GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

California Regulatory Notice Register

REGISTER 2026, NUMBER 46–Z PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW NOVEMBER 13, 2026

PROPOSED ACTION ON REGULATIONS

TITLE 2. DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES (CALHR)
Testing Process and Standards — Notice File Number Z2026–11 1539

TITLE 2. FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION
Conflict–of–Interest Codes — Notice File Number Z2026–1103–03 1541

AMENDMENT
MULTI–COUNTY: Pacheco Water District
West Hills Community College District
Antelope Valley Joint Union High School District
Truckee Donner Public Utility District
Pioneer Community Energy
Merced Community College District
Yolo–Solano Air Quality Management District

ADOPTION
MULTI–COUNTY: California County Assessors' Information Technology Authority

TITLE 4. SCHOOL FINANCE AUTHORITY
Charter School Revolving Loan Fund Program — Notice File Number Z2026–1103–04 1542

TITLE 8. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD
Requests for Accommodation — Notice File Number Z2026–1103–10 1547

TITLE 9. DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES
Early Intervention Services — Notice File Number 2026–1027–01. 1552

[Editorial Note: This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Action was originally published in the November 6, 2026 Notice Register, No. 45-Z. However, the Notice was inadvertently placed under the GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST part of the Notice Register. It should have been placed under PROPOSED ACTION ON REGULATIONS. We are listing it here as a correction and cross-reference. The original public hearing and comment period dates remain the same.]

(Continued on next page)

Time-Dated Material

TITLE 11. PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY
Data Broker Updates and DROP Audits — Notice File Number Z2026–11 1556

TITLE 11. COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING
Reserve Peace Officers — Notice File Number Z2026–1103–07 1561

RULEMAKING PETITION DECISIONS

AIR RESOURCES BOARD
Regarding Petition from James Zabel to Amend California Smog Check On–Board Diagnostic II (OBD–II) Testing Regulations for Non–Emissions Diagnostic Trouble Codes 1563

BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS
Regarding Petition from Veronica Garcia, CCEUnits to Adopt Regulations Regarding Continuing Education Instructor Standards 1565

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES
Regarding Request for Reconsideration of Petition Decision from Gateway Transportation for Adoption of a Regulation Concerning Service Code 875 Transportation Reimbursement 1567

DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
Regarding Petition from Dan Fox, President and Principal Biologist of Animal Pest Management Services, Inc., to Amend Section 6627 of Title 3 of the California Code of Regulations to Allow Voluntary Reporting of Pesticide Active Ingredients on Monthly Summary Pesticide Use Reports (MSPURs) 1567

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
Regarding Petition from Dr. Lucjan Zlotnicki Concerning Implementation of AB 64 (Health and Safety Code section 102134(c)) and the Categorical Exclusion of L and I from California Vital Records 1569

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
Regarding Reconsideration of Petition Request from Dr. Lucjan Zlotnicki Concerning Implementation of AB 64 (Health and Safety Code section 102134(c)) and the Categorical Exclusion of L and I from California Vital Records 1570

SUMMARY OF REGULATORY ACTIONS

Regulations filed with Secretary of State 1570

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. DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

TESTING PROCESS AND STANDARDS

The California Department of Human Resources (CalHR) proposes to amend the regulation described below after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations.

I. WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD

Any interested person, or their authorized representative, may submit written comments relevant to the proposed regulatory action to CalHR. Comments may also be submitted by email to raymond.titano@calhr.ca.gov. The written comment period closes at midnight on December 28, 2026. CalHR will only consider comments received at CalHR's office by that time. Submit comments to the following address:

Raymond Titano, Medical Screening Coordinator
California Department of Human Resources
1515 S Street, North Building, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95811

II. PUBLIC HEARING

CalHR has not scheduled a public hearing on this proposed action. However, CalHR will hold a hearing if it receives a written request for a public hearing from any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, no later than 15 days before the close of the written comment period.

III. AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

Government Code Section (§) 19815.4 authorizes CalHR to formulate, adopt, amend, or repeal rules, and regulations affecting the purposes, responsibilities and jurisdiction of the department that are consistent with the law and necessary for administration of its programs. The proposed amendment interprets and makes specific GovernmentCode § 19261.

IV. INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Existing California Code of Regulation (CCR) § 599.963 contains a prescribed list of substances for drug and alcohol testing for "sensitive positions" (as defined in CCR § 599.961) that includes marijuana/cannabinoids (THC). Until very recently, the only available test for marijuana/cannabinoids (THC) was via urinalysis, which only tests for nonpsychoactive cannabis metabolites. Government Code § 12954 strictly limits the consideration of nonpsychoactive cannabis metabolites in employment decisions. This legal standard conflicts with CCR § 599.963. Additionally, the recently ratified Memorandum of Understand (MOU) for Bargaining Unit (BU) 6 (MOU for BU 6) — California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) employees providing custody, supervision, and treatment of wards and inmates remanded to state custody–eliminated marijuana from the list of substances allowed under the "random" testing requirement for BU 6 employees. During the bargaining process, both CDCR and the CalHR affirmed the intent to also eliminate marijuana from the list of "random" substances the BU 6 affiliated CDCR Adult Excluded and Exempt (Adult E&E) management positions are subject to. Updating the regulation will resolve this conflict.

The list of substances for "random" and "reasonable suspicion" testing are one and the same; however, while the proposed changes intended to eliminate marijuana/cannabinoids (THC) from "random" testing, it's critical that hiring authorities continue to have the option to test for the presence of psychoactive metabolites of marijuana/cannabinoids (THC) when an employee appears to be impaired. Separating the random from the reasonable suspicion substances, thus creating two lists, and including the option for oral fluid testing in reasonable suspicion, is critical when "reasonable suspicion" of impairment exists. Updating our regulation will resolve this issue and align the testing process to conform with GovernmentCode § 12954.

V. EVALUATION OF INCONSISTENCY/ INCOMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING STATE REGULATIONS

CalHR evaluated the proposed regulations and determined that they are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

VI. ANTICIPATED BENEFITS FROM THIS PROPOSED REGULATION

Amending the regulation shall (1) reconcile the regulation to meet compliance with Government Code

§ 12954's prohibition of discrimination based on the use of cannabis off the job and away from the workplace and/or the presence of nonpsychoactive cannabis metabolites identified in employer–required drug screening tests; (2) continue the intended benefit of the current regulation by providing a new option to test for THC that complies with Government Code § 12954 thereby ensuring peace officers are not under the influence of THC while working, and (3), remove prospects for discrimination by establishing clarification that both rank–and–file and excluded/exempt employees are held to the same standard, as it was the intent of both CDCR and the CalHR that CDCR Adult E&E employees no longer be randomly tested for marijuana, consistent with the MOU for rank–and–file BU 6 employees.

VII. DISCLOSURES REGARDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

CalHR has made the following initial determinations:

1. *Mandate on local agencies and school districts*: None.
2. *Cost or savings to any state agency*: The current regulation does not have any fiscal impact on local government or private sector business, which would not change with the proposed assessment. Costs for State agencies will increase minimally and will be absorbable in existing and future budgets.
3. *Cost to any local agency or school district, which must be reimbursed in accordance with GovernmentCode § 17500 through 17630*: None.
4. *Other nondiscretionary costs or savings imposed on local agencies*: None.
5. *Cost or savings in federal funding to the state*: None.
6. *Significant, statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states*: None.
7. *Cost impacts on representative private person or business*: CalHR is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.
8. *Results of the Economic Impact Assessment/ Analysis*:

Adoption of these regulations will **not**:

a. Create or eliminate jobs within California; or,

b. Create new businesses or eliminate existing businesses within California; or,

c. Affect the expansion of businesses currently doing business within California; or,

d. Benefit the state's environment because they do not address environmental matters

Adoption of these regulations will:

e. Be expected to maintain existing worker safety and public health and welfare protections by providing an additional option for THC testing in reasonable suspicion situations. The amendments will also align the regulations with Government Code section 12954 and help ensure consistent testing standards for rank–and–file and excluded/ exempt employees.

f. Allow the use of oral fluid testing to identify current THC impairment in employees working in safety sensitive positions will increase the cost to each testing event. This increase will have a minor and absorbable impact on cost for state agencies who are required to test for the presence of THC when following reasonable suspicion testing guidelines and will be limited to occasions when it is necessary to identify if employees are currently under the influence of THC. Any additional expense will be offset by the removal of THC from random substance testing panels.

9. *Significant effect on housing costs*: None.
10. *Small Business Impact*: The proposed regulation amendment has no impact on small businesses, as it applies only to State of California government employment operations.

VIII. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with GovernmentCode § 11346.5, subdivision (a) (13), CalHR must determine that no reasonable alternative considered, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of agency, 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; or would be more cost–effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law than the proposed described in this notice.

CalHR invites interested people to present statements or arguments with respect to alternatives to the proposed regulation at the hearing, if one is requested, or during the written comment period.

IX. CONTACT PERSONS

Inquiries concerning the proposed administrative action may be Directed to:

Raymond Titano, Medical Screening Coordinator
California Department of Human Resources
1515 S Street, North Building, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95811
Telephone: 916–445–9832
Email: raymond.titano@calhr.ca.gov

The backup contact person for these inquiries is:

Michele Villados, Division Chief
Medical and Psychological Screening
California Department of Human Resources
1515 S Street, North Building, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95811
Telephone: 916–909–2801
Email: michele.villados@calhr.ca.gov

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

X. AVAILABILITY OF THE STATEMENT OF REASONS, TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS, AND RULEMAKING FILE

CalHR will have the entire rulemaking file available for inspection and copying throughout the rulemaking process at its office at the above address during normal business hours. As of the date this notice is published in the Notice Register, the rulemaking file consists of this notice, the proposed text of the regulation, and the Initial Statement of Reasons and STD. 399. Please direct requests to inspect or copy the rulemaking file to the contact person listed above.

XI. AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

After considering all timely and relevant comments received, CalHR may adopt the proposed amendment to the regulation as described in this notice. If CalHR makes modifications that are sufficiently related to the originally proposed text, it will make the modified text (with the changes clearly indicated) availability to the public and will submit a copy to anyone who has submitted a written comment, for at least 15 days before CalHR adopts the regulation as revised. Please send requests for copies of any modified regulation to the attention of Raymond Titano at the address indicated above. CalHR will accept written comments on the modified regulation for 15 days after the date on which they are made available.

XII. AVAILABILITY OF THE FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Upon completion, copies of the Final Statement of Reasons may be obtained by contacting Raymond Titano at the above address.

XIII. AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS ON THE INTERNET

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the text of the regulation in underline and strike out can be accessed through our website at www.calhr.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:
- Pacheco Water District
- West Hills Community College District
- Antelope Valley Joint Union High School District
- Truckee Donner Public Utility District
- Pioneer Community Energy
- Merced Community College District
- Yolo–Solano Air Quality Management District

ADOPTION

MULTI–COUNTY:
- California County Assessors' Information Technology Authority

A written comment period has been established commencing on November 13, 2026, and closing on December 28, 2026. Written comments should be directed to the Fair Political Practices Commission, At-

tention: 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 codes 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 codes will be submitted to the Commission for review.

The Executive Director of the Commission will review the above–referenced conflict–of–interest codes, 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 codes 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 codes. Any written comments must be received no later than December 28, 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 codes 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 4. SCHOOL FINANCE AUTHORITY

CHARTER SCHOOL REVOLVING LOAN FUND PROGRAM

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the California School Finance Authority (Authority), organized pursuant to Sections 17170 through 17199.6 of the Education Code, proposes to amend the regulations described below after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations regarding the proposed action. Any person interested may present written statements or arguments relevant to the proposed action to the attention of the Contact Person as listed in this Notice from November 13, 2026 through December 28, 2026. The Authority Board, upon its own motion or at the request of any interested party, may thereafter adopt the proposal substantially as described below or may modify such proposals if such modifications are sufficiently related to the original text. With the exception of technical or grammatical changes, the full text of any modified proposal will be available for 15 days prior to its adoption from the person(s) designated in this No-

tice as the Contact Person and will be mailed to those persons who submit statements related to this proposal or who have requested notification of any changes to the proposal.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD

Any interested person, or their authorized representative, may submit written comments relevant to the proposed regulations to the Authority. The written comment period on the regulations will be from November 13, 2026 through December 28, 2026. All comments to be considered by the Authority must be submitted in writing to the Agency Contact Person identified in this Notice by that time. In the event that changes are made to the proposed regulations during the written comment period, the Authority will also accept additional written comments limited to any changed or modified regulations for 15 calendar days after the date on which such regulations, as changed or modified, are made available to the public pursuant to Title 1, Chapter 1, Section 44 of the California Code of Regulations. Such additional written comments should be addressed to the Agency Contact Person identified in this Notice.

PUBLIC HEARING

No public hearing regarding the proposed regulations has been scheduled. Anyone wishing a public hearing must submit a request in writing, pursuant to Section 11346.8 of the Government Code, to the Authority at least 15 days before the end of the written comment period. Such request should be addressed to the Agency Contact Person identified in this Notice and should specify the regulations for which the hearing is being requested.

PROPOSED REGULATORY ACTION

The Authority proposes to amend Sections 10170.17 through 10170.23 of Title 4 of the California Code of Regulations (Regulations) as permanent regulations. The amended Regulations implement the Authority's responsibilities related to the Charter School Revolving Loan Fund Program (Program).

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

Authority: Section 43165 of the Education Code.

Reference: Sections 41365, 41366.5, and 41366.6 of the Education Code.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

The Authority was created in 1985 to assist school districts and community college districts in financing school construction projects (Education Code Section 17170, et seq.). The Authority is authorized to adopt bylaws for the regulation and conduct of its business and is vested with all powers reasonably necessary to carry out its powers and responsibilities (Education Code Sections 17179 and 17180).

Pursuant to Education Code, Section 41365, the State Legislature directed the California School Finance Authority (Authority) to commence administration of the) Charter School Revolving Loan Fund Program (Program) with the 2013–14 fiscal year and to adopt regulations to implement the statute. The Program provides for loan funds of up to $500,000 to charter schools.

SB 631, Chapter 776, amended Sections 41365, 41366.5, and 41366.6 of the Education Code, became effective January 1, 2026. As a result, the Authority proposed two sets of emergency regulations which took effect on December 30, 2025 and March 26, 2026, respectively. With this action, the Authority will be proposing the changes in both emergency actions to be established as on–going regulations for the Program.

Summary of Proposed Regulatory Actions:

Below is listing of each proposed regulatory action. The specific purpose of, and rationale for, each proposed amendment is provided in the Initial Statement of Reason.

1. Section 1010.17. Definition.

- (a) — The defined term of "Affiliated Entity".
- (b) — The defined term of "Applicant" amended.
- New (i) — The defined term of "Disaster Affected Charter School" adopted.
- (*l*) [Formerly (k)] — The defined term of "Incorporated Charter School" amended.
- (o) [Formerly (n)] — The defined term of "Nonprofit Entity" amended.
- (p) [Formerly (o)] — The defined term of "Pooled Money Investment Account" amended.

2. Section 1010.18. Eligible Applicant.

- (a) — Last portion is removed as a redundant definition reference.
- [Formerly] (b) — This subsection removed.
- (b) [Formerly (c)] — This subsection amended.
- (c) [Formerly (d)] — This subsection reworded.
- (e) — This subsection removed.

- (d) [Formerly (f)] — This subsection re–lettered.
- (g) — The subsection removed.
- (e) [Formerly (f)] — The subsection amended.
- (f) [Formerly (i)] — This subsection being amended.
- (g) [Formerly (j)] — The subsection amended.
- (h) [Formerly (k)] — This subsection amended.
- (h)(1) [Formerly (k)(1)] — The subsection amended.
- (h)(2) [Formerly (k)(2)] — The subsection amended.
- (i) [Formerly (l)] — This subsection re–lettered.

3. Section 1010.19. Application Content and Submission.

- (a) — This subsection added.
- New (b) [Formerly portion of (a)] — This subsection added.
- New (c) [Formerly (b)] — This subsection added.
- New (d) [Formerly (c)] — This subsection re–lettered.
- New (d)(1) [Formerly (c)(1)] — The subsection amended.
- New (d)(5) [Formerly (c)(5)] — The subsection amended.
- New (d)(8) [Formerly (c)(8)] — The subsection amended.
- New (d)(9)–(14) [Formerly (c)(9)–(14)] — These subsections amended.
- New (d)(16) — This subsection added.
- Formerly (d) — This subsection removed.
- (e) — The subsection amended.
- (g) — This subsection added.

4. Section 10170.20. Application Review and Evaluation/Underwriting Criteria.

- New (d)(4) — This subsection added.
- (b)(1) — This subsection amended.
- (b)(3) — This subsection amended.
- (c) — This subsection amended.
- New (c)(1) [Formerly part of (c)] — These subsections separated.
- New (c)(2) — This subsection amended.
- New (c)(3) [Formerly (c)(2)] — This subsection amended.
- New (c)(4) [Formerly (c)(3)] — This subsection amended.
- (d)(1) — The subsection amended.
- New (d)(2) [Formerly part of (d)(1)] — This subsection separated and reworded.
- New (d)(3) — This subsection amended.

5. Section 10170.21. Loan Amount and Repayment Terms.

- (a) — The subsection amended.
- (b) — This subsection amended.
- (c) — This subsection amended.
- New (c)(1) [Formerly (c)] — This subsection separated from former subsection.
- New (c)(2) — This subsection added.
- (d) — This subsection amended.
- (e) — This subsection amended.

6. Section 10170.22. Application Submission.

- (b) — This subsection amended.
- (c)(4) — This subsection amended.
- (c)(5) — This subsection amended.
- (c)(7) — This subsection amended.
- (c)(8) — This subsection amended.
- (e)(2) — This subsection amended.
- (g) — The subsection amended.
- (h) — The subsection amended.

7. Section 10170.23. Content of Application.

- (c) — This subsection amended.
- New (d) — This section added.
- New (e) — This subsection amended.

OBJECTIVES AND ANTICIPATED BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED REGULATION

These amendments will allow run an effective revolving loan program as well as complying with the mandates provided SB 631 to provide low–cost, short term, one–time financings for charter schools in need with priority towards first–year schools and those affected by disasters.

EVALUATION OF INCONSISTENCY AND INCOMPATIBILITY

The Authority performed a search in the California Code of Regulations and the proposed regulations are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulation.

CITATIONS FOR PROPOSED REGULATIONS MANDATED BY FEDERAL LAWS OR REGULATIONS

Not applicable.

OTHER MATTERS PRESCRIBED BY STATUTES APPLICABLE TO THE SPECIFIC STATE AGENCY OR TO ANY SPECIFIC REGULATION OR CLASS OF REGULATIONS

No other matters prescribed by statute are applicable to the Authority or to any specific regulation or class of regulations pursuant to Section 11346.5(a) (4) of the California Government Code pertaining to the proposed regulations or the Authority.

MANDATE ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The Authority has determined the proposed regulations do not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts.

COST IMPACTS ON A REPRESENTATIVE PRIVATE PERSON OR BUSINESS

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

COST IMPACT ON HOUSING

The proposed regulations will not have any effect on housing costs.

COST TO ANY LOCAL AGENCY OR SCHOOL DISTRICT REQUIRING REIMBURSEMENT PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT. CODE SECTION 17500 ET SEQ.

The proposed regulations will not impose a cost to any local agency or school district. The program is a grant program and does not have an application free

COST OR SAVINGS TO ANY STATE AGENCY

The proposed regulations will not impose any costs or provide any saving to any state agency.

OTHER NON–DISCRETIONARY COST OR SAVINGS IMPOSED UPON LOCAL AGENCIES

The proposed regulations will not impose any other non–discretionary costs or provide any related saving on local agencies.

COST OR SAVINGS IN FEDERAL FUNDING TO THE STATE

The proposed regulations will not impose any costs or provide any saving related to federal funding to the state.

INITIAL DETERMINATION REGARDING ANY SIGNIFICANT, STATEWIDE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT DIRECTLY AFFECTING BUSINESS

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

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

The Authority has determined that the adoption of the proposed regulations will not affect small business. The Program is a voluntary grant program available to charter schools to assist in the costs of charter school facilities.

RESULTS OF ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

Assessment of Effect on Jobs and Business Expansion, Elimination or Creation

Adoption of these regulations will not create or eliminate jobs within California, nor create new businesses or eliminate existing businesses within California. The proposed regulations could likely impact the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California. The purpose of the proposed regulations is to set forth administrative criteria and requirements for administering a relatively small loan program that will award one time funds to existing charter schools in need across the State of California.

Assessment of Effect to the Health and Welfare of California Residents, Worker Safety, and the State's Environment

The purpose of the program and proposed regulations is to set forth administrative criteria and requirements for administering this revolving loan program. The Authority do not expect any anticipated benefits to worker safety or the State's environment. However, while each financing is different, financings may allow schools to perform actions resulting in improved worker safety. Additionally, there may be a positive effect on the welfare of some California residents. As the intent of the program is to assist charter schools in need, the Program and its proposed regulations have the potential to directly benefit the welfare of students

and their related communities. The Authority does not anticipate any direct or indirect benefits to the health of California residents because of these proposed regulations.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Government Code section 11346.5(a)(13), the Authority must determine that no reasonable alternative to the regulations considered by the Authority or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Authority, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulations are proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the regulations, or would be more cost–effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law. The Authority invites interested persons to present statements with respect to alternatives to the proposed regulations during the written comment period.

AGENCY CONTACT PERSON(S)

Written comments, inquiries, and any questions regarding the substance of the proposed regulations shall be submitted or directed to:

Katrina Johantgen, Executive Director,
California School Finance Authority at:
300 South Spring Street, Suite 8500
Los Angeles, CA 90013
(213) 620–4608

or:

915 Capitol Mall, Suite 220–W
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 651–7710

or:

kjohantgen@treasurer.ca.gov

or:

csfa@treasurer.ca.gov

The following person is designated as a backup Contact Person for inquiries only regarding the proposed regulations:

Ryan Storey
300 South Spring Street, Suite 8500
Los Angeles, CA 90013
(213) 620–4608

or:

ryan.storey@treasurer.ca.gov

AVAILABILITY OF INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS, RULEMAKING FILE AND EXPRESS TERMS OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS

The Authority has established a rulemaking file for this regulatory action, which contains those items required by law. The file is available for inspection at the Authority's office at 915 Capitol Mall, Suite 220–W, Sacramento, California, during normal business hours. As of the date this Notice is published in the Notice Register, the rulemaking file consists of this Notice, the Initial Statement of Reasons, and the proposed text of the Regulations. Copies of these items are available upon request, from the Agency Contact Person designated in this Notice. The Sacramento address will also be the location for inspection of the rulemaking file and any other public records, including reports, documentation and other materials related to this proposed regulatory action. In addition, the rulemaking file, including the Initial Statement of Reasons and the proposed text, may be viewed on the Authority's Web site at www.treasurer.ca.gov/csfa.

15–Day Availability of Changed or Modified Text

After the written comment period ends and following a public hearing, if any is requested, the Authority may adopt the proposed regulations substantially as described in this Notice, without further notice. If the Authority makes modifications that are sufficiently related to the originally proposed text, it will make the modified text (with the changes clearly indicated) available to the public (including through the Authority's website described above) for at least fifteen (15) calendar days before the Authority adopts the proposed regulations, as modified. Inquiries about and requests for written copies of any changed or modified regulations should be addressed to the Agency Contact Person identified in this Notice.

Availability of Final Statement of Reasons

The Authority is required to prepare a Final Statement of Reasons pursuant to Government Code section 11346.9. Once the Authority has prepared a Final Statement of Reasons, a copy will be made available to anyone who requests a copy and will be available on the Authority's website described above. Written requests for copies should be addressed to the Agency Contact Person identified in this Notice.

TITLE 8. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD

REQUESTS FOR ACCOMMODATION

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

PROPOSED REGULATORY ACTION

The Board proposes to adopt new section 32142.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Board has not scheduled a public hearing on this proposed action. However, the Board will hold a hearing if it receives a written request for a public hearing from any interested person, or his or her 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 Board. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile (FAX) at (916) 327–6377 or by email at james.coffey@perb.ca.gov. The written comment period closes on December 30, 2026, which is 47 days after the publication of this notice. The Board will only consider comments received at the Board offices by that time. Submit written comments to:

James E. Coffey, Principal Attorney Supervisor
Public Employment Relations Board
Sacramento Regional Office
1031 18th Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

A. Authority

Pursuant to Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Educational Employment Relations Act (EERA; Government Code section 3540 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code sections 3509(a) and 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Meyers–Milias–Brown Act (MMBA; Government Code section 3500 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code sections 3513(h) and 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Ralph C. Dills Act (Dills Act; Government Code section 3512 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code section 3563(f), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Higher Education Employer–Employee Relations Act (HEERA; Government Code section 3560 et seq.). Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 99561(f), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Transit Employer–Employee Relations Act (TEERA; Public Utilities Code section 99560 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code sections 3541.3(g) and 71639.1(b), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act (Trial Court Act; Government Code section 71600 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code sections 3541.3(g) and 71825(b), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act (Court Interpreter Act; Government Code section 71800 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code sections 3524.52(a) and 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Judicial Council Employer–Employee Relations Act (JCEERA; Government Code section 3524.50 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code sections 3541.3(g) and 3555.5(c), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Public Employee Communication Chapter (PECC; Government Code section 3555 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code sections 3541.3(g) and 3551(a), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Prohibition on Public Employers Deterring or Discouraging Union Membership Chapter (PEDD; Government Code section 3550 et seq.). Pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 10421(e) and Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Building a Better Early Care and Education System Act (Childcare Provider Act; Welfare and Institutions Code section 10420 et seq.).

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 40122.1(a) and Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Orange County Transit District Act (OCTDA; Public Utilities Code section 40120 et seq.). Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 28849(b) and Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Act (BART Act; Public Utilities Code section 28848 et seq.). Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 102399(b) and Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Sacramento Regional Transit District Act (SacRTD Act; Public Utilities Code section 102398 et seq.). Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 98160.5 and Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Act (SC Metro Act; Public Utilities Code section 98160 et seq.). Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 100309(b) and Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Act (VTA; Public Utilities Code section 100300 et seq.). Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 7470.4(c) and Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and policies of the Transportation Network Company Drivers Labor Relations Act (TNC Act; Business and Professions Code section 7470 et seq.). Pursuant to Government Code section 3599.52(a) and Government Code section 3541.3(g), the Board is authorized to adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations to carry out the provisions and effectuate the purposes and the policies of the Legislature Employer–Employee Relations Act (LEERA; Government Code section 3599.50 et seq.).

B. References

The proposed new regulation references the following:

General reference: Section 7470.4(c), Business and Professions Code; Section 51, Civil Code; Sections 3509(a), 3513(h), 3514.5, 3524.52(a), 3524.55, 3551(a), 3555.5(c), 3541.3(g), 3541.3(n), 3541.5, 3563(m), 3563.2, 3599.52(a), 71639.1(b), and 71825(b), Government Code; Sections 28849(b), 40122.1(a), 98160.5(b), 99561(m), 99561.2, 100309(b), and 102399(b), Public Utilities Code; and Section 10421(e), Welfare and Institutions Code; title 42 section 12101, United States Code.

POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

PERB is a quasi–judicial agency which oversees public sector collective bargaining in California, and collective bargaining for a limited number of family child care providers and private transportation network companies. PERB presently administers seventeen collective bargaining statutes, ensures their consistent implementation and application, and adjudicates disputes between the parties subject to them. The statutes administered by PERB are: the Meyers–Milias–Brown Act (MMBA) of 1968, establishing collective bargaining for California's city, county, and local special district employers and employees; the Educational Employment Relations Act (EERA) of 1976, establishing collective bargaining in California's public schools (K–12) and community colleges; the State Employer–Employee Relations Act of 1978, known as the Ralph C. Dills Act (Dills Act), establishing collective bargaining for state government employees; the Higher Education Employer–Employee Relations Act (HEERA) of 1979, extending the same coverage to the California State University System, the University of California System, and University of California College of the Law, San Francisco; the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Transit Employer–Employee Relations Act (TEERA) of 2003, establishing collective bargaining rights for supervisory employees of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority; the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act (Trial Court Act) of 2000 and the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act (Court Interpreter Act) of 2002, together establishing collective bargaining rights for most trial court employees; the Public Employee Communication Chapter (PECC) of 2017, granting PERB jurisdiction over violations of the PECC; the Prohibition on Public Employers Deterring or Discouraging Union Membership (PEDD) of 2018, granting PERB jurisdiction over violations of the PEDD; and the Building a Better Early Care and Education System Act of 2019, known as the Childcare Provider Act (CCPA), establishing collective bargaining for family childcare providers who participate in a state–funded early care and education program.

In 2019, the Legislature amended the Orange County Transit District Act (OCTDA), granting PERB jurisdiction over unfair practice charges at the Orange County Transportation Authority. In 2020, the Legislature amended the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District Act (BART Act), grant-

ing PERB jurisdiction over disputes relating to employer–employee relations at the Bay Area Rapid Transit District. In 2021, the Legislature granted PERB jurisdiction over disputes relating to employer–employee relations at the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRTD) for those exclusive representatives that have elected to move one or more of its bargaining units to PERB's jurisdiction for unfair practice charges. In 2022, the Legislature amended the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Act (SC Metro Act), granting PERB jurisdiction over unfair practice charges at the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. In 2022, the Legislature granted PERB jurisdiction over disputes relating to employer–employee relations at the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) for those exclusive representatives that have elected to move one or more of its bargaining units to PERB's jurisdiction for unfair practice charges. Starting January 1, 2026, PERB acquired jurisdiction over a limited number of transportation network companies under the Transportation Network Company Drivers Labor Relations Act (TNC Act; Business and Professions Code section 7470 et seq.). On July 1, 2026, the Legislature tasked PERB with jurisdiction over certain employees of the California Legislature — the state's bicameral lawmaking body consisting of the Assembly and the Senate.

PERB currently does not have regulations related to reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Disability accommodation requests made by individuals appearing before PERB are decided by the Board agent processing the case. This proposed regulation aims to standardize the reasonable accommodation process and establish procedures for accommodations requests made in proceedings at any level of PERB.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST

Adoption of New Section

Proposed section 32142, subdivision (a), establishes the definitions of terms used within the regulation. These include terms such as "[p]ersons with disabilities" and "[a]ccommodation" as well as defining the role of the Disability Coordinator.

Proposed subdivision (b) details the process for requesting accommodations. Individual Board agents or the Chair of the Board will resolve requests for accommodations in proceedings before them. If a request falls outside of the scope of that agent's authority, the request shall be submitted to the Disability Coordinator. These requests may be made orally or in writing, and applicants may be required to provide additional information or verification regarding the requested accommodations. This subsection also covers the timeframe that requests should be submitted within and requires confidentiality for the request.

Proposed subdivision (c) requires that the Board respond to a request for accommodation within 20 days. This response must include the reasons for the granting or denial of the request and the nature and duration of the accommodation to be provided, if any.

Proposed subdivision (d) details the duration of any granted accommodation. This includes the situations in which the accommodation may be ended, such as requests for termination of the accommodation or modification of the accommodation.

Proposed subdivision (e) dictates the situations in which the Board may deny a request for accommodation. This includes accommodations that would create an undue financial or administrative burden, or those that would fundamentally alter the nature of the service, program or activity provided by the Board.

Proposed subdivision (f) details the review procedures for whole or partial denials of an accommodation request. The written request for review must state the reasons that the denial of the accommodations request necessitates review. The written request for review must be submitted within 20 days of the denial to the head of the division where the determination was made, or to the Board itself if denied by a division head, the Chair of the Board or the Disability Coordinator. The request for review must state the reasons that the denial of accommodations requires review. A final response to this request must occur within 20 days.

CONSISTENT AND COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING STATE REGULATIONS

The Board has determined that the proposed new regulation is 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 labor relations acts within its jurisdiction, the proposed regulation is the only regulation concerning the implementation and enforcement of these laws. Therefore, the Board has concluded that this regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing state regulations.

ANTICIPATED BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED REGULATION

PERB currently does not have regulations related to reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Disability accommodation requests made by individuals appearing before PERB are decided by the Board Agent processing the case, a division head, the

Chair of the Board, the Disability Coordinator, or the Board itself. This proposed regulation aims to standardize the reasonable accommodation process and establish procedures for accommodations requests made in proceedings at any level of PERB.

NO EXISTING AND COMPARABLE FEDERAL REGULATION OR STATUTE

During the process of developing the proposed regulation, 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, as these proposed regulatory changes apply solely to proceedings before the Board. Therefore, the Board has concluded that this regulation is neither inconsistent nor incompatible with existing Federal regulations or statutes. Note, however, that the proposed regulation was drafted to be consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act, which is codified at 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq. and the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which is codified at Cal. Civ. Code Sec. 51 et seq.

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 cost 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, as the regulation does not change the costs of any particular accommodation granted by PERB.

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 representative 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.

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 Board has determined that the proposed regulation will not affect small business because the proposed regulation will only affect public employers, public employees, and public employee organizations.

RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Board concludes that the adoption of the proposed regulation 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 regulation will make the Board's processes clearer and more efficient when assessing requests for accommodation, providing essential guidance to all parties. Ultimately, this enhanced clarity and efficiency in processing accommodation requests will promote a fair and accessible administrative process, 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 proposed regulation aims to establish a process for requesting accommodations for persons with disabilities in matters before PERB. The regulation provides guidance to Board agents who receive reasonable accommodation requests and ensure that all parties appearing before PERB go through a uniform process. This will benefit Board agents as well as persons with disabilities who may need accommodations while participating in PERB's processes.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Government Code section 11346.5, subdivision (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 regulation at the scheduled hearing or during the written comment period.

CONTACT PERSONS

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

James E. Coffey, Principal Attorney Supervisor
Public Employment Relations Board
Sacramento Regional Office
1031 18th Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
Email: james.coffey@perb.ca.gov

The backup person for these inquiries is:

Leo Melton, Regional Attorney
Public Employment Relations Board
Sacramento Regional Office
1031 18th Street
Sacramento, CA 95811
(916) 844–6148
Email: leo.melton@perb.ca.gov

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

PRELIMINARY ACTIVITIES

PERB held a public meeting on February 12, 2026, wherein the public was given the opportunity to provide comments regarding the implementation of the reasonable accommodation regulation. On February 12, 2026, the Board itself reviewed and discussed proposed regulatory text. The Board proposed edits to the regulation, and sent them back to the committee for revisions.

PERB held a public meeting on April 9, 2026, wherein the public was given the opportunity to provide comments regarding implementation of this reasonable accommodation regulation. On April 9, 2026, the Board itself approved the proposed regulatory text and the commencement of the formal rulemaking process.

AVAILABILITY OF INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS, TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATION, 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 regulation, the initial statement of reasons, and documents relied on promulgating the rulemaking package. The regulation, as well as all the information upon which the proposal is based (rulemaking file), are on file and available for public review from the agency representative listed above. Copies of these documents may be obtained by contacting James Coffey at the above address, and this notice, the proposed regulatory text, and the initial statement of reasons are also available on the Board's website at www.perb.ca.gov/laws–and–regulations/rulemaking.

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 regulation 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 regulation as revised. Requests for copies of any modified regulation and/or the final statement of reasons should be sent to the attention of James Coffey at the above address. The Board will accept written comments on the modified regulation for 15 days after the date on which they are made available.

AVAILABILITY OF FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Upon its completion, copies of the final statement of reasons may be obtained by contacting James Coffey 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 regulation in underline and strikeout can be accessed through PERB's website located at www.perb.ca.gov/laws–and–regulations/rulemaking 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.

TITLE 9. DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES

EARLY INTERVENTION SERVICES

[**Editorial Note:** This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Action was originally published in the November 6, 2026 Notice Register, No. 45-Z. However, the Notice was inadvertently placed under the GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST part of the Notice Register. It should have been placed under PROPOSED ACTION ON REGULATIONS. We are listing it here as a correction and cross-reference. The original public hearing and comment period dates remain the same.]

The Department of Developmental Services (Department or DDS) proposes to amend the Early Intervention Services regulations as described below after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Department will hold a public hearing to consider proposed amendments to the regulations for Early Intervention Services. To participate via Zoom, please access the webpage for Emergency and Proposed Regulations at https://www.dds.ca.gov/transparency/laws–regulations/emergency–and–proposed–regulations/ and follow the instructions on how to register to participate via Zoom.

DATE: January 07, 2027
TIME: 10:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M.
LOCATION: Zoom or DDS Headquarters

The Department will have limited seating available in the California Room at 1215 O Street, Suite 110, Sacramento, CA 95814 for those wishing to participate in person. To request a reasonable accommodation, please contact Cristina Tsuji at regulations@dds.ca.gov or (916) 651–0363 by 3:30 P.M. on December 24, 2026.

Please register using the link below and indicate whether you intend to participate via Zoom or in person.

https://cal–dds.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Av5DxeRETA–5NDK3UQcMBA

Participants will be given instructions on how to provide oral comments once they have accessed the hearing. The hearing will proceed on the date noted above until all testimony is submitted or by 12:00 p.m., whichever is later. At the hearing, any person may present oral or written statements or arguments relevant to the proposed action described in the Informative Digest. The Department requests, but does not require, that persons who make oral comments at the hearing also submit a written copy of their testimony via electronic submittal as described below.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD AND SUBMITTAL OF COMMENTS

The public comment period for this regulatory action will begin on November 6, 2026, and closes on January 7, 2027. To ensure consideration, your comment must be received by the Department no later than January 7, 2027. When commenting, please indicate the proposed rulemaking action to which your comment refers.

Any interested person or their representative may, orally or in writing, submit comments relevant to the proposed action described in the Informative Digest. The Department requests but does not require that a person who makes an oral comment at the hearing also prepares and submits a written copy of their testimony. Furthermore, the Department requests but does not require that all written statements on this proposed rulemaking action be submitted at least 10 days prior to the hearing so that Department staff have sufficient time to consider each comment. The Department encourages members of the public to bring any suggestions for modifications to the proposed regulatory action to staff's attention in advance of the hearing.

For consideration, any written comments shall be submitted as follows:

Mail or Hand Delivery:

Department of Developmental Services
Legislation and Regulations Branch
RE: **Early Intervention Services Regulations**
1215 O Street, M.S. 9–10
Sacramento, CA 95814; or

Electronic Submittal:

https://www.dds.ca.gov/transparency/laws–regulations/emergency–and–proposed–regulations/

It is requested that all comments contain the regulation package identifier **"Early Intervention Services Regulations"** in the subject line to facilitate timely identification and review.

Please note: Public comments should not include any personal or medical information, as your written and oral comments, and attachments become part of the public record and can be released to the public upon request under the California Public Records Act (Government Code, § 7920.000 et seq.).

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

Authority: Government Code (Gov. Code) sections 11152, 95001, 95009 and 95028 authorize the Department to adopt these regulations; Welfare and Institutions Code (Welf. & Inst. Code) sections 4405, 4514, 4626, 4627, 4648, 4681.1, 4689.7, 4695.2, 4712, 4748, 4866 and 5328.

Reference: These regulations implement, interpret, or make specific the following provisions:

- Education Code: sections 49065, 56321, 56325, 56343 and 56344.
- Gov. Code: sections 95003, 95004, 95007, 95014, 95016, 95018, 95020, 95022 and 95028.
- Health and Safety Code: sections: 1250 and 1502.
- Penal Code: sections: 240.242, 243.4, 245, 264.1, 273, 285, 286, 288, 289, 311.3, 311.4, 647, 11165.1, 11165.2, 11165.3 and 11165.6.
- Welfare & Institutions Code: sections 4501, 4502, 4503, 4504, 4512, 4514, 4517, 4520, 4543, 4546, 4622, 4626, 4627, 4642, 4643.5, 4646, 4646.5, 4647, 4648, 4648.12, 4681.1, 4689.7, 4691, 4693, 4695, 4695.2, 4705, 4712, 4740–4748, 4791, 4851, 5328, 5329, 12305.81, 15610.57, 15610.63 and 17710.
- Title 5, California Code of Regulations (CCR): sections 3001 and 3030.
- Title 20, United States Code (U.S.C.): sections 1232, 1400–1420, 1432, 1435, 1436, 1439, 1440, 1476 and 1480.
- Title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR): sections 99.7, 300.402, 300.561, 300.562, 300.564, 300.565, 300.566, 300.567, 300.569, 300.571, 300.576, 303.1, 303.9, 303.10, 303.12, 303.13, 303.14, 303.16, 303.18, 303.20, 303.22, 303.24, 303.25, 303.26, 303.27, 303.29, 303.31, 303.113, 303.174, 303.209, 303.300, 303.302, 303.321, 303.322, 303.340, 303.342, 303.343, 303.344, 303.345, 303.346, 303.401, 303.402, 303.403, 303.404, 303.405, 303.406, 303.420, 303.421, 303.422, 303.423, 303.425, 303.430, 303.432, 303.460, 303.510–303.512, 303.520, 303.522, 303.523, 303.524 and 303.527.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST AND POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Sections Affected:

The Department proposes amendment of CCR, title 17, sections 50401, 52000, 52020, 52022, 52040, 52060, 52082, 52084, 52086, 52100, 52102, 52104, 52106, 52107, 52108, 52110, 52111, 52112, 52120, 52121, 52122, 52140, 52160, 52161, 52162, 52164, 52165, 52166, 52167, 52168, 52169, 52170, 52171, 52172, 52173, 52174, 52175, 54302, 54505, and 56002.

Summary of Existing Laws and the Effect of the Proposed Regulatory Action:

The California Early Intervention Services Act (Gov. Code section 95000 et seq.) establishes California's early intervention services system, known as Early Start, for eligible infants and toddlers under three years of age and their families. The Department serves as the State's lead agency for Early Start. Regional centers and local educational agencies coordinate and provide services according to their respective responsibilities under state and federal law.

Part C of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. section 1431 et seq.) and its implementing regulations in title 34, CFR, part 303 establish requirements for identifying eligible infants and toddlers, conducting evaluations and assessments, developing individualized family service plans (IFSPs), providing early intervention services, planning transitions, and protecting parental rights and confidential information. Existing title 17 regulations implement these requirements and the California Early Intervention Services Act. Senate Bill 188 (Stats. 2022, chapter 49) amended California law concerning Early Start eligibility, service coordination, and transition. These changes include a 25–percent developmental delay threshold, separate consideration of expressive and receptive communication, recognition of fetal alcohol syndrome as an established risk condition, and at least quarterly IFSP reviews. Assembly Bill 162 (Stats. 2024, chapter 47) amended Gov. Code section 95020 regarding the frequency and modality of IFSP meetings. The proposed amendments require IFSP meetings to be conducted consistently with that section.

The Department proposes to amend title 17, division 2, chapters 1, 2, and 3 of CCR to reflect these statutory changes, update provisions addressing federal Part C requirements, and clarify responsibilities throughout the Early Start system. The proposed amendments would:

- Add and update definitions of early intervention services, participating entities, parents, and other terms used in administering Early Start.
- Update eligibility provisions to reflect the 25–percent developmental delay threshold, separate expressive and receptive communication areas, and fetal alcohol syndrome as an established risk condition.
- Require quarterly IFSP reviews and clarify meeting procedures and parental participation, establish at least seven calendar days' advance written notice before IFSP meetings with an exception for parent–requested meetings on shorter notice, and update consent, and documentation requirements.

- Address the timely initiation of services identified in an IFSP.
- Update transition planning, notification, referral, and coordination procedures for toddlers approaching their third birthday, including toddlers referred shortly before that birthday.
- Require opportunities for families to provide feedback on the transition process and require Early Start Programs to use that feedback to improve policies, procedures, and training.
- Update provisions concerning procedural safeguards, records, confidentiality, and complaints.
- Make conforming changes to regional center definitions in provisions governing research, vendorization, conflicts of interest, and residential services.
- The proposal also updates terminology, cross–references, and formatting to improve clarity and consistency.

Comparable Federal Regulation or Statute

Comparable federal law includes Part C of IDEA, title 20, U.S.C., section 1431 et seq., and its implementing regulations in title 34, CFR, part 303. Relevant provisions address early intervention services, evaluation and assessment, IFSP development and implementation, transition, parental consent, prior written notice, and dispute resolution.

The proposal incorporates federal requirements and establishes additional state standards. These include IFSP reviews every three months, a minimum seven–calendar–day written notice period for IFSP meetings with a parent–requested exception, and a requirement to arrange, provide, or purchase IFSP services within 45 days of parental consent. Proposed section 52161 also requires prior written notice by certified mail at least 30 days before specified proposed or refused actions. By comparison, 34 CFR section 303.421 requires prior written notice a reasonable time before the action and does not specify a 30–day period or certified–mail delivery.

Documents Incorporated by Reference

None.

Policy Statement Overview

Objectives:

The proposed amendments are intended to align the regulations with current California law and applicable federal Part C requirements and provide clear, consistent guidance for administering Early Start statewide. Specifically, the amendments seek to support accurate eligibility determinations, timely service planning and delivery, regular review of developmental needs, meaningful family participation, protection of parental rights, and coordinated transitions to appropriate services when toddlers leave Early Start.

The amendments also seek to clarify the responsibilities of regional centers and local educational agencies (LEAs) and establish consistent terminology and procedures for families, service coordinators, and providers.

Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulations:

The proposed amendments are anticipated to benefit the health and welfare of eligible California infants and toddlers by supporting accurate identification of developmental needs and timely access to appropriate early intervention services. Updated eligibility provisions and service definitions will help families and professionals understand who qualifies for Early Start and the services available.

Quarterly IFSP reviews will support timely adjustments to services as developmental needs and family priorities change. Clearer notice, participation, consent, and documentation requirements will help families understand their rights and participate meaningfully in decisions about services.

Updated transition procedures will strengthen coordination among families, regional centers, and LEAs and reduce the risk of service gaps when toddlers leave Early Start. Family feedback will help Early Start Programs identify and address opportunities to improve the transition process.

Consistent definitions and clearer procedures will also support more uniform implementation throughout the State.

Evaluation of Inconsistency or Incompatibility with Existing State Regulations

During the development of this regulatory proposal, the Department reviewed existing state regulations and determined that the proposed amendments are neither inconsistent nor incompatible with current state regulations.

MANDATED BY FEDERAL LAW OR REGULATIONS

California must maintain an early intervention system that complies with Part C of IDEA and title 34, CFR, part 303, as a condition of receiving federal Part C funding. Portions of the proposed amendments implement or clarify these federal requirements. Other amendments implement state law or establish additional state standards, including specific notice and service timeframes. The proposed regulatory action is therefore not exclusively mandated by federal law.

OTHER STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

None.

DISCLOSURES REGARDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Department has made the following initial determinations:

Local Mandate

Under Gov. Code section 11346.5(a)(5), the Department has determined that the proposed regulations do not impose a mandate on any local agency or school district that requires reimbursement by the State under Gov. Code, title 2, division 4, part 7, commencing with section 17500.

Fiscal Impact Estimates

The determination of the Department concerning the costs or savings incurred by public agencies and private persons and businesses in reasonable compliance with the proposed regulatory action are presented below.

Cost to any local agency or school district requiring reimbursement under sections 17500 et seq.:

The Department has determined that the proposed regulatory action would not create costs or savings to any local agency or school district.

Cost or savings to any state agency:

The Department has determined that the proposed regulatory action would create minor indeterminate costs absorbed by the Department.

Other non–discretionary costs or savings on local agencies:

The Department has determined that the proposed regulatory action would not create costs or savings or any other nondiscretionary cost or savings to local agencies.

Cost or savings in federal funding to the State Gov. Code 11346.5(a)(6):

The Department has determined that the proposed regulatory action would create minor indeterminate costs absorbed by the Department.

Housing Costs

In accordance with Gov. Code section 11346.5(a)(12), the Department has made the initial determination that the proposed regulatory action will not have an effect on housing costs.

Significant Adverse Economic Impact on Business, Including Ability to Compete with Business in Other States

The Department has made an initial determination that the proposed regulatory action would not have a statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states, or on representative private persons.

The proposed amendments primarily update eligibility, service planning, coordination, notice, transition, and procedural requirements for Early Start Programs. Although service providers may be affected, the Department does not anticipate that these changes will result in a significant statewide adverse economic impact on businesses.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT

(A) *The creation of jobs within the State of California.*

The Department cannot determine whether the proposed regulatory action will result in the creation of jobs within California.

(B) *The elimination of jobs within the State of California.*

The Department does not anticipate that this regulatory action would have an impact on the elimination of jobs within the State of California.

(C) *The creation of new business within the State of California.*

The Department does not anticipate that this regulatory action would have an impact on the creation of new business within the State of California.

(D) *The elimination of existing businesses within the State of California.*

The Department does not anticipate that this regulatory action would have an impact on the elimination of existing businesses within the State of California.

(E) *The expansion of businesses currently doing business within the State of California.*

The Department does not anticipate that this regulatory action would have an impact on the expansion of business within the State of California.

(F) *The benefits of the regulation to the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety, and the state's environment.*

The proposed regulations benefit the health and welfare of California infants and toddlers by improving access to early intervention services strengthening family participation and helping children develop essential skills. Pursuant to Gov. Code section 11346.5(a)(10), this proposed rulemaking action will not affect worker safety or the State's environment.

COST IMPACTS ON REPRESENTATIVE PRIVATE PERSONS OR BUSINESS

In developing this regulatory proposal, the Department's staff evaluated the potential economic impacts on representative private persons 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 rulemaking action and anticipates minor indeterminate costs that will be absorbed by the Department.

DETERMINATION OF EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

The Department has determined that there is no significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting small businesses because these regulations pertain only to regional centers working under the Department and the LEAs which are funded through the California Department of Education.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Gov. Code section 11346.5(a)(13), 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 provisions of law. During the public hearing and written comment period, the Department invites interested persons to present statements or arguments with respect to alternatives to the proposed regulation.

CONTACT PERSONS

Inquiries concerning the substance of the proposed regulatory action may be directed to Rachel Nerland, CPS II, (916) 654–1571 or Ryan Digman, CPS III, (916) 654–3627.

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

The Department has compiled a record for this rulemaking action which includes all the information upon which the proposal is based, including an Initial Statement of Reasons (ISOR) for the proposed regulatory action and the proposed regulation text.

Copies of the proposed ISOR and the full text of the proposed regulatory language, may be accessed on the Department's website listed below, or may be obtained upon request to Cristina Tsuji, Legislation and Regulations Analyst, (916) 651–0363, 1215 O Street, M.S. 9–10, Sacramento, California, 95814

Further, the agency representative to whom nonsubstantive inquiries concerning the proposed administrative action, including requests for inspecting the rulemaking record, may be directed is Cristina Tsuji, Legislation and Regulations Analyst, at Regulations@dds.ca.gov or by phone at (916) 651–0363.

AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

The Department may adopt or make modifications to the proposed regulatory action as described in this notice after considering all timely and relevant comments received during the 45–day comment period. If modifications that are substantially related are made by the Department, the notice of modified text and modified text with the changes clearly indicated will be made available to the public for at least 15 days before the Department adopts the regulation as revised. Copies of any modified text will be sent to anyone who commented on the first 45–day package or who otherwise has filed a request for notice of regulatory actions with the Department pursuant to Gov. Code section 11346.4(a)(1). You may request to receive copies of any modified regulations from the contact person indicated above. The Department will accept written comments on the modified regulations for 15 days after the date on which they are made publicly available.

AVAILABILITY OF FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

Upon its completion, the Department will post the Final Statement of Reasons (FSOR) on the Department's website listed below. Please direct requests for copies to the contact person(s) listed above.

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS ON THE INTERNET

Copies of the Notice of Proposed Action, the ISOR, the proposed regulation text, and all subsequent regulatory documents, including the FSOR, when completed, are available on the Department's website for this rulemaking at https://www.dds.ca.gov/transparency/laws–regulations/emergency–and–proposed–regulations/.

TITLE 11. PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY

DATA BROKER UPDATES AND DROP AUDITS

Sections Affected: California Code of Regulations, title 11, sections 7601, 7602, 7603, 7604, 7610, 7612, 7613, 7614, 7615, 7616, 7620, 7621, 7630, 7631, 7632, and 7633.

The California Privacy Protection Agency (Agency) proposes to adopt and amend the regulations described below after considering all comments, objections, and recommendations regarding the proposed action.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Agency will hold a public hearing to provide all interested persons an opportunity to present oral or written statements or arguments with respect to the proposed regulations:

Date: Wednesday, January 6, 2027
Start Time: 10 A.M. Pacific Time
Location: Cannabis Control Appeals Panel Hearing Room
400 R Street, Suite 330
Sacramento, CA 95811

To join virtually:

https://cppa–ca–gov.zoom.us/j/82871463357

To join by telephone:

(408) 961–3927
(408) 961–3928
(408) 961–3929
(855) 758–1310

Webinar ID: 828 7146 3357

International numbers available:

https://cppa–ca–gov.zoom.us/u/kcJ3jTgyhZ

Reasonable accommodations are available upon request. Please contact Kevin Sabo at regulations@cppa.ca.gov or (279) 278–5086 by 5:00 P.M. on Wednesday, December 29, 2026, if reasonable accommodations are necessary.

The hearing will proceed until all testimony is submitted or until 12:00 p.m., whichever is later. At the hearing, any person may present oral or written statements or arguments relevant to the proposed action. Participants will be given instructions on how to provide oral comment once they have accessed the hearing. The Agency requests, but does not require, persons who make oral comments to also submit a written copy of their testimony via email to regulations@cppa.ca.gov.

WRITTEN COMMENT PERIOD

Any interested person, or their authorized representative, may submit written comments relevant to the proposed regulatory action. The written comment period closes at 5:00 P.M. Pacific Time on Wednesday, January 6, 2027. Only written comments received by that time will be considered. Within your comment, please indicate the proposed rulemaking action to which your comment refers to at the top of the page: **Data Broker Updates and DROP Audits**.

Please submit written comments to:

Email: regulations@cppa.ca.gov

Please include "Public Comment on Data Broker Updates and DROP Audit Regulations" in the subject line.

Mail: California Privacy Protection Agency
Attention: Legal Division — Regulations Public Comment
400 R Street, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95811

Written and oral comments, attachments, and associated contact information (e.g., address, phone, email, etc.) become part of the public record and will be posted on our public website: https://cppa.ca.gov/regulations/drop_audits.

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

Authority: Section 1798.99.87, Civil Code.
Reference: Sections 1798.99.80, 1798.99.91, 1798.99.82, 1798.99.86, and 1798.99.86.5, Civil Code.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Summary of Existing Laws and Effect of the Proposed Action

The California Privacy Protection Agency (Agency) implements and enforces the Delete Act. (Civ. Code, § 1798.99.80 et seq.) The Delete Act requires the Agency to maintain a public data broker registry and establish an accessible deletion mechanism that allows a consumer, through a single verifiable request, to require every registered data broker to delete personal information related to that consumer. (Civ. Code, § 1798.99.86(a).) Every data broker is required to access the deletion mechanism at least once every 45 days, retrieve and process deletion requests, and continue to delete newly collected personal information for consumers who have submitted requests. (Civ. Code, § 1798.99.86(c), (d).) Civil Code section 1798.99.87(a) authorizes the Agency to adopt regulations to implement these statutory requirements.

The Agency adopted regulations implementing the data broker registry, which became effective on January 1, 2025, and regulations governing the accessible deletion mechanism, which became effective on January 1, 2026. (Cal. Code Regs., title 11, §§ 7601–7622.) The Agency launched the accessible deletion mechanism, known as the Delete Request and Opt–out Plat-

form (DROP) on January 1, 2026, and consumers immediately began submitting deletion requests through the DROP (DROP request). As of November 1, 2026, more than a half million consumers have submitted DROP requests containing almost three million individual consumer identifiers to 680 data brokers with active accounts in the DROP.

Since the DROP has become operational, the Agency identified several areas where the existing regulations could better align with the platform's functionality or with data brokers' operational realities. Because the initial regulations were adopted before the DROP was operational, certain provisions do not account for the more fully developed functionality of the DROP or issues that have come to the Agency's attention as consumers and data brokers use the system.

Data brokers have also raised recurring questions about definitions, scope of obligations, hashing and matching procedures, deletion requirements, suppression–list maintenance, and reporting. These issues reveal areas of confusion that could interfere with consistent and privacy–protective processing of DROP requests.

Separately, the Delete Act requires data brokers to undergo an independent third–party audit every three years beginning January 1, 2028. (Civ. Code, § 1798.99.86(e).) The statute does not specify essential audit parameters, including timing, scope, the qualifications and independence of auditors, the evidence required, or the contents of the audit report. Without regulations, audits would vary widely in rigor, comparability, and value, providing little assurance to consumers or useful information to the Agency and leaving data brokers uncertain about compliance expectations.

The Agency issued an Invitation for Preliminary Comments related to DROP audits and received 12 written comments consisting of 77 pages of input from data brokers, ad–tech companies, trade associations, nonprofits, individuals, and small businesses. Commenters emphasized auditor qualifications and independence, the importance of evidence over assertion, backups and downstream deletion requirements, and scope discipline. Agency staff also conducted comparative research, consulted academics, and engaged other agencies. The proposed regulations were developed after careful consideration of that information and input.

The Agency proposes to amend section 7601 through 7604, 7610, 7612 through 7616, 7620, and 7621 to better align the regulations to DROP and data broker operations, define terms, and to clarify data broker's ongoing obligations. The Agency also proposes adopting proposed Article 5, consisting of sections 7630 through 7633, which establishes the timing, auditor qualifications and independence standard, scope, evidence standard, and report contents for the audits required by Civil Code section 1798.99.86, subdivision (e).

Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Regulations

The proposed amendments to sections 7600 through 7622, together with the proposed adoption of Article 5, update the regulatory framework governing data broker registration, DROP access, DROP deletion request processing, and the statutory requirement that data brokers undergo periodic compliance audits. When the Agency first adopted regulations implementing the Delete Act, the DROP had not yet been fully developed, and several provisions reflected early assumptions about how the system would function. Since the DROP's launch, the Agency has gained substantial experience operating the system, responding to data broker inquiries, and observing where the regulatory text could more closely align with the DROP's more fully developed functionality. The proposed amendments to Articles 2, 3, and 4 address those issues by clarifying definitions, correcting outdated terminology, improving internal consistency, and ensuring that the requirements governing registration, DROP account creation, deletion list selection, access obligations, processing, suppression list maintenance, and status reporting account for progress in implementation, data broker operational realities, and issues that have arisen since the regulations were initially adopted.

Proposed Article 5 implements Civil Code section 1798.99.86, subdivision (e), which requires data brokers to undergo an independent third–party audit of their compliance with deletion processing obligations beginning January 1, 2028, and every three years thereafter. Because the statute mandates audits but does not specify how they must be conducted, who is qualified to perform them, what specific components of processing they must evaluate, or what the audit report must contain, regulations are necessary to provide this structure. The proposed regulations establish predictable timing rules for the first audit cycle and the subsequent three–year cycles, set qualification and independence standards to ensure competent and objective auditors, and identify the key elements of deletion processing that every audit must assess, including deletion list selection, DROP access timeliness, standardization and hashing procedures, matching accuracy, deletion and opt–out actions, status reporting, suppression list maintenance, and instructions to service providers. These requirements ensure that audits evaluate actual performance rather than internal policies alone. The regulations also specify the required contents of the audit report, including findings, documentation of noncompliance, and certifications by both the auditor and executive management. Together, these provisions create a comprehensive audit framework that supports accountability, transparency, and enforceability.

The combined proposed amendments and new regulations create a clearer, more accurate framework that advances the Delete Act's purpose. Consumers begin by gaining more reliable deletion processing, stronger data minimization protections, and independent verification of data broker compliance. Data brokers benefit by receiving clearer, system–aligned requirements. The Agency benefits from regulations that strengthen enforcement, improve communication, and provide the definitional and structural foundation needed for DROP audits beginning in 2028. Together, these proposed changes produce a coherent, workable regulatory scheme that reflects operational experience, incorporates stakeholder feedback, and fulfills the Delete Act's statutory mandates.

COMPARABLE FEDERAL REGULATIONS

There are no existing federal regulations or statutes comparable to these proposed regulations.

DETERMINATION OF INCONSISTENCY/ INCOMPATIBILITY WITH EXISTING STATE REGULATIONS

As required by Government Code section 11346.5, subdivision (a)(3)(D), the Agency has conducted a careful evaluation and has determined the proposed regulations are not inconsistent or incompatible with existing state regulations.

FORMS OR DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

None.

OTHER STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

None.

DISCLOSURES REGARDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

The Agency has made the following initial determinations:

Mandate on local agencies or school districts: None.

Cost or savings to any state agency: Pursuant to Civil Code section 1798.99.86, subdivision (e)(2), data brokers are required to submit their triennial audit reports and related materials to the Agency only upon the Agency's written request; therefore, there is not fiscal impact from the regulations, as this falls within the Agency's ongoing enforcement operations, which continue to be funded through the Data Brokers' Registry Fund via annual registration and access fees pursuant to Civil Code sections 1798.99.81 and 1798.99.87, subdivision (b), and require no additional General Fund appropriation. The proposed regulations are not expected to impose fiscal impacts on any other state agency.

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

Other non–discretionary costs or savings imposed upon local agencies: None.

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

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

Cost impacts on representative private person or business: The proposed regulations fall into two categories; updates to current data broker regulations and new provisions related to DROP audits. The most significant costs to businesses relate to the DROP audit. However, the requirements to engage an external, independent auditor and to undergo an audit triennially are imposed directly by Civil Code section 1798.99.86, subdivision (e), and therefore are not costs related to the proposed regulations. Additionally, the Agency anticipates any costs associated with the clarifying amendments are expected to be subsumed within the ordinary costs of complying with existing regulations, as the amendments do not impose new substantive obligations.

This analysis evaluates only the incremental regulatory costs attributable to the Agency's implementing specifications. For DROP audits, these include auditor qualification and independence verification required by proposed section 7631, minimum assessment components and evidentiary expectations contained in section 7632, and audit report contents and certifications found in section 7633. For data broker regulations updates, this includes the six–year retention of service provider notification records pursuant to section 7613, subdivision (e), and the 10–business–day account update requirements in section 7610, subdivision (b). The incremental regulatory costs vary by business size and system complexity, reflecting the documentation, evidence, and recordkeeping needed to support audits of statutory obligations.

For a small business data broker — typically a single primary system with limited service provider integrations — incremental one–time costs to align documentation, data maps, and audit–ready logging with proposed sections 7631 through 7633 are estimated at approximately $1,686. Incremental ongoing annualized costs for recordkeeping, service provider notification documentation, and audit period preparation are estimated at approximately $1,604 per year.

For a typical or larger data broker — multiple systems and service provider integrations — incremental one–time costs to align documentation and logs and to

organize audit support materials are estimated at approximately $3,816. Incremental ongoing annualized costs for recordkeeping and audit–period preparation are estimated at approximately $3,181 per year.

The Agency found no cost impact on representative private persons.

Effect on housing costs: None.

Business report requirement: Businesses would be required to submit related audit documents to the Agency upon request; however, that requirement is statutory. It is also necessary for the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the state that the regulation apply to businesses.

Small business determination: The proposed regulations would apply to approximately 680 data brokers as of November 1, 2026, of which approximately 170, which equates to 25 percent, are estimated to be small businesses.

RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Agency has conducted an economic impact assessment and concluded:

Creation or Elimination of Jobs: The proposal would not result in the creation or elimination of jobs. However, demand for independent third–party auditors with privacy, data deletion, and information systems expertise, as well as compliance and engineering roles at data brokers and consultancies, may increase.

Creation of New Businesses or Elimination of Existing Businesses: The proposal would not result in an elimination of businesses. New audit, privacy assurance, and technical compliance service provider businesses may form to serve the data broker market.

Expansion of Businesses: Firms providing accounting, information systems audit, privacy assurance, and information technology services, including firms already serving businesses subject to the Agency's cybersecurity audit regulations, may expand their practices to conduct DROP audits in accordance with the proposed regulations.

Worker Safety: The proposal would not benefit worker safety as the provisions proposed regulations do not pertain to, nor impact, worker safety.

Environment: The proposed regulations do not pertain to the state's environment and are not expected to impact the environment.

Health, Safety, and Welfare: The proposal would benefit the health, safety, and welfare of California residents by supporting statutory privacy protections. The proposal would improve identifier match accuracy, clarify deletion actions and exemptions, ensure sustained suppression of personal information, and establish uniform, evidence–based audits of statutory obligations across systems and service providers.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Government Code section 11346.5, subdivision (a)(13), the Agency must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Agency or that has 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 private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or provision of law. The Agency invites interested parties to submit alternatives with respect to the proposed regulations. The Agency's own alternatives to the proposed regulations are described in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

CONTACT PERSONS

Inquiries concerning the proposed rulemaking action may be directed to:

Kevin Sabo
California Privacy Protection Agency, Legal Division
400 R Street, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95811
(279) 278–5086
regulations@cppa.ca.gov

In the event the contact person is unavailable, inquiries regarding the proposed action may be directed to the following backup contact person:

Elizabeth Allen
California Privacy Protection Agency, Legal Division
400 R Street, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95811
(279) 895–1356
elizabeth.allen@cppa.ca.gov

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

The Agency will have the entire rulemaking file available for inspection and copying throughout the rulemaking process upon request to the contact person(s) above. As of the date this Notice is published in the Notice Register, the rulemaking file consists of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the Text of Proposed Regulations ("express terms" of the regulations), the Initial Statement of Reasons, STD. 399, and any other information upon which the proposed rulemaking is based. The text of this Notice, the express terms, and

any information upon which the proposed rulemaking is based are available on the Agency's website at https://cppa.ca.gov/regulations/drop_audits. Please refer to the contact information listed above to obtain copies of these documents.

AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

After considering all timely and relevant comments, the Agency may adopt these regulations substantially as described in this Notice. If the Agency makes modifications which are sufficiently related to the originally–proposed text, it will make the modified text with the changes clearly indicated, available to the public for at least 15 days before the Agency adopts the regulations, as modified. Please direct requests for copies of any modified regulations to the contact person listed above. The Agency 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, a copy of the Final Statement of Reasons will be available on the Agency's website at https://cppa.ca.gov/regulations/drop_audits. Please direct requests for copies to the contact person(s) listed above.

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS ON THE INTERNET

Copies of this Notice, express terms, Initial Statement of Reasons, and any information upon which the proposed rulemaking are based are available on the Agency's website at https://cppa.ca.gov/regulations/drop_audits.

TITLE 11. COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

ADOPT COMMISSION REGULATION 1202.14, RESERVE PEACE OFFICERS EMPLOYED BY PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Notice is hereby given that the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) proposes to adopt regulations in Division 2 of Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations as described below in the Informative Digest. A public hearing is not scheduled. Pursuant to Government Code (GC) section 11346.8, any interested person, or their duly authorized representative, may request a public hearing. POST must receive the written request no later than 15 days prior to the close of the public comment period.

Public Comments Due by December 28, 2026.

Notice is also given that any interested person, or authorized representative, may submit written comment(s) relevant to the proposed regulatory action by fax at (916) 404–5619, by email to Stacy Townsend at stacy.townsend@post.ca.gov, or by letter to:

Commission on POST
Attention: Stacy Townsend
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605–1630

AUTHORITY AND REFERENCE

This proposal is made pursuant to the authority vested by Penal Code (PC) section 13503 (authority of POST), and PC § 13506 (POST authority to adopt regulations). This proposal is intended to interpret, implement, and make specific PC § 13503(e), which authorizes POST to develop and implement programs to increase the effectiveness of law enforcement, including programs involving training and education courses.

INFORMATIVE DIGEST/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

On September 30, 2021, Governor Newsom signed Senate Bill (SB) 2 (2021). SB 2 made significant changes to existing Government and Penal Codes, respectively. These changes provide for additional peace officer hiring eligibility requirements. SB 2 also grants POST the authority to certify all peace officers in California, and subsequently take action against those certifications, should POST determine serious misconduct occurred. While the peace officer eligibility hiring requirements went into effect on January 1, 2022, the remaining changes to Government and Penal Codes went into effect on January 1, 2023.

This rulemaking action will provide reserve peace officers, engaged in full–time employment at a private institution of higher education as authorized by PC § 830.75, a path toward POST Certification and eligibility for POST Professional Certificates. Currently, campus safety officers, designated under PC § 830.75 as reserve peace officers, must complete the regular basic course and complete a field training program (FTP) through the agency with which they maintain a valid memorandum of understanding. This can pose a challenge for the campus safety departments because they cannot utilize their officer(s) in their intended capacity until they complete the requisite FTP, and could potentially lose their officer(s) if they cannot pass the sheriff's or police department's FTP. The campus safe-

ty department must then provide additional training specific to their university's needs and policies.

The regulation proposed in this rulemaking action will create a pathway for specified reserve officers to obtain a POST Basic and Professional Certificate, and therefore, allow campus safety departments operating under the authority granted by PC § 830.75 to establish their own FTPs and deploy their campus safety officers to the field much sooner.

Anticipated Benefits of the Proposed Amendments:

The benefits anticipated by the proposed regulation will create a pathway for campus safety departments to provide their own FTPs. This will increase the efficiency of the state of California in delivering services to stakeholders. Thus, the law enforcement standards are maintained and effective in preserving peace, protection of public health, safety, and welfare of California. The proposed amendments will have no impact on worker safety or the state's environment.

Evaluation of Inconsistency/Incompatibility with Existing State Regulations:

POST has determined that this proposed regulation is not inconsistent nor incompatible with existing regulations. After conducting a review for any regulations that would relate to or affect this area, POST has concluded that these are the only regulations that concern processes and procedures for peace officer eligibility in the state.

DOCUMENT(S)/FORM(S) INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

There are no documents/forms incorporated by reference in this proposed action.

DISCLOSURES REGARDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

POST has made the following initial determinations:

Mandate on local agencies or school districts: None.

Cost or savings to any state agency: None.

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

Other non–discretionary costs or savings imposed on local agencies: None.

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

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

Significant, statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting California businesses: POST has determined that the proposed regulations 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.

Significant effect on housing costs: None.

Small Business Determination: POST has determined that the proposed regulation will not affect small businesses because the regulation affects individual reserve peace officers engaged in full–time employment at a private institution of higher education as authorized by Penal Code § 830.75 seeking to obtain a POST Basic Certificate and POST Professional Certificates. Additionally, the Commission's main function to establish and maintain training standards for law enforcement has no effect financially on small businesses.

RESULTS OF ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT

POST concludes that it is (1) unlikely the proposal will create or eliminate jobs in the state of California, (2) unlikely that the proposal will create or eliminate any businesses, and (3) unlikely that the proposed regulations will result in the expansion of businesses currently doing business within the state.

Benefits of the Proposed Action: As stated above under the Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview, the benefits of the regulation will provide an avenue for reserve peace officers engaged in full–time employment at a private institution of higher education as authorized by Penal Code § 830.75 a path toward POST Certification and eligibility for POST Professional Certificates. Thus, the law enforcement standards are maintained and effective in preserving peace, protection of public health, safety, and welfare in California. There would be no impact that would affect worker safety or the state's environment.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with Government Code § 11346.5, subdivision (a)(13), POST must determine that no reasonable alternative it considered, or that has otherwise identified and brought to its attention, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed, or would be as effective as and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action, or would be more cost–effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law than the proposed action.

CONTACT PERSONS

Questions regarding this proposed regulatory action may be directed to Stacy Townsend, Commission on POST, 860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100, West Sacramento, CA 95605–1630, at (916) 970–4644. General questions regarding the regulatory process may be directed to Alondra Castellanos Gutierrez at (916) 266–2331.

TEXT OF PROPOSAL

Individuals may request 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, the Commission on POST at 860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100, West Sacramento, CA 95605–1630. These documents are also located on the POST Website at www.post.ca.gov/Regulatory–Actions.

ADOPTION OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS/AVAILABILITY OF CHANGED OR MODIFIED TEXT

Following the public comment period, the Commission may adopt the proposal substantially as set forth without further notice, or the Commission may modify the proposal if such modifications remain sufficiently related to the text as described in the Informative Digest. If the Commission makes changes to the language before the date of adoption, the text of any modified language, clearly indicated, will be made available at least 15 days before adoption to all persons whose comments were received by POST during the public comment period and to all persons who request notification from POST of the availability of such changes. A request for the modified text should be addressed to the agency official designated in this notice. The Commission will accept written comments on the modified text for 15 days after the date that the revised text is made available.

AVAILABILITY AND LOCATION OF THE RULEMAKING FILE AND THE FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

The rulemaking file contains all information upon which POST is basing this proposal and is available for public inspection by contacting the person(s) named above. As of the date this notice is published in the Notice Register, the rulemaking file consists of this notice, the proposed text of the regulations and the initial statement of reasons.

To request a copy of the Final Statement of Reasons once it has been approved, submit a written request to the contact person(s) named above.

RULEMAKING PETITION DECISIONS

AIR RESOURCES BOARD

PETITION FOR RULEMAKING AMENDMENT UNDER GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 11340.6: AMENDMENT OF CALIFORNIA SMOG CHECK ON–BOARD DIAGNOSTIC II (OBD–II) TESTING REGULATIONS FOR NON–EMISSIONS DIAGNOSTIC TROUBLE CODES

October 29, 2026

Mr. James Zabel

jimzabel3@gmail.com

Dear Mr. Zabel:

Thank you for submitting the August 1, 2026, petition for rulemaking entitled "Petition for Rulemaking Amendment Under Government Code Section 11340.6: Amendment of California Smog Check OBD–II Testing Regulations for Non–Emissions Diagnostic Trouble Codes" to the California Air Resources Board (CARB or Board), pursuant to Government Code section 11340.6. CARB staff acknowledged receipt of the petition on August 19, 2026. CARB appreciates that you agreed to extend the deadline for response to the petition to October 31, 2026, and now responds in this letter.

The petition expresses issues about the current Smog Check program's policy to enforce an automatic failure if a vehicle's on–board diagnostic (OBD) system illuminates the malfunction indicator light (MIL), regardless of the underlying diagnostic trouble code's (DTC) nature. Specifically, the petition indicates that this policy places an undue, unfair, and disproportionate financial burden on California motorists without providing any matching environmental or air quality benefits. The petition cited the following examples as failures that do not increase emissions or degrade the performance of the catalytic converter or oxygen sensors: malfunctions related to active grill shutters, transmission temperature sensors, ambient air temperature sensors, and internal instrument cluster.

Therefore, the petition requests CARB amend its OBD II system and Smog Check testing rules to eliminate the policy that requires an automatic Smog

Check failure for an illuminated MIL when the underlying DTC is unrelated to vehicle emissions. The petition proposes that the following language be added to the regulation: "A vehicle shall not fail the California Smog Check inspection solely due to an illuminated Malfunction Indicator Light, if the stored diagnostic trouble codes (DTCs) are verified by the testing equipment to be purely auxiliary, safety, or convenience–related parameters that have no direct or measurable impact on tailpipe or evaporative vehicle emissions." The petition did not identify the specific section of the California Code of Regulations to be affected, but did specify amendments to OBD II, which only covers light– and medium–duty vehicles.

At the outset, CARB does not oversee the Smog Check program, and CARB's OBD II regulation (title 13, California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 1968.2) does not dictate any requirements for Smog Check, including the pass and fail criteria. CARB's OBD II regulation establishes requirements for how the OBD II system must operate; it does not control how other agencies use the OBD II system for their programs. The Bureau of Automotive Repair (BAR), under the Department of Consumer Affairs, is the agency in charge of the Smog Check program[1], and title 16, CCR section 3340.42.2 "Test Methods and Standards for the On–Board Diagnostic Inspection," which BAR implements, is the regulation that dictates the criteria for when a Smog Check inspection would be considered failing.

However, CARB does want to comment on why malfunctions of certain components are required to illuminate the MIL. CARB's OBD II regulation requires the OBD II system to monitor the performance of virtually all emission–related components and systems like the catalyst and the fuel system to make sure they are working properly. (See, e.g., 13 CCR 1968.2, subdivision (e) and (f).) The regulation requires the system to store a DTC and illuminate the MIL when it detects a malfunction of these components or systems. (13 CCR 1968.2, subdivision (d)(2).) Some emission control devices have several purposes. For example, active grill shutters are used by some manufacturers to improve aerodynamics during high–speed driving and to more quickly warm up the engine during cold starts to help reduce emissions.

To ensure a robust OBD II system, the OBD II regulation also requires monitoring of any components that are used by OBD diagnostics to make sure a malfunction of any component does not cause errors in the OBD diagnostics system itself that can result in erroneous or incorrect decisions, such as falsely calling a working emission control component bad or, conversely, falsely calling a failing emission control component good. Either of these outcomes could impact the OBD system's ability to accurately inform operators and Smog Check inspectors of the vehicle condition. These other monitored components are required to be monitored by the OBD II regulation because they can indirectly impact emissions.

For example, an ambient temperature sensor may be used by other OBD diagnostics responsible for monitoring important emission controls like the fuel evaporative system. The evaporative system leak diagnostic (which checks for emission leaks in the evaporative system) may only run when the ambient temperature sensor shows a reading that is not too hot and not too cold in order to make correct decisions on whether the evaporative system is working properly. A malfunctioning ambient temperature sensor may prevent the evaporative system leak diagnostic from operating and thus prevent detection of a fuel vapor leak in the evaporative system. Virtually all vehicles use ambient temperature sensor information in the emission control system and OBD II system to adjust or correct for the effects of ambient temperatures to achieve both low emissions and correct diagnostic decisions.

As another example, transmission malfunctions may affect the way the vehicle runs such that certain OBD diagnostics may be prevented from running. Therefore, OBD II systems currently have diagnostics that monitor the transmission to make sure it is working properly. The transmission temperature sensor may be used by these transmission diagnostics to determine if the transmission is malfunctioning (or functioning properly), so a malfunctioning transmission temperature sensor may prevent the transmission diagnostics from running and detecting transmission malfunctions, or falsely reporting a malfunction.

The OBD II regulation also requires MIL illumination when internal instrument cluster malfunctions occur that prevent the cluster from receiving signals from the OBD II system, specifically signals telling the instrument panel to illuminate the MIL for a malfunction detected by the OBD II system. (13 CCR 1968.2, subdivision (d)(2.2.4).) This requirement is important, considering the MIL is the primary indicator to the driver of an emission–related malfunction, which is intended to motivate the driver get the malfunction fixed quickly to keep emissions on the vehicles low for as long as possible, as well as to notify the driver that the vehicle is in a condition that will fail a Smog Check inspection.

Vehicle and engine manufacturers are required to follow the OBD II regulations and follow the regulation requirements when designing their OBD II systems. Since modern vehicles include a highly integrated network of computers, sensors and actuators,

[1] Health and Safety Code section 44002: "The department shall have the sole and exclusive authority within the state for developing and implementing the motor vehicle inspection program in accordance with this chapter."

manufacturers often incorporate components into the emission control system or OBD system to fine tune emission control or improve the OBD system robustness. These relationships for how a component might affect emissions or be used as part of the OBD system may not be intuitive to the outsider looking in. Accordingly, when a vehicle manufacturer designs a compliant OBD system and illuminates the MIL and stores a DTC for a particular malfunctioning component, the manufacturer has concluded that the identified component either affects emissions directly or is needed to ensure the OBD system can reliably detect malfunctions of other components that do directly affect emissions. CARB believes it is appropriate that such malfunctions are flagged for repair in Smog Check — although, again, CARB itself does not make failure determinations for the Smog Check program.

Therefore, after careful consideration of the petition and the current context of OBD regulations, for the reasons described above, CARB denies the petition in whole, pursuant to paragraph (a) of Government Code section 11340.7.

The record upon which this decision is based includes the petition, this letter, and the technical content of the OBD II regulation. CARB appreciates and welcomes your continued engagement and information sharing within these ongoing public processes to improve our programs and the achievement of our shared important policy goals.

In accordance with Government Code section 11340.7(d), a copy of this letter is being transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law for publication in the California Regulatory Notice Register. The agency contact person in this matter is Randy Reck, Senior Attorney, available at (279) 208–7585 or randy.reck@arb.ca.gov. Interested parties may obtain a copy of the petition upon request to Jennifer Simpson, Supervisor, Board Administration and Regulator Coordination Unit, jennifer.simpson@arb.ca.gov. Upon request physical copies may be obtained from 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California, 95814.

Sincerely,

/s/

Steven S. Cliff, Ph.D., Executive Officer

cc:

(via email only)

California Office of Administrative Law

Lauren Sanchez, Chair, California Air Resources Board

California Air Resources Board Honorable Board Members

Femi Olaluwoye, Deputy Executive Officer, California Air Resources Board

Shannon Dilley, Chief Counsel, California Air Resources Board

Abigail May, Deputy Counsel, California Air Resources Board

Robin Lang, Division Chief, Emissions Certification and Compliance Division, California Air Resources Board

Lisa Yacoubian, Assistant Division Chief, Emissions Certification and Compliance Division, California Air Resources Board

Mike Regenfuss, Branch Chief, On–Board Diagnostic Branch, Emissions Certification and Compliance Division, California Air Resources Board

BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS

PETITION FOR ADOPTION OF A REGULATION REGARDING CONTINUING EDUCATION INSTRUCTOR STANDARDS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 11340.6

November 2, 2026

Veronica Garcia, Executive Director

CCE Units

Sent via email to: cceunits@gmail.com

Dear Ms. Garcia:

This letter is in response to your email received by the California Board of Chiropractic Examiners (Board) on October 2, 2026, wherein you request that the Board consider whether rulemaking is appropriate regarding the qualifications, disciplinary history, disclosure, rehabilitation, and oversight of individuals who teach Board–approved continuing education (CE).

Consistent with the provisions of Government Code section 11340.7, subdivision (a), this letter is to advise you that the Board has granted in part and denied in part your request.

No specific text will be adopted, as you did not propose or draft regulatory language, and you did not reference the authority of the state agency to take the action requested per Government Code section 11340.6, subdivision (c). However, the Board reviewed the policy issues raised in your petition and considered whether additional regulatory action is warranted.

PETITION ISSUE NUMBER 1

Petitioner requests that the Board consider whether its CE standards should provide a fair method for evaluating rehabilitation in the context of teaching CE.

Petitioner notes there are doctors who have made serious mistakes but later accepted responsibility and complied with the disciplinary process including completing probation, complying with Board orders, paying required fines, fees, or cost recovery, completing required education, petitioning for reinstatement, and demonstrating years of subsequent compliance. Petitioner further requests that the Board consider factors such as the nature and seriousness of the misconduct, compliance with Board orders, completion of probation, reinstatement, subsequent conduct, time elapsed, evidence of rehabilitation, and protection of the public when evaluating CE providers. Petitioner states that a rehabilitated doctor can provide valuable education precisely because of what the doctor experienced and that past disciplinary experience can be an opportunity to promote ethics, compliance, and prevention.

Discussion

Existing law at California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 16, sections 362 and 363 states requirements for CE provider approval, duties, and responsibilities and for CE course approval. The Board has already approved proposed amendments to CCR, title 16, sections 362 and 363 that would require consideration of a CE instructor's license status, history of criminal convictions, and history of formal discipline, together with an explanation of each applicable disciplinary action. The proposed amendments also allow applicants to submit information regarding rehabilitation and current fitness to serve as a CE instructor through the course application and appeal process.

Decision

For the reasons stated above, rulemaking petition issue Number 1 is granted in part and denied in part. The Board grants the petition to the extent it requests consideration of rehabilitation in the evaluation of CE instructors, as that issue is already being addressed through a pending regulatory proposal. The petition is otherwise denied because it fails to reference the authority of the Board to take the action requested.

PETITION ISSUE NUMBER 2

Petitioner states sexual misconduct and serious patient–boundary violations deserve particular attention because of the nature of chiropractic practice, which involves hands–on treatment and close physical contact with patients. Petitioner requests that the Board determine appropriate safeguards when a CE instructor's disciplinary history involves sexual misconduct or serious boundary violations.

Discussion

Existing law at CCR, title 16, sections 362 and 363 states requirements for CE provider approval, duties, and responsibilities and for CE course approval. The Board has approved proposed amendments to CCR, title 16, sections 362 and 363 that would require disclosure and consideration of criminal and disciplinary history, including any formal discipline involving acts of sexual abuse, sexual misconduct, or sexual relations with a patient. Under the proposal, applicants would be required to provide information regarding the disciplinary action, including the licensing agency, case number, violations, and an explanation of the matter. These amendments are intended to provide the Board with the additional information necessary to evaluate whether approval of a CE instructor is consistent with public protection.

Decision

For the reasons stated above, rulemaking petition issue Number 2 is granted.

PETITION ISSUE NUMBER 3

Petitioner requests the Board provide clear guidance and standards concerning instructor licensing status, disciplinary history, pending matters, probation, reinstatement, rehabilitation, disclosure, and circumstances requiring additional review or safeguards.

Discussion

Existing law at CCR, title 16, sections 362 and 363 states requirements for CE provider approval, duties, and responsibilities and for CE course approval. The Board's pending amendments to CCR, title 16, sections 362 and 363 would require disclosure of license status, criminal convictions, and formal disciplinary actions. The proposed amendments also allow applicants to provide information regarding rehabilitation and current fitness to serve as a CE instructor.

The Board does not find that additional regulations concerning pending criminal or administrative disciplinary matters are necessary at this time. A pending charge, investigation, or accusation does not constitute a final determination of misconduct and may ultimately be dismissed, resolved without a conviction or discipline, or adjudicated in favor of the respondent. For this reason, the Board finds that final criminal convictions and disciplinary actions provide a more appropriate and objective basis for evaluating an individual's qualifications and current fitness to serve as a CE instructor. Nothing in the Board's current or proposed regulations prevents a CE provider from independently considering pending criminal or disciplinary matters when selecting instructors or determining whether additional safeguards are appropriate.

Decision

For the reasons stated above, rulemaking petition issue Number 3 is granted in part and denied in part. The Board grants the petition to the extent it requires clarification regarding CE instructor qualifications, criminal and disciplinary history, and rehabilitation, as those issues are already being addressed through pending regulatory amendments. The petition is otherwise denied because it fails to reference the authority of the Board to take the action requested.

Sincerely,

/s/

Kristin Walker

Executive Officer

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PETITION DECISION FOR ADOPTION OF REGULATION — SERVICE CODE 875 GATEWAY TRANSPORTATION

SENT VIA EMAIL: rbellgtway1@gmail.com

Craig Allen, Vice President

Gateway Transportation

1872 Winchester Court

Fairfield, CA 94533–3616

Dear Craig Allen:

The California Department of Developmental Services (Department) has reviewed Gateway Transportation's October 5, 2026, request for reconsideration of the Department's October 1, 2026, decision denying the petition for adoption of a regulation concerning service code 875 transportation reimbursement submitted pursuant to Government Code section 11340.7(c).

After careful consideration, the Department maintains its original decision, and the request for reconsideration is denied. The request does not provide a basis for changing the Department's original determination regarding the proposed regulatory action.

The Department recognizes the concerns about transportation reimbursement and provider costs, and reassessed transportation rates within the past 12 months. Additionally, Assembly Bill 2423 (Chapter 904, Statutes of 2024) requires biennial rate reviews, with future rate adjustments contingent upon legislative appropriation in the annual Budget Act and approval of federal funding.

The Department will address the additional questions regarding Rate Reform and transportation cost assumptions separately. Accordingly, the Department's October 1, 2026, decision remains unchanged.

Sincerely,

/s/

MEGAN SCHLAGER, Chief

Legislation and Regulations Branch

Legislation and Public Affairs Division

cc: Dana Simon, Department of Developmental Service

DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION

REGARDING PETITION FROM DAN FOX, PRESIDENT AND PRINCIPAL BIOLOGIST OF ANIMAL PEST MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC., TO AMEND SECTION 6627 OF TITLE 3 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS TO ALLOW VOLUNTARY REPORTING OF PESTICIDE ACTIVE INGREDIENTS ON MONTHLY SUMMARY PESTICIDE USE REPORTS (MSPURS)

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 October 9, 2026[1].

PARTY SUBMITTING THE PETITION

Petitioner is Dan Fox, President and Principal Biologist of Animal Pest Management Services, Inc.

PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS REQUESTED TO BE AFFECTED

Petitioner requests that DPR amend section 6627 of Title 3 of the California Code of Regulations (3 CCR) to allow voluntary reporting of pesticide active ingredients on Monthly Summary Pesticide Use Reports (MSPURs).

[1] Although the petition is dated September 22, 2026, DPR first received the petition via email on October 9, 2026.

REFERENCE TO AUTHORITY TO TAKE THE ACTION REQUESTED

Petitioner cites to Food and Agricultural Code (FAC) section 12979 as DPR's primary authority for pesticide use reporting, FAC sections 11456 and 12976 as DPR's general rulemaking authority, and FAC sections 12976, 13145, 13188, and 14005 as other supporting and related DPR authorities to regulate pesticide use reporting and recordkeeping.

REASONS SUPPORTING THE AGENCY DETERMINATION

Summary of Petition

Petitioner requests that DPR allow voluntary reporting of pesticide active ingredients on MSPURs for greater transparency, to enhance public right–to–know, and to reduce unnecessary perceived risk associated with pesticide use.

Summary of Agency's Determination

DPR is denying the petitioner's request to amend 3 CCR section 6627 to allow voluntary reporting of pesticide active ingredients on MSPURs because the requested amendments are redundant and there is no evidence of operational need. Moreover, the requested amendments are not generally applicable or enforceable and do not materially alter any requirement, right, responsibility, condition, prescription or other regulatory element of any CCR provision.

Reasons for Denial

The petition asserts that since 3 CCR section 6627 only requires reporting of the formulated product rather than the active ingredients, the quantity of the actual pesticide active ingredient of concern can be substantially overstated and increase perceived risk. The petitioner provides examples of pesticide products containing low percentages of active ingredient(s), including products that contain multiple active ingredients or that are highly diluted, and states that the amount of actual active ingredient used is often minuscule compared with the total amount of product applied. The petitioner states that reporting the active ingredient(s) would make the data more realistic and understandable to members of the public, community groups, journalists, or non–experts and is less likely to generate unnecessary public concern. The petitioner explains that explicit active ingredient information prevents both under– and overestimation of chemical use. In addition, the petitioner states that risk is primarily driven by the active ingredient and that reporting on the total amount of product used can create a misleading picture of chemical loading in the environment. Finally, the petitioner explains that explicitly listing the amount of active ingredients (and the amount applied) on MSPURs aligns the reported data with the science that regulators and researchers use and gives the public the information they care about. The petition does not provide evidence to allow DPR to conclude that the current reporting requirements overstates pesticide use, increases concern associated with pesticide use, or creates a misleading picture to the public, community groups, journalists, or non–experts.

To address these concerns, the petitioner requests that DPR make the following changes:

- Amend 3 CCR section 6627 to add subsection (b)(8) to allow optional reporting of active ingredient information, including common name of each active ingredient listed on the product label, the percentage by weight of each active ingredients and the amount of each active ingredient, for each pesticide product to be reported.
- Amend the associated MSPUR form to add optional information fields and associated instructions for "Optional Active Ingredients Detail — Link to Product Entries," including common name of each active ingredient listed on the product label, the percentage by weight of each active ingredients, and the amount of each active ingredient.

As the petitioner acknowledges, the amount of active ingredient applied can be determined under the existing MSPUR form and regulation text. Applicators currently report the pesticide product registration number on the MSPUR form and pursuant to 3 CCR section 6627. When PUR data are received by DPR, the product registration number is linked to DPR's pesticide product registration database, which contains the product's active ingredient composition, including the percent by weight of each active ingredient and inert ingredient. Using this information, DPR calculates the amount of active ingredient applied. The amount of active ingredient applied is readily available to the public in the Annual PUR reports, via the California Pesticide Information Portal (CalPIP), and via a Public Records Act request. Therefore, the proposed change to provide the option of additionally reporting active ingredient amounts would be redundant and is not operationally necessary.

The requested changes to add optional information fields also do not require a rulemaking. They do not fall within the definition of a regulation outlined in Government Code section 11342.600 because optional information fields are not generally applicable or enforceable. The requested changes do not materially alter any requirement, right, responsibility, condition, prescription or other regulatory element of any CCR provision and are exempt from the rulemaking procedure specified in article 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act pursuant to 1 CCR section 100. The petition acknowledges that the requested changes to the MSPUR form can be made without a regulation

change. DPR concludes that the petitioner does not demonstrate a need for a rulemaking action because the requested amendments are to add to optional information fields to the MSPUR that will not be generally applicable, have the force and effect of law and do not materially alter any requirement, right, responsibility, condition, prescription or other regulatory element.

For these reasons and because no evidence of operational need or legal concern is provided in the petition in support of the request to amend 3 CCR section 6627, 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 PUBLIC HEALTH

30 DAY RESPONSE TO PETITIONER
AB 64 AND THE EXCLUSION OF Ł AND ł
FROM CALIFORNIA VITAL RECORDS

October 20, 2026
VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL
Attention: Dr. Lucjan Złotnicki
l.zlotnicki@consultous.com

RE: Response to Petition AB 64 and the categorical exclusion of Ł and I from California vital records

Dear Dr. Lucjan Złotnicki:

On September 21, 2026, the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) received your petition for rulemaking under Government Code section 11340.6. Pursuant to Government Code section 11340.7, CDPH denies this petition. The bases for denial are set forth below.

The petition proposes that CDPH withdraw its exclusion of Latin letters with a diacritical stroke that crosses the base character from California vital records, repeal any related criteria or guidance that disallow such characters, and amend CDPH's diacritical–mark list to expressly include these letters. The petition further requests that CDPH initiate formal rulemaking or, alternatively, revise the list under Health and Safety Code section 102134(c).

CDPH maintains that AB 64, codified at Health and Safety Code section 102134(c), explicitly authorizes the State Registrar to develop a list of acceptable diacritical marks "through all–county letters or similar instructions … without taking further regulatory actions." In CDPH's view, the current list satisfies the statutory requirement, and CDPH's explanatory guidance is issued as part of, and in support of, that same list–compilation process.

With respect to the petition's request that CDPH "repeal" related criteria or guidance, CDPH clarifies that any explanatory guidance describing why a particular mark is or is not currently included reflects CDPH's application of section 102134(c)'s list–compilation authority to the specific marks evaluated to date. Such guidance is not a freestanding rule of general application separate from the list itself, and our evaluation of any given mark, including Ł and I, remains subject to revision through the all–county–letter process as circumstances, technical capability, and further review warrant. Because the statute exempts the list from the Administrative Procedure Act process, CDPH determined that no formal rulemaking petition is necessary or appropriate under Government Code chapter 3.5. Accordingly, the petition under Government Code section 11340.6 is unnecessary and is therefore denied.

The Department has not included the Ł and ł because the stroke mark intersects the base letter and may obscure the underlying English letter "L" such that it is no longer recognizable or understood as the underlying English character. If the Department were to include the letters Ł and ł, such marks could result in inconsistency as the amendment registration of diacritical marks is a manual process and the Department commonly receives handwritten applications. Inclusion of Ł and ł would present operational challenges under current procedures, potentially resulting in repeated amendments to the certificate as there is a higher likelihood of error due to the obfuscation of the underlying English character.

Although the petition is denied for the reasons stated above, CDPH remains committed to open communication with stakeholders regarding implementation of AB 64 and the diacritical–mark guidance developed under Health and Safety Code section 102134(c). CDPH is willing to schedule an informal stakeholder engagement meeting to discuss your concerns and to provide an opportunity for further clarification regarding its current practices. If you would like to arrange a meeting, please advise of your availability, and CDPH will coordinate a suitable time.

If you have any questions, please reach me at Keith.VanWagner@cdph.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,
/s/
Keith Van Wagner
Assistant Chief Counsel
Office of Legal Services

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

30 DAY RESPONSE TO PETITIONER
AB 64 AND THE EXCLUSION OF Ł AND ł
FROM CALIFORNIA VITAL RECORDS

November 3, 2026
VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL
Attention: Dr. Lucjan Złotnicki
l.zlotnicki@consultous.com
RE: Response to Petition Reconsideration Request for AB 64 and the categorical exclusion of Ł and ł from California vital records

Dear Dr. Lucjan Złotnicki:

On October 20, 2026, the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) received your reconsideration request under Government Code section 11340.7(c).

CDPH has accepted your reconsideration request and pursuant to section 11340.7(a), CDPH has set a virtual hearing for your petition reconsideration on January 18, 2027, from 10:00 a.m.–11:00 a.m..

CDPH is confirming the petition denial letter has been submitted to the Office of Administrative Law for publishing in the Notice Register on November 13, 2026.

Please use the following information to attend the virtual hearing on January 18, 2027:

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join: https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/290618326544079 4?p=vykZ8F6pF5a4Pvkpv0
Meeting ID: 290 618 326 544 079 4
Passcode: c8NK2XL9

Dial in by phone

+1 (916) 306–8051, 851771853# United States, Sacramento
Find a local number
Phone conference ID: 851 771 853#

If you have any questions, please reach me at Keith.VanWagner@cdph.ca.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,
/s/
Keith Van Wagner
Assistant Chief Counsel
Office of Legal Services

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.

Occupational Safety and Health (Cal–OSHA) Division
File # 2026–1022–01
Pressure Vessel Fees

In this emergency file and print action pursuant to Labor Code section 7721, subdivision (e), the Occupational Safety and Health (Cal–OSHA) Division increases fees for boiler and tank permits and inspections.

Title 08
Amend: 344, 344.1, 344.2
Filed 11/02/2026
Effective 11/02/2026
Agency Contact: J. Steve Barnett (619) 358–1785

Department of Financial Protection and Innovation
File # 2026–0922–02
Update to Regulations Referencing the Recodified Public Records Act

This nonsubstantive action by the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation ("Department") amends: citations to the California Public Records Act ("PRA"), which was recodified by the Legislature in 2021; references to the "Department of Business Oversight," which was the former name of the Department prior to the statutory name change in September 2020; and the Department's contact telephone number, which has been updated to reflect an active line that the public and stakeholders can contact the Department through.

Title 10
Amend: 102.203, 250.10, 280.153, 1422.5.1, 1950.122.2
Filed 11/03/2026
Agency Contact:
Jackeline Sanchez (916) 628–9158

Department of Financial Protection and Innovation
File # 2026–0922–05
Citation Update and Heading Spelling Correction

In this action pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 1, section 100, the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation updates a cross reference pursuant changes made in Statutes of 2011, Chapter 243 (S.B. 644).

Title 10
Amend: 10.123
Filed 11/02/2026
Agency Contact:
Jackeline Sanchez (916) 628–9158

Board of Behavioral Sciences
File # 2026–0917–02
Continuing Education; Exams; Renewals

This rulemaking action by the Board of Behavioral Sciences amends regulations regarding continuing education including incorporating registrants into the existing requirements. These changes are based on statutory changes made through Assembly Bill 1759 (Chapter 520, Statutes of 2022).

Title 16
Amend: 1822.51, 1829.2, 1877.2, , 1887, 1887.1, 1887.2, 1887.3, 1887.4.2, 1887.4.3, 1887.12
Filed 10/29/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Christy Berger (916) 574–7995

Board of Pilot Commissioners
File # 2026–0921–05
Pilot Trainee Training Program

In this rulemaking action the Board of Pilot Commissioners (BOPC) amends the Pilot Trainee Training Program to expand the period during which BOPC may dismiss a pilot trainee without cause from one year to eighteen months and adds a tolling provision for absences for purposes of calculating the eighteen–month training period. BOPC also replaces gendered pronouns with gender–neutral language.

Title 07
Amend: 214
Filed 10/29/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact:
Allen Garfinkle (415) 397–2253

Department of Food and Agriculture
File # 2026–0925–02
Plants That Are Pests

In this rulemaking action, the Department of Food and Agriculture amends a regulation to include all plants rated A or B pursuant to 3 California Code of Regulations § 3162 as plant pests.

Title 03
Amend: 3060.3
Filed 11/03/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Rachel Avila (916) 698–2947

Department of Public Health

File # 2026–0922–04

Department Examinations for Licensure

This Department of Public Health rulemaking action repeals regulations governing the licensing examination of bioanalysts, clinical chemists, clinical microbiologists, clinical toxicologists, clinical cytogeneticists, clinical genetic molecular biologists, oral pathology laboratory directors, histocompatibility laboratory directors, and other clinical laboratory master's or doctoral degree specialist categories established by the Department. The repeal removes the requirement that the Department select a panel to conduct the in–person examination that includes Department staff and clinical laboratory bioanalysts or clinical laboratory master's or doctoral degree specialists not employed by the Department who are licensed under Business and Professions Code Div. 2, Chapter 3.

Title 17
Amend: 1034
Filed 11/03/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact:
Jasmine Fullwood (279) 217–0681

Department of Toxic Substances Control

File # 2026–0923–01

Adding Certain Acids and Bases to the Candidate Chemicals List

This rulemaking action by the Department of Toxic Substances Control ("Department") amends the Safer Consumer Products regulations to add twelve (12) acids and bases to the Candidate Chemicals List based on finding that there is potential for exposure to these chemicals from consumer products and that these exposures may contribute to or cause significant or widespread adverse impact to both humans and environmental organisms.

Title 22
Amend: 69502.2
Filed 11/03/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Ellia La (916) 302–0360

Employment Development Department
File # 2026–0922–07
Foster Child Bonding

In this regular rulemaking action, the Employment Development Department (EDD) amends the requirements that claimants must complete on EDD's Family Temporary Disability Insurance claim form when taking time off to bond with a foster child.

Title 22
Amend: 2706–1, 2706–2, 2708(c)–1, and 3267–1
Filed 11/02/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Victor Lao (916) 890–5269

Fish and Game Commission
File # 2026–0917–06
Sport Fishing 2026 (Inland and Marine)

This rulemaking action by the Fish and Game Commission revises inland and marine sportfishing requirements to increase angler opportunities, to protect vulnerable fish populations, change gear requirements, fish measurement and sampling protocols, steelhead report card requirements, low–flow requirements, and to make clarifying, organizational, and nonsubstantive changes.

Title 14
Amend: 1.62, 1.73, 1.74, 2.10, 4.20, 5.00, 5.65, 5.85, 5.88, 6.34, 6.35, 7.00, 7.40, 7.50, 8.00, 8.10, 28.25, 28.30, 28.32, 28.35, 230, 701
Repeal: 2.11
Filed 10/29/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: David Haug (916) 902–9286

Department of Food and Agriculture
File # 2026–0925–01
Insects Which May Be Imported

In this rulemaking action, the California Department of Food and Agriculture (DFA) amends the list of insects that may be imported or shipped into or within California without a permit. This action further amends the list to include insects that have been previously released under state permit in California for biological control of insect, weed, or other types of pests and insects native to California for which a permit has been issued for unrestricted movement and use in California.

Title 03
Amend: 3558
Filed 10/29/2026
Effective 01/01/2027
Agency Contact: Rachel Avila (916) 698–2947

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.