

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY  
AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD**

2520 Venture Oaks, Suite 350  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
(916) 274-5721  
FAX (916) 274-5743  
[www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb](http://www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb)

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS**

## CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS

Sections 1598 and 1599 of the Construction Safety Orders

**Update of Reference to California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets  
and Highways (CA MUTCD)****MODIFICATIONS AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RESULTING FROM  
THE 45-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There are no modifications to the information contained in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

**SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO WRITTEN AND ORAL COMMENTS:**I. Written Comments

Mr. David Shiraishi, Area Director, Region IX, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, by letter dated February 19, 2014.

Comment:

Mr. Shiraishi commented that Federal OSHA has reviewed the proposal and found it to be commensurate with federal standards.

Response:

The Board thanks Mr. Shiraishi for his comments and participation in the Board's rulemaking process.

II. Oral Comments

Oral comments received at the February 20, 2014, Public Hearing in Sacramento, California.

There were no oral comments received from the regulated public at the February 20, 2014 Public Hearing in Sacramento, California.

Mr. Bill Jackson, Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board Member.

Comment:

Mr. Jackson stated that one of the documents relied upon for this rulemaking is a list of significant changes that came from CalTrans. He said that he would like to know what those changes are.

Response:

A list of significant changes in the CA MUTCD, 2012 edition is available in the rulemaking binder for review (it is listed as a Document Relied Upon in the Initial Statement of Reasons), and copies of the document will be provided to the Board before the Board votes on this proposal.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS RELIED UPON

None.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

None.

DETERMINATION OF MANDATE

These regulations do not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts as indicated in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board invited interested persons to present statements or arguments with respect to alternatives to the proposed regulation. No alternative considered by the Board 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 adopted action, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provision of law. Board staff were unable to come up with any alternatives/no alternatives were proposed by the public that would have the same desired regulatory effect.