

CALIFORNIA APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL

CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 8

CHAPTER 2, SUBCHAPTER 1,

SECTIONS 201, 201.1, 206, 212, 212.3, 212.4, 214, 214.1, 214.2, 214.3, 214.4, and 215

FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

UPDATE OF INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

As authorized by Government Code section 11346.9(d), the California Apprenticeship Council ("Council") incorporates the Initial Statement of Reasons prepared in this rulemaking. The following are the changes made to the proposed text of the Regulations as issued at the start of this rulemaking and no changes in the basis or rationale for the proposal.

201(b) Deleted text 180 restored and 300 noted as changed.

206(a)(2) Restored text "... For programs in the building and construction trades industry, the agreement shall be submitted to DAS in an acceptable electronic format, and a signed original of the agreement shall be retained by the program for at least three years following the completion or cancellation of the agreement." to conform to current regulation text.

206(b)(1) Restored text and subsections (A) and (B) "... For programs in the building and construction trades industry, the agreement shall be submitted to DAS in an acceptable electronic format, and a signed original of the agreement shall be retained by the program for at least three years following the completion or cancellation of the agreement.
(B) The agreement ..." to conform to current regulation text.

206(b)(2) Deleted proposed text ... "A copy of the approved agreement shall be filed with the CAC for its review." to conform to current regulation text.

212(a)(6) Replaced "journeymen" with "journeyworkers" to conform to current regulation text.

212(b)(7) Restored text "current address," to conform to current regulation text.

212.3 Edited the title to include the hyphenated "Self-Evaluation"

212.3(e)(1) Changed "Chief DAS" to "DAS Chief" to conform to current regulation text.

212.4(b) Removed ", except that deregistration proceedings for violation of equal opportunity requirements shall be processed in accordance with Section 215:" as the existing Section 215 requires apprenticeship programs to comply with the CalPlan adopted in 1986, considered an appendix to Section 215. Reference to the CalPlan is deleted from the amended text because the CalPlan has been rendered obsolete since its last update.

212.4 – Authority and Reference note, updated Sections to Sections and added “3081” to Authority to conform to current regulation Authority Note and removed “3073.1, 2074, 3074.3” and added “3081,3082, 3083” to the Reference note to conform to current regulation Reference Note.

215 – Noted the new title with underline.

215 – Authority and Reference note, “3075.1 and 3076” were replaced with 3076-3078, and 3080-3084 and 3096, to the Reference note to conform to current regulation Reference Note and section 3096 was removed as it was repealed in 1981.

215(c) Renumber section 215(c) to use numbers (1)-(4) instead of letters for current proposed subsections (A)-(D).

Updated the Initial Statement of Reasons on p. 6, to reflect that FEHA’s protected characteristics are broader than those in Labor Code section 3073.9(a) and removed statement that they are identical.

DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON

None.

LOCAL MANDATES DETERMINATION

The proposal does not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts.

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The Council held public hearings on June 19 in Oakland and June 21 in Los Angeles and received no comments, either written or oral, on the proposal.

ALTERNATIVES THAT WOULD LESSEN ECONOMIC IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS

No alternatives were proposed to the Council that would lessen any adverse economic impact on small business.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Council invited interested persons to present statements or arguments with respect to alternatives to the proposed standard. No alternative considered by the Council would be (1) more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed; or (2) would be as effective as and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted action, or (3) would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing

the statutory policy or other provision of law. The Council was unable to come up with any alternatives or no alternatives were proposed by the public that would have the same desired regulatory effect.