

DIVISION OF THE STATE ARCHITECT

Access Code Collaborative

March 15, 2021

Brad Morrison: Okay. All right. Let's go ahead and start then. Okay, so, well, why don't we go ahead. Welcome everybody. Thank you for, you know, thank you for your patience. Let me just say that first and allowing us to get this set right. So, I think we're ready to go and I think we'll, ask Ida to get up and have a comment for us to get the meeting started. Okay, Go ahead Ida.

Ida Clair: Thanks, Brad. So, welcome everyone to another code cycle. We actually have very few proposals this code cycle. Mostly necessitating clarity that we are moving forward. In other words, no big endeavors like we did last code cycle with detectable warnings and public housing. And so, we're gonna take a little bit lighter on the code development for this code cycle, but we do have other work that we're working on that we're gonna tap into the ACC as we move forward.

Three of them are objectives, our guidance documents. We're working on a guidance document for electric vehicle charging, one for public housing, which most of you have seen or some of you have already participated and seen that one, and detectable warnings. So, we will be working on guidance documents and bringing, using the ACC to help and inform those guidance documents moving forward.

We have also requested funds from, in the governor's budget, for continuation of our detectable warning study. And that is actually the fourth step of our whole effort on detectable warnings. The first was the task force, the second part was the regulations, the third is the guidance document, and the fourth is actually completing the study that has been suspended for, since 2008 right now. So, a long time. We're looking forward to starting that up again. We're very, very excited that, hopefully that can actually happen again. We've requested funds from the governor's budget. We will know by May whether or not those funds have been granted to complete the study.

So, that's part of our work moving forward. And then also in preparation for the intervening code cycle of the 2022, meaning the next code cycle, not our present one, we are looking for improving the language around path of travel and developing language for clarity on that. And so, this group will likely in this code cycle form the task force for that path of travel discussion.

So, while we're not working on actual code, I mean we're working on actual code language, but it's not extensive. There are other objectives that we need you to inform and participate on. So, that's what we have for, on the agenda for the next 18 months till the next code cycle starts.

And, yeah, we're excited to, to develop those, those, supportive resources. We're excited to finish the Detectable Warning study again if we get the funding and we're excited to use this group as a task force that can help us inform proposed amendments to path of travel language so that it can better, be better enforced.

Other than that, we will discuss the code proposals that we have on our agenda today for this code cycle. And I will throw it back to Derek to take over. Unless you guys have any questions on what I've said.

Dara Schur: I have a question. This is Dara but I don't know if we're supposed to be raising our hands or not. So, procedural clarification.

Brad Morrison: Let's raise your hands...

Dara Schur: In the chat or should I just jump in?

Brad Morrison: Jump in, jump in, and then we'll, we'll go from there if we need to raise hands.

Dara Schur: Okay. So, at the end of the last session, we, during last year's amendments to the public housing Sections, there were a number, there were several Sections that we flagged, and Bill Hecker flagged that needed critical amendments to be consistent with the ADAG 2010. And to be clear, one of 'em was on technical infeasibility or structural infeasibility. And I'm not remembering off the top of my head,

I, I understand, I mentioned this, we submit, resubmitted those again this year for possible consideration. We were told last year that they would be considered in this round. It appears that you're not gonna consider them. I wanna make, I think they ought to be considered this round, but if you don't have the resources, I know it's a short cycle. I, I wanna make sure they end up being considered next year because I think there was some agreement that they needed to be fixed and I'm concerned that they're gonna sit out there for several years with some problems in them.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Let's...

Ida Clair: So, we'll look at that Dara. It won't be for this code cycle because we have such a short window this code cycle. We are, yeah, it's a short window. So, to get the necessary study and development, they are not off the table, and we can discuss 'em for a future code cycle. Absolutely. Which probably, I'll meet with Sue to clarify which ones they are and move them up to the next code cycle if possible.

If it's...

Dara Schur: Let me know if there's any confusion. We submitted the ones that we had some agreement on at the Bill Hecker called out and some additional ones. So, I'm happy to clarify at any point.

Ida Clair: Okay. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great.

Gene Lozano: Brad, Gene.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Dara. Hi Gene. Come on in.

Gene Lozano: I'm not trying, first thing I preface, I'm not trying to get this on our agenda for today, but I'm just wanna bring up something that I would like to see that we have some future meeting, a discussion on an item that came up during the last code cycle.

And it was brought up initially during public hearing before the Building Standards Commission from Tim Thimesch regarding the definition of detectable warning. The California Council Blind did support, still on record, we did support the addition of persons who are visually impaired to that definition.

So, that was clear to the reader that these detectable warnings were for that population. Tim Thimesch, Attorney, had an issue that he brought before. He felt that by the additional of that tax, limited when it came to just people with visual impairments and somebody who had some other disability that could be benefit from detectable warnings, had related to their disability, not convenience, but actual functional limitation, they could benefit that if they came to a location on the edge of a boarding platform and it wasn't there, they would have no legal standing.

I'm not attorney. I don't know whether how foul that it is. During that, the hearing and I'm wrapping it up very quickly. I was asked to make certain that this was brought to the attention ACC and that there'd be some discussion. And, and that's all I wanted to see in the future. I just want, since I made a promise that I would bring it to this body, that I would like, you know, it to be considered at some time during this code cycle for discussion and I, not to add to an item, but it just have a discussion on it and see what is the feeling of DSA, General Services, et cetera. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Gene, thanks. I, we got it. I got some information down on it so we will be sure and follow up with you. I did schedule some, some open time today, but I think we've used that. Just trying to get this, you know, everybody kind of, set up today. So, if there's an opportunity at the end, we can bring it up for discussion and if not, we can come back to you at a future meeting and get, get a little more of a presentation for it. Okay?

Gene Lozano: Sure.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Gene. Okay. Any more questions to Ida before we start on the code amendments? Okay. All right. Any other questions or comments at all in a general sense or anything before we get started? All right. Hearing none, I'm gonna turn it over to Derek to start out with our first, for our first Section, which is 11B-108, Maintenance of Accessible Features.

Derek Shaw: Okay. And Brad if I can just clarify for a moment here. For the most part I'm gonna be handing off each of these items to staff that has done the work on preparing these. But if you don't mind keeping me in the process here as the touchstone on each of these, I'd appreciate that.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Sounds good, Derek. Thank you.

Derek Shaw: Okay. Staff has done a great job on working on these items. They are just to cement everybody's perspective on these. Please keep in mind these are early drafts of these items and what we're looking for with this meeting is review and

comments on these drafts. We'd certainly like to hear your suggestions on ways these could be made better or any other just general comments about each of the items as we go along. Okay. So, greatly appreciate all of the collaborative members helping us out today. Okay. So, I think the first one I'd like to turn this over to Susan Moe.

This is on the current item 11B-108. That's regarding the Maintenance of Accessible Features.

Susan Moe: Thank you, Derek. So, actually this particular item, and it's in Chapter 11B, Section 11B-108. This was actually brought to our attention by Dara and when we took a look at this, the way this currently reads, it's 11B-108 Maintenance of Accessible Features. A public accommodation shall maintain in operable working condition. Those features of facilities and equipment that are required to be accessible to and usable by piece, by persons with disabilities. Isolated or temporary interruptions in service or accessibility due to maintenance or repair shall be permitted.

And in looking at this, it doesn't, it picks up the responsibility of a public accommodation, but it doesn't pick up the responsibilities of a public entity. And in addition to that if you look at Chapter 11B, there are other facilities like commercial facilities that are regulated by Chapter 11B, also religious facilities. So, what we are proposing is the new language.

The new suggested text is Features, facilities and equipment required by Chapter 11B to be accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities shall be maintained in operable working condition. Isolated or temporary interruptions in service or accessibility due to maintenance or repairs shall be permitted. So, when we look at this, as I said, features, facilities and equipment required by Chapter 11B. So that will pick up all those different, it'll pick up public housing, it'll pick up public buildings, it'll pick up commercial facilities, religious institutions, everything that's regulated by Chapter 11B. So, with that we can go ahead and entertain any comments or questions.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Mo. Okay. Does anybody have any comments on this one?

Vidal Medina: This is Vidal.

Brad Morrison: Hi, Vidal.

Vidal Medina: Well, is there, is there any exclusions to this, the way it's rewritten in regard to facilities?

Susan Moe: Actually Vidal, the way this is written, it goes beyond what the current requirements are because like I said, currently it just says a public accommodation. So, the way this is rewritten, all of these different facilities that are required by Chapter 11B to be accessible have to be maintained in operable working condition.

So, this actually, because at the federal level, commercial facilities are not required to be accessible. Neither are religious facilities but those are facilities that are

regulated in Chapter 11B. So, this actually picks up all those different elements that currently, if you were to read this, it only would apply to a public accommodation.

Vidal Medina: And, and thank you very much for the explanation, but that's what I was alluding to was this, sometimes there is these exemptions and maybe there, well, like you mentioned the federal level. But thank you very much for that. Appreciate it.

Susan Moe: You're welcome. Yeah.

Susan Moe: Okay. Dara.

Dara Schur: Sue, thanks a lot for doing this. I think this is critical to make sure this happens in public housing. This is an issue that comes up a lot where elevators go out for months at a time stranding people in higher floors or, you know a railing and a ramp isn't working and it's a hazard. And this is a really important amendment to make everybody understand that these aren't one time, you don't just put 'em in and ignore 'em. They have to be maintained so greatly appreciate this. Thank you. I like it. Thank you.

Susan Moe: You're welcome.

Jihee Lee: This is Jihee. This makes sense to me. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Jihee. Anybody else?

Carol Loeffler: It makes sense to me. I like the clarification a lot. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Carol.

Gene Lozano: Gene, I'm in support of it.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Gene.

Gary Layman: This is Gary in support of it.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Gary.

Hannah Barker: This is Hannah. Same. I like it.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Hannah.

Soojin Hur: This is Soojin. The same here. Support it.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Soojin.

Vidal Medina: This is Vidal in support.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Vidal.

Kaylan Dunlap: And Kaylan too.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Kaylan.

Arfaraz Khambatta: This is Arfaraz in support of it too.

Brad Morrison: Great Arfaraz. Okay. Great. This is good. Yeah. Anybody else?

Lewis Springer: Lewis Springer, I'm in support of it too.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Lewis. All right. Well, it seems like we have a strong support for this one. Why, if there's no more comments we could move on to the next. Is that okay?

Okay, let's move on to the next, Derek, how about if I send it over to you and you can refer it out to staff?

Derek Shaw: Thank you, I appreciate that. Okay. This, this next, item is, we're, we're gonna go as much as we can, we're gonna go through sequentially through the document package that you received, so it'll be easier to navigate. Here the second item is regarding the Definition of Access Aisle. And with this, I'd like to turn it over to Debbie Wong to present this item. Debbie.

Debbie Wong: Hi everyone. Can you hear me? Oh, good.

Brad Morrison: Yes. Loud and clear.

Debbie Wong: And I just have a suggestion. Instead of everyone voicing their you know, agreeance, thumbs up, thumbs down. This is a suggestion. You can have everyone just raise their hand up or down or, I don't know if that feature is available for Zoom.

Brad Morrison: Yes, it is. We do have, there's a, there's a, a way to express your reaction, if you, if you like that, and raise hand is actually one or thumbs up is another one. And then an alternate way to do that is also to just indicate thumbs up on the screen. But, but I'm, I'm really so happy everybody's here. You can do whatever you wanna do and I'll be just fine with me. Okay. Debbie, go ahead.

Debbie Wong: So, we are proposing amending the definition of the word access aisle. I'm gonna give a little background and then explain the changes and then give you a reasoning, statement of reason. So, this term access aisle is currently just California defined term. And it was first introduced in 11B in 2006 to meet the requirements of ADAG. In 2010, ADAS did not carry this forward this term, and during the rewrite of 11B in 2012 where we adopted ADAS as the model language, we did not repeal this language. We kept it. So, it's ours.

And so, the changes we're going to be making are, we're going to be removing the term pedestrian. And the second change that we'd like to propose, and it's not included in your packet, is striking the word parking, and replacing it with vehicle. And what that will do is it covers both areas where accessible aisles are required in 11B. So, both accessible parking and EVC spaces.

So, I'm gonna read to you the current code language for access aisle. An accessible pedestrian space adjacent to or between parking spaces that provides clearances in compliance with this code. So, the first change is the removal of the term pedestrian. The reasoning behind that is, it's going to provide clarity for code users when they're

determining detectable warning scoping requirements because, and it's, this is specifically associated with requirements for locating dws. I'm mean saying DWS for detectable warnings because DW, DWS and the scoping is confusing, and DSA is making or taking steps to provide some clarity. So, the word pedestrian in the definition is confusing because 11B requires the placement of detectable warnings to be located at the head of an accessible aisle.

And it's a general understanding that detectable warnings warn. People, individuals of hazardous conditions. So, when 11B is requiring the placement of detectable warnings at, I said I was gonna say DWS, but I keep saying detectable warnings. Sorry guys. That's very inconsistent. So, when 11B is saying place the detectable warnings at the head of an access aisle, then are we saying that the access aisle is a hazardous condition, which is in conflict with the word pedestrian space or with access aisle being defined as a pedestrian space.

So, if removing this term makes it, it provides a little more clarity for code users. And I initially requested this change because when I was learning how to apply 11B a couple of years ago, that's one inconsistency that I found, and it was confusing.

So, the second change we are proposing, and again it's not included in your packet, is we're striking the term parking and including it and replacing it with vehicles. And that addresses just updating the definition to include a new code provision of EV spaces. And the reasoning, well, that's the reasoning. So, let's see. So, now let's open it up for discussion and comment.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Debbie. Appreciate it. Looks like Dara has got her hand raised.

Dara Schur: Sorry, did not mean to.

Brad Morrison: Oh, okay.

Gene Lozano: Brad, Gene.

Brad Morrison: Hi Gene. Come on in.

Gene Lozano: I, Debbie, I think I understand it. Could you please read what it would be if it adopted? What would the text read as?

Debbie Wong: Sure, of course. So, the code text, if adopted, would read an accessible space adjacent to or between vehicle spaces that provides clearance in compliance with this code.

Gene Lozano: I can support that. I like it. And I was just wondering, and I, you, I don't expect you have this top of your head, but can you tell me, you mentioned that the, at the intention there, that the detective warnings at the head of accessible aisle. Is there a Section that clearly states that, not that you have to interpret, but clearly states that, and I was just wondering, sometime I could be provided the citation to that?

Debbie Wong: No, there's no clear code path.

Gene Lozano: Okay. Then I'll just put, as a, for the record, I'd like to see some future code cycle, that there is the path there that clearly states that, but that's off topic I realize right now, but I'm in support of what you're proposing.

Debbie Wong: Well, generally, the transitions that occur from a circulation path that leads, that connects to an access aisle, the transitions usually already address detectable warnings. For example, the transition from a sidewalk down to an accessible aisle will include curb ramps. The requirements of curb, curb ramps include the location and requirements for detectable warnings. So, I that, does that help with your, the response to your question?

Gene Lozano: I understand that. The only reason is, and, and just during one of, prior to the start of the last code cycle, and it was the last meeting of, that was at your facility that Derek conducted, there were one or two people, particularly Parks, who said they had, they were looking for that clearly to have it clear, clearly stated there and, and I've heard other people say it.

That's it. And, its off topic, but thank you very much.

Debbie Wong: Okay.

Brad Morrison: Hi. We have a comment, looks like Arfaraz has got his hand raised.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Thank you. I, I just wanna state that I'm in support of this change, Debbie, with two suggestions for your consideration. One is that the term that you're trying to address is also addressed, is also included in the def in the Chapter two definition for accessible route.

Where it says, exterior accessible routes may include parking access aisles. And I'm wondering if you, if you wanna strike the word parking from that definition as well. And then the second suggestion is, that if we're gonna use, if we're gonna use an adjective to define the space, then let's go with vehicular instead of vehicle. Which is a noun. Thank you.

Debbie Wong: So, in response to your first comment about parking aisles, I, you know, that did come up and if you read, please reread it because it, it will state may include parking access aisle, so it's not inclusive, right? So that's why that is not going to be touched. Is that clear?

Arfaraz Khambatta: Yes. I think you make your point clear about that. Just with the addition off access aisle, so EV spaces and then of course there was always access aisles for passenger loading zones. If you're looking to clarify, maybe, parking could be stricken, but you're, you're absolutely right. It's not an all, all-inclusive list.

Debbie Wong: Right. So yeah, that did come up. Thanks, Arfaraz. And then you said something else that I wanted to respond to. What was your second? Oh, vehicular. Vehicle is in the code. So, we're trying to use code language.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Except vehicular is also in the code. So...

Debbie Wong: In a different context though. So, vehicle space is vehicular way, so it's a different context.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Right. I mean but, just from a language perspective, is vehicle also used as an adjective? And this is more of a question.

Ida Clair: When we're talking about, I believe in the technical language, I know for electric vehicle charging stations specifically, but I believe also for parking space, actually for I think for both, it does make reference to a vehicle space as a noun. That's considered together. Vehicular space is not used in the existing code language right now. Vehicular way is, but vehicle space, we talk about it in the language right now in Section 812 specifically. And then also I believe in parking. I'd have to check that though.

Derek Shaw: And this is, this is Derek. If I could add to this, so Arfaraz, you're suggesting using the word vehicular rather than vehicle, is that correct?

Arfaraz Khambatta: That that's correct. Yeah.

Derek Shaw: Okay, good. Well, we've made note of that and so we'll go ahead and take a closer look at this particular issue. You know, I, and then we'll make our determination on how this language may need to be modified after we additionally study it. Okay. I think it's an excellent suggestion. Okay. And, and we'll definitely wanna this further.

Arfaraz Khambatta: And, and I just wanna say for the record, if you choose not to, I wouldn't lose sleep over it. It's just a suggestion. I still support the change.

Derek Shaw: Okay, great. Well thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Arfaraz. We can all use the sleep. Okay. Other comment on access aisles. Okay. No more comments. I'm looking through the screen here to see if anybody's got a hand or anything.

Jihee Lee: Hi, this is Jihee. I put my thumbs up but it disappeared, so.

Brad Morrison: Oh no it's there.

Jihee Lee: It's letting you know that I support it.

Brad Morrison: You support it. Thank you very much, Jihee. Appreciate it. Thanks, Soojin. Appreciate it. Okay, thanks, Kaylan. Arfaraz. Great. Cool.

Debbie Wong: So, I just did a word search and there's vehicular describes areas, ways, you know, but not space. But, oh, sorry, that was just a side note.

Brad Morrison: So, would it be appropriate to use it, Derek?

Debbie Wong: I'm sorry. No, as Derek stated, we'll study it and discuss it. Thanks. I just wanted to note that I did a quick word search.

Brad Morrison: Oh, okay. Thanks, Debbie. Appreciate it. Dara, did you have a question?

Dara Schur: I don't have any objections now. I, I just wanted to say we usually consult with our technical expert Bill Hecker, and I haven't had chance to run these by him, so I may have some additional comments, but for the moment we're fine. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you. Okay, go ahead.

Derek Shaw: This is Derek. If you do have additional comments that you'd like to forward to DSA, you're welcome to send them to me and I'll make sure they get distributed out to the scene.

Dara Schur: Okay. Will do. No problem. Thank you, Derek.

Derek Shaw: Okay, thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay, thanks everybody. Any additional comments on access aisles? Okay. Hearing none, why don't we move on to the next page. Jessica, if you could queue it up and then, Derek, if you wanna start off and introduce the staff person who wrote this one.

Derek Shaw: Okay. Very good. So, this next item begins on page five of your code amendments package. This item addresses Section 11B-206.4. It's the scoping for entrances. And Susan Moe has done some great work on this item. I'd like to ask Sue, if you would, please present this item.

Susan Moe: Sure. So, the reasoning for this, we've heard repeatedly over the years that this particular Section is really confusing for code users. So, what we're looking at, currently when you look at 11B-206.4, it talks about entrances, and it says entrances shall be provided in accordance with Section 11B-206.4. Entrance doors, doorways, and gates shall comply with Section 11B-404 and shall be on an accessible route complying with Section 11B-402.

Well then, a subsection under that is 11B-206.4 and then that talks about entrances and exterior ground floor exits. So, what it says there is all entrances and exterior ground floor exits to buildings and facilities shall comply with Section 11B-404. And then we see that there are two exceptions, and that's exterior ground floor exits serving smoke proof enclosures, stairwells and exit doors serving stairs only shall not be required to comply with Section 11B-404. And then exits in excess of those required by Chapter 10, and which are more than 24 inches above grade shall not be required to comply with Section 11B-404. And then it refers you over to Section Chapter 10, Section 1009.10 for the signage that is required.

So, what we're proposing, and then there's the companion Section that will go along with this because in looking at this, what we're hearing from building officials, this repeatedly gets missed. They don't look at the requirements for exits. They don't understand that the exit and at the level of exit discharge, it has to take you all the way to a public way.

So, what we're looking at here is, that this Section would only apply to entrances and anything that applies to exits will be moved over into Section 11B-207, which is accessible means of egress. Which it seems like that's a better location because

that's what we're looking at. We're looking at a component of an accessible means of egress.

So once this Section, if it's approved, once it's modified or amended, it would then say 11B-206.4. That Section would remain the same. Entrances shall be provided in accordance with Section 11B-206.4. Entrance doors, doorways, and gates shall comply with Section 11B-404 and shall be on an accessible route.

And then those exceptions and any reference in 11B-206.4.1 would be struck because we'll pick that up in Section 11B-207. So that subsection 11B-206.4.1 then would just read entrances and then it will say all entrances shall comply with Section 11B-404. So, with that we'll take any comments and that's what we're looking at for this proposed code change.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Sue. Okay, Dara and Arfaraz. Dara, why don't you go first and Arfaraz, I'll call you in when she's done.

Dara Schur: This is Dara. I, I just wanna clarify something cuz I think I understand it, but I'm not sure.

So, some of these exits that go into smoke proof enclosures, like I worked in a building in downtown Oakland where you exited on the fifth floor to a smoke free enclosure on the fire stairs. And that was where in an evacuation a person with a wheelchair could go to sit and sort of be a rescue space cuz they couldn't go down the stairs and elevators weren't working so they could go out into this space.

So, I assume that the transition from the hallway into the smoke proof enclosure, stairwell rescue space would still be accessible. It's just that the route down would not be accessible. Is that correct?

Susan Moe: And actually, Dara, what you're talking about is an area of safe refuge. And one of the things after doing some more research, and we'll talk about this, when we look at 11B-206.7, we need to get rid of that smoke proof enclosure because what you take a look at when you look at exiting, you look at exit access, you look at the exit. And then the exit that's at the level or exit discharge, which is at the ground floor level. So, in actuality, you can have a smoke proof enclosure that is a horizontal exit, or sometimes what you see is a smoke proof enclosure. And sometimes the reasoning for some of these, horizontal exits is because you're looking at allowable area increases.

So that's one of the things that we'll talk about when we talk about 11B-207, that currently we include smoke proof enclosures, but we actually need to get rid of that.

Dara Schur: So, the place of refuge would still be accessible, it's just the route out of it would not?

Susan Moe: Yeah. And there's specific requirements. And then it depends on if the area of safe refuge, if the building is fully sprinkled and it's depending on the number of occupants, you don't necessarily have to provide an area of safe refuge.

Dara Schur: Okay. Thank you. I think I understand.

Derek Shaw: If I could add, this is Derek. If I could add just a little bit to Sue's points on this. This, this change here does not diminish the requirement for the area of safe refuge or rescue system. Those, they have requirements for each of those elements. And so those requirements do require an accessible route to those areas, even when they're contained within a stairwell location. Okay? So, this change doesn't diminish that at all. Thank you.

Susan Moe: And those requirements for what you need to do at areas of assisted rescue and areas of safe refuge, you find those in the fire code in Chapter 10. Because it has very specific requirements for those areas.

Thank you.

Derek Shaw: If I, if I could just correct that just because when we use the term informally, the fire code sometimes, that gets confused with the actual California Fire Code. I think Sue is referring to Chapter 10 of the California Building Code here which addresses fire and life safety means of egress issues.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Arfaraz.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Thank you. So, as I'm reading 11, the proposed language for 11B-206.4.1, it seems a repetition of what's already in 11B-206.4, barring the word all. So, I'd also, what I'd like to suggest is that we add the word all before the second sentence in 11B-206.4. Therefore, it would read entrances shall be provided in accordance with 11B-206.4. All entrance doors, doorways, and gates shall comply with Section 11B-404 and shall be on an accessible route complying with 11B-404, excuse me, 402. And then 11B-206.4.1 gets stricken all together. I'd also like to state that 11B-206.5.1 already states that each entrance to a building or facility required to comply with 11B-206.4 shall comply with 11B-404.

So, there's redundancy there and so I would recommend striking out 11B-206.4.1 in its entirety and adding the word all to 11B-206.4 to describe all entrance doors, doorways, and gates. Thank you.

Susan Moe: Thanks, Arfaraz. Yeah, we'll take a look at that.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Sue. Okay, Jihee.

Jihee Lee: I have the same exact comment of Arfaraz. So that's that.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks, Jihee. Ernest, did you still wanna comment? I saw your hand up earlier.

Ernest Wuethrich: Nope, we're already addressed. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Thank you. All right, any other comments on this one? Scoping? Any other comments before we, we, I'm, as you can probably tell, I'm a little bit worried about our agenda. We have about a half hour left, so I just wanna make sure we get through the items.

So, not hearing any more comments, I'm gonna suggest that we move on to our next item if that's okay. So, Derek, let me turn it over to you.

Derek Shaw: Okay. Thank you. The next item is on page seven of your code change package. Here, this item address is complimentary to the item that Sue just presented and it addresses Section 11B-207 Scoping for Accessible Means of egress. Sue.

Susan Moe: Yeah, like I said, this is the companion Section. So, what you can see there currently under accessible means of egress, it says general means of egress shall comply with Chapter 10, Section 1009.

And then there are exceptions where means of egress are permitted by local building or fire life safety codes to share a common path of egress travel, accessible means of egress shall be permitted to share a common path of egress travel. Areas of refuge shall not be required in detention and correctional facilities. And then item number three, accessible means of egress are not required to be provided in existing buildings.

So, what we are proposing here is Section 11B-207.1 would instead read means of egress shall comply with Chapter 10, Section 1009, and Section 11B-207. Means of egress shall provide an accessible route complying with Section 11B-402 to a public way.

And again, what we heard from code officials is that this gets overlooked all the time. And this was actually in the 2010 edition of the California Building Code. So, we're just sort of reinstating that provision. The first three exceptions would remain the same. The means of egress are permitted by a local building official, and it goes on areas of refuge shall not be required in detention and correctional facility facilities and accessible means of egress are not required to be provided in existing buildings.

Now this next Section, what you're seeing now is basically just sort of our draft. And I've been giving this some more thought. And I think potentially what we're trying to do here is put too much into one exception. So, currently, as it reads, exit doors that provide access only to or from smoke proof enclosures, interior stairways and associated vestibule shall not be required to comply with Section 11B-404 or be located on an accessible route. I'm gonna read the other two exceptions and then I'll come back to this particular item.

Number five. Exception five at required accessible exits, when an accessible route cannot be provided from the level of exit discharge to the public way, either safe disposal areas complying with Chapter 10, Section 1028.5, or exterior areas for assisted rescue, complying with Chapter 10, Section 1009.7 shall be provided.

And then the last one is exits in excess of those required by Chapter 10, shall not be required to comply with Section 11B-404 or be located on an accessible route. Directional signs shall be provided at these exits in compliance with Chapter 10, Section 1009.10.

So, going back to item number four, one thing that we need to do is strike that reference to a smoke proof enclosure because potentially you are going to have to have smoke proof enclosures that would be required to be accessible. And really the point that we're trying to get to here, if it's doors that are serving stairways because,

and they're associated vestibule, that's not an accessible route, that's a circulation path.

However, typically at ground level more often than not because what you're trying to do is meet all your requirements for fire life safety, and you're looking at your, determining the number of exits and the distance to the exits and all that. So typically, what happens at the first floor, you will have an exit door that serves the exit access and it'll pass through that stairway, and then it continues on to that exit discharge.

So, I think what we need to do is a little wordsmithing on this particular Section and potentially we might have to divide this up into two exceptions so we can make it abundantly clear that when you're at that ground floor level, if you have a door and obviously you're not going to proceed up through the stairway, but you're gonna go through that door and go to the exterior of the building and then continuing onto the public way, that door, even though it serves that stairway, would have to be accessible.

So, we realize that that exception we've gotta do a little tweaking on. So, with that, we'll take any comments or questions. And like I said, what we're, we just want to compile everything that is required for an accessible means of egress into one Section.

Brad Morrison: Okay. I'm not seeing any hands raised in the comment or any in the pictures, but does anybody have a question or a comment about this one? Egress? Okay. Lewis? Okay. I got three. Okay, great. Good. Lewis, why don't you go ahead and start us off.

Lewis Springer: So, Sue, when I look at doors in the field, really the only exit door that I consider is the door exiting out of the building. So it would be, you know, it and it doesn't have hardware on the outside of the door. So, it's really not to and from that smoke and proof enclosure, it's only from the smoke proof enclosure.

Susan Moe: Or from the stairwell.

Lewis Springer: From the stairwell.

Susan Moe: Yeah.

Lewis Springer: And there's no hardware on the outside. I always look to make sure that the space is provided on the inside that you can push. It's usually a push. But the exterior door on the outside is the only thing that I don't look at as far as requiring the space to, to pull the door open. Cuz that's really where you're, where it's not required in my opinion.

Susan Moe: Okay. Thank you, Lewis.

Brad Morrison: Great. Dara.

Dara Schur: I'm trying to follow this. I think I've got it. I, and I think we've had some of this discussion before, but I'm really troubled by exception three that you don't have to provide accessible means of egress in an existing building. I understand that

you don't have to retrofit an existing building if you're not doing any retrofits to make something accessible. But if you are retrofitting, it seems like, you know, you would have to provide this in existing buildings. So, I'm kind of troubled by that.

Susan Moe: Well, Dara that was actually an amendment that came about in a previous code cycle. And what happened with that, it was always in Chapter 10. And at one point we just referred to it, but then what was happening, the International Code Council, they were removing that exception from Chapter 10, and they were going to put it into the existing building code. So, we realized then when that happened, because that had been an exception that had been adopted for decades, that we needed to incorporate that into Chapter 11B. So that particular item number three, we're not looking at for this code cycle.

Dara Schur: Yeah, I guess what I'm raising is that it's a problem to not have an accessible exit if you're doing remodeling. It seems very contrary to me, to the ADA and to the need to serve the disability community and get them out of the building safely. And so, I'm very troubled by it. And I guess what I'm asking is, can we revisit it?

Susan Moe: All right, thanks.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Dara? Can I just respond to Dara's concern? So, an accessible entrance and exit is required in all existing facilities. And under the ADA and the CBC, the term accessible means of egress is defined in Chapter 10 in Section 1009.

And it doesn't necessarily mean an accessible route complying with 11B-402. So, in Chapter, in Section 1009, you could have an interior staircase which could be a component off an accessible means of egress. But it's not necessarily an accessible route of travel, which an existing building or an alteration to an existing building would still require if that makes sense.

Okay. With that, I'm gonna go back to my concerns about this section, all the changes here. So first of all, when you look at 11B-207.1, it says generally, general means of egress shall comply with Chapter 10. But then it goes on, just add Section 1009. And I think it should just stop at Chapter 10 because truly means of egress needs to comply with all of Chapter 10.

If you're talking about accessible means of egress, then yes, accessible means of egress shall comply with Chapter 10, Section 1009. So, it's one or the other. If that makes sense. And then, by going on to say that a means of egress provides an accessible route complying with 402 to a public way, that again is at conflict with the verbiage in Chapter 10 itself.

So, because means of egress as defined in Chapter 10 doesn't really comply with accessibility provisions of 402. So, we need to clean that up so there's no conflict between the two Chapters in my opinion. And then I also support Lewis's comment on exit only doors. Any door that is operable must comply with 11B-404. Unless, you know, and it, it would need to essentially have the maneuvering clearances on both sides, even if it leads into a stairwell. I think that's confirmation that we received from both DSA and the US Access Board in the past. So, I wanna clarify that DSA is not reversing its position on that. Thank you.

Susan Moe: Thanks, Arfaraz.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Arfaraz. Go ahead, Sue.

Susan Moe: Oh no, I just wanted to say thank you.

Brad Morrison: Ok. Thanks, Arfaraz. Okay. Jihee, you're up next.

Jihee Lee: I have similar comments as Arfaraz towards the end. Here in the exceptions, it says it doesn't require to comply. You know, Section 404, you know, the whole Section 404. There could be things that doesn't, I mean it looks like the intent was to give some wiggle room for cases where it's not possible to provide level changes and things. Slopes and you know, steps down on the first ground level, that kind of challenges.

But there could be like door pressure, door width, door, or hardware requirement. Those could still be required to be accessible. So, I'm just a little bit questioning why would we wanna completely give Section 404 completely to not have to comply. So, it just seems too wide of a exception. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Sue, do you wanna respond?

Susan Moe: No, I, we will just take a look at that and take it under consideration. And I think what we need to go back and take a look at is what is, some of this is, current language that we're just carrying forward. So, but yeah, we'll definitely go back and take a look at that.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Sue. Gary, you're up next.

Gary Layman: Hello, this is Gary. I do concur with Arfaraz and some, however, the door needs to clear floor area on both sides. And the purpose, I support the means of egress not being on existing buildings, cuz there's many existing buildings that you cannot provide an accessible route from the public way or from the exit to the public way.

Which, that's why that exception is very important for not providing an exit from the public or from egress from an existing building. But then on 207.1, the general, well, 11B-207 is accessible means of egress. So, if you put accessible in there again, it's repeating itself since that topic is accessible means of egress.

One comment that I, additional comment that I would have is, is it possible to put the exception accessible, the exception to entrances in existing buildings on the previous topic that we discussed for entrances? The reason is I've run into many situations where they're not, they're not catching in existing buildings on an alteration or repair where it says an accessible entrance.

And there have made other exits that have been provided because the fire department or fire marshal wanted additional exits in an old existing building. And then they were claiming that that's also an entrance, that's a new entrance, and then therefore trying to make it accessible. And there was no way possible to make it accessible.

And so, if it was set in an exception in that one code on the previous for entrances, that would certainly be helpful. Just my, my take.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks Gary.

Susan Moe: Yeah, thank you, Gary.

Brad Morrison: Sue, do you, you wanna respond or anything? Or?

Susan Moe: No, we'll just take this, all these comments into consideration. Yeah.

Dara Schur: Okay. Okay. Great. Lewis, do you have another question? I just see your hand up. I didn't know if you would just hadn't turned it off.

Lewis Springer: Yeah, no more questions.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Okay. Thanks Lewis. Appreciate it. Okay. Any more questions on this item? Okay, not hearing any let's move on to the next. Derek, can I turn it over to you?

Derek Shaw: Yes, that's good. Okay, so the next item is on, I believe it's on page 10 of your package. And this is regarding Section 11B-216.5, Scoping and Required sign at Electric Vehicle Charging Station, EVCS. Okay. And, and Debbie Wong has prepared this item. Debbie, would you please present?

Debbie Wong: Thanks, Derek. So, this is related to putting requirements for required identification signs at, which occur at EVCS in the scoping section under sign. So, you know, this is a, EVCS is relatively a new code section. So, as it's being more scrutinized with more use, we're finding that well, code users are highlighting certain holes in the code and we're noticing something's missing. So, we're gonna fix it.

So, one thing is, this is important because what, placing the sign requirements for EVCS in the scoping Section 11B-216, which is signs. The reason why that's important is 216, it directs the code user to the technical requirements for sign, which is 11B-703 or Division Seven. And Division Seven includes the technical requirements for communication features like, contrast of characters, the height of the character, the height of the sign, so anything the, the features related to signs.

So, what this code amendment is going to do is we're going to add, we're going to change 11B-216.5 Parking. We're gonna add the requirements for signs for electric vehicle charging spaces. So, since, I'm not gonna read the current because we're adding text, so I will just note when we're adding texts. So, 11B-216.5 parking and then the new text added is and electric vehicle charging spaces. Signs identifying parking spaces and signs within parking facilities shall comply with Section 11B-216.5.1.

And then we've added another subsection to include signs identifying electric vehicle charging stations or spaces. So, in parens, EV spaces shall comply with Section 11B-216.5.3. And so, under that includes requirements for parking spaces. And then we've added under the subsection 11B-216.5.3 EV Spaces.

EV Spaces complying with Section 11B-812 shall be identified by signs complying with Section 11B-812.8. And as I stated, the importance of it is because it directs the code user to 11B-703 and provisions for signs. And that is, we can open up for discussion now. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Debbie. I can see, okay, so Ernest has a question, and I can see Gene has a question. So, Ernest, why don't you go ahead.

Ernest Wuethrich: Hello. Thanks, Debbie. So, I think it's great to have the scoping in there. My only question is, I don't think it's a huge deal, but I'm just thinking of how code users are gonna be looking at this is. I think earlier in the scoping section, there was a specific attempt by DSA I think to clarify that an EVCS is not a parking space. I think 208.1. And if, well I think that the scoping is gonna, is required and clarifies all this for the signs, merging parking signs with EVCS signs could maybe potentially take a step back and, you know, combining that the EVCS and the parking spaces kind of share some of the same requirements. Which maybe they do but, I don't know if there's a way to help separate those two requirements.

Brad Morrison: Okay, thanks Ernest. Any comment?

Debbie Wong: That's so, that's so interesting. I had the exact same reaction, but then, you know, when it comes to signage, it's pretty, pretty much the same. And when you place parking and EVCS the same sentence, I don't, in a way, it's, it makes a separation to me. I, I saw that as more of a separation by putting in the same subsection, but I see your point. Thanks, Ernest. That's exactly what I thought too.

Ernest Wuethrich: Cool.

Kaylan Dunlap: This, this is Kaylan. I had the same initial reaction and as I looked at it a little bit more, then I had Debbie's reaction.

Brad Morrison: Ok. Great. Thanks, Kaylan. Okay. We have Gene next up in the queue.

Gene Lozano: Yes. I was, I, I'd, I would like to know why we don't put right up here in the first two sentences, state that Section 11B-703.5. there. All the other subparts in the 216, all of them have the cross references to the, either the entire Section of 703 or its subparts specifically for the type of sign. Why isn't that right there in the 11B-216.5? Having it there rather than having to go through other sections to essentially get to it. Just to be consistent throughout the whole 216 Section.

Brad Morrison: Okay, Thanks Gene. Debbie?

Debbie Wong: I see what you're saying, but by placing the requirement for the code users and by directing them to 703 at the topmost parent, parental section under 216, I think that has more of a wider coverage. But I, but I see what you're saying, and we'll have to discuss that with, unless, Derek, you would like to, state anything now, but yeah. We'll, I'm looking at 216 general, so it's included in general.

Gene Lozano: And all the other subparts .2, .3, .4, all the way to the end.

Debbie Wong: Right. I, that's an excellent point.

Derek Shaw: Yeah. What, well, Gene, we'll definitely take a look at your comment and see if this warrants a. So, we'll take a good close study on it.

I would point out though that as you go through Section 11B-216.1,.2, .3 and so on, that they, they're really not duplicative. That each subsection under 11B-216 has its own unique requirements. And, while sometimes they may seem to be duplicative, I think they're all generally pretty unique to their..

Gene Lozano: No, I don't mean duplicate, Derek. I don't mean duplicate. I mean, is each of them is unique and, and, and does specify the requirements that are appropriate from 11B-703. That's my point. And here would be appropriate within 216.5 to have it there. That it's 11B-703.5 is to be complied with. Now, maybe it's not in the first sentence, but within this 216.5 having it Why, why should this be any different from the other unique type of signs, having that specified in the stroke, in the scoping?

Derek Shaw: Well, one, one thing that does make it unique is that when we look at what the current requirements are for the signage at parking spaces, we see that, that really the primary requirement there is for the minimum test pipe. Okay? And that actually, it does not seem to invoke the entirety of Division Seven.

Gene Lozano: Well, I'd say 0.5. 703.5 only. Visual characters. That's all I'm talking about. The visual characters. Nothing else.

Derek Shaw: Yes. Yes, that's true. However, you know when we do talk about the character height, that, that is a, a requirement that we have right now called parking signage that deviates from what would normally be the method of calculating character height requirements on signs under Division Seven.

So, you know, we need to study this a little bit closer. Take your comment into consideration and confirm the appropriateness of that code language.

Gene Lozano: Okay. Yeah. And, and I can understand that maybe there's, there's some other, where there's something about the height, the characters, so forth. The case stroke with and other aspects of 703.5 need to be still addressed. And so please look at it there cuz I, I, it just from the layperson that is trying to go through it, it doesn't hurt to have, and I believe to having it right here, right up front like all the others. And then you can go through the cross references and work weed, you drill down. So, thank you.

Derek Shaw: Okay, good. Thanks a lot Gene.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Thank you, Gene. Thank you, Derek. Thank you, Debbie. Okay. Carol is next up in the queue.

Carol Loeffler: Hi. Thank you. I have a question because at the very, very beginning when we were talking about the access space, there was a comment that you were getting rid of parking because there, that was too restrictive. It seemed like to me that you were wanting to make it, so that you have that availability for the electric vehicle, for instance.

And so, I'm confused why are you getting rid of parking at the beginning with, it was the very first one that we were talking about, and I apologize. It was...

Debbie Wong: Access aisle.

Carol Loeffler: Access aisle. Chapter One, Section 202, when you were talk, you said, to get rid of parking spaces. To get rid of parking. Did I misunderstand?

Debbie Wong: No.

Derek Shaw: You know Carol, if I could reply to that. Carol, I think what Debbie was describing in the proposed changes to access aisle is to strike the word parking and instead replace that with vehicle or vehicular.

Carol Loeffler: Right.

Derek Shaw: And the idea was not to eliminate the concept of parking from that definition, but instead to recognize that you have parking access aisle, you have electric vehicles charging space access aisles, and you have passenger loading and drop off zone access aisles. And so, a more generic term that's all-inclusive would be vehicle rather than the limiting term of just parking, which leaves out ev charging station access aisles and passenger loading plan.

Carol Loeffler: Okay. Okay. I appreciate that. So, if I could re-clarify what I'm saying, then basically you're not eliminating the word parking. What you were clear with the, it was clarification of what an access aisle means within the, within a structure or place in which, I hear its hard vehicles with...

Debbie Wong: The vehicle space covers both parking space and EV space.

Carol Loeffler: Okay.

Debbie Wong: It's a more generic term.

Carol Loeffler: And that's where your access space then goes away and parking goes away. But in the rest of the documents that we're looking at, parking remains because it has more than one use.

Derek Shaw: The requirements on parking wouldn't be diminished by the change to the definition of access aisle. Okay. But what does happen in the code is that that definition of access aisle more appropriately also includes now the access aisle for electric vehicle charging as well as parking.

Carol Loeffler: Okay. Perfect. That, that clarifies it very, very well. Thank you.

Derek Shaw: Great. You're welcome.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Carol. Soojin.

Soojin Hur: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to add to Ernest question, and I had the same exact reaction. And I understand Debbie and Kaylan's follow up, but I think it

has been that we added new section, new subsection when it comes to like the requirement for EV charging stations.

So just for the record, it would be great if you could consider like adding a 216.14 or something. Like a totally separate section so that it's not, I mean, cause I feel like error can be made if somebody reads this and like 216.5 it has parking and EV station sign and then they don't read through everything and then, you know, the parking sign can be provided at EV charging station, which we do not want. So, I just wanted to say that.

Brad Morrison: Great.

Debbie Wong: Thank you, Soojin. That totally makes sense.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Soojin. Thanks. Thanks, Debbie. Oh, Arfaraz.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Sorry. Forgot to unmute myself there. Yeah, I, you know, I just in, in line with what Soojin and Ernest have already said with regard to, for, for both code users and code enforcers, there is that, maybe it's just teething issues. But, sometimes you'll, you'll come across a permit applicant wanting to install a parking space with EV charging infrastructure, which is to say they still want people to park there and therefore it's a parking space.

And, and in the code, I think we are implying that an ev charging space is not a parking space. So, I and again, perhaps DSA can clarify that for all of us, whether or not a parking space can also have ev charging infrastructure and then be deemed a parking space and be striped or you know, the pavement markings and so forth can follow the parking requirements and not the ev charging requirements or maybe both requirements, I'm not sure.

But that seems to be the issues in the ground on the, or amongst the code enforcers. And just from the perspective of representing other code enforcement officials across the state, I wanna bring it DSA's attention that that is, that is a recurring issue that we're, we're seeing in the field. Thank you.

Derek Shaw: Sure. I'd like to address that if I may.

Brad Morrison: Sure, Derek.

Derek Shaw: The California vehicle code tells us that cars that are left in electric vehicle charging stations or spaces that are not charging are subject to being towed. So, when it is suggested or proposed, and usually our experience has been that it's in an effort to minimize the diminishment of the number of parking spaces. But when it is suggested that a charging station might serve as dual duty as a parking space as well, you really run into, you really put the vehicle driver at risk for having their vehicle towed. And if, if the vehicle is then incorrectly towed as a driver may allege, then it puts the property owner at risk for having to deal with the legal responses to that.

And so that, that's been the nature of DSA's attempt to clearly separate what requirements apply to parking spaces and what requirements apply to electric vehicle charging stations. One of the very common proposals that, that we hear

about all the time is, hey, I've already got one or two accessible parking stalls. Can't I just add an EV charger to those accessible parking stalls and provide accessible charging for those drivers with disabilities? And the answer to that as would be reflected in our rule making when we first brought in the ev charging station requirements was that no, that's an inappropriate proposal for altering the existing parking, accessible parking spaces.

What that does is, is two things. And we've been, DSA's been consistent on that throughout, is it diminishes the access to accessible parking because when you have electric vehicle users coming in and occupying the space for charging, then it's no longer available for parking.

And similarly, when you have disabled drivers who use the space for parking, then it diminishes the access for accessible charging. So that's why the code was practiced to distinguish between those two spaces. Now it doesn't surprise me I think that we still, that among the 500 plus building officials in California Building Departments that you still get proposals from designers and property owners to combine those spaces.

And it also isn't surprising that you may have a difference in building official interpretation on this. I, I think DSA been clear the whole time along that these two spaces should not be co-located. And, and we're still maintaining that with, even with this proposal and attempting to distinguish the spaces here within signage requirement, to make sure that we've got some language that applies to the parking spaces, accessible parking spaces, and some language that applies to the accessible ev charging.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Derek.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Thanks, Derek and I totally understand what you just said and thank you for elaborating on DSA's position. I think the challenge that code enforcers are facing, and code users are facing is other than that one location that I don't have the code section in front of me, but I think Ernest referred to that one area in the code where it says that for the purposes of this section...

Ernest Wuethrich: It's 208.1, Arfaraz.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Thank you. 208.1 where it says EV spaces aren't considered parking spaces. It would, it would certainly help if rather than it being hidden there in that one section, if it, if it's more upfront and center, so that we're DSA's position is, is more clear on that. And that would help code enforcement as well as code users to better, to better interpret the code intent. Thank you.

Derek Shaw: Thanks, Arfaraz.

Brad Morrison: Okay, Thank you. I've got two more comments here and once we, just bear with me folks because once we get through these two comments, we'll address the time issue. We're running a little late, so I just wanna be sure and come back to that before we go any further out. But let me get these two comments in while we're on the topic. Gene, you're up next. Gene?

Gene Lozano: No, I guess.

Brad Morrison: Okay.

Gene Lozano: No, I don't have anything. I guess I need to hit...

Brad Morrison: The hand.

Gene Lozano: Yeah. Star nine. I guess it's okay.

Brad Morrison: Thanks Gene. Appreciate it. Okay. Vidal.

Gene Lozano: It says. It just, I get an announcement saying that I'm, you will be informed that I've raised my hand. It doesn't take it down. You have to do it.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks, Gene. I will, I'll do what I can. Thank you. Vidal.

Vidal Medina: Yes. Not, not being in the business and just basically providing services to consumers and information, one of the things that jumped out at me right now was, is there, and it gives, and I have this question, is there any requirements for persons with disabilities using the stations, electric vehicle charging stations in regard to signage?

Now, there was a little bit of discussion right now from Derek on that topic and then that helped me understand that. But the person who does have an electric vehicle with a disability and a placard, how are they going to determine the stations and how, not just how to use them, but whether they could park there?

And I think Derek answered that question, not you can't park there long periods of time because it's not a parking, but I can see there's going to be some confusion on interpretation from persons with disabilities who have placards and they may, they may kind of decide on their own, well, this allows me to come in at this charging station, charge my vehicle and use it as a parking. Not, not knowing where those parkings are gonna be placed. Over.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks Vidal. Any, any comments? Okay.

Derek Shaw: You know what, I, this is Derek, and I can respond to that.

Yes. There are requirements for signage at accessible electric vehicle charging stations. The, the, the requirements are going to require identification sign with the international symbol of accessibility. That's the wheelchair symbol sometimes people call it that. As well as signs identifying van accessible ev charging stations. Now for, recognizing the, the impact that electric vehicle charging stations may have on very small facilities, the requirements for providing identification signs, that's the ISA and the van accessible spaces.

But the requirements for where you have four or fewer total electric charging stations, then we, we do not have a requirement for the ISA, or van accessible signage. Where we have five to 25 total electric vehicle charging station, we require one van accessible EVCS shall be identified with an ISA, international symbol of accessibility.

And that the required standard accessible EVCS is one of them would not be required to be identified with an ISA. And then when we get to facilities with 26 or more total electric vehicle charging stations, then all required van accessible and all required standard accessible electric vehicle charging stations must be identified with the ISA.

And so,

Vidal Medina: Thank you very much.

Derek Shaw: {Indiscernible} identification requirements.

Vidal Medina: Thank you, Derek.

Derek Shaw: You're welcome, Vidal.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Derek. And thank you, Vidal. Okay. Since there are no further comments on this topic here, I just want to step in and address the time issue. We're 15 minutes over our, you know, our time for this meeting. And I just wanna put it forth to the group or to the DSA staff how you'd like to proceed.

Derek Shaw: Well, Brad, if, if, if the collaborative members are, are willing to continue on, we're happy to continue on.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Would that be possible for everybody to stay on? For, we have four more code Sections to go through, so it could take us probably another half hour. Well, would that be possible for, for most of you to hang on.

Bob Raymer: Yeah. I'm gonna have to leave in about 10 minutes but that's okay. Go ahead and finish your business. Just let me know how things went. Okay?

Brad Morrison: Will do. Thanks. We'll have recording up this pretty soon and some meeting notes as well.

Dara Schur: Yeah, this is Dara. I have to get off at three. I have another call, but I can stay on until three.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Thanks, Dara.

Jihee Lee: This is Jihee {indiscernible} time until three.

Brad Morrison: Okay, Thank you.

Arfaraz Khambatta: This is Arfaraz. I can, I can stay on until three, but I'll have to peel off after, before, slightly before three.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks, Arfaraz. Appreciate it.

Vidal Medina: This Vidal, I can stay on until three.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Okay, let's, let's go through, why don't we, go ahead and pick up another section then. Derek, why don't you go ahead and introduce the next Section.

Okay. Sue, if you don't mind, would you please present Section on 11B-224.7. This is addressing Scoping for Housing at a Place of Education.

Susan Moe: Alrighty, So, there's only one item that we're going to change here. So rather than reading all of it, I'm only gonna read through the one subsection that we're changing.

And that is 11B-227 or 224.7.2 multi-bedroom units with adaptable features. And as it's currently stated, it says multi-bedroom housing units with adaptable features shall be provided as required by Section 11B-233.3.1.2. The number of required multi-bedroom housing units with adaptable features shall be reduced by the number of multi-bedroom housing units with mobility features.

And really what we're doing here is cleaning up a drafting error so that section 11B-224.7.2. And there's one other little tweak that we're gonna make to this, but what it will read in its revised format is accessible units with adaptable features. And then it'll go, that'll be the title. So, it's 11B-224.7.2 accessible units with adaptable features.

And then the Section will read, Accessible units with adaptable features shall be provided as required by Section 11B-233.3.1.2. The number of required accessible units with adaptable features shall be reduced by the number of multi-bedroom housing units with mobility features required by Section 11B-224.2.

And in that last sentence, instead we're going to state that units with adaptable features shall be reduced by the number of units with mobility features. And really what we're doing here, what we're finding in student housing, you see a lot of these different universities and what they do, they will have efficiency units and studio apartments that are basically a one-person unit.

They're not a multi-bedroom housing unit. So, we wanna clear that up because when we rewrite this and tweak it, then it will be in compliance with what the Fair Housing Accessibility requirements, how they would regulate these sorts of facilities because they do regulate dormitories. So, we just wanna clear this up and make it, so people understand that.

The accessible units with adaptable features that are consistent with what's required for the Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines that we're not gonna be in conflict with that. So basically, that's what we're doing with that Section. So, I'll be happy to answer any questions.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Sue. Okay. Questions on this one? Dara, you wanna start out?

Dara Schur: Sue, I, I have to say I'm a little confused, but maybe I'm not understanding exactly what you mean when you talk about adaptable units. Are you talking about adaptable units under the Fair Housing Act which are 11A but

incorporated into 11B? Are you talking about full-fledged mobility units under 11B- that have adaptable features? Cause that, that term is used in two different ways.

Susan Moe: What you need to look at, so if you look at the accessible units whether it's housing at a place of education or residential dwelling units under 11B, you've got the units with mobility features that's consistent with the 2010 ADA standards. The accessible units with adaptable features. And that's what we've pulled from Chapter 11B that are somewhat consistent with the Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines, but it goes beyond the requirements of the Fair Housing Accessibility Guidelines. And then you've got the units with communication features. So those are the three types of units. Again, it's units with mobility features, accessible units with adaptable features and the units with communication features.

Understand that an undergraduate student at a place of education, the units with mobility features actually have fewer adaptable features because you do have to install the grab bars at the outset. You can't do that later like you would do for the residential dwelling units that are regulated under Section 11B-233.3.

Dara Schur: I, it still sounds to me like this is a slight reduction in full accessibility.

Susan Moe: Actually, Dara this is a significant, it's an improvement in accessibility because if you were to look at this right now, and you look at that particular section and it reads multi-bedroom housing units with adaptable features, and then it goes on that these are the accessible units with adaptable features.

The way that people interpret this, and rightfully so when they have undergraduate student housing at a place of education, they think that the studio and efficiency apartments where they're not multi-bedroom housing units, that those don't have to comply, and in fact they do. So as written right now, it is somewhat of a reduction in access and with rewriting this, it's going to significantly improve it. Because basically what's gonna happen then when you follow through on the scoping for this, all of those studio and efficiency apartments, that could be on upper floors of a student housing facility.

You're basically gonna have a number of the units with mobility features. All of the rest of the units are going to be required to be accessible with adaptable features. But as it's written right now, when people have the undergraduate student housing at a place of education and they have studio and efficiency apartments that are not multi-bedroom, they think that they don't have to comply with this Section.

So, we're actually cleaning it up so there won't be any question as to whether or not those studio or efficiency apartments have to comply.

Dara Schur: Okay. I guess I'll just have to trace the path a little bit because to make the, I certainly understand and appreciate the change from multi-bedroom housing units to unit to accessible units. That makes sense that you're covering, studios and efficiencies. And that I appreciate very much.

Susan Moe: But those are also covered under the units with mobility features. Because if you look at the other Section here, 11B-224.7.1, which is the multi-

bedroom housing units with mobility features, really all that's talking about is the accessible route throughout the unit in compliance with Section 11B-809.2.

So, you go to the parent's section of this and if you look at that table 11B-224.2, I believe it is, that's gonna pick you up the number of units that would be required with mobility features.

Dara Schur: Okay. I, I, I hear what you're saying. I, I'll take a look at this with Bill Hecker and get back to you, but I certainly appreciate the intent and support the intent to make sure we're covering the studios and efficiencies and providing more accessibility. So, thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thanks. Thanks, Dara. Thanks, Sue. Vidal.

Vidal Medina: Yes, I, you know, I, I, I'm looking at this and one of the things that, that happens at our agency is sometimes students or, or family of students, especially we at Fresno State, have an autism group that, that runs some, some housing on, on campus, but there also is the old housing campus as well.

But one of the things I want to ask, would there. Clear definitions on the definition of the different features, whether it be communication, mobility, or adapted features for the student or the parents that, that would the college need to require, would the college need to, to provide that to both students and parents? In regards to definitions?

Susan Moe: Well, actually Vidal, when you go through the technical Sections, then it gives you the requirements for the units, accessible units with adaptable features, the units with mobility features and the units with communication features. So, you'll pick all that up in the technical provisions. So, there isn't necessarily one definition. You really have to go through those technical provisions.

Vidal Medina: And it would be okay to direct the persons that are leasing or handling the housing on campus? One thing we find here locally is that the university doesn't run the university housing. It's basically a subcontractor and there's been some issues and so it would be okay to direct them to that information that's provided right, by the DSA.

Susan Moe: Yeah. Yeah. Because even if they're a subcontractor, I mean they still have to comply.

Vidal Medina: Absolutely. That's been my argument for a while.

Susan Moe: Nope, they still, still have to comply.

Vidal Medina: All right.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Vidal. Thanks, Sue. Okay. Any more comments on this particular item? Okay. Hearing none. Can Derek, can I turn it over to you to introduce the next one? We have oh, three minutes. So, let's do our best.

Dara Schur: Yeah, I'm gonna have to get off. I'm afraid to make my three o'clock call, so I'll catch up. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Dara. Appreciate it.

Derek Shaw: Okay, well, thank you. The next one is covering Section 11B-306.2.2 the exception.

This item addresses toe clearance and the maximum depth under a lavatory. Currently the code by way of exception to Section 11B-306.2.2 requires toe clearance at, under a lavatory to extend 19 inches maximum under lavatories, required to be accessible. Okay. What, the problem that this causes is that in another section of the code that was brought in from the 2010 ADA standard when we updated Chapter 11B.

That tells us that, and that's in Section 11B-308.2.2, it tells us that the clear floor space shall extend beneath the element for a distance not less than the required reach step over the obstruction. Okay? So, we have these two sections, and I'm not gonna say they're in conflict, but they do severely restrict the design choices that are available for complying with both these sections simultaneously.

Now remember we're talking about lavatories and those are the hand washing fixtures within a toilet room. Okay? And so, there, what if I can just interpret this in layman's term is that the concern here is that you can't reach past the 19 inches maximum toe clearance depth to reach the controls to turn on and off the water at those hand washing fixtures, the lavatory.

Okay. Because typically the levers that are provided to turn the water on are located at the back of the basin for these lavatories. Okay. A literal compliance with the codes would require more creative solutions. Likely it would require the controls, the lever controls to be located in a non-standard location.

And this might be satisfied by providing an {indiscernible} side of lavatories. This does represent an extra expense on construction projects. And so, what we're proposing here, at least with this first draft, and we'd like to get comments back on this, is proposing to strike the exception to Section 11B-306.2.2, and to, and in striking it, the effect would be that under lavatories they would utilize the standard maximum depth of 25 inches maximum under an element.

Okay. And with that, I'm happy to entertain any comments or questions.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks Derek. Let's see here. Okay. Arfaraz, you're up.

Arfaraz Khambatta: Hi Derek. So my understanding off the 19 inch max under lavatories, the way it's been explained to me by Senior Architects at the Oakland Regional Office has been that you wouldn't wanna have any kind of control that is more than 19 inches away because the lavatories by their very nature, they remain wet because not everyone does in a public restroom will do the courtesy of wiping down the counter or the edge of the lavatory.

So, when someone has to reach more than 19 inches over a lavatory, they end up getting their shirt wet, so that 19 inches maximum has been in the code going back, I want wanna say to the 1990s as far as my memory can serve me, in Chapter 11B. So, by removing it, we would be removing a requirement that's been in the California

Building Code for a couple of decades. So, it wasn't something that came about, just recently if that's what you stated. And with that, I'm gonna have to peel away. Thank you. Thank you for taking my question.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Arfaraz. All right.

Derek Shaw: I, I understand that that Arfaraz has left the meeting and that's fine. I'd still like to go ahead and reply briefly if I could. I, I think that that history is, is interesting on this. It's true that the 19-inch maximum depth, under lavatory has been in the code for, quite a long time, decades.

However, what is, what was new to the code was the language that was brought in with the 2010 ADA standard. And it's in that other section that created a new interaction between code section that was not present prior to the revision of chapter 11B, the rewrite of that for the 2013 code.

So yes, the 19-inch maximum under lavatory has been in place for decades. However, it's that new interaction of requirements interacting with Section 11B-308.2 .2, which was new to prohibit any reaching further than the maximum toe clearance under a fixture or under an element.

Brad Morrison: Okay, Great. Thanks for the clarification, Derek. Appreciate it. Other comments on this one? Okay. Not hearing any. Let's move on. Derek, can you introduce our next one, the pedestrian traffic control buttons.

Derek Shaw: Sure. This one will be pretty, pretty straightforward. Two code cycles go, DSA had proposed to strike our requirements for poll supported pedestrian traffic control buttons. And just to remind everybody what the code requirements are for those, and they've been in place for quite a long time, 20 plus years, that where you have the pedestrian traffic control button, that identification would be provided with a textured yellow horizontal band with a black band above and below the yellow band.

Okay. What DSA is proposing again, is to strike this section. The reason behind it is that DSA does not have the authority to try to write regulations for traffic control devices. And a pedestrian traffic control button is a button that controls the stoplight. It causes the stoplight to turn from green to red and generally will have a pedestrian notifier, a pen head, I think that's what they call 'em, that has the walk or don't walk symbols along with them, as well as in a lot of location audio identification as well.

Lacking the authority to write such regulations in the code, DSA has attempted at its earliest point, once these issues became known to us, we've attempted to delete this section just simply since we don't have the authority to write it. There were some concerns, well the last time we brought this up, the code advisory committee approved this item.

However, when we got to the Building Standards Commission, they had indicated that this item should be further studied. DSA has further studied it. We, you know, our legal opinion is validated and the position that we don't have the authority to do this. So, with that, I think for this one, this might be a little bit different than the other, but I think what we're looking for is comments that are general in nature and might focus in on whether this change is a valid change for DSA to pursue.

So, with that, I'd sure like to hear some comments.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks. Thanks, Derek. Appreciate it. It looks like Gene is ready here. So, Gene, why don't you go ahead and make your comment.

Gene Lozano: Can you hear me now?

Brad Morrison: Yes. Gotcha. Now Gene. Loud and clear.

Gene Lozano: Okay. I think the focus as to the understanding what these markings is, there's a problem with it. These, this was introduced in, back in the 1981 and it was to identify the pole, not the device. The pole that the device was mounted on. It's a pedestrian sign.

It is to mark the pole that's used and provide directional information that on this pole is the device. It has nothing to do with the operation of the device. Now, there's three sentences that make up this section and the third one I have to agree clearly is an operational thing as to the mounting height of the device. So, it should not be there. I agree with that.

However, the rest of the other two sentences are dealing with the color coding that is on the pole to mark the presence of it. So, it can be seen from a distance, the located, whether the pole is a utility pole or if it's a stub pole. And it could be in a flower bed, it could be anywhere.

It, this section does not specify where the poles to be or what kind of pole or anything. It's just that whatever is determined by the local traffic engineer, where to put it, that it's marked. It's needed to identify that and it's for inaccessible or accessible. There is nothing connected with the type of device it is, and it does not help you to cross the street or know when to cross anything.

And, and that's the reason I'm arguing that. And have provided you with at least a rough draft of some wording that puts the focus more on the poll, including the title of the, this section, that, that we're talking about the poll being marked. And it has nothing to do with the operation of the device or the device itself.

So that's, that's generally what I have provided you with some proposed texts. There could be a little more that I could provide later reflectance, so forth for the striping, but that's the gist of it. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Gene.

Gene Lozano: And I should add the fact that it went to the California Traffic Devices Control Committee and it kind, yes, they, they felt that, you know, at the time that it should not go, DSA should not have anything to do with it, but they also have the misunderstanding. The chair at the time did fortunately, did have the understanding that the, it had nothing to do with the device. And he felt that it should be within the realm of authority of DSA, but it went no further. It basically, went in dormancy there and it's unresolved there. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Gene. Appreciate it. Are there any further comments on this one? Okay.

Derek Shaw: Thank you, Gene. This is Derek. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Okay, not hearing any further Derek, why don't we introduce our last item, the identification signs at EVCS.

Okay. Real good. For this one, Debbie has worked on this one. I've worked with her on it. So, I'd like Debbie to go ahead and present this last item. This is regarding Section 11B-812.8, the technical requirements for required identification sign at Electric Vehicle Charging Station. This is, related to the earlier item that Debbie has presented, an hour ago or so.

Debbie Wong: Everyone, there is currently no provision for technical requirements for lettering, for required identification signs at EVCS. So, we're talking about the size of the lettering on the required identification signs, which occur when scoping requires signage. So, we are proposing to add a subsection that addresses this under 11B-812.8 identification signs.

So, the addition will be 11B-812.8 lettering required. Identification signs at van accessible electric vehicle charging spaces shall be identified with a designation start quotation mark van accessible end quotation mark invisible characters with the minimum height of one inch.

Okay, so we could open it up to, for your comments. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay, Thank you. Debbie. Looks like Gene has a question or a comment. Gene, why don't you go ahead. Okay.

Gene Lozano: This gene again. This, I believe that when you're talking about the visual characters that you should say complying with Section 11B-703.5, which is the requirements for the visual characters.

And you do have the part afterwards about the one inch there. If, if we're not gonna have anything in 11B-216.5 to do with 703.5, and you're gonna have to drill down all the way down to get down to this. Then this is a place to have the citation for this for 773.5.

So, the person, the user, or the enforcement user of the code, sees visual characters but knows there's more than just a one-inch minimum character height. That there's other things that has to be done to make it a sign that is visually accessible. So, I'm just saying having the citation for the section here just before the minimum one inch.

And at the same time, I really believe that it still needs to be in 11B-216.5. So, it's not that hidden all the way down here. And I don't know where in between personally where somebody going from 216.5 gets down here, finds that they have to do the 703.5. Thank you.

Debbie Wong: Thank you. Noted.

Brad Morrison: Okay, Thanks, Gene. Thanks, Debbie. Appreciate it. Okay. Any further comments?

Okay. Not hearing any, not seeing any hands. I guess we'll move off that part of the agenda. And the only thing I see in the comments that I haven't seen addressed is, a question about our next meeting. I think it was Jihee that left that question. Can anybody respond to that with the group?

Susan Moe: Before we get a response, we got an email that Microsoft Office, they were having problems with all their applications. So, they, it was Microsoft, it wasn't us, and that's why teams, why teams didn't work.

Brad Morrison: Okay. All right. Good to know. Nice to know that everybody has a bad day, right? Yeah. Even Microsoft.

Vidal Medina: There's, there's never a dull moment with this virtual meeting thing. I mean the platforms. No, it's, it's a mess.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Okay. Okay. So, the question was just about the next meeting. I didn't know if anybody wanted to answer that or if there was a more of a formal response coming out later. Just to let us know so we can wrap up the chat.

Derek Shaw: Okay. This is Derek. We do not have the next meeting scheduled at this time, so we really have no information to share.

We will certainly want to engage with the collaborative and discuss further issues. And so, I think we will wanna schedule those meetings as we get a little further into the code development cycle here. So, we'll try to schedule those as early as possible and provide notification and communication as early as we can.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks Derek. Thank you for answering that. Appreciate it. Ernest, did you have question? Go ahead.

Gene Lozano: Just be, I think about the meeting there and I just want, because this is being recorded for the record, I just, I don't know. I, the last item I just wanted just to note that, I really think that citation 703.5 should be in the, both locations, even as duplicate. It doesn't hurt that, I believe, to having both locations. Just want that for the record. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks. Thanks, Gene. Appreciate that. Ernest, did, did you have a question? Go ahead.

Ernest Wuethrich: Yeah, just before we wrap up, I had a question for DSA and I know that, so you mentioned earlier that there were gonna be some of these additional guides that are gonna be released to support some of the changes that are gonna take place in July. We've had questions through like CASI especially of, if there's an anticipated schedule of when we may see these things rolled out?

Ida Clair: No.

Ernest Wuethrich: Okay.

Ida Clair: So, I will let you know that our first goal is to address the electric vehicle charging guides just because it's a commitment that we've made to the governor's office. And so, the accessibility changes that will happen first. We have a new hire

starting April 1st because we're a little short staffed on developing some of this information. So, we're gonna try to get to it. That's why our package is not that large. We're gonna try to get to it as soon as possible because we know that July is coming up. But we don't have a timeline right now.

Ernest Wuethrich: Would I be able to press if you think it, something related to blended transitions maybe released prior to July?

Ida Clair: We can, we can talk further Ernest in trying to address, it's, it was really focused on being a whole document kind of moving forward.

Ernest Wuethrich: Okay.

Ida Clair: Obviously, the public housing one has already been done. We're working on EVCS first because of this other commitment that we've made. So, the, the detectable warnings is what remains.

So, if you wanna, and, you know, if you wanna talk offline as to specific concerns that you wanna address with blended transitions, we can, we can listen and try to incorporate it into anything that we produce.

Ernest Wuethrich: Awesome. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Thanks, Ida. Thanks, Ernest. Appreciate it. Any other comments for the good, for the good of the order?

Okay, not hearing any. I will announce this meeting coming to an end and we'll see you all at the next juncture. And DSA will be back to us with the next date that we'll be expected to be at. Thank you very much everybody. And if you have any further questions, please go ahead, and send 'em on in and we'll see that they're addressed. Thank you,

Ida Clair: Brad, can you ensure that we receive a copy of the recording please since it's your half?

Brad Morrison: Yes. Yes. I'm gonna do the recording and I'll do a set of summary notes as well.

Ida Clair: Thank you.

Brad Morrison: So, I'll get the recording over to you pretty soon here, okay?

Ida Clair: Okay. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks a lot.