99561(h), 99561(j), 99561(k), 99561(l), 99561(m), 99561.2, 99562, 99563.7, 99563.8, 99564, 99564.1, 99564.2, 99564.3, 99564.4, 99566.1, 99566.3, 99567, 99569, 100301, 100309(b), 101344, 102399(b), 102400, 102401, 102403, 102404, 102405, 102406, 102407, 102408(b)(2), 102414, 103401, 120505, 125521, Appendix 1, Section 4.4 and Appendix 2, Section 13.91;

Welfare and Institutions Code sections 10421(e), 10424, 10427.5, 10427.7, 10428, 10428.3, 10428.5, 10428.5(c) and 10428.5(d);

California Rule of Court 2.257; and,

Firefighters Union, Local 1186 v. City of Vallejo (1974) 12 Cal.3d 608; and *Coachella Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District v. Public Employment Relations Board* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 1072.

POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

PERB is a quasi–judicial agency that primarily oversees public sector collective bargaining in California. It currently administers 18 collective bargaining statutes, ensures these laws are applied consistently, and resolves disputes between the parties covered by them.

The laws under PERB's jurisdiction cover a wide range of workers across the state. The Meyers–Milias–Brown Act (MMBA) of 1968, which came under PERB's purview in 2001, established collective bargaining rights for employees of California's cities, counties, and local special districts. The Educational Employment Relations Act (EERA) of 1976 created PERB and extended these rights to employees in public K–12 schools and community colleges. In 1978, the Ralph C. Dills Act (commonly known as the Dills Act) provided bargaining rights for state government employees. A year later, the Higher Education Employer–Employee Relations Act (HEERA) of 1979 brought employees of the California State University system, the University of California system, and the University of California, College of the Law, San Francisco under PERB's coverage.

Additional statutes expanded PERB's role in the years that followed. The Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act of 2000, along with the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act of 2002, established collective bargaining rights for most trial court employees. The Transit Employer–Employee Relations Act (TEERA) of 2003 granted bargaining rights to supervisory employees of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. In 2017, the Judicial Council Employer–Employee Relations Act (JCEERA) created bargaining rights for Judicial Council employees.

Also in 2017, the Public Employee Communication Chapter (PECC) gave PERB jurisdiction over violations of laws related to employee communications. In 2018, PERB gained further authority through the Prohibition on Public Employers Deterring or Discouraging Union Membership (PEDD) to handle violations related to union membership rights. In 2019, the Childcare Provider Act (CCPA), part of the Building a Better Early Care and Education System Act, granted collective bargaining rights to family childcare providers. That same year, the Orange County Transit District Act (OCTDA) expanded PERB's authority to include labor relations at the Orange County Transit District.

In 2020, the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit Act (SFBART Act) placed Bay Area Rapid Transit labor relations under PERB's authority. In 2021, the Sacramento Regional Transit District Act (Sacramento RTD Act) extended PERB's oversight to disputes involving the Sacramento Regional Transit District, but only for those exclusive representatives opting to bring one or more of their bargaining units under PERB's jurisdiction.

Effective January 1, 2023, two new laws further expanded PERB's responsibilities. The Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Act (SC Metro Act) grants PERB the authority to administer and enforce labor relations provisions applicable to employees of the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Act (VTA Act) grants PERB similar authority over labor relations at the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, but only for exclusive representatives opting to bring one or more of their bargaining units under PERB's jurisdiction.

Effective July 1, 2026, the Legislature Employer–Employee Relations Act (LEERA) grants collective bargaining rights to employees of the California State Legislature and grants PERB jurisdiction over related disputes.

The Legislature has now enacted the Transportation Network Company Drivers Labor Relations Act (TNC Act), which went into effect on January 1, 2026. The TNC Act establishes collective bargaining rights for TNC drivers in the State of California and requires PERB to enforce its provisions.

As explained in more detail in the Informative Digest, the regulatory changes proposed by this notice address PERB's need to implement and clarify rules and procedures regarding representation matters under the TNC Act, including representation requests, petitions, and elections, and requests related to impasse resolution. The regulatory changes proposed by this notice also address PERB's need to implement and clarify the process for resolving disputes arising under the TNC Act, including the filing and processing of unfair practice charges.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST

A. Adoption of New Sections

Proposed Section 32042 adopts a definition of "TNC Act" as "the Transportation Network Company Drivers Labor Relations Act codified in Chapter 10.7

of Division 3 of the Business and Professions Code (commencing with Section 7470)."

Proposed Section 32043 defines terms applicable to matters arising under the TNC Act. Specifically, this proposed section specifies that the terms "transportation network driver organization" and "TNC driver organization" may each be interpreted to include two or more TNC driver organizations that jointly file a petition or request.

Proposed Section 32710 clarifies that representation and certification proceedings arising under the TNC Act are governed by proposed Chapter 11, which sets forth regulations (proposed Sections 110100–110650) that pertain specifically to the TNC Act. This proposed section further clarifies that Subchapter 6 of Chapter 1 of PERB's regulations (Sections 32700–32804), which generally governs representation proceedings, does not apply to TNC Act matters.

Proposed Section 110100 specifies which of PERB's general regulations are applicable to TNC Act matters. Proposed subsection (a) lists the general case processing regulations in Chapter 1 of PERB's regulations that apply to TNC Act matters. Proposed subsection (b) provides notice that additional existing regulations that apply specifically to unfair practice charges under the TNC Act are listed in proposed Section 110220.

Proposed Section 110120 concerns security of data obtained pursuant to the TNC Act. Proposed subsection (a) provides that the Board shall disclose data pertaining to TNC drivers only to the extent necessary under the TNC Act or otherwise required by law. Proposed subsection (b) describes the circumstances under which a TNC driver organization, TNC, or multicompany committee will need to notify PERB's Office of the General Counsel of an actual or suspected data breach pertaining to TNC driver data.

Proposed Section 110147 sets forth procedures for expediting TNC Act matters before the Board. This proposed section incorporates the substantive elements of existing Section 32147, which governs expediting matters under all other statutes administered by PERB, but adapts the text to apply specifically to the TNC Act.

Proposed Section 110164 describes the process for a TNC, TNC driver, TNC driver organization, or multicompany committee to file an application for joinder under the TNC Act. This proposed section incorporates the substantive elements of existing Section 32164, which governs joinder applications under all other statutes administered by PERB, but adapts the text to apply specifically to the TNC Act.

Proposed Section 110200 describes who may file an unfair practice charge and which entities an unfair practice charge may be filed against under the TNC Act.

Proposed Section 110210 specifies that the applicable limitations period for unfair practice charges under the TNC Act is six months from when the charging party knew or should have known of the alleged violation.

Proposed Section 110220 lists the sections of Subchapter 5 of Chapter 1 of PERB's regulations that apply to unfair practice proceedings under the TNC Act.

Proposed Section 110300 governs proof of support requirements in representation proceedings under the TNC Act. This proposed section incorporates the substantive elements of existing Section 32700, which governs proof of support requirements in representation proceedings under other statutes administered by PERB, but adapts the text to apply specifically to the TNC Act and encompasses key differences set forth in the TNC Act.

Proposed Section 110350 requires that, within 10 days after the Board prepares a list of active TNC drivers pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 7470.6, subdivision (b), PERB's Office of the General Counsel will post the median number of rides completed in the past six months and the number of active TNC drivers on PERB's website.

Proposed Section 110400 provides for the filing of an application for designation as a TNC driver organization (Business and Professions Code section 7470.7).

Proposed Section 110410 provides for the filing of a request for a determination as to whether a TNC driver organization is authorized by at least 10 percent of active TNC drivers (Business and Professions Code section 7470.8, subdivision (a)(1)).

Proposed Section 110420 provides for the filing of a petition for certification based on majority proof of support (Business and Professions Code section 7470.8, subdivision (b)).

Proposed Section 110430 provides for the filing of a petition for a representation election based on a showing of at least 10 percent proof of support but less than 30 percent proof of support (Business and Professions Code section 7470.8, subdivision (d)).

Proposed Section 110435 provides for the submission of proof of support of at least 10 percent of active drivers by a TNC driver organization that wishes to appear on the ballot in a representation election resulting from a petition filed pursuant to proposed Section 110430 (Business and Professions Code section 7470.8, subdivision (d)(1)(B)).

Proposed Section 110440 provides for the filing of a petition for certification based on at least 30 percent but less than majority proof of support (Business and Professions Code section 7470.8, subdivision (b)(2)).

Proposed Section 110445 provides for the submission of proof of support in response to a petition filed under proposed Section 110440, indicating that at least 30 percent of active TNC drivers either support another TNC driver organization or do not wish to be represented by any TNC driver organization (Business and Professions Code section 7470.8, subdivision (b)(2)).

Proposed Section 110450 provides for the filing of a petition for amendment of certification by a certified driver bargaining organization in the event of a change such as a merger, amalgamation, affiliation, or transfer of jurisdiction.

Proposed Section 110460 provides for the filing of a petition for decertification of a certified driver bargaining organization (Business and Professions Code section 7470.8, subdivision (e)(2)).

Proposed Section 110470 provides for the filing of a petition by a covered TNC to be exempted from a monthly notification requirement upon the certification of a certified driver bargaining organization (Business and Professions Code section 7470.9, subdivision (e)(2)).

Proposed Section 110520 provides for the Board's supervision of secret ballot elections under the TNC Act.

Proposed Section 110525 provides for the issuance of directed election orders, except to the extent the parties reach an approved consent election agreement, and also provides that "No Representation" shall appear as a choice on each ballot in all elections other than a runoff election.

Proposed Section 110530 clarifies the timelines within which various TNC Act elections must commence and describes the circumstances under which the Board may stay an election.

Proposed Section 110540 governs the tally of ballots in a TNC Act election.

Proposed Section 110550 governs the filing and processing of objections to the conduct of an election under the TNC Act.

Proposed Section 110620 provides for the filing of a petition to refer a bargaining dispute to mediation (Business and Professions Code section 7470.14, subdivision (d)).

Proposed Section 110630 provides for the filing of a petition to refer a bargaining dispute to arbitration (Business and Professions Code section 7470.14, subdivision (e)(2)).

Proposed Section 110640 provides for the filing of a petition to apportion the share of mediation or arbitration costs among covered TNCs based on market share (Business and Professions Code section 7470.14, subdivision (e)(3)(B)).

Proposed Section 110650 provides for the filing of a petition for Board approval of a sectoral bargaining agreement (Business and Professions Code section 7470.17, subdivision (a)).

B. Amendments to the Text of Existing Sections

Section 32092 provides a definition for the term "electronic signatures" and details when documents are deemed to be electronically signed. Subsection (b), which provides that a document is deemed to have been signed when electronically filed, is made expressly inapplicable to proof of support under Section 32700. The proposed amendment updates subsection (b) to provide that it is also inapplicable to proof of support under Section 110300, which governs TNC Act–specific proof of support. The proposed amendment to subsection (b) also capitalizes the word "Section" for consistency purposes.

Section 32110 sets forth requirements for the electronic filing of documents with PERB through e–PERB, as that term is defined by Section 32090. Subsection (c) generally allows a party to use an electronic signature on documents filed through e–PERB, but specifies that electronic signatures on proof of support may only be used to the extent permitted under Section 32700. The proposed amendment updates subsection (c) to also limit electronic signatures on proof of support to the extent permitted under proposed Section 110300, which governs TNC Act–specific proof of support. The proposed amendment includes other non–substantive edits for readability and consistency purposes.

Section 32115 specifies the locations for filing documents with PERB in representation matters that are not filed electronically. The proposed amendment to subsection (c) extends its application to representation matters filed under the TNC Act. The proposed amendment also includes a non–substantive grammatical edit to subsection (a).

Section 32120 provides for the filing of a written agreement or memorandum of understanding under certain specified labor relations statutes with the Board. The proposed amendment to this section deletes the references to specific labor relations statutes and extends the provision's application to agreements entered under all labor relations statutes administered by PERB, including the TNC Act.

Section 32135 concerns filing requirements for non–electronic filings. Subsection (a) exempts proof of support as described in Section 32700 from the requirement that all documents be accompanied by proof of service. The proposed amendment updates subsection (a) to also exempt proof of support as described in proposed Section 110300, which governs TNC Act–specific proof of support.

Section 32140 addresses the proper recipient for filing or service of documents. The proposed amendment adds subsection (d)(4) to identify the proper recipient on behalf of a TNC or a multicompany committee and (d)(6) to identify the proper recipient on behalf of a TNC driver organization. Subsections (d)(4) and (d)(6), as proposed, also provide that such entities will provide contact information for at least one individual designated to receive service of documents related to the TNC Act. The proposed amendment also adds subsection (f), which requires PERB, upon request, to provide information in its possession regarding the individuals designated to receive service of documents related to the TNC Act. The proposed amendment further includes non–substantive edits for readability and consistency purposes.

Section 32150 concerns the issuance of subpoenas. Subsection (a)(4) defines the term "consumer or employee notice" to mean a notice provided to a non–party consumer or employee. The proposed amendment to subsection (a)(4) expands the definition of "consumer or employee" to include TNC drivers. Subsection (d)(4) grants a Board agent discretion to require a party requesting a records subpoena to serve a consumer or employee notice if it seeks confidential personal records of a natural person who is not a party, an agent of a party, or an employee exclusively represented by a party. The proposed amendment to subsection (d)(4) expands the application of this subsection to circumstances in which a records subpoena seeks confidential personal records of a TNC driver represented by a certified driver bargaining organization. Subsection (e)(5) provides that, if a Board agent has required a consumer or employee notice, such notice must be served on the non–party consumer or employee. The proposed amendment to subsection (e)(5) expands the application of this subsection to require service on a TNC driver, as applicable. Subsection (i)(2) empowers a Board agent to resolve any objections filed by a consumer or employee resulting from a consumer or employee notice. The proposed amendment to subsection (i)(2) expands the application of this subsection to encompass objections from a TNC driver resulting from a consumer or employee notice. The proposed amendment also includes non–substantive edits for consistency purposes.

Section 32155 concerns the circumstances under which a Board agent or Board member will be recused from a case. Subsection (f) provides that a party aggrieved by the Board's determination regarding a motion for recusal may include the matter in a writ of extraordinary relief authorized by certain specified labor relations statutes, or a writ proceeding in superior court challenging the Board's refusal to issue a complaint. With respect to the ability to challenge a recusal decision in a writ of extraordinary relief, the proposed amendment to subsection (f) reformulates the text to delete the references to specific statutes and extend the provision's applicability to any statute that authorizes writs of extraordinary relief from a final decision of the Board itself.

Section 32325 concerns the remedial powers of the Board and lists reinstatement of employees and back pay as examples of available remedies. The proposed amendment to this section lists reinstatement or reactivation of TNC drivers as an example of available relief. The proposed amendment also replaces "back pay" with "make–whole relief."

Section 32380 specifies administrative decisions that are not appealable. The proposed amendment adds subsection (d) to include decisions by a Board agent pursuant to proposed Sections 110620 or 110630 (governing requests for referral to mediation or arbitration).

Section 32615 specifies the required contents of an unfair practice charge. Subsection (a)(4) requires the charging party to provide the sections of the Government Code, the Public Utilities Code, the Welfare and Institutions Code, or applicable local rules alleged to have been violated. The proposed amendment to subsection (a)(4) replaces this language to require the "statutory provision(s), regulatory provision(s), or local rule(s)" alleged to have been violated.

Section 32661 concerns the filing of repugnancy claims for unfair practice charge cases that were deferred to arbitration because the parties' written agreement covered the dispute. Subsection (a) allows a party to file an unfair practice charge based on a claim that a settlement or arbitration award is repugnant to the applicable labor relations statute. The proposed amendment to subsection (a) removes references to the filing of an unfair practice charge and replaces it with text providing that a charging party may oppose post–arbitration deferral based on an assertion that the settlement, arbitration award, or arbitration process is repugnant to the applicable labor relations statute. Subsection (b) describes the required contents of an unfair practice charge alleging repugnancy. The proposed amendment to subsection (b) replaces this description with text clarifying that a party asserting repugnancy must file a charge alleging both the facts showing a violation of the applicable statute and facts supporting repugnancy. The proposed amendment to subsection (b) further addresses situations in which an unfair practice charge has been placed in abeyance based on pre–arbitration deferral, and for those cases requires that the charging party allege facts supporting repugnancy as part of an amended charge. Subsection (c) provides that the Board agent reviewing the charge shall have all the powers and duties specified in Sections 32620, 32630, and 32640, and that the issuance of a complaint is not appealable to the Board itself except as provided in Section 32360. Subsection (d) provides that the Board itself may, at any time, direct that the record be submitted to the Board itself for decision. The proposed amendment to this section deletes subsections (c) and (d).

Section 32700 concerns the requirements for valid proof of employee support in representation proceedings. The proposed amendment to this section adds subsection (g), which provides that proof of support under the TNC Act is governed by proposed Section 110300.

C. Amendments Only to the Authority and Reference Citations of Existing Regulations

Section 31001 provides for meetings of the Public Employment Relations Board.

Section 32020 provides a definition for the term "Board."

Section 32030 provides a definition for the term "Board itself."

Section 32040 provides a definition for the term "Executive Director."

Section 32050 provides a definition for the term "General Counsel."

Section 32055 provides a definition for the term "Chief Administrative Law Judge."

Section 32060 provides a definition for the term "headquarters office."

Section 32075 provides a definition for the term "regional office."

Section 32080 provides a definition for the term "day."

Section 32090 provides a definition for the term "e–PERB."

Section 32091 provides a definition for the term "electronic filing."

Section 32093 provides a definition for the term "electronic service" where authorized or required by statute or within PERB's regulations.

Section 32094 provides a definition for the term "filed" as the term is used for the formal submission of documents with PERB.

Section 32105 provides for the severability of PERB's regulations.

Section 32125 describes the filing requirements for documents with confidential information.

Section 32130 addresses the computation of time for filings with PERB.

Section 32132 concerns the requirements for an extension of time in which to file documents with the Board.

Section 32136 describes the circumstances under which a late filing may be excused.

Section 32143 concerns the placement of PERB cases in abeyance.

Section 32145 concerns the waiver of time period requirements to expedite a matter.

Section 32149 concerns the issuance of investigative subpoenas.

Section 32161 establishes rules governing participation in PERB proceedings and the recording, photographing, or broadcasting of PERB proceedings.

Section 32162 concerns the confidentiality of Board investigations.

Section 32168 concerns the conduct of hearings.

Section 32169 concerns the taking of depositions.

Section 32170 concerns the powers and authority of a Board agent conducting a hearing.

Section 32175 concerns the rules of evidence in representation cases.

Section 32176 concerns the rules of evidence in unfair practice cases.

Section 32178 concerns the burden of proof in unfair practice cases.

Section 32180 concerns the "rights of parties" to representation including self–representation.

Section 32185 concerns ex parte communications with Board agents.

Section 32190 concerns filings and rulings on motions.

Section 32200 concerns the appeal of rulings on motions and other interlocutory matters.

Section 32205 concerns requests to continue a formal hearing.

Section 32206 concerns the production of statements of witnesses after testimony.

Section 32207 concerns stipulation of facts for purposes of hearing.

Section 32209 concerns the procedure for correction of hearing transcripts.

Section 32210 concerns the filing of informational briefs and oral argument.

Section 32212 concerns briefs and oral argument.

Section 32215 concerns issuance of proposed decisions.

Section 32220 concerns contemptuous conduct by a party or a party's agent.

Section 32230 concerns the refusal of a witness to testify.

Section 32295 concerns ex parte communications with members of the Board itself or legal advisers to Board members.

Section 32300 concerns the filing of exceptions to Board agent decisions.

Section 32305 provides that proposed decisions become final if no timely exceptions are filed.

Section 32310 provides for the filing of responses to exceptions.

Section 32312 provides for the filing of reply briefs in support of exceptions.

Section 32315 concerns oral argument on exceptions.

Section 32320 concerns issuance of decisions by the Board itself.

Section 32350 provides for a definition of administrative decisions.

Section 32360 concerns requirements for appeals of administrative decisions.

Section 32370 concerns requests for a stay following an appeal.

Section 32375 provides for responses to administrative appeals.

Section 32400 provides that a motion for reconsideration is not required to exhaust administrative remedies.

Section 32410 provides for the filing of requests for reconsideration.

Section 32450 concerns the filing of requests for injunctive relief.

Section 32455 concerns the investigation of requests for injunctive relief.

Section 32460 provides for recommendations by the General Counsel concerning requests for injunctive relief.

Section 32465 provides for decisions by the Board itself concerning requests for injunctive relief.

Section 32470 concerns the authority of the General Counsel regarding requests for injunctive relief where a quorum of the Board itself is unavailable.

Section 32616 specifies in which regional office unfair practice charge filings should be made.

Section 32620 concerns the processing of unfair practice charges by Board agents.

Section 32621 concerns the amending of unfair practice charges.

Section 32625 concerns the withdrawal of unfair practice charges.

Section 32630 concerns the dismissal of unfair practice charges.

Section 32635 provides for the appeal of dismissals of unfair practice charges.

Section 32640 concerns the issuance of complaints in unfair practice charge cases.

Section 32644 provides for the filing of an answer in unfair practice charges where a complaint issues.

Section 32645 concerns non–prejudicial errors in unfair practice charges and related documents.

Section 32647 concerns amendments to complaints in unfair practice charge cases before hearing.

Section 32648 concerns amendments to complaints in unfair practice charge cases during a hearing.

Section 32649 concerns the filing of answers to amendments to complaints in unfair practice charge cases.

Section 32650 concerns the conduct of settlement conferences in unfair practice charge cases.

Section 32980 concerns enforcement of compliance with final decisions of the Board.

CONSISTENT AND COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING STATE REGULATIONS

The Board has determined that the proposed regulatory adoptions and amendments are not inconsistent or incompatible with existing regulations. After conducting a review of all regulations that would relate to or affect this area of California law, the Board has determined that due to PERB's exclusive jurisdiction to implement and enforce the TNC Act, the proposed regulations are the only regulations concerning the implementation of the TNC Act. Therefore, the Board has concluded that these regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

ANTICIPATED BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Implementing the TNC Act will impact hundreds of thousands of TNC drivers, their representative driver organizations, and approximately 14 TNCs operating in the State of California.

The purposes of the TNC Act include: promoting the right of TNC drivers to organize and designate representatives of their own choosing to negotiate terms and conditions of their work, or to refrain from doing so; facilitating the prevention or prompt resolution of disputes between TNCs and TNC drivers; and improving the working conditions of TNC drivers, which would, in turn, improve the vital services they provide to the general public.

The proposed regulatory changes will further the purposes of the TNC Act. The proposed regulations bring clarity to procedures governing representation matters under the TNC Act, thereby ensuring prompt and efficient recognition of the collective bargaining rights afforded to TNC drivers and driver organizations. By establishing case processing procedures for alleged TNC Act violations, the proposed regulations facilitate the prompt resolution of disputes between TNCs and TNC drivers and promote labor peace. Ultimately, the proposed regulations will safeguard the procedural and substantive rights provided by the TNC Act to TNC drivers, TNC driver organizations, and TNCs, which will benefit California residents by promoting stable collective bargaining and dispute resolution.

NO EXISTING AND COMPARABLE FEDERAL REGULATION OR STATUTE

During the process of developing these proposed regulatory adoptions and amendments, the Board has conducted a search for any similar federal regulations and statutes on this topic and has determined that there are no existing, comparable federal regulations or statutes that govern matters arising under the TNC Act. These proposed regulatory changes apply solely to labor relations matters among TNC drivers, their representative driver organizations, and TNCs operating in California. Federal labor relations statutes and their corresponding regulations do not cover these individuals or entities. For example, because TNC drivers are classified as independent contractors, the National Labor Relations Board does not exercise jurisdiction over these workers. Therefore, the Board has concluded that these regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing Federal regulations or statutes.

DISCLOSURES REGARDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Board has made the following initial determinations:

Mandate on local agencies and school districts: The proposed action would not impose any new mandate.

Cost to any local agency or school district which must be reimbursed in accordance with Government Code section 17500 et seq.: The proposed action would not impose any new costs which must be reimbursed.

Other non–discretionary costs or savings imposed upon local agencies: The proposed action would not result in any new costs which must be reimbursed, or savings imposed upon local agencies.

Cost or savings to state agency: The proposed action would not result in any new costs or savings.

Cost or savings in federal funding to the state: The proposed action would not result in any new costs or savings.

Cost impact on private persons or directly affected businesses: The agency is not aware of any cost impacts that a private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

Significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states: The proposed action will have no impact on the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states. The proposed regulations are expected to benefit businesses by making PERB's processes clearer, promote prompt resolution of labor disputes, and overall promote stable collective bargaining consistent with the TNC Act.

Significant effect on housing costs: There will be no effect on housing costs.

Business Reporting Requirement: The proposed action will not require a report to be made.

The proposed regulations will apply to small businesses to the extent that any TNCs meet the legal definition in Government Code section 11342.610. However, the proposed regulations are expected to benefit such entities to the extent that they make PERB's processes clearer, promote prompt resolution of labor disputes, and overall promote stable collective bargaining consistent with the TNC Act.

RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Board concludes that the adoption of the proposed regulations and amendments will neither create nor eliminate jobs in the State of California, nor result in the creation of new businesses or elimination of existing businesses, or result in the expansion of businesses in the State of California.

Benefits to health and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment: The regulations will make the Board's processes clearer and more efficient when disputes arise under the TNC Act, providing essential guidance to all parties. Ultimately, this enhanced clarity and efficiency in dispute resolution will promote stable collective bargaining and the continuous delivery of vital rideshare services that TNC drivers provide to California communities, thereby benefiting the welfare of all California residents.

There are no anticipated benefits or effects on the health of California residents, worker safety, or the state's environment.

BENEFIT ANALYSIS

The adoption of these proposed regulations will implement and clarify procedures for PERB's administration and enforcement of the TNC Act. This will significantly benefit TNC drivers, their representative driver organizations, and TNCs, as well as the broader community by facilitating the expedient resolution of labor disputes under the TNC Act. The regulations will make the Board's processes clearer and more efficient, providing essential guidance to all parties. Ultimately, this enhanced clarity and efficiency in dispute resolution will promote stable collective bargaining and the continuous delivery of vital rideshare services that TNC drivers provide to California communities, thereby benefiting the welfare of all California residents.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Government Code section 11346.5, subsection (a)(13), the Board must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the agency or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the agency 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.

The Board invites interested persons to present statements or arguments with respect to alternatives to the proposed regulations at the scheduled hearing or during the written comment period.

CONTACT PERSONS

Any questions or suggestions regarding the proposed action should be directed to:

Sara Kang Rhee, Senior Regional Attorney
Public Employment Relations Board
425 W. Broadway, Suite 400
(818) 696–6346
Email: sara.kang@perb.ca.gov

The backup person for these inquiries is:

James Coffey, Principal Attorney Supervisor
Public Employment Relations Board
1031 18th Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 584–5676
Email: james.coffey@perb.ca.gov

Please direct requests for copies of the proposed text (the "express terms") of the regulations, the initial statement of reasons, the modified text of the regulations, if any, or other information upon which the rulemaking is based, to Sara Kang Rhee at the above address.

PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES

On November 12, 2025, PERB held a special public meeting wherein the public was given the opportunity to provide comments regarding the implementation of the TNC Act and the proposed text of the regulations. Comments were received from four constituent entities prior to the meeting. In response to this feedback, the Board agreed at the public meeting to modify the proposed text and present it at the next public meeting for further comment.

On February 12, 2026, the Board held a public meeting wherein the public was given the opportunity to provide comments regarding the modified proposed rulemaking package. Comments were received from two constituent entities prior to the meeting.

The Board considered the comments and, at the public meeting, proceeded to approve the proposed regulatory text and the commencement of the formal rulemaking process.

PERB has also relied upon the Economic Impact Assessment identified in this notice in proposing regulatory action.

AVAILABILITY OF STATEMENT OF REASONS, TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS, AND RULEMAKING FILE

The Board will have the entire rulemaking file available for inspection and copying throughout the rulemaking process at its office at the above address. As of the date this notice is published in the California Regulatory Notice Register, the rulemaking file consists of this notice, the express terms of the proposed regulations, the initial statement of reasons, and documents relied on in promulgating this rulemaking package. The express terms of the proposed regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposed regulations are based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representatives listed above. Copies of these documents may be obtained by contacting Sara Kang Rhee at the above address. The Notice of Proposed Action, Initial Statement of Reasons, and express terms of the proposed text are also available on the Board's website at https://perb.ca.gov/laws–and–regulations/rulemaking/rulemaking–transportation–network–company–drivers–labor–relations–act/.

AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

After holding a hearing, if one is requested, and considering all timely and relevant comments, the Board may adopt the proposed regulations substantially as described in this notice. If the Board makes modifications that are sufficiently related to the originally proposed text, the modified text with changes clearly indicated shall be made available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date on which the Board adopts the regulations as revised. Requests for copies of any modified regulations and/or the final statement of reasons should be sent to the attention of Sara Kang Rhee at the above address. The Board will accept written comments on the modified regulations for 15 days after the date on which they are made available.

AVAILABILITY OF THE FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Upon its completion, copies of the final statement of reasons may be obtained by contacting Sara Kang Rhee at the above address.

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS ON THE INTERNET

Copies of this notice of proposed action, the initial statement of reasons, and the text of the proposed regulations in underline and strikeout, can be accessed through PERB's website at www.perb.ca.gov throughout the rulemaking process. Written comments received during the written comment period will also be posted on PERB's website. The final statement of reasons or, if applicable, notice of a decision not to proceed will be posted on PERB's website following the Board's action. These documents may be viewed on PERB's website at the following address: https://perb.ca.gov/laws-and-regulations/rulemaking/rulemaking-transportation-network-company-drivers-labor-relations-act/.

TITLE 14. FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

USE OF NATIVE RATTLESNAKES

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Fish and Game Commission (Commission), pursuant to the authority vested by sections 200, 205, 713, 1002, 1002.5, 1050, 2118, 2120, 2122, 2150, 2150.2, 2157, 5060, 5061 of the Fish and Game Code, interpret or make specific sections 75, 200, 205, 395, 396, 398, 713, 1002, 1002.5, 1050, 2116, 2116.5, 2117, 2118, 2120, 2125, 2150, 2150.2, 2150.4, 2151, 2157, 2190, 2193, 2271, 3005.5, 3007, 3503, 3503.5, 3511, 3513, 3950, 5060, 5061, 6896, 7149.3, 10500, 12000 and 12002, Fish and Game Code; Sections 11503 and 11506 Government Code; Section 597, Penal Code; Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 21.82 and 21.85; and Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit, proposes to add Section 42.1 and amend sections 43 and 703, Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR), relating to the use of native rattlesnakes.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Unless otherwise specified, all section references in this document are to Title 14, CCR.

The proposed regulatory changes add Section 42.1, Title 14 CCR, Commercial Use and Possession of Native Rattlesnakes for Exhibition, amend Section 43, Title 14, CCR, Captive Propagation of Native Reptiles for Use as Pets, and subsection 703(c) relating to Commercial Use and Possession of Native Rattlesnakes. The Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) has requested the proposed amendments for the purpose of establishing a legal framework to permit the commercial exhibition of California native rattlesnakes. It is necessary that the Fish and Game Commission:

- Establish a legal framework allowing commercial exhibition of California native rattlesnakes.
- Create a permitting process for possession and exhibition, covering activities such as dog aversion training, film production, and safe–handling courses.
- Define detailed permit application requirements and permittee responsibilities, including housing, care, record keeping, safe handling, and lawful acquisition.
- Address gaps in existing regulations, which currently do not authorize these forms of commercial exhibition for native species.
- Support public safety by promoting accurate rattlesnake–related information and responsible commercial practices.
- Update related sections (Sections 43 and 703) to align permitting procedures, application requirements, inspections, and fees with the new regulatory structure.

Proposed Regulatory Changes

Addition of Section 42.1

The new section establishes a permitting system for the commercial use and exhibition of native rattlesnakes in California. It defines key terms, outlines who qualifies as a handler, and explains what activities require an exhibition permit. The permit is valid for three years and requires applicants to provide personal, business and facility information, emergency plans, veterinary care, and details on rattlesnake numbers and intended uses.

The regulation includes strict care, housing, handling, and safety standards; limits on the number of snakes a permittee may possess, and restricts acquisition to approved sources. Facilities may be inspected, and permittees must keep detailed records, report escapes or injuries, and comply with all other laws. Lastly, the section outlines the denial, suspension, and revoking of permits for violations and the process of appeal.

Proposed changes to Section 43

The amendments update Section 43 to modern standards, revise the permit application process, and clarify that the regulation covers both commercial and noncommercial captive propagation of native reptiles specifically for use as pets. The application form has been updated, renamed, and has additional identification, business, and contact requirements added. The form will no longer be incorporated by reference and is now described in the regulation. The definition of "pet" is clarified, outdated language is removed, and several terms are updated for consistency.

Minor clarifications are made throughout regarding permitted activities, species nomenclature, enclosure standards, humane care requirements, recordkeeping, and annual reporting. The confidentiality subsection is deleted as it conflicts with the Public Records Act.

Lastly, the subsection updates inspection provisions to provide clarity regarding scheduling, authority, and consequences of refusal.

Proposed changes to Section 703

Addition of a new subsection to set the fees for commercial use of possession of native rattlesnakes for other purposes.

Benefit of the Regulations

There is a need to establish a legal framework to permit the commercial exhibition of California native rattlesnakes. This authority does not exist under any other regulations but is needed to address other forms of beneficial commercial (financial gain or profit) exhibition such as dog aversion training, film industry, and safe handling courses.

Consistency and Compatibility with Existing Regulations

The proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations. Section 20, Article IV, of the state Constitution specifies that the Legislature may delegate to the Commission such powers relating to the protection and propagation of fish and game as the Legislature sees fit. The Legislature has delegated to the Commission the power to adopt regulations governing reptiles (Section 4902, Fish and Game Code). No other state agency has the authority to adopt regulations concerning native rattlesnakes. The Commission has reviewed its own regulations and finds that the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Comments Submitted by Mail or Email

It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted on or before **December 3, 2026** at the address given below, or by email to FGC@fgc.ca.gov. Written comments mailed, or emailed to the Commission office, must be received on **December 11, 2027**. If you would like copies of any modifications to this proposal, please include your name and mailing address. Mailed comments should be addressed to Fish and Game Commission, P.O. Box 944209, Sacramento, CA 94244–2090.

Meetings

NOTICE IS GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held in the California Natural Resources Building, 715, P Street, Sacramento, California, which will commence at 8:00 a.m., or soon thereafter, on **Tuesday, October 13, 2026** and may continue at 8:00 a.m. on **Wednesday, October 14, 2026, Thursday October 15, 2026 and Friday, October 16, 2026**. This meeting will also include the opportunity to participate via webinar/teleconference. Instructions for participation in the webinar/teleconference hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling 916–653–4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that any person interested may present statements, orally or in writing, relevant to this action at a hearing to be held at the East End Complex Auditorium, 1500 Capitol Ave, Sacramento, CA 95814, which will commence at 8:00 a.m., or soon thereafter, on **Tuesday, December 15, 2026**, and may continue at 8:00 a.m. on **Wednesday, December 16, 2026**. This meeting will also include the opportunity to participate via webinar/teleconference. Instructions for participation in the webinar/teleconference hearing will be posted at www.fgc.ca.gov in advance of the meeting or may be obtained by calling 916–653–4899. Please refer to the Commission meeting agenda, which will be available at least 10 days prior to the meeting, for the most current information.

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strikeout format can be accessed through the Commission website at www.fgc.ca.gov. The regulations as well as all related documents upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative, Melissa Miller–Henson, Executive Director, Fish and Game Commission, 715 P Street, Box 944209, Sacramento, California 94244–2090, phone (916) 653–4899. Please direct requests for the above–mentioned documents and inquiries concerning the regulatory process to Melissa Miller–Henson or Jenn Bacon at FGC@fgc.ca.gov or at the preceding address or phone number. **Casey McVay, Lieutenant Law Enforcement Division, Department of Fish and Wildlife, has been designated to respond to questions on the substance of the proposed regulations. Mr. McVay can be reached at** LEDRegulations@wildlife.ca.gov.

AVAILABILITY OF MODIFIED TEXT

If the regulations adopted by the Commission differ from but are sufficiently related to the action proposed, they will be available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date of adoption. Any person interested may obtain a copy of said regulations prior to the date of adoption by contacting the agency representative named herein.

If the regulatory proposal is adopted, the final statement of reasons may be obtained from the address above when it has been received from the agency program staff.

IMPACT OF REGULATORY ACTION/RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The potential for significant statewide adverse economic impacts that might result from the proposed regulatory action has been assessed, and the following initial determinations relative to the required statutory categories have been made:

(a) Significant Statewide Adverse Economic Impact Directly Affecting Business, Including the Ability of California Businesses to Compete with Businesses in Other States:

The Commission does not anticipate any significant statewide adverse economic impacts that would directly affect businesses as a result of the proposed regulations.

(b) Impact on the Creation or Elimination of Jobs Within the State:

The proposed regulations may increase economic opportunities through job creation, as the demand for certain exhibition services can be met through lawful permitting of such activities.

(c) Effects of the Regulation on the Creation of New Businesses or the Elimination of Existing Businesses Within the State:

The regulation will allow the permitting of new businesses with the Exhibition Permit. There are currently no businesses permitted, but the Commission anticipates that the legalization of commercial rattlesnake exhibition is estimated to create fewer than 100 new businesses, although it remains difficult to precisely determine the total number, given the current absence of lawfully permitted activity in this business sector.

(d) Effects of the Regulation on the Expansion of Businesses in California:

None.

(e) Benefits of the Regulation to the Health and Welfare of California Residents and Worker Safety:

The Commission anticipates that the proposed regulations to legalize commercial handling of rattlesnakes for exhibition purposes — such as dog aversion training, use in the film industry, and safe handling courses — will impact businesses, small businesses, and individuals seeking to commercially handle these reptiles in those settings. As the activities are currently not allowed, the resulting expansion of economic opportunity is expected to attract new entrants into the market.

Additionally, allowing safe–handling training and dog aversion training to legally occur will provide important health and safety protections for both humans and dogs, especially when encountering rattlesnakes during their work. Legalizing these trainings is anticipated to reduce snakebites and the costs to California residents and the dogs used for aversion training which also benefit worker safety.

(f) Effects of the Regulation on the State's Environment:

None.

(g) Cost Impacts on a Representative Private Person or Business:

The Commission anticipates that the proposed regulation will create some cost impacts to private businesses in the form of the proposed fees. The proposed fees include $456 for the inspection fee, $312 for the application fee, and $144 for the permit fee, which are all collected at once for a cost of $871.75. Under the proposed regulations, the permit fee is refunded to the applicant should their application fail. With the assumption that 100 permits will be issued the first year and a third of that (approximately 33) each year after due to the 3–year lifespan of the permit before renewal, the Department estimates that $87,175 will be collected in the first year and approximately $28,767.75 collected in subsequent years (for the first three years the costs are $87,175 + $28,767.75 + $28,767.75 = $144,710.50). These calculations do not include the 3% surcharge charged by the Automated License Data System.

(h) Costs or Savings to State Agencies or Costs/Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

None.

(i) Nondiscretionary Costs/Savings to Local Agencies:

None.

(j) Programs Mandated on Local Agencies or School Districts:

None.

(k) Costs Imposed on any Local Agency or School District that is Required to be Reimbursed Under Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4, Government Code:

None.

(l) Effect on Housing Costs:

None.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

It has been determined that the adoption of these regulations may affect small business. The Commission has drafted the regulations in Plain English pursuant to Government Code Sections 11342.580 and 11346.2(a)(1).

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The Commission must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Commission, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Commission, 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.

TITLE 15. BOARD OF STATE AND COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

STANDARDS AND TRAINING OF LOCAL CORRECTIONS AND PROBATION OFFICERS

Pursuant to the authority granted by Penal Code sections 6035 and 6036, the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC[1]) hereby gives notice of the proposed regulatory action(s) described in this public notice. It is the intent of the BSCC to amend regulations contained in Title 15, Division 1, Chapter 1, Subchapter 1, California Code of Regulations (CCR), which is commonly known as Standards and Training of Local Corrections and Probation Officers, after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations regarding these regulations.

PUBLIC HEARING

The BSCC did not schedule a public hearing on this proposed action. However, the BSCC will hold a hearing if it receives a written request for a public hearing from any interested person, or their authorized representative, no later than 15 days before the close of the written comment period.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD

Any interested person, or their authorized representative, may submit written comments relevant to the proposed regulatory action to the BSCC.

A written comment period has been established commencing on September 18, 2026, and closing on November 2, 2026. The BSCC will consider only comments received by the closing date. Submit comments to:

Board of State and Community Corrections
Attention: Amanda Ferreira, Staff Services Manager I (Specialist)
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95833
Phone: (916) 324–2878
Fax: (916) 322–2461
Email: regulations@bscc.ca.gov

POST–HEARING MODIFICATIONS TO THE TEXT OF THE REGULATIONS

Following the public comment period, the BSCC may adopt the proposed regulations substantially as proposed in this notice or with modifications that are sufficiently related to the original proposed text and notice of proposed changes. Any modifications made to the full text of the proposed regulations will be clearly indicated and made available to the public for at least 15 days prior to the date that the BSCC adopts, amends, or repeals the regulation(s). The BSCC will accept written comments on the modified regulation text during the 15–day period. Comments should be addressed to the primary contact person as provided above.

NOTE: To be notified of any modifications, you must submit written/oral comments or request that you be notified of any modifications.

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

Penal Code sections 6035 and 6036 authorize the BSCC to establish minimum standards for selection and training of local corrections and probation officers. The proposed regulations would implement, interpret, and make specific sections 6035 and 6036.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

This rulemaking action proposes amendments to Title 15, Division 1, Chapter 1, Subchapter 1 of the California Code of Regulations related to the Standards and Training of Local Corrections and Probation Officers Program. These amendments update the regulatory criteria for certifying training courses, reviewing applications for certification, allocating funds, maintaining records, and evaluating program effectiveness.

Summary of Existing Laws and Effect of the Proposed Action

Penal Code sections 6035 and 6036 require the Board to establish minimum standards for the selection and training of local corrections and probation of-

[1] For the purpose of this document, "BSCC" and "Board" are used interchangeably to refer to the Board of State and Community Corrections.

ficers and authorize the Board to amend those standards as necessary. These statutes form the foundation of the Standards and Training for Local Corrections (STC) program and govern how training requirements are developed, certified, delivered, and evaluated. Under existing regulations in Title 15, Division 1, Chapter 1, Subchapter 1 of the California Code of Regulations, the Board has established criteria for certifying training courses, reviewing applications, allocating funds, maintaining records, and evaluating program effectiveness.

Current regulatory language requires the Board to consider the cost of training when certifying courses, reviewing applications, and conducting program evaluations. Regulations also reference "tuition" as a type of allowable expense and as a category for record–keeping. However, the Board is not a party to the financial transactions between participating agencies and training providers and does not oversee, verify, or participate in determining the actual costs of training delivery. Because agencies pay providers directly, cost–related concerns are identified only when reported or discovered incidentally, limiting the Board's ability to reliably evaluate or apply cost information within these regulatory processes.

The proposed regulatory amendments remove cost–related criteria from the course certification standards, application requirements, and program evaluation factors. Specifically, references to "cost of providing instruction," "cost–effectiveness," and "costs associated with delivery" are eliminated from sections 231, 232, and 320. Additionally, outdated terminology, such as the use of "tuition," is replaced with "course training costs" to more accurately reflect the expenses incurred by participating agencies and to improve clarity and consistency across the regulations.

By eliminating cost as a regulatory factor, the proposed amendments ensure that the Board relies only on information it can consistently and effectively evaluate. The revised regulations better align with the Board's administrative role, remove criteria that cannot be practically assessed, and modernize the regulatory text to reflect the operational reality of how training costs are incurred, tracked, and reported. These updates do not change the intent or core structure of the existing regulations; rather, they streamline requirements, reduce ambiguity, and support more accurate application and monitoring of training standards.

Determination of Inconsistency/Incompatibility with Existing State Regulations

The BSCC has determined that these proposed regulations are not inconsistent or incompatible with existing regulations. After conducting a review for any regulations that would relate to or affect this area, the BSCC has concluded that these are the only regulations that address minimum standards for selection and training of local corrections and probation officers.

Comparable Federal Statute or Regulations

There are no comparable federal regulations or statutes.

Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulation

The anticipated benefits of the proposed regulations include improved clarity, consistency, and practical application of the standards governing course certification, application review, allocation of funds, record–keeping, and program evaluation within the Standards and Training for Local Corrections Program. By removing cost as a criterion, the Board must evaluate, the certification and program evaluation processes will rely solely on factors the Board can consistently assess. This reduces unintended barriers created when cost information, over which the Board has no direct oversight, affects whether courses may be certified or favorably evaluated.

The proposed amendments are expected to broaden opportunities for training providers to offer a wider range of certified courses and enhance the flexibility for participating agencies to select training most appropriate for their operational needs. Increased access to relevant, high–quality training supports improved overall preparedness, competency, and professional development among local corrections and probation officers, contributing to safe and effective operation of local detention facilities.

Updating terminology, including replacing "tuition" with "course training costs," further benefits agencies and training providers by improving clarity and ensuring the regulatory language accurately reflects how training expenses are incurred and documented within the program. This clarity supports more consistent implementation of training requirements and aids in accurate record–keeping and monitoring.

DISCLOSURE REGARDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

The BSCC has made the following initial determinations:

Mandate on local agencies and school districts: None.

Cost or savings to any state agency: None.

Cost to any local agency or school district which must be reimbursed in accordance with Government Code sections 17500 through 17630: None.

Other nondiscretionary costs or savings imposed on local agencies: None.

Costs or savings in federal funding to the state: None.

Significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states: None.

Cost impacts on a representative private person or businesses: The BSCC is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

The BSCC concludes that it is unlikely that these regulations will (1) create new businesses or eliminate existing businesses within California, (2) create jobs or eliminate jobs within California, (3) affect the expansion of businesses currently doing business within California; and (4) affect worker safety or the State's environment. The BSCC concludes that it is likely that these regulations will benefit the health and welfare of California residents, particularly local corrections and probation staff and the individuals in their care, by supporting greater access to relevant, high–quality training. By removing cost–based criteria that the Board cannot reliably evaluate, the proposed amendments enable agencies to select training courses that best meet operational needs without being limited by cost constraints, thereby improving staff preparedness, competency, and overall facility safety.

Significant effect on housing costs: None.

Business Report Determination: None.

Small Business Determination: The BSCC has concluded that the implementation of this action will not affect small businesses, as these regulations apply solely to the standards and training for local corrections and probation officers and do not impose any requirements on small businesses.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Government Code section 11346.5, subdivision (a)(13), the BSCC must determine that no reasonable alternative it considered or that has otherwise been identified and brought to its attention 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.

The BSCC invites interested parties to present statements or arguments with respect to alternatives to the proposed regulations during the written comment period or public hearing if one is requested.

AVAILABILITY OF RULEMAKING DOCUMENTS

The Rulemaking File, which includes all the information on which this proposal is based, is available for viewing by request at the BSCC's office and may also be accessed through the BSCC's website at http://www.bscc.ca.gov.

AVAILABILITY OF MODIFIED TEXT

If the BSCC makes modifications that are sufficiently related to the originally proposed text, it will clearly indicate the changes and make the modified text available to the public for at least 15 days before the BSCC adopts the regulations as revised. The modified text may be accessed through the BSCC website at http://www.bscc.ca.gov. Those persons who do not have access to the Internet may submit a written request to the contact persons listed below.

AVAILABILITY OF INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS AND FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

The Initial and Final Statement of Reasons may be accessed through the BSCC website at http://www.bscc.ca.gov. Those persons who do not have access to the Internet may submit a written request to the contact persons listed below.

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS; INTERNET ACCESS

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in strikeout and underline can be accessed through our website at http://www.bscc.ca.gov. Those persons who do not have access to the Internet may submit a written request to the contact persons listed below.

CONTACT PERSON FOR SUBSTANTIVE AND/OR TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

Inquiries concerning the proposed action may be directed to the primary contact person:

Amanda Ferreira, Staff Services Manager I (Specialist)
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95833
Phone: (916) 324–2878
Fax: (916) 322–2461
Email: regulations@bscc.ca.gov

The auxiliary contact person is:

Ginger Wolfe, Assistant Deputy Director
2590 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 200,
Sacramento, CA 95833
Phone: (916) 621–2886
Fax: (916) 322–2461
Email: regulations@bscc.ca.gov

TITLE 17. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

CALIFORNIA NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASE REGISTRY

Notice is hereby given that the California Department of Public Health (Department) is proposing the regulation described below. This notice of proposed rulemaking commences a rulemaking to make the regulations permanent after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations regarding the regulation.

PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS

Public Comment Period

The Department will hold a virtual public hearing on November 6, 2026 (See "Public Hearing" for further details).

Written comments will be accepted from September 18, 2026 until 5:00pm on November 6, 2026. Written comments must be submitted as follows:

1. By email to: Regulations@cdph.ca.gov;
2. By fax transmission to: (916) 440–5747;
3. By postal service or hand delivered to: California Department of Public Health, Office of Regulations, 1415 L Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814.

All comments, including email or fax transmissions, should include the regulation package identifier "**DPH–23–008 California Neurodegenerative Disease Registry**" in the subject line to facilitate the timely identification and review of the comment.

For the Department to provide copies of any notices for proposed changes to the regulation text of which additional comments may be solicited, include your name and your mailing address or email address with your written comment.

Public Hearing

The hearing will be held via Microsoft Teams ®, on November 6, 2026 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., and may be accessed at the following link:

California Department of Public Health
Office of Legal Services • 1415 L Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 558–1710 • (916) 440–5747 FAX
Department Website (www.cdph.ca.gov)

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join: https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/241124853001496?p=vYhIW1QLf9sysXhEhs
Meeting ID: 241 124 853 001 496
Passcode: ZL2QX7XW

Dial in by phone

+1 916–306–8051,,499056735# United States, Sacramento
Find a local number
Phone conference ID: 499 056 735#

During the hearing, any person may present oral statements or arguments relevant to the proposed action described in this notice. The Department requests but does not require persons who make oral comments during the hearing to also submit a written copy of their testimony as follows:

1. By email to: Regulations@cdph.ca.gov;
2. By fax transmission to: (916) 440–5747;
3. By postal service or hand delivered to: California Department of Public Health, Office of Regulations, 1415 L Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814.

All comments, including email or fax transmissions, should include the regulation package identifier "**DPH–23–008 California Neurodegenerative Disease Registry**" in the subject line to facilitate the timely identification and review of the comment.

For the Department to provide copies of any notices for proposed changes to the regulation text of which additional comments may be solicited, include your name and your mailing address or email address with your written comment.

An agenda for the public hearing will be made available upon request. For individuals with disabilities, the Department shall provide, upon request, assistive services such as sign–language interpretation, real–time captioning, note takers, reading or writing assistance, and conversion of written public hearing materials into Braille, large print, and audiocassette or computer disk.

Note: The range of assistive services available may be limited if requests are received without adequate preparation time prior to the public hearing.

Authority and Reference

Authority for the proposed regulatory change is provided in sections 131050, 131051, 131052, 131200, 103870, 103870.1, 103871, 103871.1, and 103871.2 of the Health and Safety Code (HSC).

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Summary of the Proposed Regulations

The California Department of Public Health (hereafter "Department") proposes to adopt Subchapter 17 (sections 7201–7265) of Division 1, Chapter 4, Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations to establish standards and technical requirements for submitting case reports containing patient health data to the California Parkinson's Disease Registry (hereafter "Parkinson's Registry") and the California Neurodegenerative Disease Registry (hereafter "Neurodegenerative Registry"). The Department also proposes requirements for research institutions and government agencies to request access to confidential information gathered by the Parkinson's Registry and Neurodegenerative Registry (hereafter collectively called "registries"). The Department also proposes procedures for individual patients to access their own personal information, to limit their participation in research by joining a Do Not Contact List, and to request destruction of erroneous data reported to the registries. These proposed regulations will implement, interpret, and make specific the provisions in the Health and Safety Code that established the registries to provide clarity to the regulated community regarding how to report cases to the Department and how to request data from the registries.

Background and Summary of Existing Laws and Regulations

The California Parkinson's Disease Registry and the California Neurodegenerative Disease Registry are modeled after the California Cancer Registry. After it was fully implemented in 1988, the California Cancer Registry quickly grew into one of the leading cancer registries in the world due to the size and diversity of the state's population and became a cornerstone for medical research worldwide. California lawmakers have since adapted this successful disease registry model to confront the public health challenges of Parkinson's disease and neurodegenerative disease.

In 2004, Health and Safety Code sections 103860 and 103865 were enacted to establish the California Parkinson's Disease Registry.

In 2017, Health and Safety Code sections 103870, 103870.1, and 103870.2 were enacted to establish the Richard Paul Hemann Parkinson's Disease Program with an original sunset date of January 1, 2020. The sunset date was amended in 2019 to extend the Richard Paul Hemann Parkinson's Disease Program to January 1, 2021.

In 2021, Health and Safety Code section 103870.2 was repealed to extend the Richard Paul Hemann Parkinson's Disease Program indefinitely and sections 103871, 103871.1, and 103871.2 were enacted to establish the California Neurodegenerative Disease Registry. Section 103871 was amended in 2023 to include amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS), also known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

Collectively, these provisions of the Health and Safety Code require the Department to conduct a program of epidemiological assessments, and to establish a statewide system for the collection of information for determining the incidence and prevalence of Parkinson's disease and neurodegenerative disease within the state. The Health and Safety Code further requires a hospital, facility, physician and surgeon, or other health care provider (collectively called "mandatory reporters") to report cases of Parkinson's disease and specified neurodegenerative diseases to the Department. The Department's proposed regulations would clarify how the Department will implement, interpret, and make specific the provisions of the Health and Safety Code and administer the Parkinson's Registry and Neurodegenerative Registry.

Policy Statement Overview:

Problem Statement:

The Department requires regulations to establish the standards and technical requirements for mandatory reporters who must submit cases of Parkinson's disease and neurodegenerative disease to the registries. The Department further requires regulations to establish procedures for research institutions and government agencies to request access to confidential information contained in the registries. The Department requires regulations to establish procedures for individual patients seeking to access their personal information, to limit patient participation in research by enabling patients to join a Do Not Contact List, and to request destruction of erroneous data reported to the registries. Finally, the Department requires regulations to establish the reporting schedule for each neurodegenerative disease.

Objectives (Goals): The broad objectives of this proposed regulatory action are:

- Establish the administrative framework of the Parkinson's Registry and Neurodegenerative Registry.
- Establish submission standards for mandatory reporters to transmit case reports containing patient health data to the registries.
- Establish the technical requirements for mandatory reporters to interface securely with the Department's reporting environment where case reports are collected.
- Establish the list of neurodegenerative diseases subject to reporting mandates.
- Establish the schedule for when each reporting mandate takes effect.

Benefits:

- Increased efficiency and consistency for the Department program administering the registries.
- Increased efficiency and consistency for mandatory reporters submitting case reports to the registries.
- Improved patient experiences for individuals whose data is reported to the registries.
- Improved reliability for research institutions and government agencies accessing data contained in the registries.

Evaluation as to Whether the Proposed Regulations are Inconsistent or Incompatible with Existing State and Federal Regulations

The Department has reviewed existing state and federal regulations and concludes that the proposed regulations are compatible with existing state and federal regulations.

Substantial Difference from Federal Regulation or Statute

The Department has determined these regulations are not substantially different from either a federal regulation or statute.

Local Mandate Determination

The Department has determined this regulatory action would not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts, nor are there any costs for which reimbursement is required by part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of division 4 of the Government Code.

Fiscal Impact Estimate

The Department has determined that the regulations will have no impact on:

A. **Cost or savings to any local agency or school district:** None.
B. **Cost or savings to any state agency:** None.
C. **Other Nondiscretionary Cost or Savings Imposed on Local Agencies:** None.
D. **Cost or savings in federal funding to the state:** None.

Housing Costs

The Department has determined that the regulations will not have an impact on housing costs.

Significant, Statewide Adverse Economic Impact on Business

The Department has made the initial determination that this action will not have a significant, statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

Summary of the Economic Impact Assessment

The Department has determined that the regulations will have no impact on:

1. **The creation or elimination of jobs within California.**
2. **The creation or elimination of new businesses within California.**
3. **Expansion of businesses currently doing business in the state.**
4. **The benefits of the regulation to the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment.**

The proposed regulations will not improve worker safety or the state's environment, but may benefit the health and welfare of California's residents by improving patient experiences for individuals whose data is reported to the registries.

Cost Impacts on Representative Person or Business

The Department does not anticipate any statewide cost to individuals to comply with this regulation over its lifetime. This regulatory action only establishes the standards and technical requirements for mandatory reporters who must submit cases of Parkinson's Disease and neurodegenerative diseases to the registries to determine incidence and prevalence, and will designate Parkinson's Disease and/or Alzheimer's Disease, MS, and ALS as reportable to the Department. There is no direct cost to individuals diagnosed with Parkinson's Disease and/or Alzheimer's Disease, MS and ALS by making these diseases reportable to the Department.

The Department has determined that there is a variable cost to a hospital or facility since a hospital or facility may need to update their health information technology to enable the Department to collect neurodegenerative disease information to determine incidence and prevalence of reportable neurodegenerative disease(s). That cost may vary from $1,000–$250,000 depending on the type of health information technology adopted by the hospital or facility. HSC sections 103870 and 103871 already require hospitals and facilities diagnosing or providing treatment for a patient with neurodegenerative diseases to report each case of a neurodegenerative disease to the Department in a format as prescribed.

Given the initial cost for reporting neurodegenerative disease(s) by a hospital or facility were established in the HSC, the Department has determined that any additional financial cost associated with this regulatory action is unknown.

Small Business

The Department has determined that there would not have an effect on small business. The proposed regulations only apply to hospitals and facilities that diagnose or provide treatment for patients with Parkinson's Disease (PD) and/or other neurodegenerative diseases (e.g., Alzheimer's Disease, multiple sclerosis [MS], and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis [ALS]) in the state.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The Department must determine that no reasonable alternative it considered or that has otherwise been identified and brought to its attention 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.

AVAILABILITY STATEMENTS

The Department has prepared and has available for public review an initial statement of reasons for the proposed regulations, all the information upon which the proposed regulations are based, and the text of the proposed regulations. The Office of Regulations, 1415 L Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814, will be the custodian of public records, including reports, documentation, and other material related to the proposed regulations (rulemaking file).

To request that a copy of this public notice, the regulation text, and the initial statement of reasons or alternate formats for these documents be mailed to you, please contact:

David Martin
Office of Regulations
1415 L Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 440–7673
Email: david.martin@cdph.ca.gov or Regulations@cdph.ca.gov, or use the California Relay Service by dialing 711.

Backup contact:

Hannah Strom–Martin
Office of Regulations
1415 L Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (279) 217–0764
Email: hannah.strom–martin@cdph.ca.gov

Upon specific request, these documents will be made available in Braille, large print, audio format, or computer disk.

The full text of any regulation which is changed or modified from the express terms of the proposed action will be made available by the Department's Office of Regulations at least 15 days prior to the date on which the Department adopts, amends, or repeals the resulting regulation.

FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

A copy of the final statement of reasons (when prepared) will be available upon request from the Office of Regulations.

INTERNET ACCESS

Materials regarding the action described in this notice (including this public notice, the text of the proposed regulations, and the initial statement of reasons) that are available via the Internet may be accessed at www.cdph.ca.gov by clicking on these links, in the following order: Decisions Pending & Opportunities for Public Participation, Proposed Regulations.

TITLE 22. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

REDUCTION CHAMBER STANDARDS (DPH–24–012)

Notice is hereby given that the California Department of Public Health (Department) is proposing the regulation described below. This notice of proposed rulemaking commences a rulemaking to make the regulations permanent after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations regarding the regulation.

PUBLIC PROCEEDINGS

The Department is conducting a 45–day written public proceeding during which time any interested person or such person's duly authorized representative may present statements, arguments or contentions (all of which are hereinafter referred to as comments) relevant to the action described in the Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview section of this notice.

To request copies of the regulatory proposal in an alternate format, please write or call: David Martin, Office of Regulations, 1415 L Street Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814, at (279) 217–0888, email to David.Martin@cdph.ca.gov or use the California Relay Service by dialing 711.

PUBLIC HEARING

A public hearing has not been scheduled for this rulemaking. However, the Department will conduct a public hearing if a written request for a public hearing is received from any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, no later than 15 days prior to the close of the written comment period, pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.8.

ASSISTIVE SERVICES

For individuals with disabilities, the Department will provide assistive services such as conversion of written materials into Braille, large print, audio format, and computer disk. For public hearings, assistive services can include sign–language interpretation, real–time captioning, note takers, reading, or writing assistance. To request these assistive services, please call David Martin at (279) 217–0888 or (California Relay at 711 or 1–800–735–2929), or email Regulations@cdph.ca.gov or write to the Office of Regulations:

California Department of Public Health

Office of Legal Services • 1415 L Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 558–1710 • (916) 440–5747 FAX

Department Website (www.cdph.ca.gov)

at the address noted above. Note: The range of assistive services available may be limited if requests are received less than 10 business days prior to public hearing.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD

Written comments pertaining to this proposal, regardless of the method of transmittal, must be received by Office of Regulations on November 5, 2026, which is hereby designated as the close of the written comment period. Comments received after this date will not be considered timely.

Written Comments must be submitted as follows:

1. By email to: Regulations@cdph.ca.gov. It is requested that email transmission of comments, particularly those with attachments, contain the regulation package identifier "DPH–24–012 Reduction Chamber Standards" in the subject line to facilitate timely identification and review of the comment.
2. By fax transmission to: (916) 636–6220.
3. By postal service or hand delivered to: California Department of Public Health, Office of Regulations, 1415 L Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814.

All comments, including email or fax transmissions, should include the regulation package identifier, DPH–24–012 Reduction Chamber Standards, along with your name and your mailing address or email address in order for the Department to provide copies of any notices for proposed changes to the regulation text on which additional comments may be solicited.

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

Under Health and Safety Code sections 131200 and 131056, the Department has authority to adopt and enforce regulations for the execution of its duties. Under Business & Professions Code section 7714.3, the Department has the authority to adopt, and amend, rules and regulations prescribing the standards for reduction chambers to preserve the public health and safety and to ensure the destruction of pathogenic microorganisms.

References: Sections 7001, 7002.7, 7010.3, 7010.8, 7025, 8393, 8392, 8395, 107150, 114710, 114715, 114970, 114985, 117690, 120130 Health and Safety Code (HSC); Section 7714.3, Business and Professions Code (BPC).

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Summary of Proposal:

The California Department of Public Health (Department) proposes to adopt rules and regulations concerning the sale and use of reduction chambers in the death–care industry. Assembly Bill (AB) 351 (Garcia, Chapter 399, Statutes of 2022) authorizes reduction as an additional disposition method, along with burial, cremation, and alkaline hydrolysis, and directs the Department to adopt rules and regulations prescribing standards for reduction chambers to preserve the public's health and safety and to ensure the destruction of pathogenic microorganisms. AB 351 also authorizes the Department to create an application process by which reduction chamber manufacturers may apply for sale and use of their reduction chambers in California. This proposal seeks to establish reduction chambers standards that will preserve public health and safety.

Background:

Reduction, also known as Natural Organic Reduction, was first authorized as a final disposition method in Washington State in 2019, and is defined in their regulations as "the contained, accelerated conversion of human remains to soil." The process relies on aerobic microorganisms to decompose human remains in a chamber or vessel. Reduction requires an operator to add organic plant materials to feed the decomposing microorganisms as well as air and water to maintain aerobic decomposition.

As of September 2025, fourteen states have authorized reduction as a disposition option (Washington, Colorado, Oregon, Vermont, California, New York, Nevada, Arizona, Maine, Delaware, Maryland, Minnesota, Georgia, and New Jersey). However, as of 2025, reduction is practiced only in Washington, Colorado, Oregon, and Nevada. Colorado providers operate without a comprehensive regulatory structure. Oregon's regulations require operators to "…utilize an industry–specific vessel that meets industry and commercial standards for use as a reduction chamber…" but do not specify criteria for pathogen destruction or post–reduction testing parameters. Nevada operators rely primarily on statutes for guidance, and proposed regulations do not address chamber designs or functionality. Washington regulations provide guidance on vessel performance and confirmatory post–reduction testing for indicator pathogens and heavy metal pollutants. New York's regulations are the most comprehensive regarding reduction operations, including vessel descriptions, organic plant materials required to achieve reduction, operating procedure, data logging, and confirmational testing.

There are no federal regulations pertaining directly to reduction and associated processes. The Department intends to adapt parts of the United States Environmental Protection Agency's composting guidance, applicable neighboring state reduction program regulations, and to utilize scientific studies related to reduction to develop California's reduction chamber program.

Problem Statement:

Section 26 of AB 351 authorizes reduction as a method for final disposition. However, no statutes or regulations exist prescribing standards for the safe and effective application of this method. Currently, only one commercial entity manufactures reduction chambers anywhere, either domestically or internationally. The new industry will require oversight to ensure safe and effective operations. Reduction is in its infancy and industry best practices have not been developed. Without regulations that prescribe minimum standards for reduction chambers, reduction would pose a risk to public health and safety. Reduction chambers could break during operation, creating a hazard for the operator. The operator may not be able to confirm the reduced remains are free of pathogens, risking exposure to anyone handling the remains. The reduction process may stop if improperly maintained, in which case the human remains would be incompletely reduced.

Objectives (Goals) of the Regulation:

The broad objective of this proposal is to effectuate the Department's statutory mandate to prescribe standards for the preservation of public health and safety by adopting rules and regulations for the manufacture, sale, and use of reduction chambers.

Anticipated Benefits:

This proposal ensures that reduction chambers are manufactured and operated safely and effectively. Standards for reduction chamber construction preserve the dignity of the human remains. The prescribed requirements for monitoring the reduction process ensure reduced human remains are safe to handle.

AB 351 allows for the reduced human remains to be returned to the relatives and friends of the deceased person in soil form. However, unlike burial, where any pathogens are sequestered with the human remains, or cremation and alkaline hydrolysis, where high heat and pressure destroy pathogens, reduction carries a risk of pathogen exposure if conducted incorrectly. The regulations that are being proposed reduce pathogen exposure risks for reduction facility operators and recipients of the reduced remains.

Unlike cremation, which requires large quantities of fossil fuels to incinerate a human body and emits harmful greenhouse gases in the process, the energy required to achieve reduction is primarily produced by microbiological decomposers. By comparison, reduction uses only a fraction of supplementary or additional energy. The process results in a nutrient rich material, very similar to compost, that may be used as a soil amendment, directly benefiting the health of Californians and the environment.

Evaluation as to Whether the Proposed Regulations Are Inconsistent or Incompatible with Existing State and Federal Regulations:

The Department has determined that the proposed regulations are not inconsistent or incompatible with existing state regulations. After conducting a review for any regulations that would relate to or affect this area, the Department has concluded that these are the only regulations that concern the reduction chamber language.

Substantial Difference from Federal Regulation or Statute:

There are no Federal statutes or regulations pertaining to reduction or reduction chambers.

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

None.

MANDATED BY FEDERAL LAW OR REGULATIONS

The Department determined these regulations are not identical to previously adopted or amended federal regulations.

OTHER STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The Department has determined there are no other statutory requirements.

LOCAL MANDATE

The Department has determined that the proposed regulations would not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts, nor are there any costs for which reimbursement is required by Part 7 (commencing with section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code.

FISCAL IMPACT ESTIMATES

Cost to any local agencies or school districts that must be reimbursed pursuant to Section 17561 of Government Code:

The Department has determined that these regulations would not impose a mandate on any local agencies or school districts.

The cost or savings to any state agency:

The Department does not anticipate any cost or savings to any state agency.

Other Nondiscretionary Cost or Savings Imposed on Local Agencies:

The Department does not anticipate any other nondiscretionary cost or savings imposed on local agencies.

Cost or Savings in Federal Funding to the State:

The Department has determined that the regulations will not affect federal funding.

HOUSING COSTS

The Department has determined that the proposed regulations will have no impact on housing costs. The regulations only affect potential reduction chamber manufacturers and operators.

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

The Department has made the initial determination that the proposed regulations would not have a significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

STATEMENT OF THE RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

The Department has determined that the regulations affect the following as described:

A. The creation or elimination of jobs within the State of California.

The proposed regulations are not likely to create or eliminate significant numbers of jobs in the state. However, it is possible that new reduction chamber manufacturers and operators will determine additional workers are required to manufacture or operate reduction chambers.

B. The creation of new businesses or the elimination of existing businesses within the State of California.

The proposed regulations are not likely to create or eliminate significant numbers of businesses in the state. As of April 2025, only six businesses in the country operate reduction chambers. It is likely that a small number of businesses will be created in the state to meet the demands of the population.

C. The expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California.

The proposed regulations are not likely to significantly expand businesses currently operating in the state. Of the six reduction chamber operators mentioned above, only two of them represent businesses that expanded into reduction. The others are stand–alone operations that were built specifically to offer reduction services. It is likely that a small number of businesses currently operating in the state will expand into reduction to meet the demands of the population.

D. The benefits of the regulation to the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment.

The proposed regulations will benefit the health and welfare of California's residents, worker safety, and the environment. The reduction chamber design and performance standards will ensure California's residents won't be exposed to pathogens or heavy metal pollutants. Requirements for safe operations will benefit worker safety and preserve the dignity of the human remains. The environment will benefit both directly and indirectly from the application of the nutrient–dense reduced human remains in a conservation area (HSC section 7054.5) and a drastic decrease in greenhouse gas generation where reduction is preferred over cremation.

COST IMPACTS ON REPRESENTATIVE PERSON OR BUSINESS

The Department is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

BUSINESS REPORT

It is necessary for the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the state that this regulation applies to businesses.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Department has determined that the proposed regulations will have no adverse impact on small businesses. The proposal defines the parameters for the manufacture and operation of reduction chambers, and the application process to sell and use reduction chambers. The proposal applies only to small businesses that choose to manufacture or operate reduction chambers.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The Department has determined that no reasonable alternative considered by the Department or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Department which would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulatory action, or would be more cost–effective to affected private persons.

BPC section 7714.3(b), as authorized by AB 351, mandates the Department adopt rules regarding the sale and use of reduction chambers in California. This section also mandates that a reduction facility may only operate a reduction chamber that is approved by the Department and that the Bureau will not issue a license to a reduction facility that is not operating an approved reduction chamber. The Department would be out of compliance with the authorizing legislation if this proposal is not promulgated.

TECHNICAL, THEORETICAL, AND/OR EMPIRICAL STUDIES, REPORTS OR DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON

BPC section 7714.3(b) authorizes the Department to promulgate rules and regulations regarding reduction chambers, a new technology for use in death–care settings. No specific technology is required by this proposal. However, these regulations describe prescriptive and performative standards that specify manufacturing criteria and safe and effective operations of reduction chambers to preserve public health and safety and destroy pathogenic microorganisms, as mandated by statute.

Berge, Glanville, Millner, Klingborn, Methods and microbial risks associated with composting of animal carcasses in the United States (2009) Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association 234.1: 47–56.

Costa and Akdeniz, A Review of the Animal Disease Outbreaks and Biosecure Animal Mortality Composting Systems (April 28, 2019) Waste Management 90:121–131.

Cremation Association of North America, Statement on Natural Organic Reduction (Nov 16, 2022) www.cremationassociation.org/positionstatements.html.

Glanville, Richard, Harmon, Reynolds, Ahn, and Akinc, Final Project Report — Environmental Impacts and Biosecurity of Composting for Emergency Disposal of Livestock Mortalities (March 1, 2006) Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Grant Contract#03–7141–08.

Guardabassi, Dalsgaard, Sobsey, Occurrence and survival of viruses in composted human faeces (2003) Sustainable Urban Renewal and Wastewater Treatment, Number 32.

Harvey, Thesis — Biodegradation of Bacillus anthracis Endospores in Compost (Feb 28, 2019) University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada.

Jones and Martin, A Review of the Literature on the Occurrence and Survival of Pathogens of Animals and Humans in Green Compost (November 2003) The Waste and Resources Action Programme, ISBN:1–84405–063–7.

Meine Erde, Ist die neue Erde schadstoffbelastet?
www.meine–erde.de/reerdigung/haeufige–fragen [as of July 10, 2024].

Nemet, Perić, and Lončarić, Microbiological Activities in the Composting Process — A Review (November 28, 2021) Columella Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Vol.8 Number2:41–53.

Ondruschka, Verhoff, & Puschel, „Reerdigung" — Alternative Bestattung oder Beschleunigte Kompostierung (September 20, 2022) Archiv für Kriminologie 250:67–74.

Schwarz, Höfert, Kutschera, Dreisig, Becker, Kohl, Baumann, Babian, and Dresler, Die „Reerdigung" (January 17, 2024) Rechtsmedizin 34:86–93. doi.org/10.1007/s00194–023–00681–6.

Siri, Body composition from fluid spaces and density: Analysis of methods (1956) University of California, Berkeley, Radiation Lab.

United States Environmental Protection Agency, 40 CFR Part 503, Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge.

Urry, Cain, Wasserman, Minorsky, Reece, Campbell Biology. 11th ed. (2017) Pearson Education, Inc.

USDA (2017) Livestock Mortality Composting Protocol.

Xiong, Wang, Huo, Yan, Gao, Wang, Gu, and Wang, Effect of Aeration Rates on the Composting Processes and Nitrogen Loss During Composting (September 21, 2017) Applied Environmental Biotechnology Vol.2, Issue 1:1–8.

Xu, Reuter, Inglis, Larney, Alexander, Guan, Stanford, Xu, McAllister, A Biosecure Composting System for Disposal of Cattle Carcasses and Manure Fol-

lowing Infectious Disease Outbreak (2009) J. Environ. Qual., 38: 437–550. doi.org/10.2134/jeq2008.0168.

CONTACT PERSON

Inquiries regarding the substance of the proposed regulations described in this notice may be directed to Patrick Woods, Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist), at Patrick.Woods@cdph.ca.gov.

All other inquiries concerning the action described in this notice may be directed to David Martin, Office of Regulations, at (279) 217–0888.

In any inquiries or written comments, please identify the action by using the Department regulation package identifier, DPH–24–012 Reduction Chamber Standards.

AVAILABILITY STATEMENTS

The Department has prepared and has available for public review an initial statement of reasons for the proposed regulations, all the information upon which the proposed regulations are based, and the text of the proposed regulations. The Office of Regulations, 1415 L Street, Suite 500, Sacramento, CA 95814, will be the custodian of public records, including reports, documentation, and other material related to the proposed regulations (rulemaking file).

In order to request that a copy of this public notice, the regulation text, and the initial statement of reasons or alternate formats for these documents be mailed to you, please call David Martin 279–217–0867, (or the California Relay Service at 711), send an email to regulations@cdph.ca.gov, or write to the Office of Regulations at the address previously noted. Upon specific request, these documents will be made available in Braille, large print, audio format, or computer disk.

The full text of any regulation which is changed or modified from the express terms of the proposed action will be made available by the Department's Office of Regulations at least 15 days prior to the date on which the Department adopts, amends, or repeals the resulting regulation.

FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

A copy of the final statement of reasons (when prepared) will be available upon request from the Office of Regulations.

INTERNET ACCESS

Materials regarding the action described in this notice (including this public notice, the text of the proposed regulations, and the initial statement of reasons) that are available via the Internet may be accessed at www.cdph.ca.gov by clicking on these links, in the following order: I am Looking For: Administrative, Proposed Regulations, Current Regulatory Proposals.

GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST

DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

PROPOSED CONSENT DECREE
SETTLEMENT VINE HILLS COMPLEX,
MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) invites you to review and comment on a proposed consent decree (Consent Decree) between DTSC and 75 parties (Settling Defendants, identified below) regarding the closed Vine Hill Complex landfill, located at 896 Waterbird Way, Martinez, Contra Costa County, California 94553 (Contra Costa County Parcel Nos. 380–020–016, 380–020–002, and 159–250–014) (Facility). **The public comment period will begin on September 25, 2026, and end on October 25, 2026.**

DTSC lodged in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the proposed Consent Decree in the case *California Department of Toxic Substances Control, et al. v. Calistoga Holdings, LLC, et al.*, Case Number 3:26–cv–09589. The proposed Consent Decree resolves DTSC's claims against the Settling Defendants under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 *et seq*. DTSC alleges that each of these parties disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility and seeks to recover costs of responding to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances at the Facility. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Settling Defendants will provide $4,115,047.57 to pay for the Facility's post closure and corrective action activities to protect human health and the environment at and around the Facility. The proposed Consent Decree provides that Settling Defendants are entitled to contribution protection under CERCLA and DTSC's covenant not to sue Settling Defendants with respect to certain matters.

The proposed Consent Decree would be the second consent decree related to the Facility. In 2023, the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, in *DTSC, et al. v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*, Case Number 4:21–cv–07453, approved a consent decree resolving DTSC's CERCLA cost recovery claims against a different group of defendants that had allegedly disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility (the First Consent Decree). Under the First Consent Decree, the defendants resolved their liability related to the Facility by providing monetary payments to be used to reimburse DTSC for past and future response costs and fund post closure and corrective action activities at the Facility. The First Consent Decree contemplated additional cost recovery efforts by DTSC against other parties who disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility. The proposed Consent Decree reflects those efforts.

The 75 Settling Defendants are: Apache Corporation; American Linen Supply Company; Asphalt Products Oil, LLC; Associated Cooperatives, Inc.; Babbitt Bearing Company Inc.; Ball Metal Beverage Container Corporation; Bayer Corporation; BlueTriton Brands, Inc. (f/k/a Arrowhead Mountain Spring Water Company); California Almond Growers Exchange; Carboline Company; Cargill Incorporated; Celanese Corporation; Clorox Services Company; Communications & Power Industries LLC; Conagra Brands, Inc.; ConocoPhillips Company; Costco Wholesale Corporation; Coty Inc.; Court Galvanizing, Inc.; Crowley Marine Services, Inc.; DAP Products, Inc.; E.F. Kludt & Sons, Inc.; Ecodyne Corporation; Ecolab Inc.; Environmental Resource Holdings, LLC, successor to Occidental Chemical Corporation; Farwest Corrosion Control Company; Four–D Metal Finishing, Inc.; General Dynamics Corporation; Osram Sylvania Inc., on behalf of GTE Lenkurt Inc.; H.B. Fuller Company; Henkel US Operations Corporation; Hexion Inc.; Hilliard Oil & Gas, Inc.; Hoya Corporation USA; Huck International Inc.; Huntway Refining Company; Jones–Hamilton Co.; Keystone Shipping Co.; Louisiana–Pacific Corporation; Mack Trucks, Inc.; Masonite Corp.; Matheson Tri–Gas, Inc.; McKesson Corp.; Mission Linen Supply; Motorola Solutions, Inc.; Northern California Power Agency; OCLI, n/k/a Viavi Solutions, Inc.; Olin Corporation; Oxy USA Inc., successor to Cities Service Oil & Gas; Petroleum Sales, Inc.; Prudential Overall Supply; Ramos Environmental Engineering, Inc. (Ramos Oil Recyclers dba Ramos Environmental Services); Santa Fe Geothermal (Calistoga Holdings, LLC); Simplot Company; Six Flags Entertainment Corporation; Southern California Edison Company; Southern California Gas Company; Sumiden Wire Products Corporation; Sun Chemical Corporation; Texas Instruments Incorporated; Textron, Inc.; The Pasha Group; Thrifty Oil Co.; Timex Group USA, Inc. (TGUSA); Unilever; United States Pipe and Foundry Company, LLC (aka U.S. Pipe); Varian Medical Systems, successor of Varian Associates, Inc.; Veolia ES Technical Solutions, L.L.C.; Verizon Communications Inc.; Vishay GSI, Inc.; Vopak North America, Inc.; Osram Sylvania, Inc., on behalf of Wesgo Technical Ceramics; Western Forge & Flange Co., LLC; Weyerhaeuser NR Company; Xerox Corporation.

How you can participate: DTSC will consider public comments on the proposed Consent Decree postmarked or received by October 25, 2026. **Comments should include the phrase "Vine Hill CD Settlement Comments" in the subject line of your letter or email.** DTSC may withdraw its consent to the proposed Consent Decree if it receives comments that disclose facts or considerations that indicate the proposed Consent Decree is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate.

Address comments to:

Mary Gaspari
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826
Mary.Gaspari@dtsc.ca.gov

Where do I get information: The proposed Consent Decree is available in DTSC's EnviroStor database at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/getfile?filename=/public%2Fdeliverable_documents%2F2443531632%2FVine%20Hill%20-%20Proposed%20CD_Redacted.pdf.

General Vine Hill Complex Information at:

https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile_report?global_id=80001501.

A hard copy of the proposed Consent Decree is also available from the DTSC Sacramento Office by written request to Mary Gaspari sent to the physical address or the email address above. Or the proposed Consent Decree can be reviewed in person, by appointment Monday — Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at:

DTSC Regional Central File Room/Contact: Simon Vang
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826.
(916) 255–4159

For additional questions about the Vine Hill Complex or the proposed consent Decree: Please contact the following DTSC staff:

Mary Gaspari, DTSC Project Manager at (916) 255–6574 or Mary.Gaspari@dtsc.ca.gov.

Colette Charles, DTSC Public Participation Specialist at (916) 516–6484 or Colette.Charles@dtsc.ca.gov.

Media Relations Office at MediaRelations@dtsc.ca.gov.

DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

PROPOSED CONSENT DECREE SETTLEMENT PANOCHE FACILITY, BENICIA, CALIFORNIA

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) invites you to review and comment on a proposed consent decree (Consent Decree) between DTSC and 56 parties (Settling Defendants, identified below) regarding the closed Panoche Facility landfill, located at 2251 Lake Herman Road, Benicia, California 94510 (Solano County Parcel Nos. 181–270–01, 181–270–05, and 181–240–05) (Facility). **The public comment period will begin on September 25, 2026, and end on October 25, 2026.**

DTSC lodged in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, the proposed Consent Decree in the case *California Department of Toxic Substances Control, et al. v. Environmental Resource Holdings, LLC, et al.* The proposed Consent Decree resolves DTSC's claims against the Settling Defendants under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 *et seq.* DTSC alleges that each of these parties disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility and seeks to recover costs of responding to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances at the Facility. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Settling Defendants will provide $3,541,214.36 to pay for the Facility's post closure and corrective action activities to protect human health and the environment at and around the Facility. The proposed Consent Decree provides that Settling Defendants are entitled to contribution protection under CERCLA and DTSC's covenant not to sue Settling Defendants with respect to certain matters.

The proposed Consent Decree would be the second consent decree related to the Facility. In 2024, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, in *DTSC, et al. v. Exxon Mobil Corporation, et al.*, Case Number 2:21–cv–01739, approved a consent decree resolving DTSC's CERCLA cost recovery claims against a different group of defendants that had allegedly disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility (the First Consent Decree). Under the First Consent Decree, the defendants resolved their liability related to the Facility by providing monetary payments to be used to reimburse DTSC for past and future response costs and fund post closure and corrective action activities at the Facility. The First Consent Decree contemplated additional cost recovery efforts by DTSC against other parties who disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility. The proposed Consent Decree reflects those efforts.

The 56 Settling Defendants are: Apache Corporation; Asphalt Products Oil, LLC; Associated Cooperatives, Inc.; Babbitt Bearing Company Inc.; Ball Metal Beverage Container Corporation; Bayer Corporation; California Almond Growers Exchange; Cargill, Incorporated; Celanese Corporation; Clorox Services Company; Communications & Power Industries LLC; Conagra Brands, Inc.; ConocoPhillips Company; Court Galvanizing, Inc.; Crowley Maritime Corp.; DAP Products, Inc.; E.F. Kludt & Sons, Inc.; Ecodyne Corporation; Environmental Resource Holdings, LLC, successor to Occidental Chemical Corporation; Farwest Corrosion Control Company; Flint Group North America (Flint CPS Inks Holdings LLC); Four–D Metal Finishing, Inc.; Ghilotti Bros. Inc.; Osram Sylvania Inc., on behalf of GTE Lenkurt Inc.; H.B. Fuller Company; Henkel US Operations Corporation, f/k/a Henkel Corporation; Hexion Inc.; Huck International Inc.; JCI Jones Chemicals, Inc.; Jones–Hamilton Co.; Keystone Shipping Co.; Louisiana–Pacific Corporation; Mack Trucks Inc.; Masonite Corp.; Matheson Tri–Gas, Inc.; McKesson Corp.; Mission Linen Supply; Northern California Power Agency; Northrop Grumman Systems Corporation; OCLI, n/k/a Viavi Solutions, Inc.; Olin Corporation; Oliver & Co, Inc.; Oxy USA Inc., successor to Cities Service Oil & Gas; Prudential Overall Supply; Santa Fe Geothermal (Calistoga Holdings, LLC); Simplot Company; Six Flags Entertainment Corporation; Sumiden Wire Products Corporation; Sun Chemical Corporation; Texas Instruments Incorporated; Thrifty Oil Co.; Timex Group USA, Inc. (TGUSA); Unilever; United States Pipe and Foundry Company, LLC (a/k/a U.S. Pipe); Varian Medical Systems, successor of Varian Associates, Inc; Western Forge & Flange Co., LLC.

How you can participate: DTSC will consider public comments on the proposed Consent Decree postmarked or received by October 25, 2026. **Comments should include the phrase "Panoche CD Settlement Comments" in the subject line of your letter or email.** DTSC may withdraw its consent to the proposed Consent Decree if it receives comments that disclose facts or considerations that indicate the proposed Consent Decree is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate.

Address comments to:

Mary Gaspari
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826
Mary.Gaspari@dtsc.ca.gov

Where do I get information: The proposed Consent Decree is available in DTSC's EnviroStor database at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/getfile?filename=/public%2Fdeliverable_documents%2F4740086197%2FPanoche%20-%20Proposed%20CDx2_Redacted.pdf.

General Panoche Facility Information at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile_report?global_id=80001291.

A hard copy of the proposed Consent Decree is also available from the DTSC Sacramento Office by written request to Mary Gaspari sent to the physical address or the email address above. Or the proposed Consent Decree can be reviewed in person, by appointment Monday — Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at:

DTSC Regional Central File Room/Contact:
Simon Vang
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826.
(916) 255–4159

For additional questions about the Panoche Facility or the Proposed Consent Decree: Please contact the following DTSC staff:

Mary Gaspari, DTSC Project Manager at (916) 255–6574 or Mary.Gaspari@dtsc.ca.gov

Colette Charles, DTSC Public Participation Specialist at (916) 516–6484 or Colette.Charles@dtsc.ca.gov

Media Relations Office at MediaRelations@dtsc.ca.gov

DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

PROPOSED CONSENT DECREE SETTLEMENT MONTEZUMA HILLS FACILITY, RIO VISTA, CALIFORNIA

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) invites you to review and comment on a proposed consent decree (Consent Decree) between DTSC and five parties (Settling Defendants, identified below) regarding the closed Montezuma Hills Facility, located at 6292 Little Honker Bay Road, Rio Vista, Solano County, California 94571 (Solano County Parcel Number 0048–050–340) (Facility). **The public comment period will begin on September 25, 2026, and end on October 25, 2026.**

DTSC lodged in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, the proposed Consent Decree in the case *California Department of Toxic Substances Control, et al. v. Oxy USA Inc., et al.* The proposed Consent Decree resolves DTSC's claims against the Settling Defendants under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 *et seq.* DTSC alleges that each of these parties disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility and seeks to recover costs of responding to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances at the Facility. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Settling Defendants will provide $683,724.94 to pay for the Facility's post closure and corrective action activities to protect human health and the environment at and around the Facility. The proposed Consent Decree provides that Settling Defendants are entitled to contribution protection under CERCLA and DTSC's covenant not to sue Settling Defendants with respect to certain matters.

The proposed Consent Decree would be the second consent decree related to the Facility. In 2024, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, in *DTSC, et al. v. Chevron Oronite Company LLC, et al.*, Case Number 2:21–cv–01737, approved a consent decree resolving DTSC's CERCLA cost recovery claims against a different group of defendants that had allegedly disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility (the First Consent Decree). Under the First Consent Decree, the defendants resolved their liability related to the Facility by providing monetary payments to be used to reimburse DTSC for past and future response costs and fund post closure and corrective action activities at the Facility. The First Consent Decree contemplated additional cost recovery efforts by DTSC against other parties who disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility. The proposed Consent Decree reflects those efforts.

The five Settling Defendants are: Apache Corporation; ConocoPhillips Company; Environmental Resource Holdings, LLC, successor to Occidental Chemical Corporation; Hilliard Oil & Gas, Inc.; Oxy USA Inc., successor to Cities Service Oil & Gas.

How you can participate: DTSC will consider public comments on the proposed Consent Decree postmarked or received by October 25, 2026. **Comments should include the phrase "Montezuma Hills CD Settlement Comments" in the subject line of your letter or email.** DTSC may withdraw its consent to the proposed Consent Decree if it receives comments that disclose facts or considerations that indicate the proposed Consent Decree is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate.

Address comments to:

Mary Gaspari
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826
Mary.Gaspari@dtsc.ca.gov

Where do I get information: The proposed Consent Decree is available in DTSC's EnviroStor database at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/getfile?filename=/public%2Fdeliverable_documents%2F2142231583%2FMontezuma%20Hills%20-%20Proposed%20CDx2_Redacted.pdf.

General Montezuma Hills Facility Information at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile_report?global_id=48290004.

A hard copy of the proposed Consent Decree is also available from the DTSC Sacramento Office by written request to Mary Gaspari sent to the physical address or the email address above. Or the proposed Consent Decree can be reviewed in person, by appointment Monday — Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at:

DTSC Regional Central File Room/Contact:
Simon Vang
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826.
(916) 255–4159

For additional questions about the Montezuma Hills Facility or the proposed consent decree: Please contact the following DTSC staff:

Mary Gaspari, DTSC Project Manager at
(916) 255–6574 or Mary.Gaspari@dtsc.ca.gov

Colette Charles, DTSC Public Participation Specialist at (916) 516–6484 or
Colette.Charles@dtsc.ca.gov

Media Relations Office at
MediaRelations@dtsc.ca.gov

DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

PROPOSED CONSENT DECREE SETTLEMENT BENSON RIDGE FACILITY, KELSEYVILLE, CALIFORNIA

The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) invites you to review and comment on a proposed consent decree (Consent Decree) between DTSC and three parties (Settling Defendants, identified below) regarding the closed Benson Ridge landfill, located at 7620 Highway 29, Kelseyville, Lake County, California 95451 (Lake County Parcel Nos. 7–018–13, 7–029–6, 7–030–21, and 9–022–01) (Facility). **The public comment period will begin on September 25, 2026, and end on October 25, 2026.**

DTSC lodged in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the proposed Consent Decree in the case *California Department of Toxic Substances Control, et al. v. et al. v. ConocoPhillips Company, et al.*, Case Number 1:26–cv–09590. The proposed Consent Decree resolves DTSC's claims against the Settling Defendants under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601 *et seq.* DTSC alleges that each of these parties disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility and seeks to recover costs of responding to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances at the Facility. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Settling Defendants will provide $312,458.52 to pay for the Facility's post closure and corrective action activities to protect human health and the environment at and around the Facility. The proposed Consent Decree provides that Settling Defendants are entitled to contribution protection under CERCLA and DTSC's covenant not to sue Settling Defendants with respect to certain matters.

The proposed Consent Decree would be the second consent decree related to the Facility. In 2024, the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, in *DTSC, et al. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, et al.*, Case Number 4:21–cv–07450, approved a consent decree resolving DTSC's CERCLA cost recovery claims against a different group of defendants that had allegedly disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility (the First Consent Decree). Under the First Consent Decree, the defendants resolved their liability related to the Facility by providing monetary payments to be used to reimburse DTSC for past and future response costs and fund post closure and corrective action activities at the Facility. The First Consent Decree contemplated additional cost recovery efforts by DTSC against other parties who disposed of hazardous substances at the Facility. The proposed Consent Decree reflects those efforts.

The three Settling Defendants are: ConocoPhillips Company; Homestake Mining Company of California; Santa Fe Geothermal (Calistoga Holdings, LLC).

How you can participate: DTSC will consider public comments on the proposed Consent Decree postmarked or received by October 25, 2026. **Comments should include the phrase "Benson Ridge CD Settlement Comments" in the subject line of your letter or email.** DTSC may withdraw its consent to the proposed Consent Decree if it receives comments that disclose facts or considerations that indicate the proposed Consent Decree is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate.

Address comments to:

Mary Gaspari
Department of Toxic Substances Control
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826

Mary.Gaspari@dtsc.ca.gov

Where do I get information: The proposed Consent Decree is available in DTSC's EnviroStor database at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/getfile?filename=/public%2Fdeliverable_documents%2F3584049820%2FBenson%20Ridge%20-%20Proposed%20CD_Redacted.pdf.

General Benson Ridge Facility Information at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/profile_report?global_id=80001336.

A hard copy of the proposed Consent Decree is also available from the DTSC Sacramento Office by written request to Mary Gaspari sent to the physical address or the email address above. Or the proposed Consent Decree can be reviewed in person, by appointment Monday — Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at:

DTSC Regional Central File Room/Contact:
Simon Vang
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826.
(916) 255–4159

For additional questions about the Benson Ridge Facility or the proposed consent decree: Please contact the following DTSC staff:

Mary Gaspari, DTSC Project Manager at
(916) 255–6574 or Mary.Gaspari@dtsc.ca.gov

Colette Charles, DTSC Public Participation
Specialist at (916) 516–6484 or
Colette.Charles@dtsc.ca.gov

Media Relations Office at
MediaRelations@dtsc.ca.gov

RULEMAKING PETITION DECISION

DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

DECISION ON PETITION FROM THE MOSQUITO AND VECTOR CONTROL ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA CONCERNING VECTOR CONTROL AGENCIES

This is the written decision required by Government Code section 11340.7 on a petition requesting the adoption, amendment or repeal of a regulation.

AGENCY

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) received a petition for rulemaking under Government Code section 11340.6 on August 3, 2026.

PARTY SUBMITTING THE PETITION

Petitioner is the Mosquito and Vector Control Association of California.

PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS REQUESTED TO BE AFFECTED

Petitioner requests that DPR amend or repeal section 6651 (current 6981) of Title 3 of the California Code of Regulations to remove the exemption from apiary notification for vector control agencies that apply a diluted pesticide under agreement with the Department of Health Services.

REFERENCE TO AUTHORITY TO TAKE THE ACTION REQUESTED

Petitioner cites to the Apiary Protection Act, Food and Agricultural Code section 29001 et seq. as DPR's authority to adopt regulations governing pesticide use and honeybee protections. [1]

REASONS SUPPORTING THE AGENCY DETERMINATION

Summary of Petition

Petitioner provides the following reasons for the requested action:

- The current regulation is confusing because it refers to a pesticide formulation for application to address mosquitoes not in use by any Vector Control Agencies.
- Unless DPR wishes to amend the exemption based on contemporary techniques, described in the petition as Ultra Low Volume (ULV) application, DPR should repeal the exemption.

Summary of Agency's Determination

DPR is denying petitioners' request to amend or repeal section 6651 (current section 6981) of Title 3 of the California Code of Regulations. Although the petition asserts the regulation addresses an activity not currently practiced by vector control agencies, current

[1] Petitioner also references section 11340 of title 2 of the California Code of Regulations as authority to repeal the regulation. No such section exists related to regulatory rulemaking authority, and DPR concludes Petitioner meant to reference Government Code section 11340, which is the general statute regarding rulemaking procedure for state agencies.

vector control activity is not shown to be affected by the rule being in place. As such, the petition does not demonstrate a need for any specific amendment or repeal of the regulation.

Reasons for Denial

The petition asserts the existence of the exemption leads to confusion as to whether an exemption to Apiary Notification for vector control activity using a dilute solution exists.

Petitioner describes how current vector control practices do not involve applying a dilute solution and therefore do not qualify for the apiary notification exemption. As petitioner states, "The purpose of this letter is to request that the Department consider amending or removing its current vector control exemption to the Apiary Protection Act regulations because no vector control products meet the exemption's terms." Petitioner then generally describes current vector control practices that are different from the one falling within the exemption. Based on the information in the petition, DPR concludes the petitioner does not use the exemption and instead notifies apiaries when application of pesticide labeled toxic to bees is made to blooming plants. However, DPR does not conclude from this description of current practices that the exemption has not or cannot be used, or causes meaningful confusion, as there is no supporting evidence in the record and DPR has not verified these claims at this time.

For any Vector Control Agency that does currently apply a pesticide targeting vector populations and rely on the apiary notification exemption, repeal or amendment would potentially have an impact. The petition asserts this application method is not used by its members but does not provide evidence to allow DPR to conclude no entity uses and/or can use the exemption.

The petition alternately generally suggests that DPR could consider updating the regulations to exempt ULV applications by vector control agencies, but does not provide proposed language to amend the regulation; the petition only proposes deletion language for consideration. While DPR is supportive of regulatory updates to reflect modern application practices, the petition provides only general statements on the benefit of ULV applications and does not provide concrete examples of how those applications would meet the regulatory intent to avoid apiary impacts from the use of pesticides labeled toxic to bees.

In sum, the exemption does not appear to apply to Petitioner's actions as described, and repeal of the exemption also would not affect any current practice of Petitioner. Nor does the petition describe any person or entity impacted by the regulation or any benefit to any person from its proposed repeal. Finally, the petition does not provide any specifics about an amendment to section 6981.

Since no evidence of operational need or legal concern is provided in the petition in support of the request to repeal section 6981, DPR denies the petition.

AGENCY CONTACT PERSON

Jeannie Alloway, Senior Legal Analyst
Department of Pesticide Regulation
1001 I Street, P.O. Box 4015
Sacramento, CA 95812–4015
(916) 324–2666
jeannie.alloway@cdpr.ca.gov

RIGHTS OF INTERESTED PERSONS TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THE PETITION

Any interested persons may obtain a copy of the petition by contacting the contact person named above.

DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
/s/
Karen Morrison, Director
September 2nd, 2026

SUMMARY OF REGULATORY ACTIONS

REGULATIONS FILED WITH THE 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.

California Health and Human Services Agency
File # 2026–0813–03
Conflict–of–Interest Code

This is a Conflict–of–Interest code that has been approved by the Fair Political Commission and is being submitted for filing with the Secretary of State and printing only.

Title 22
Amend: 10100
Filed 09/09/2026
Effective 10/09/2026
Agency Contact: Deepa Menon (916) 263–0324

Department of Justice
File # 2026–0727–01
DFPI Escrow Licensee Surety Bond Form

This action, submitted by the Department of Justice pursuant to Government Code section 11343.8, is a request to file with the Secretary of State the amended Escrow Licensee Surety Bond form of the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation (DFPI) and to print the title of the bond form in Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations at section 31.7.

Title 11
Amend: 25 (31.7)
Filed 09/02/2026
Effective 09/02/2026
Agency Contact: Lisa W. Chao (213) 269–6239

State Personnel Board
File # 2026–0811–01
Conflict–of–Interest Code

This is a Conflict–of–Interest code that has been approved by the Fair Political Commission and is being submitted for filing with the Secretary of State and printing only

Title 02
Amend: 549
Filed 09/03/2026
Effective 10/03/2026
Agency Contact:
Joseph Ruggiero (916) 653–0920

Bureau of Automotive Repair
File # 2026–0728–01
Decertification of Equipment Manufacturers

In this section 100 action pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 1, section 100, the Bureau of Automotive Repair amends its regulation to make grammar changes, punctuation changes, and to capitalize the word "Bureau."

Title 16
Amend: 3340.17.1
Filed 09/03/2026
Agency Contact:
Sidney Villareal (916) 970–8421

Board of Education
File # 2026–0727–03
Early Start Eligibility Criteria Alignment

This State Board of Education rulemaking action aligns Early Start eligibility criteria for a local education agency (LEA) with the existing Early Start eligibility criteria applicable to a regional center.

Title 05
Amend: 3030, 3031
Filed 09/08/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Lori Adame (916) 319–0860

Department of Food and Agriculture
File # 2026–0803–02
Guava Root–Knot Nematode Eradication Area

This regular rulemaking action by the California Department of Food and Agriculture ("Department") establishes a statewide eradication area for the guava root–knot nematode.

Title 03
Adopt: 3591.34
Filed 09/09/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Rachel Avila (916) 698–2947

Department of Food and Agriculture
File # 2026–0729–01
Oak Mortality Disease Control

In this rulemaking action the California Department of Food and Agriculture updates its host list for oak mortality disease to align with the United States Department of Agriculture's host list for the disease.

Title 03
Amend: 3700
Filed 09/08/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Rachel Avila (916) 698–2947

Department of Justice
File # 2026–0727–02
Notice of Law Enforcement Sales/Transfers of Unsafe Handguns

This action by the Department of Justice adopts regulations further specifying requirements for reporting the sale or transfer of an unsafe handgun pursuant to Penal Code section 32000, subdivision (e)(2).

Title 11
Adopt: 4341, 4342, 4343, 4344
Filed 09/08/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact:
Marlon Martinez (213) 269–6437

ScholarShare Investment Board
File # 2026–0804–03
CalKIDS Program

In this rulemaking action, the ScholarShare Investment Board advises institutions how to distribute funds for the CalKIDS Program and adopts an appeals form for beneficiaries to use funds after turning 26.

Title 05
Amend: 31010, 31016, 31018
Filed 09/09/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Noah Lightman (916) 201–6382

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 oal.ca.gov.