

BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

July 17, 2018

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Batjer called the meeting to order at approximately 10:25 a.m., 400 R Street, First Floor Hearing Room, California Victim Compensation Board, Sacramento, California.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: Secretary Marybel Batjer, Chair
Larry Booth
Elley Klausbruckner
Erick Mikiten
Kent Sasaki
Steven Winkel
Raj Patel
Juvilyn Alegre

Commissioners Absent: Peter Santillan

Commissioner Klausbruckner led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Batjer gave the instructions regarding public comments and teleconferencing.

2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF APRIL 17, 2018 MEETING MINUTES

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

No questions or comments from the Commissioners.

MOTION: Chair Batjer entertained a motion to approve the April 17, 2018 meeting minutes. Commissioner Booth made a motion to approve, and it was seconded by Vice Chair Winkel. The vote was unanimous to accept the motion.

3. CLOSED SESSION: PENDING LITIGATION

Chair Batjer advised that today's agenda Item No. 3 is a closed session so that the Commission may confer or receive advice from the Office of the Attorney General. The teleconference line, YouTube video, and captioning will be muted during this time. When the Commission reaches Agenda Item 4, the YouTube captioning will resume and the teleconference line will be live. At this time, we ask that the members of the audience please step outside while the Commission conducts its closed session. Thank you.

Closed session.

A short recess was taken.

Open session resumed.

4. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES NOT ON THIS AGENDA

Chair Batjer advised that the Commission may receive public comments on matters not on the agenda. Matters raised may be briefly discussed by the Commission and/or placed on a subsequent agenda. No action may be taken by the Commission on items raised during this agenda item.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

There were no public comments at this time.

5. COMMISSION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair Batjer stated items 5a and 5b provide an opportunity for the Commission to add or remove members and appoint a chair for each standing committee. The Commission last selected and appointed members for its two standing committees on October 21, 2015. Each committee may be comprised of one to five commissioners and meets on an as needed basis.

a. Chair Batjer stated the Code Adoption Committee is comprised of commissioners Elley Klausbruckner, Peter Santillan, and Raj Patel. James Barthman, former commissioner, served as chair for the Code Adoption Committee, and due to his passing it is necessary for the Commission to select a chair for this committee. She stated this is also an opportunity for the commissioners to consider being a member of this committee. The purpose and responsibilities of the Code Adoption Committee are:

1. Identifying means of improving the code adoption process
2. Early participation in the model code process
3. Review and nominate members for the Code Advisory Committees

Chair Batjer asked if any other commissioners would like to serve on the Code Adoption Committee.

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

Vice Chair Winkel volunteered to serve on the committee.

Chair Batjer asked if there were any volunteers to chair the committee.

Commissioner Klausbruckner nominated Commissioner Patel.

Commissioner Patel agreed to be the chair of the Code Adoption Committee.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

No questions or comments from the Public.

MOTION: Chair Batjer entertained a motion to add Vice Chair Steven Winkel to the Code Adoption Committee and Commissioner Raj Patel as the chair of the Code Adoption Committee. Commissioner Sasaki made a motion to approve, and it was seconded by Commissioner Booth. The vote was unanimous to accept the motion.

b. Chair Batjer stated the Appeals Committee is comprised of commissioners Kent Sasaki, Steven Winkel, and Larry Booth. The purpose and responsibilities of this committee are to work with the Executive Director to determine the appropriate course to administer a valid appeal pursuant to the regulations in the California Administrative Code.

Chair Batjer asked whether any commissioners wish to be removed from the committee or wish to serve on the committee.

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

No questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

No questions or comments from the Public.

Chair Batjer confirmed there will be no changes to the Appeals Committee.

6. DIVISION OF THE STATE ARCHITECT REPORT

Chair Batjer advised that a representative of the Division of the State Architect will give an update on its collaboration outreach with the disability access community relative to the accessibility code creation.

Ida Clair, principal architect with the Division of the State Architect (DSA), shared details on their Access Code Collaborative (ACC). She stated in October of 2017, after a comprehensive survey, interview of stakeholders, and a detailed application process, DSA launched its Access Code Collaborative. ACC members were selected for service with the assistance of their partnering agencies, the Department of Rehabilitation and the California Commission on Disability Access.

She stated the Access Code Collaborative is comprised of 13 individuals from throughout the state who represent a cross-section of stakeholder groups and two ex-officio members, whose purpose is to ensure DSA is considering a wide range of views and perspectives in developing CBC [California Building Code] regulations addressing accessibility. The group consists of four individuals with disabilities. Note: their goal is to target four individuals that have distinct disabilities; two disability advocates; one design professional; two building facility owner representatives; two code enforcement representatives; one Certified Access Specialist; one building construction industry representative. The two ex-officio members are alternating DSA staff and a member from Housing and Community Development. The length of service of stakeholder representatives on the ACC is staggered initially to ensure overlap among members for continuity and institutional memory. After an initial term of either 18 months or 3 years, each representative will serve three-year terms.

She stated the ACC is facilitated by an independent facilitator, who works with ACC to develop the group charter. A planning committee comprised of three ACC members was established to work with the facilitator and DSA on scheduling, reporting, and group dynamics. The ACC kicked off in late October with a two-day training for members and invited guests. The training covered DSA's statutory authority for the accessibility regulations, the process for submitting proposals, the BSC rulemaking process, in addition to learning collaboration skills. Six meeting dates were established for the code

cycle; four have been completed and two are upcoming - one after their Code Advisory Committee meeting and one to wrap up the year and discuss how to improve moving forward.

She advised working meetings of ACC were not open to the public for public participation, but the public was able to listen in, in an effort to maintain transparency. Concurrently with ACC discussions, DSA conducted its required outreach to the public on the proposed accessibility amendments. These meetings were held in February and April 12th. Comments and feedback on the proposed amendments by the public were brought back to the ACC for further discussion.

She stated ACC has worked differently from other advisory groups that DSA has had in the past, which functioned similarly to BSC access code advisory committee. Purposefully, DSA decided not to use the term advisory group, but to use the term collaborative instead. While DSA is ultimately responsible for regulatory language and still maintains the authority to determine which regulations proceed through the code cycle process, DSA feels that the collaborative process evolved the initial proposals into proposed regulations that are clear, intentional, and enforceable. Not only did DSA work diligently with ACC as a whole, DSA also convened a series of approximately six meetings with vested stakeholders specifically on the proposed housing amendments. These individuals volunteered to have further discussions between varied interests in order to achieve regulation language that was mutually acceptable. Success was not measured by achieving unanimity, but instead in resting secure in the knowledge that DSA did its due diligence in listening to all stakeholders in arriving at regulations that provide the necessary accessibility for individuals with disabilities. The ACC was able to offer support for most of the amendments proposed by DSA, and for the remaining amendments generally agreed that the perfect should not get in the way of the good. For the members who were part of the ACC after the initial training, all would agree that the experience was arduous, yet successful, in that an environment of cooperation and mutual respect was maintained through the discussions, and a better understanding of the needs of the disability community was achieved while acknowledging stakeholder concerns.

She advised that in September, half of the ACC will decide if they wish to sign on for another three-year term or whether they choose to term out. The remaining members will continue to serve until July 2020, when their term will expire. Applications for ACC membership are accepted on an ongoing basis. New members will be selected who are able to represent the specific stakeholder group, and they will start a three-year term that will begin in January.

She stated as part of service on the ACC, members are required to perform outreach to the user group they represent and offer feedback to the ACC on proposed amendments. Many fulfilled this objective during the development process this past year and in the first ACC meeting of the coming code cycle. Those who will continue serving will be asked to provide a plan of their future outreach efforts.

She stated DSA thanks all the ACC members and the facilitator for the commitment of service on the ACC. DSA looks forward to a new year with new and challenging issues to discuss. She encouraged the public to visit the DSA ACC webpage, where the transcripts of all meetings are available, as well as information on the ongoing activities of the ACC.

She explained the ACC was their greatest outreach effort for DSA; however, they do still provide a lot of outreach and education programs to supplement their activities. DSA Academy continues to offer four 4-day training sessions on the California Building Code to architects, engineers, and building enforcement personnel. And, in addition to in-person training, this fall they will launch their learning management system that will allow them to provide online training on demand. She advised that DSA has been working diligently to provide opportunities for focused training on the new regulations for electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS). They have an EVCS dedicated website. They have provided training throughout the state to utility companies, station developers, and design professionals. They also have a YouTube video online currently, which is closed captioned, discussing the regulations in detail. The link is available from DSA's Electric Vehicle Charging Station Accessibility webpage. DSA is further expanding outreach and education. They are working with the Department of Rehabilitation to bring the Certified Access Specialist program to more individuals and to generate interest in the disability community about the program. DSA also seeks to educate the public about the ADA and California Building Code accessibility by training our Certified Access Specialists because they know they are the best vehicle for this education with regard to the ADA. DSA reached out to inform the local business community about the responsibility for accessibility compliance working with members of the legislature who asked DSA to speak. DSA works with the California Commission on Disability Access for their development guide that assists businesses or facility owners in achieving and maintaining compliance to state and federal accessibility standards.

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

Commissioner Booth asked how many applicants there were for ACC.

Ms. Clair stated when they initially started, they had approximately 60 applicants, and from that group 13 were selected. The remaining applications stay in the database. DSA will call for applications, if necessary, but those who have applied in the past are still on the list and eligible for consideration.

Commissioner Booth asked what the selection process is.

Ms. Clair responded that once the applications are submitted, the applicant can designate which group they prefer to represent. She stated there are many individuals who actually represent many groups, and so they can actually rank, if they fit different profiles, who they prefer to represent. DSA then develops a slate from all the received applications. Three of them form a caucus. The DSA has its own caucus, as well as the California Commission on Disability Access (CCDA) and the Department of Rehabilitation (DOR). They all receive the applications and provide a slate of individuals that they would like to consider, along with an alternate selection. DSA then gets together with their facilitator to reconcile the slate and develop a master slate; that master slate is the selection of the individuals. Some of the individuals may be called and told they have been slated in their secondary community as opposed to the primary and asked, "do you accept". She stated all members, once selected, are willing to serve.

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked are these applicants on a voluntary basis, specifically are their travel expenses partially reimbursed.

Ms. Clair confirmed the applicants are fully reimbursed for travel, meals, mileage, and lodging, depending on how close they are to the area. The group decided to have in-person meetings, especially initially when they are working on the regulations. They decided to have video conference for meetings discussing feedback, how they are feeling, and upcoming meetings.

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked if you were to think about the group demographics are 50/50 between Northern California and Southern California or is there is a bigger number coming from Northern California.

Ms. Clair confirmed it is purposely designed to be 50/50. In order to get a well-balanced group of stakeholders, the following criteria are given to the CCDA and DOR in selecting individuals to consider: gender, disability, large jurisdictions, small jurisdictions, wide-state representation, owner representatives, one to be governmental and one to be private.

Chair Batjer asked whether DSA will continue to offer in-person classes on code development at the DSA University.

Ms. Clair confirmed that they will be. In their analysis of the Certified Access Specialist, when they are required to do training for maintaining their credential, DSA is investigating training options that they pursue so that DSA can tailor their online on demand with regard to the time, cost, and the availability similarly so that they are choosing to access California-specific information that comes from the source developer as opposed to from out of state.

Commissioner Mikiten thanked DSA and Ms. Clair for their efforts. This issue has been discussed for approximately two years, since the early discussions of how to put this together, what the profile would be, and what the execution of creating the group would entail. He stated this is more than a great starting point, with a robust group selected from a wide-range of individuals with different opinions and insights. He is very hopeful that it will help make the process for the Commission easier because the process of what happens before new regulations comes before the Commission will be more transparent, and there will be more participation by people with disabilities and the people who are representing them throughout the state.

Commissioner Sasaki and seconded Commissioner Mikiten's praise of DSA's efforts. He asked if DSA received feedback; if so, are there any possible changes or improvements to the process.

Ms. Clair in the discussions with our members, all have been very pleased with the interaction. The goal was to achieve a consensus and to work collaboratively, so she stated she does not foresee changes in the collaborative effort. In the two remaining sessions they have, they have the ability to reflect back on the year and determine if there are any procedural changes to be made. She stated at this time, they are not aware of any changes because feedback has not been solicited, but the group is aware that it will be on an upcoming agenda, and we have asked them to think about what changes and improvements that they want to make but our final discussion – our next two discussions, depending on how much time and feedback from the Code Advisory Committee takes with this group, we will begin to discuss how we can move forward and what changes may be necessary so we haven't solicited that opinion yet – other than everyone who has participated up to this point throughout the whole process is pleased with being recognized that they have a voice and that others are listening and that others have a greater understanding of each other.

Commissioner Sasaki stated that soliciting opinions or feedback would be very beneficial.

Ms. Clair agreed with Commissioner Sasaki. She advised one improvement they would like to move forward with is for those individuals that represent the individuals with disabilities in the group are having difficulty getting to the hearing impaired or the deaf, and so DSA has been working with DOR.

Commissioner Patel also thanked Ms. Clair for her leadership and everyone else's participation in this important program. He asked as part of the collaborative, is there an opportunity to take either the existing code or new code provisions and discuss it as a group.

Ms. Clair stated that DSA has suggested to the group, especially in the training, to be aware of the discussions and that the code provisions are selected early on and working with the group to determine which provisions will move forward, but that proposals are submitted at all times, and if something comes up through the code development process where it might be too late to introduce a provision that is good, to make note of it and be a sponsor of it and voice their opinions.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

No questions or comments from the Public.

7. THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Chair Batjer stated the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is requesting a readoption of their emergency building standards rulemaking file, number HCD EF 01/18, that the Commission approved April 17, 2018. Pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act, emergency regulations are effective for 180 days. A readoption will extend the effective date of the emergency regulation language 90 days, allowing HCD additional time to complete the certifying rulemaking process. The regulatory language is not open for discussion by the public; however, the regulatory language may be challenged or modifications made and may be suggested during the certifying rulemaking process, which includes a public comment period.

Emily Withers, Codes and Standards Administrator II, and Stoyan Bumbalov, Codes and Standards Administrator I, appeared on behalf of the Department of Housing and Community Development. Ms. Withers thanked the Commission for providing an opportunity for HCD to request readoption of their emergency regulations on emergency

housing, originally approved by the Commission on April 17, 2018 as HCD EF 01/18. HCD's original proposal was submitted as emergency regulations in accordance with Government Code Section 11346.1 and is effective until October 15, 2018. Due to the timing of the commission meetings, these regulations will expire or lapse one or two days before the next commission meeting; therefore, HCD is requesting approval for readoption today with an effective readoption date of October 16, 2018, which will keep the regulations effective until January 14, 2019. These regulations amend the 2016 California Building Code by adding voluntary Appendix N and the 2016 California Residential Code by adding voluntary Appendix X. Both appendices are similar and placed in both codes so jurisdictions may locally adopt either appendix. As summarized on HCD's finding of emergency, these standards were developed for the following reasons:

1. To address California's critical need for emergency housing.
2. To assist local jurisdictions in ensuring that locally approved emergency housing will meet minimum standards for health and safety.
3. To assist HCD in implementation of Assembly Bill 932 of 2017 or Chapter 786 Statutes of 2017, which became effective January 1, 2018. This legislation directed HCD to review and approve draft emergency housing ordinances of seven jurisdictions; however, it did not provide specific building criteria for HCD to use when reviewing and approving these ordinances.
4. To provide recognition of different types of emergency housing and identify minimum health and safety standards.

She stated it is HCD's intention to seek approval for permanent adoption of these regulations. To meet this goal, HCD has initiated the formal rulemaking process with the 45-day public review period July 15 to August 27, 2018. They hope to receive valuable comments during this process to further refine their regulations, as necessary. HCD is also considering a focus group meeting during the public review process to further engage stakeholders. As far as informing the public and stakeholders, HCD has issued Information Bulletin 2018-01 informing local code enforcement agencies, third-party agencies for factory-built housing, and other interested parties of the emergency regulations. A revised information bulletin will be issued when the regulations are approved for readoption and also upon permanent adoption. These emergency regulations are also being incorporated into HCD's proposals for the 2019 California Building Code and Residential Code, and they were introduced in a focus group meeting convened by HCD on April 5, 2018.

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

No questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

No questions or comments from the Public.

MOTION: Chair Batjer entertained a motion to consider the Department of Housing & Community Development's request to readopt the emergency building standards for emergency housing or shelter ordinances in the 2016 California Building Code and Residential Code. Commissioner Klausbruckner made a motion to approve, and it was seconded by Commissioner Sasaki.

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

Commissioner Klausbruckner commented that she hoped someday to see this in the model codes as well, so that it is applied nationwide, as it is very much needed.

Chair Batjer agreed with Commissioner Klausbruckner.

The vote was unanimous to accept the motion.

8. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Chair Batjer stated Executive Director, Mia Marvelli, will provide an overview of the Commission's business.

Ms. Marvelli stated the governor issued Executive Order B-52-18 in May, which directs state agencies to develop programs to improve forest management and restoration, provide regulatory relief for timber harvesting, increase opportunities for prescribed burning, as well as support wood products innovation programs. This order directs many state agencies, specifically Building Standards Commission (BSC), in coordination with other state agencies such as HCD and the Office of State Fire Marshal (SFM), to review and consider the Tall Wood Building amendments, which are being proposed for the 2021 International Building Code. Those are currently being developed at the International Code Council hearings over the course of this year and next year. The executive order directs state agencies to consider proposing those amendments early, so rather than in the next edition of the code, it would be the 2019 intervening cycle. Over the next year, state agencies will be reviewing those amendments in order to begin the adoption process early. The bulk of the International Code changes add new construction types and will also create new allowances for building height, stories, and floor areas. Since most of these proposed code changes

are within the authority of SFM, BSC will be working closely with them to conduct any workshops that are needed. BSC's staff is participating in the statewide efforts of the governor's office to support the implementation of the executive order.

She advised, additionally, in May the governor signed two new legislative bills establishing statewide water efficiency goals, SB-606 and AB-1668. These bills establish tiered goals of per-person water usage beginning upon enactment through the year 2030. One of the goals is 55 gallons per day per-person usage; in 2025, the goal goes to 52.5 gallons; and in 2030, 50 gallons. The bills also include incentives for water suppliers to use recycled water and require water suppliers to set annual budgets. She stated these bills do not mandate any changes to the California Plumbing Code or the CALGreen Code, but what staff finds is, often when the other state agencies start discussing how to implement these, BSC will monitor working groups because some of those provisions trickle into what they need to do to buildings to meet these goals. She will advise once she becomes aware of the names of those working groups.

Ms. Marvelli stated staff has conducted approximately 10 education and outreach forums early in the year this year, most have been in person. They also interacted with 40 architects down in Southern California utilizing videoconferencing. In addition, BSC is in the process of producing three short videos in an effort to get people interested in using more of the detailed guides. The first video focuses on the role of CBSC and the commissioners. Another video will explain the steps of the rulemaking process. It also will be used as a companion for the rulemaking guide. The last video discusses Title 24 in greater detail. It also is a complement to BSC's "Guide to Title 24". BSC will solicit stakeholders for their input moving forward, and additional videos will be created to support those needs. She stated BSC participates with many of the ICC chapters and the design professional organizations and meet in person to give more timely updates to what is happening during the cycle and also with CALGreen updates.

She stated, staff processed about 40 rulemakings for the 2018 code adoption cycle, in May and early June. For the first phase of the cycle, the Code Advisory Committee will review and provide recommendations. She stated the six code advisory committee meetings will begin this Thursday with the people from Health Facilities. The meetings and rulemaking documents are publicly noticed a minimum of 15 days prior to the meetings. Meetings for Health Facilities, Access, and Building, Fire and Other have already been noticed. The rulemaking materials are available online. There will be weekly CAC meetings between this week and the week of August 22nd. These meetings are not at the same location, so she advised reviewing the agenda for the proper location. BSC has just updated their home webpage, and there is a link on the front page as well as under featured links that will direct people to the materials. She

mentioned this is a great time to begin looking at the material and developing comments for presentation at the code advisory committee meetings. Those rulemakings may be altered based on the recommendations that the Code Advisory Committee gives, and those rulemakings will be re-noticed for the 45-day comment periods. There will be two 45-day comment periods; the first one will begin in September. Half the regulations will be in one, and half the regulations will be in the other. When that concludes, the final rulemaking packages will be submitted back to BSC staff, hopefully around November, and at that time they will be prepared. The Commission will meet again and take action on those rulemakings in December and January.

Chair Batjer thanked Ms. Marvelli and acknowledged the efforts put forth by BSC staff.

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked a question on the Tall Wood Building early adoption. She commented that process has not gone through ICC and asked if it gets derailed during the public comment portion whether BSC would move forward with the early adoption or hold off until the following cycle.

Ms. Marvelli stated BSC and the State Fire Marshal are monitoring what is happening at the model code level. It is their understanding there are two stages: Group A is happening currently and will be solidified by November or December; and Group B, which is more structurally related and where reference standards will be updated, will be happening next year. She confirmed Commissioner Klausbruckner's comment in that if the model code development cycle does not pass all of those provisions, BSC would consider what is certified at the model code level, so that is why they are in a holding pattern and monitoring what is happening. She stated even with that, the state agencies still have to vet those regulations, run workshops, and have California public input to determine if those are, in fact, what need to be adopted in California. She stated a lot of the regulations fall within the Office of the State Fire Marshal's authority.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

No questions or comments from the Public.

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

Vice Chair Winkel wanted clarification on the adoption process. He commented if things are final from the Track A version in December, that would give nonstructural information for the State Fire Marshal and other agencies to look at, in terms of Tall

Wood. He asked what would that mean in terms of early adoption. Would that start after the regular adoption process in December and January and then move into the middle of 2019?

Ms. Marvelli stated they haven't really structured how the workshops will work and how many have to be done, which would be a coordination issue. She agreed with Vice Chair Winkel in that there would be regulations to work with. She stated early adoption means that rather than adopting it in the next edition of the California codes, it would be done in the intervening cycle, and those would be effective July 1, 2021, three years from now, so there would be an 18-month jump on those regulations. Those will have to be repealed, and the model code language will be adopted, potentially with amendments.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

No questions or comments from the Public.

9. CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION STRATEGIC PLAN

Chair Batjer stated the Strategic Plan Ad Hoc subcommittee and Deputy Executive Director, Michael Nearman, will report on the California Building Standards Commission Strategic Plan. The Commission may discuss and take action on the Strategic Plan.

Michael Nearman mentioned that Commissioner Booth was involved in the process and development and has some items to discuss. He stated the intent of the Strategic Plan is to ensure the Commission's continued effectiveness in fulfilling its vision and mission. Periodic updates are needed to keep the Strategic Plan current and consistent with the goals and objectives of the agency. This is also to ensure that the Commission's performance regarding its role in California's regulations of buildings and administration of rulemaking is kept as current as possible.

To begin the process last year, Commissioner Barthman and Commissioner Booth volunteered to review and make recommendations to update the California Building Standards Commission's Strategic Plan. Since the last update, there have been many changes in staffing, both at the commission level and within the BSC administrative staff and technical staff, as well as the processes that BSC administers. The following items provide an overview of some of the updates made to the plan:

1. On page 3, provided by the executive director, is a summary to the Strategic Plan. This is now included following the table of contents and will follow the schedule for update.
2. On page 4, a sentence identifying BSC's position as a division within DGS and clarifying that the chair of the Commission is the secretary of Government Operations Agency.
3. Various edits offering an update to the vision statement on page 5. Commissioner Booth advised the most important update is in the first sentence where improvement of the codes was inserted as one of the commitments, as opposed to just the maintenance. Mr. Nearman clarified to the commissioners that the red text that is underlined and stricken is the extent of the changes done.
4. Following the update, there were also changes made to Item No. 3, which is on page 6, under the Goals and Objectives section.
5. Updated Items B and C, with a modification to the language, and added a new item F.
6. Under Goal A for the Strategic Objectives, a new Item A-4 was added with new language.
7. Under Goal B, Strategic Objectives, Items B-2 and B-3 were amended or modified for the plan, no changes were needed for Goal C.
8. Under Goal D, Strategic Objectives, there were minor edits on D-1 and D-2, D-3 had significant modification, and D-5 was added. Commissioner Booth mentioned the Commission has been pretty forthright and successful in trying to improve communication with stakeholders and get their input.
9. Goal E received two new items, E-5 and E-6, bottom of page 9.
10. Update to the annual review process was also made. They have decided to establish a three-year review process so that it aligns with the triennial cycle, so every triennial they will go through the Strategic Plan as well.
11. Added two new appendices to the plan, Item D, which is a reprint of the current California Building Standards law, and Item C, which is the history of CBSC. Mr. Nearman asked the Commission for its approval of the Strategic Plan.

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

Commissioner Klausbruckner asked in Appendix B, when they do the vote, can they make sure to update the standing committees based on the earlier vote before they vote on this.

Mr. Nearman agreed that they will do that and make a note of it on the tally sheet.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

No questions or comments from the Public.

MOTION: Chair Batjer entertained a motion to approve the Strategic Plan update. Commissioner Klausbruckner made a motion to approve with one amendment, an amendment being to Appendix B, understanding committees, adding Vice Chair Winkel to the Code Adoption Committee and designating Commissioner Patel as the chair of that particular Code Adoption standing committee, and it was seconded by Vice Chair Winkel. The vote was unanimous to accept the motion.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Questions or Comments from the Commissioners:

No questions or comments from the Commissioners.

Questions or Comments from the Public:

No questions or comments from the Public.

11. ADJOURN

MOTION: Chair Batjer entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Booth made a motion to approve, and it was seconded by Vice Chair Winkel. The vote was unanimous to accept the motion.