

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS
TITLE 27, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS**

**AMENDMENT TO SECTION 25903
NOTICES OF VIOLATION**

**SAFE DRINKING WATER AND TOXIC ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1986
PROPOSITION 65**

UPDATE OF INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

No update of the Initial Statement of Reasons is necessary, since no changes to the regulation were made.

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENT RECEIVED DURING THE INITIAL NOTICE PERIOD OF SEPTEMBER 2, 2011 THROUGH OCTOBER 18, 2011.

COMMENT: William Verick stated that he will not take advantage of the electronic notice regulation because it is too burdensome to check the websites of all 58 district attorneys to see if they accept service or not. He also stated that it would be more useful if the Attorney General's website would provide a list of District Attorneys and a portal through which private enforcers could send one notice and have it automatically e-mailed to all relevant other public enforcers.

RESPONSE: The Attorney General's website already lists the District Attorneys who accept electronic notice and provides their e-mail addresses. This can be found at <http://ag.ca.gov/prop65/contacts.php>. A portal on the AG's website where enforcers could send one notice and have it automatically e-mailed to all relevant public enforcers is not currently possible due to budget constraints.

ALTERNATIVES DETERMINATION

In accordance with Government Code, section 11346.9(a)(7), OEHHA has considered available alternatives to determine whether any feasible alternative would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulations were proposed. OEHHA has also considered whether a feasible alternative existed that would be as effective as and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action. OEHHA has determined that no feasible alternative considered would be more effective, or as effective and less burdensome to affected persons, than the proposed regulatory amendments.

LOCAL MANDATE DETERMINATION

OEHHA has determined this regulatory action will not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts nor does it require reimbursement by the State pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code. OEHHA has also determined that no nondiscretionary costs or savings to local agencies or school districts will result from this regulatory action. It should be noted that all state and local government agencies are expressly exempt from Proposition 65. Thus, this regulatory amendment will not impose any mandate on local agencies or school districts.