

CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
May 6, 2026

Wednesday, May 6, 2026

Agenda Item 1. Call to Order

Chair Nick Maduros called the meeting of the California Building Standards Commission (CBSC) to order at 10:00 a.m. This meeting was held in-person at the meeting location listed below and remotely through Zoom and teleconference.

Meeting Location:

Office of California Cradle-to-Career
400 R Street, First Floor, Suite 140
Sacramento, CA 95811

Pursuant to [Senate Bill 470](#) (Chapter 222, Statutes of 2025), effective January 1, 2026, this meeting has a physical location where the majority of the commissioners are present, the public is able to be present in-person and also have the ability to participate via Zoom.

Roll Call: Roll was called by Pamela Maeda; a quorum was established.

Commissioners present: Secretary Nick Maduros, Frank Ramirez, Elley Klausbruckner, Laura Rambin, Peter Santillan (remote), Aaron Stockwell, and James Haskin.

Commissioners Absent: Raj Patel, Kent Sasaki, Oliva Mae Asuncion, and Janice Cheung-Powell

Chair Maduros led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Deputy Executive Director Kevin Day provided teleconference and venue instructions.

Agenda Item 2. Comments from the public on issues not on this agenda

Comments and questions from the commissioners: None

Public comment:

Judi Schweitzer, a member of the CBSCs Green Building Code Advisory Committee and the United States Green Building Council (USGBC), noted typos and errors in the proposed CALGreen language related to stormwater and renewable energy.

Agenda Item 3. Review and approval of meeting minutes

a. January 14, 2026

Comments from the commissioners:

Commissioner Rambin noted her last name was misspelled.

There were no public comments.

Motion: Chair Maduros entertained a motion to consider the approval of the January 14, 2026, meeting minutes. Commissioner Rambin moved to approve as amended, with the correction of her last name; Commissioner Haskin seconded. Motion carried 5 yes, and 1 abstain.

Agenda Item 4. Commission Business**a. Personnel**

CBSC Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov recognized Cynthia Biederman for 21 years of state service upon retirement.

b. Commissioner re-appointments

Chair Maduros announced that Governor Gavin Newsom reappointed Kent Sasaki and appointed Janice Cheung-Powell and Olivia Mae Asuncion to four-year terms in March 2026. Commissioner Sasaki, Commissioner Cheung-Powell, and Commissioner Asuncion were unable to attend this meeting due to prior professional commitments.

c. Appointing new members of the Appeals Committee**d. Appointing new members of the Code Adoption Committee**

Due to Commissioner Cheung-Powell, and Commissioner Asuncion absences, appointments were tabled to the next meeting to allow them more time for onboarding.

e. Discuss new procedures related to future code adoption cycles

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov reviewed the January 2026 decision to hold a dedicated meeting to discuss the intervening proposals submitted for the 45-day public comment period. During the January commission meeting it was also suggested that this additional meeting for the 45-day proposals become a standard practice to streamline the approval process.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioners Haskin, Klausbruckner, and Ramirez were in support of the additional opportunity to discuss the 45-day proposals and provide feedback.

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked if this process does not work out at this meeting, could this decision be re-evaluated.

Chair Maduros said that the process could be re-evaluated as needed, but this would be discussed at a future meeting.

Public Comments:

Bob Raymer, representing California Building Industry Association (CBIA), Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA), California Business Properties Association (CBPA) and California Apartment Association (CAA), strongly supported the inclusion of a Commission meeting to discuss the code changes posted for the 45-day public comment period.

Dara Schur, representing Disability Rights California (DRC), asked for clarification on the process, specifically, whether the commission would make decisions during these meetings.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov clarified that there will not be any vote for the 45-day agency proposals.

Mitchel Baker with California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) asked for clarification on how the State Agencies are expected to present and respond to questions during these meetings.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov stated that the expectation for agencies is to attend the meetings and answer questions, as needed. The agencies did not need to present the entire 45-day submittal.

Motion: Chair Maduros entertained a motion to consider new procedures related to future code adoption cycles. Commissioner Haskin moved; Commissioner Ramirez seconded. Motion carried 6 yes, 4 absent.

Agenda Item 5. Office of State Fire Marshal (SFM EF 01-25) Readoption of an emergency building standard pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.1(h): 2025 California Wildland Urban Interface Code (WUI), California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 7.

Deputy Executive Director Kevin Day provided background on the emergency readoption under Government Code Section 11346.1(h) and clarified the procedure. He specified that SFM has demonstrated substantial progress in the 2025 WUI Code rulemaking.

Chief Crystal Sujeski of Code Development and Analysis with SFM summarized the emergency and the need for readoption.

Commissioner Comments: None

Public Comments:

Bob Raymer, representing California Building Industry Association (CBIA), Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA), California Business Properties Association (CBPA) and California Apartment Association (CAA), strongly supported the emergency rulemaking that had some corrections that needed to reflect the existing laws.

Motion: Chair Maduros entertained a motion to consider the Readoption of an emergency building standard pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.1(h) Commissioner Rambin moved; Commissioner Klausbruckner seconded. Motion carried 6 yes, 4 absent.

Agenda Item 6. Review and discuss the 45-day state agency proposals for the 2025 Intervening Code Adoption Cycle.

a. Procedures and general discussion

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov provided an overview of the procedure and clarified that the Commission will not take any vote or action. He also specified that the public could provide comments and ask questions, but that the comments/questions discussed at this meeting would not be included in the 45-day rulemaking record.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked if there could be a discussion of AB 130 before discussing the rulemaking proposals.

Commissioner Ramirez asked if each item can be discussed regarding AB 130.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov stated that simple questions could be answered during the meeting, but for more complicated questions legal council may need additional time to prepare a response for the commission.

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked if the 6-year moratorium in AB 130 was specifically related to cost of construction.

Chair Nick Maduros responded there are specific exceptions allowed; changes are precluded during the moratorium unless they meet one of the exceptions.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov clarified that the 6-year moratorium is for residential construction, but the restrictions for the intervening code adoption cycle have no sunset date and they apply to everything, not only residential construction.

Public Comments:

Enrique Huerta, Senior Director of Policy and Legislation with Climate Resolve, asked if the building moratorium during the intervening code adoption cycle would conduct an intersectional analysis of how extreme heat, wind, and drought affect building conditions in the WUI.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov summarized the effect of AB 130 and clarified that no changes to Title 24 could be proposed except those that meet the exceptions provided in the bill.

Laura Walsh, Policy Manager with Save The Bay, asked how the emergency exception of AB 130 could be interpreted, and if cities could use this exception to respond to emergency situations such as FEMA flood map and conditions.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov noted that Agenda item 6 was to review the intervening cycle rulemaking proposals and not related to local amendments.

b. Office of Statewide Hospital Planning and Development (OSHDP) – HF & GREEN/PEME

- OSHDP 01/25 California Administrative Code, Part 1
- OSHDP 02/25 California Building Code, Part 2, Volume 1
- OSHDP 04/25 California Electrical Code, Part 3
- OSHDP 05/25 California Mechanical Code, Part 4
- OSHDP 06/25 California Plumbing Code, Part 5

Eric Jacobsen Supervisor of Building Standards Unit with OSHDP, presented an overview of the OSHDP proposals. He noted that the proposals were largely non-substantive.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Stockwell and Commissioner Ramirez asked if the agencies would present a summary of the proposals.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov stated that agencies were told not to prepare a presentation.

Commissioner Rambin supported that agencies provide an intro for their proposals.

Several Commissioners asked the OSHDP proposals were AB 130 compliant.

Eric Jacobsen stated that OSHDP responded to all CAC comments, including regarding AB 130. He insisted that all OSHDP proposals are administrative in nature.

Commissioner Haskin outlined the six exceptions under AB130 and raised a concern that except for the State Fire Marshal amendments in the WUI Code, most code amendments seem substantive and may not fit the listed exceptions.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov stated that CBSC staff evaluated the agency proposals and have provided feedback related to AB 130 to all agencies He also noted that for the last Commission meeting, the CBSC staff would provide Commissioners with the Staff reports, which will include all unaddressed AB130 issues.

Public Comments:

Christopher Ruch with Sheet Metal Workers, Local 104, submitted written comments on OSHDP 05/25, Section 407.3.1. He noted that the technician performing the service

may not be certified and recommended adding a requirement to ensure technicians are certified to perform the work.

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked whether the proposal could be considered non-substantive.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov stated that CBSC staff would work to provide as much information as possible to support the Commission's decisions related to AB 130 compliance.

Eric Jacobsen responded that the amendment is simply a reference to an existing code section and does not add anything to the existing requirements.

Bill Zelmer Program Manager, Physical Access and Regulatory Affairs with Sutter Health, stated that the CAC reviewed the proposals with the understanding that substantive changes would alter the requirements, but would allow for clarifications in the language that did not change the existing requirements.

c. Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) – GREEN/PEME

- HCD 01/25 California Green Building Standards Code, Part 11

Mitchel Baker, Assistant Deputy Director with HCD, provided an overview of the proposal, all approved by the CAC.

Commissioner and Public Comments:

Bob Raymer, representing California Building Industry Association (CBIA), Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA), California Business Properties Association (CBPA) and California Apartment Association (CAA), supported this proposal and stated that the GREEN/PEME CAC reviewed the proposals and the changes.

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked if a voluntary measure that can be adopted by a local jurisdiction would be considered a substantive change.

Chair Nick Maduros answered that he understood the intent to AB 130 is to prevent the codes from changing, and that the substantive changes would not comply unless they met one of the exceptions.

Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov stated that the CBSC staff understood similarly that any substantive changes did not comply with AB 130 unless that change met one of the exceptions.

d. California Building Standards Commission (BSC) – GREEN/PEME

- BSC 03/25 California Green Building Standards Code, Part 11

Tim Freeman, Associate Architect with BSC, presented an overview of the proposal. He confirmed that written public comments related to errors previously discussed in this meeting have been submitted for review and any necessary changes.

Commissioner and Public Comments:

Bob Raymer, speaking on behalf of the California Building Industry Association (CBIA), Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA), California Business Properties Association (CBPA), and California Apartment Association (CAA), expressed support for the Part 11 proposals. He stated that many of the proposed amendments reviewed by the Green/PEME CAC were withdrawn from the rulemaking package in order to make the rulemaking package compliant with AB 130, and that the CAC's intent is for the proposals which were removed to be addressed during the next Triennial Code Adoption Cycle.

Commissioner Haskin observed that the proposed changes seem to be administrative in nature. Additionally, he pointed out a possible error regarding a reference to section 4.106.4.5, noting that this section does not exist and the last subsection is listed as 4.106.4.4.

e. Division of the State Architect (DSA-SS) – GREEN/PEME

- DSA-SS 04/25 California Green Building Standards Code, Part 11

Eric Driever, Principal Architect with DSA, presented an overview of the proposal.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked if the proposal applied to additions and alterations. She also raised a concern that some of the proposed changes related to additions and alterations may be substantive.

Eric Driever responded requesting the specific sections of the proposal that Commissioner Klausbruckner referred to and asked if an email could be sent to DSA through the BSC staff with that information.

Public Comments: None

f. Office of the State Fire Marshal (SFM) – GREEN/PEME & BFO/SDLF

- SFM 02/25 California Mechanical Code, Part 4
- SFM 04/25 California Wildland-Urban Interface Code, Part 7
- SFM 01/25 California Building Code, Part 2
- SFM 03/25 California Fire Code, Part 9

Chief Crystal Sujeski provided an overview of the proposed changes.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Klausbruckner requested clarification regarding the classification of toxic chemicals. She highlighted that the proposed changes to the Global Harmonized System (GHS), specifically the classification of methanol as a toxic substandard, would have considerable implications for construction practices. Commissioner Klausbruckner emphasized the importance of incorporating these changes into the relevant standards and suggested that an informational bulletin could be issued to facilitate this process.

Chief Crystal Sujeski from the State Fire Marshal (SFM) explained that the proposed revisions are meant to clarify existing standards. She stated that the intent is to integrate the standards found in Appendix E—which are currently not adopted—into the official definitions to address confusion concerning hazardous materials.

Chair Nick Maduros expressed uncertainty about whether aligning the code with other standards would meet the exception criteria outlined in AB 130.

Commissioner Haskin raised concerns regarding the proposed changes related to flammable refrigerants, questioning whether these modifications would satisfy the requirements of AB 130. He suggested that the changes might need to be classified as an emergency to secure approval. While Commissioner Haskin agreed on the necessity of the change, he cautioned that it may not be considered non-substantive for compliance with AB 130.

Public Comments:

Loren Ross, Code Compliance Engineer with ARCLIN, provided comments regarding SFM Item 4-2. He suggested that the language concerning coatings and surface treatments be revised to ensure it does not restrict the use of products with stringent quality control procedures that are not exposed to exterior weathering.

Greg Andersen, representing IBHS and serving as a member of the CWUI workgroup, commented on SFM Item 4-8. He requested changes related to coatings and proposed that further corrections be made during a 15-day public comment period.

Bob Raymer, representing California Building Industry Association (CBIA), Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA), California Business Properties Association (CBPA), and California Apartment Association (CAA), expressed support for the proposals. He noted that Part 7 includes an exception in AB 130 for WUI standards.

Addressing the ASHRAE mechanical code proposal, Bob Raymer explained that during the CAC meetings, SFM legal counsel confirmed that the SFM proposals comply with AB 130. He stated the proposed change is permissible as a technical update under exception 2(a) of AB 130 and could also be considered an emergency change, making it compliant with AB 130.

Bob Raymer stated that AB 209 (2022) mandates that CBSC adopt the latest version of ASHRAE 15 refrigerant safety standards, which aligns with the actions being taken.

Deputy Executive Director Kevin Day Summarized AB 130 guidance which CBSC staff provided to the CAC and Commission.

Larry Williams, Retired Assistant Fire Marshal, with California Code Professionals, reported submitting a comment letter requesting clarification on the application of Local Responsibility Areas with "High" hazard severity zones.

Jay Peters, representing Codes and Standards International, voiced support for the proposed changes.

Justin Gibson with Chula Vista Fire Department also expressed support for the proposals. He submitted a comment letter along with Kevin Reinertson's comments requesting clarification regarding the application of the proposals.

Deputy Executive Director Kevin Day concluded by summarizing the written comments submitted by the individuals who presented at the meeting.

Chair Nick Maduros announced that the ACCESS proposals will be heard at 1:00pm.

A Lunch Break was scheduled at 12:15 pm.

The ACCESS proposals were addressed out of order for HCD and DSA due to the start time of ASL at 1:00 pm.

g. California Building Standards Commission (BSC) – BFO/SDLF

- BSC 01/25 California Administrative Code, Part 1
- BSC 02/25 California Existing Building Code, Part 10

Carol Hagler, Code Specialist with BSC, provided an overview of the proposed changes for Part 1.

Woo Cheong, Associate Architect, provided an overview of the proposed changes for Part 10.

Commissioner and Public Comments: None

h. Office of Statewide Hospital Planning and Development (OSHDP) – BFO/SDLF

- OSHPD 03/25 California Building Code, Part 2, Volume 2
- OSHPD 07/25 California Existing Building Code, Part 10

Eric Jacobsen with OSHPD provided an overview of the proposals.

Commissioner and Public Comments: None

i. Division of the State Architect – Structural Safety (DSA-SS) – BFO/SDLF

- DSA-SS 01/25 California Administrative Code, Part 1
- DSA-SS 02/25 California Building Code, Part 2

- DSA-SS 03/25 California Existing Building Code, Part 10

Diane Gould, Principal Structural Engineer with DSA, provided an overview of the proposals.

Commissioner and Public Comments: None

j. Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD-1AC) – ACCESS

- HCD 01/25 California Building Code, Part 2; California Electrical Code, Part 3; California Mechanical Code, Part 4; California Plumbing Code, Part 5

The ACCESS proposals were addressed out of order for HCD and DSA due to the start time of ASL at 1:00 pm.

Assistant Deputy Director, Mitchel Baker with California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) provided an overview of the proposals.

Commissioner Comments: None

Public Comments:

Dara Schur, representing Disability Rights California (DRC), opposed certain changes and sent in written comments for this meeting.

k. Division of the State Architect – Access Compliance (DSA-AC) – ACCESS

- DSA-AC California Building Code, Part 2, Chapters 2, 11B, and 35

Eric Driever, Principal Architect with DSA, presented the access proposal. He noted comments received during the CAC meeting led to significant modifications to the 45-day submittal. This is in alignment with the California Health and Safety Code Section 18942.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked if DSA had reviewed the letter submitted by CALBO with their comments and objections. She also asked DSA to clarify why their proposal is not considered a substantive change, and why there is a confusion between CALBO's perspective and DSA's perspective.

Eric Driever explained that some of the changes are substantive, but they comply with the AB 130 exception for changes which conform with the changes to federal standards.

He added that some of the 45-day changes may address some of the concerns raised by CALBO.

Chair Nick Maduros asked how DSA will address the recommendations for disapproval and/or further study at the CAC ACCESS meeting.

Eric Driever stated that DSA appreciated the recommendations but disagreed and made changes based on the California Health and Safety Code Section 18942.

Commissioner Haskin asked why some of the proposals that were disapproved or sent for further study by the CAC ACCESS Committee were carried forward by DSA in disagreement with the CAC recommendations.

Eric Driever responded that CAC comments were considered and, in some cases, followed. However, DSA believed the revised proposal was in compliance with AB 130.

Commissioner Rambin commented and stated her appreciation for DSA's efforts.

Public Comments:

Sue Moe, Architect, CASp with ACCESS Compliance Consulting stated that she was on the CALBO ACCESS committee and had reviewed the documents. She noted that CALBO's comment letter expressed concern that the proposed changes did not include all the scoping requirements pertaining to the number of units which are included in HUD 504, and had different replacement cost requirements for determining alterations than those under the HUD 504 regulations.

Dara Schur, representing Disability Rights California (DRC), supported the proposal and followed up on the written comments. She stated that the proposal complies with the law, expressed disagreement with CALBO's criticism, and strongly disagreed that the changes are not compliant with AB 130 restrictions.

Deputy Executive Director Kevin Day summarized a written comment received from Danile Miller expressing concerns regarding AB 130 compliance, DSA's authority, and the CAC ACCESS Committee's recommendations.

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked for clarification on why federal standards needed to be incorporated into the code, given that federal laws already apply.

Chair Nick Maduros stated that it may not be mandatory for all federal laws to be incorporated into the building standards.

Eric Driever stated that there is California Statute mandating compliance with minimum federal law. DSA is now seeking to comply with the 2014 HUD deeming notice and has been out of compliance with this notice until now.

Kendra Muller commented that California regulations are generally more restrictive than federal law.

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked if federal law needed to be duplicated in state regulations if it already applies.

Eric Driever responded that incorporating the federal law into the building code make the requirements of the law enforceable by DSA and local building departments.

Sue Moe questioned whether it is feasible to incorporate all federal standards into state regulations, given the number of different federal agencies that exist and provide funding to state entities.

Chair Nick Maduros asked whether the concern raised regarding the proposed scoping requirements was valid and whether other states similarly adopt federal requirements into their state laws.

Eric Driever stated that some proposals did need to be revised to better interpret federal law.

Michelle Davis, Supervising Architect with DSA, indicated that other states do not incorporate the federal standards into state regulations. She stated that the proposed standards include the requirements in the HUD Deeming Notice and were not the requirements included in UFAS.

Agenda Item 6. Future Agenda Items

Commissioners Rambin, Haskin, and Ramirez requested additional clarification and resources regarding AB 130, noting that its language is subject to interpretation. Executive Director Stoyan Bumbalov responded that the relevant guidance is available in the Commissioners' E-binder. Commission Counsel Viana Barbu added that AB 130 lacks clarity and must be applied on a case-by-case basis.

Agenda Item 7. Adjourn

Motion: Chair Maduros entertained a motion to adjourn; Commissioner Klausbruckner moved to approve; Commissioner Rambin seconded. Motion carried 6 yes, 4 absent.

Chair Maduros adjourned the meeting at 2:10 pm.