

Division of the State Architect

Access Code Collaborative Meeting

August 15, 2023

Brad Morrison: Today's meeting was originally scheduled for, um, to meet till three o'clock from nine o'clock to three o'clock. And we've revised the agenda down and we think we have what looks to be a three-hour meeting. It looks like we're, we'll probably be able to finish by noon. However, it depends on the discussion for some of the items.

As you can tell, we have, some big items coming up today, discussion of the charter and such. So we, it depends on the discussion of the items and, about 11 o'clock or so, we'll, kind of give you an update and let you know how we're doing with our time schedule and, um, and whether or not we need to ask for more time, beyond that noon hour that we're, we're considering as being our breaking point, you know, our sort of our end of the meeting point.

So, um, let me just kind of leave you with that for now and let you know that we're tracking the time and that we'll watch and report back and let you know if we need more time for the day. But as it as it looks now, we're looking to probably for 12 o'clock end. Okay. So, before we start, does anybody have any questions about, it can be about anything, whether today's agenda or other things. Richard, go ahead.

Richard Skaff: Thank you. Um, Brad, I, I just want to know what was, you said you, you and Eric and staff, um, reduced the items on the agenda. What was taken off?

Brad Morrison: Well, I think they originally planned, I, I'll let Eric speak to this maybe in more detail, but I was originally planned was much more of a, um, a detailed meeting and I think, one of the things that we're not doing today are any code, um, Code proposals, which, which normally consume a lot of the time that we have.

So, today's meeting is much more, focused on sort of background issues like the charter and, the triennial code cycle and a few other things. Let me, let me bring Eric in here and maybe you can provide it a little bit more detail there. Go ahead, Eric.

Eric Driever: Thank you. Thank you for the comment, Richard, that there have been no items reduced or taken off the agenda.

It's just in the assessment of the time, we're estimating that it could take less time. Um, certainly not going to close the meeting off.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. And, and without the code proposals, it really takes, you know, that, that's, that's really where a lot of the time goes, I think, you know, get into the details there.

So anyway, so that's, that's where we are. Why don't we go ahead and kind of, um, move our agenda along and not seeing any more questions. I'll go ahead and go on to slide two. So, you see our goals for today are to recap the 2022 intervening cycle. to reconsider review, consider changes to and obtain consensus on the ACC charter.

So, we have the charter in here as discussion item, some, some changes proposed there. We also, discussed plans for the 2024 triennial cycle. And last but not least, recap the evaluation of the technical warnings, advisory committee, EWAC, and discuss the next steps. So those are our four goals for today, and I think we're pretty good in sort of the time that we've allotted.

So, we'll kind of move on there. And, what I'd like to do in order to kind of get us going, we have a good, collection of folks that have shown up. So, what I'd like to do is go around and have everybody, introduce themselves to each other again, we're still new in terms of formation of the committee here, so I'd like to just kind of go through the introduction process and, and, have everybody just share. And please just share, who you are, what you do, and how you came to the committee really briefly, if you can. Okay. So, I'm going to start with the, um, the, ACC members, and we'll just go down the list that's, you know, on the page there. So, Mehdi, can you come on in and introduce yourself?

Mehdi Shadyab: Well, good morning, everybody my name is Mehdi Shadyab. Um, I'm with the city of San Diego. Been with them since 1988. Been in the practice of construction as an engineer for all over 44 years. You know, in 1991 when we were asked to enforce the accessibility requirements that just was, you know, put into being enforced by the jurisdictions.

Um, since then I've never stopped enforcing and learning and reading and researching and, that has been a passion of mine for, for since then. And I've been involved with many accessibilities committee. Currently I chair the chapter, local chapter of ICC, the accessibility, committee, discussing variety of issues.

I'm involved with the training of our staff so they can do much better enforcement and plan review. and I'm very proud and honored to be part of this group. Hopefully I can participate and provide a positive impact, for the next couple of years. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Mehdi. Appreciate it, Michal. Michal Healy.

Michal Healy: Hi everyone, I'm Michal Healy. I'm the director of facility development and planning for Santa Clara Unified School District in the Bay area of California. And I am a licensed architect, and my job is to help, um, plan and master plan the, um, really help, help maintenance with any projects, but, um, planning any construction projects for the school district.

Um, so I work in conjunction with the architects that we hire, and I hope to just bring a K-12 experience perspective to the committee and, um, some of our trials and tribulations with getting things constructed. So that's my, background. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks Michal. Appreciate it. Jorge.

Jorge Rivas: Hi, my name is Jorge Rivas and, I live in San Diego and I'm just here to help out in any way I can and, um, try to make things better for the disabled community. Great. Thanks Jorge. Appreciate it. Mark. Good morning, folks. Mark here. also, a member of the physically disabled community, with, my legs, having been, um, removed by a bomb in Afghanistan, kind of representing the, the veteran, physically disabled, community to some capacity.

Mark Zambon: Um, I am down in Los Angeles currently in law school and, um, met Eric on a swim in Lake Natomas a couple years ago as swim buddies. That's kind of how my in, to the committee came about. So, good morning, everyone. Have a great one.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Mark. Appreciate it. Nathan.

Nathan Dison: Just getting off on mute. Sorry. Um, Nathan Dyson or Nate Dyson. Um, I'm an architect at Gensler, um, technical director there. It's a, it's a large architecture firm and we have a lot of commercial clients, um, building owners and, the community that kind of owns and deals with disabled requirements, disability access requirements in the built environment.

And so, I'm here to represent them, but, um, I would like to, you know, state that I'm a strong advocate within Gensler for, um, better disabled access within the built environment. And so, you know, very honored and happy to be here and helping to represent the building and construction industry, but also, um, representing back to them the needs of the disabled community.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Nate. Appreciate it. Larry.

Larry Grable: Good morning. Larry Grable, executive Director of Service Center for Independent Life, one of the six independent living centers in LA County. Um, way I got on the board is somehow the application came across my desk and as we are very, you know, my, um, system change advocates are, are very involved in affordable accessible housing and we do a lot of transition diversion work. Um, thought that this was something I needed to be involved with and, got our word out there. So, thank you for the opportunity and look forward to participating.

Brad Morrison: Oh, great. Thanks Larry. Appreciate it. Sue.

Susan Moe: Good morning. my name is Susan Moe. I'm an architect and a certified access specialist. I worked for 17 years for one architectural firm in the private sector. One of my last big jobs when I worked for Ed Cado was the Ziggurat building over in West Sacramento, where the Department of General Services is now located.

The good thing with Ed, he, when I went to work for him, he said he would teach me everything I needed to know to become a licensed architect. So, I basically served an apprenticeship with his office and, became licensed. Then in 2006 I went to work for the Department of General Services and the Real Estate Services and Design Unit, and my supervisor there was a gentleman named Dennis Ellis.

So, in 2011, when it was decided that chapter 11A would be completely rewritten, Dennis went over to the division of the state architect first, and then by that time I'd become a certified access specialist. So, I followed Dennis over to DSA, so I was fortunate to participate in the big rulemaking when, um, chapter 11B was revamped, I also, created the first of the open book CASp exams.

I left the division of the state architect two years ago and now I have my own consulting firm and my main focus when I was at the division of the state architect was in all the various housing regulations. So, I'm happy to serve on the committee and, glad to be here. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Sue. Appreciate it. Nubyaan.

Nubyaan Scott: Good morning. Can you hear me okay, Brad?

Brad Morrison: You sound good.

Nubyaan Scott: Okay, awesome. Good morning. Um, my name is Nubyaan Scott. I'm based in Northern California. I currently work as an ADA compliance officer within the UC system. And I previously worked as a civil rights attorney and a good portion of my work focused on advocacy for increased affordable and accessible housing.

I also previously worked in fair housing and did advocacy for people with significant developmental disabilities. And previous to that I operated a statewide assistive technology resource hotline. Um, I'm looking forward to continuing to work with my ACC colleagues and also getting to know you all better. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Nubyaan. Appreciate it, Richard.

Richard Skaff: Um, good morning, all. Um, my name is Richard Skaff. I, in 1978 decided to save 50 bucks and trim a tree and ended up becoming a para when the branch I was standing on broke and fell 35 feet. Um, I managed a major restaurant on Fisherman's Wharf, had experience with disability related issues or civil rights. I was a white, upwardly mobile male with a wife and two kids living in a three-year-old home in Mill Valley, um, with a view of the bay. Um, and, um, it was quite a shock, um, to, um, become a person with a disability and understand the implications, not just the physical implications, but the civil rights implications.

And, um, I went on to start the, um, Marin Center for Independent Living as the first president of the board, and then the first executive director, um, [indescribable], I've been a friend of and worked with for almost 40 years was working at Department of

Rehab at the time and had started the Community Access Network program, something that before her death last year, we were talking about, recreating. Um, it was a program that would, um, find volunteers throughout the state, people with disabilities. She would bring them up to Sacramento through Department of Rehab funding, um, to do a two-day code training. Um, so that there were code, and I'm going to use the term experts. Um, at that time, the code was a lot less. Um, it, it was not as detailed as it is today. So it was, it was relatively, easier to learn and become expert at. Um, and we would go back to our communities and meet with business owners or cities, counties, public entities, um, and work on assuring that, um, facilities in our community met California Title 24 and were accessible.

It was an amazing event. That's how I learned about, Title 24 and Access and Codes. And from that point, um, became a member, early on with DSA on, its access advisory committees, and did that for years until the, um, last eight years with the previous state architect who, I will say, um, did not like access.

Um, in fact, the day. That we, a group of us met with him when he was first, appointed. Um, we met, and we spent the first half hour, the seven of us talking about the issues we hoped he would, um, respond to during his tenure. And then he spoke and the first thing he said to us was, I can't wait until I don't have to deal with you people anymore.

That sort of set the tone for the next eight years. Um, I'm glad to see that's changed. Um, we have Eric, who is an amazing person. and I say that especially because of his openness and willingness to hear, um, issues, um, whether they're difficult issues or not. Difficult meaning that there is a substantial opposition to areas, of access that people with disabilities need.

I do want to say that I am a little disappointed, um, with the, um, limited number of people with disabilities on the ACC right now. I'm hoping that we have a majority, we should continue to have a majority of people with disabilities on the ACC. Um, we should have a majority because this whole process is to assure that the built environment is accessible.

And unless we have people with varying types of disabling conditions who have experience living with their disabilities on this committee, um, we won't hear what we need to hear. Um, and that's the issues that are still outstanding with either existing access codes or the need for, new code, additions to Title 24.

Um, thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

Brad Morrison: Okay, thank you, Richard. oh, and Dominica, and please tell me if I'm pronouncing your name wrong. Dominica, are you with us today? Okay, let's, let's move on. Anne, would you like to introduce yourself? Anne Riggs.

Anne Riggs: I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

Brad Morrison: Yeah, there you go.

Anne Riggs: Thank you. Okay. Hi. Apologies. I was on double mute. Um, I'm Anne Riggs. I'm representing Design Professionals. I am an architect. Um, I'm actually, I specialize in the design of, publicly funded and affordable housing. I am also a certified access specialist, and I am the inclusive design lead for San Francisco based David Baker Architects.

Um, and in that role, um, you know, my sort of personal goal, advocacy goal, is to help bridge the, the disconnect between facility access compliance and disability justice. Um, you know, there tends to sometimes be a mindset that that minimum compliance with the building code is sufficient to provide access, which I think we all know is not the case.

It's a starting point and we want to make sure that the code ensures, um, an equitable minimum. Access compliance requirement, but then also, um, in the design community, we want to be only taking that as a starting point and going much, much, much farther to achieve equitable, environments. That's, that's me.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Ann. Appreciate it, Sean.

Sean McNamara: Good morning, everyone. Um, as with, many of you, I've got, kind of, several connections, to the, the various advocacy groups here. Um, background was in, local jurisdictional, code enforcement building, code enforcement. Um, I myself do not have a disability, but my oldest two daughters, 20 and 15, both have disabilities, um, cognitive and, mobility.

So, it's something that, you know, years ago I was drawn to, you know, accessibility in the built environment. Um, I'm a CASp as well. Um, I was named as a representative for facility owners. Um, up until about three weeks ago, I was working for, Target Corp, leading code compliance initiatives and accessibility, um, you know, across their, their fleet across the country.

Um, I recently jumped ship back to the public sector, um, and, been named campus building official at UC, Berkeley. Um, so, still, you know, the facility owner, I'm still in that world. But also, back in, you know, the code enforcement side. Um, hope to be able to continue on, you know, with the committee.

Um, you know, if there's any aversion to that, you know, certainly would, you know, give up my, my seat if, need be. But, yeah, I still have a, a strong connection with, my former colleagues in the public or private sector. Um, and look forward to continuing on, you know, as the committee sees.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Sean. Appreciate it.

Tim McCormick: Tim, I think that's a better put my, camera back up. Huh? Yeah, I guess you can see me now, right? Okay. Well, um, I'm glad to be here this morning.

It's nice to hear everybody's stories. I've been involved in the construction, architect engineering industry for almost 50 years now. Probably too long, but I do actually like what I'm doing, so I keep doing it. And because of that, I've worn a lot of different hats.

I actually started out in construction. I've been a carpenter, a superintendent. I was a general contractor for a while. Then I actually had an accident, which made me very sensitive to, limitations. My results were not quite as dramatic and, life changing as they've been for Richard or Mark, but it did certainly give me a great degree of sensitivity for the issue.

And I began to realize even back in the eighties when we were doing, commercial tenant improvements and malls and things, that there were accessibility of requirements that were first coming in. It was all new. Um, since then I became a licensed civil engineer and I've also kept my contractor's license.

I work now as a consultant. I spent about 13 years as a building official, both for a city and a county. And so, I had primary code of enforcement responsibilities, um, for a number of regulations, including accessibility regulations. And I learned a lot about the importance of language and clarity of language.

So, my outlook for a lot of this is simply, can I build it? It's just that simple. Is the language clear enough that I can build it? And so, I'm going to try in my role here, representing Code of Foresters, to take that view of, you know, is it clear enough and easy to be understand. Sometimes we can't see the porous for our own trees.

It's difficult to write code language. I've written a lot of it over the last 30 years. I'm, I've learned a lot from listening to people who read it after I wrote it and told me I, I wasn't making sense yet. And, um, that's just the challenge of writing it. And it does take a village and a lot of people to get it.

So, with all of our, valuable and noble intents for getting, you know, equal access throughout our, our, regulations, we also have to keep in mind that the simpler we make it, the more likely it will be done and understood by the vast audience of people who will be reading these regulations we write.

And so, um, that's what I hope to bring, is a, a certain amount of, can we say it simpler? Can we make it easier to understand so that everybody can do it? And, um, that's, that'll be hopefully my take and contribution.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Tim.

Richard Skaff: Brad,

Brad Morrison: I appreciate it. Yes.

Richard Skaff: Brad? Brad, can I interrupt just for a second to add something?

Cause um, Tim just brought something up that is extremely important. Um, we have, we have a state that gives local building officials the authority, the ability to interpret all code, not just access code, but all code. The problem that has been created, there's two problems. One that we don't write code that's clear.

we write code in code language that very few people understand when it gets down to the contractor or the building official or whoever is making the final determination on site. We need some specific issues to happen. Number one, each of the five code writing agencies should have what we finally have had over the years that I've been asking for, interpretive manual.

I know it's not called that, but we need that so that those that make interpretations can understand the intent of the, of the code that was written by one of the five code writing agencies. The other issue is the very problem of having, um, that ability in local enforcement and interpretation of code.

Um, and I'm not suggesting that the code officials are bad people, but what I am suggesting is we have chaos statewide. We do not have what is supposed to be happening, and that's consistency with code interpretation and enforcement. I'm not sure how to solve that. There is a simple way to solve that, take away the authority.

And I know I will probably hear a great, um, scream from a lot of people take away the authority to interpret code by local officials, have the interpretation done by each of the fi, each of the code writing agencies. And the, the issues then that are the responsibility of the local building official would be to enforce those codes as interpreted by the writer of the code.

Um, and I've been a writer of some of the codes in Title 24. I understand both the process and the difficulty in both creating a code and interpreting it. Um, and I think this is something, this committee and. The other code writing agency should be discussing as a group to see what we can do, um, to get consistency in code interpretation statewide. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay, thanks Richard. Appreciate it. Okay, so I'd like to move on to the other side of, um, on the left side of our column here and introduce people by agency here. So, let me, open it up, to, Ida, are you with us still? Ida's also on a training today. Um, so she

Ida Clair: No, that finished at eight.

Brad Morrison: Oh, there she is. Okay. There. She's Okay. There you go.

Ida Clair: I'm here. Um, introducing myself. So, um, welcome. I'm the State Architect. Um, I came to DSA in 2013 as CASp Technical Administrator. Then I promoted to Principal Architect, which is Eric's role, and now, um, acting State Architect in 2019, and then state architect in 2021.

Prior to coming to DSA, my specialty in private practice was affordable multi-family housing, where, um, I had to deal with a lot of the federal standards, um, that sometimes three or four that were applicable, um, for a project including state standards. And, um, became an access specialist in 2009. Early in the, DSA, um, issuance of the exam, I took the second offering.

Um, I also established, along with a few others, the Certified Access Specialist Institute and, um, developed this Cassie's professional standards and codes of ethics and worked with the legislature on 11SB-1186. And then I was its Director of Legislative Affairs. Um, I was also on the team that did the comparison for the 2010 ADA standards for DSA, which was a national team prior to my coming with DSA and I addressed the housing comparisons with the, um, 2010 CBC to the 2010 ADA standards.

I did the housing section for that for DSA, I'm sorry, for the team, which was under contract for DSA. So, um, have a long history in access. However, I'm still always learning and that's why I was on training this morning because, you can never learn enough of access, that's for sure. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank, thank you Ida. Appreciate it. Eric,

Eric Driever: Well, good morning. I'd like to actually just start by thanking, um, all the ACC members that are in attendance, and we actually do have, quite a few, folks that are calling in. I want to really thank them for calling in and expressing their interest by attendance.

I think there's about 24 of you that are on the phone and listening in, and I know that, Richard, you had some earlier stated concerns about that, um, in terms of their active participation in the meeting, we'll certainly get to that. But I did at least want to thank everybody for joining both the ACC members and the folks that are calling in for, as participants.

My name is Eric Driever. I'm Principal Architect here at DSA, as, um, I mentioned over architectural codes and policies. I'm responsible for not just the, access regulations, um, portion of headquarters, but also CASp, fire life safety and, um, a few, and sustainability. I should throw that in there.

And a couple other smaller programs, um really, um, appreciate the ability to be here with you today. I come from private practice prior to 2012, and since, in 2012, I joined, the state working for DGS RESD; Real Estate Services Division. Um, I think I actually backfilled most Sue Mo's position when I joined D s A there when she moved over, or when I joined, DGS when she moved over to DSA.

Um, and I, I'm hoping that she didn't retire simply because I joined DSA, but I seemed to follow Sue around quite a bit, appreciate her being on the, ACC and, um, look forward to working with everybody on the, on the meeting today.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you. Eric. Michelle.

Michelle Davis: Hello everybody, my name is Michelle Davis.

I'm a supervising architect here at DSA and I have been here, one year, tomorrow. Um, so relatively new to state service. Before that, I was, at a number of private practice firms and I have, well, I'm a licensed architect and a CASp, and I have spent my career working on everything from multi-family and single-family housing to hospitals and prisons and commercial projects.

And pretty much if it's a building, I've probably worked on it in some capacity or another. Well, I've been a cast since 2010. it is a passion of mine and, this is probably the only time you'll hear me say this, but I spent the first, six years of my life wearing braces. On my legs. And, um, I, my husband is also a person with a disability.

Um, so I have some experience and knowledge. Um, and I just, you know, like I said, it's a passion and I, hope to make practical and logical steps with the code so that we do not have chaos, and everybody can understand the code and what it's trying to achieve. So, thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Michelle. Appreciate that. Kirklyn.

Hi, I'm Kirklyn Cox. I'm a Senior Architect for DSA less than a month into the position. So, newer than Michelle. Um, but I'm coming up on five years of state service. I've been, I was hired on state, the Real Estate Services, division, so RESD, um, suit. I'm familiar with the Ziggurat building.

That's where I, where my office was for four and a half years. So, um, come over within DGS to DSA, just, just a few weeks ago. So, prior to some of the projects I worked on with, RESD were, was access barrier removal projects and design and construction. So, I have that experience coming into this position.

Um, prior to that I worked in private practice, doing healthcare projects. Um, obviously a lot of, a lot of accessibility issues there. Um, so I'm new here. Um, there's a lot to do for DSA and I'm looking forward to helping, um, them with all their various accessibility initiatives. So, um, here a little rolling up my sleeves.

Put in some elbow grease and help out with that stuff. So, looking forward to collaborating with the ACC and working with all the members. And so, um, looking forward to, what's coming down the pipe.

Brad Morrison: Great, thanks Kirkland. Appreciate it. Welcome. Thank you. let's see, Greg.

Eric Driever: I'd like to announce though that, or maybe Michelle can announce she's not, Alicia is not with us today, but many of you may know that we've had some vacancies and we are really close to having those filled.

But Alicia Chavez will be joining us next week. Alicia comes to us from private practice as a really experienced architect from a local firm, um, and we're looking forward to having her on the team.

Brad Morrison: Sounds good. Thanks. Thanks Eric. Appreciate that, Greg.

Greg Hartley: Hey everybody, my name's Greg Hartley. I work for Eric as a Program Analyst. I work with, the LMS system and on the ACC and also the Historical Building Safety Board. Um, so if you guys have any issues with Zoom or any questions about ACC, you can always shoot me an email, um, and I can get back to you on any information you need. And I look forward to working with everyone here.

Brad Morrison: Thank you. Great. Thank you, Greg. Appreciate it. Greg is the backbone. He's really got a handle on the whole system here, so, he's a very important person. Okay, so next one up. Um, I see, for HCD we have Veronica. Veronica, would you like to introduce yourself?

Veronica Turdean: Of course. Good morning, everyone. My name is Veronica.

I'm Associate Construction Analyst and Chapter 11, an access code specialist for the Department of Housing and Community Development. I've been holding, I think, the co-officio member position for about a year now, so this will be my second year around. since I'm the accessibility specialist representing HCD I will inform our co-development team of any upcoming changes related to 11B.

Just to make sure that I coordinate, you know, in Chapter 11A and there is no conflict, with each other. This collaboration should diminish code, conflict, conflict and minimize confusion along the enforcing agencies about me. Throughout the years, I have owned various positions in architecture field, in private sector, and I work for the state for DGS and BSC for quite a few years.

Um, for DGS and BSC I was an Architectural Designer. I worked in space planning. I helped design spaces for the state, but also worked for, um, a company that worked for Department of Justice. So, I designed a lot of penitentiaries and courthouses and, um, so I worked for a lot of architectural firms as well.

Um, I always liked 11A and 11B. It was something that I was always interested in, so it was always assigned to me every time I had to design something. Um, and since one of my family members, um, has special needs, it's something that's very near and dear to my heart. So, I hope I can make an impact and I can help.

Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you very much, Veronica. Appreciate it. Next up we have, um, either Kevin Day or a designee from the Building Standards Commission. Okay. That's you, Tom?

Tom Martin: Yes, I would be the designee. Kevin Day is not only the Deputy executive director, but he is also acting executive director.

So, I am here for him today as he is quite busy in both of his roles. My name is Tom Martin. I was an electrician for 30 something years working on low-income housing. Um, so I've dealt with the electrical part of, um, access for low income, not, I'm sorry, not low-income housing, um, public housing. And I worked, went, worked for the state at HCD in 2012.

I dealt with accessibility there for 11 years, um, almost 11 years to the day, transferred to, Building Standards Commission as a staff services manager, one specialist. And then as of yesterday, I promoted to an Associate Architectural, an Associate Construction Analyst. Um, and I will be here representing Building Standards Commission today.

Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Tom. Appreciate it. Um, okay, next up we have, let's see, for CCDA. April, are you here?

April Dawson: Hi. Hi everyone. Um, this is April Dawson and I'm the Executive Director of the California Commission on Disability Access. And we're one of the ex-officio agencies for the ACC. And we are a 17-member public commission whose mission is to increase access across California through dialogue and collaboration with a variety of stakeholders, including, but not limited to the, the business disability and all levels of government communities.

And, um, I myself am very passionate about placemaking and, making sure that there, that the people who are most affected by the code, which is every, everyone in the community, have an opportunity to, um, be able to have an opinion about it before it gets written into the law. So, I'm really passionate about stakeholder engagement, particularly for people with disabilities and others who, um, are sometimes underrepresented in these placemaking spaces.

So really passionate about being here today. And, our commission focuses, mainly on business access for people with disabilities, including websites. So that's our, our main focus. Um, but we also place ourselves in larger, placemaking conversations and code conversations. So happy to be here today and looking forward to working with all of you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, April. Appreciate that. From DOR, I think, Ken, are you, are you representing DOR today?

Ken Ng: Yes, sir. Good morning. My name's Ken and I'm from Department of Rehab Rehabilitation. I'm here. Presenting our deputy Ana Acton. So, what DOR does is that we are the state department that promote and educate about public, about the civil rights of people with disability.

Our department focused on providing service to a number of nonprofits. Those they would have their ability to provide different type of benefit to the people with disability community. Another thing we do here in DOR is that we provide job placement and job training to the people with disability, and we also provide technical assistance to the public so they can find information relating to any disability related information.

So happy to see you guys here and, um, hopefully I can contribute and help. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Ken. Appreciate that. Okay and from the DRC we have Kendra.

Kendra Muller: Good morning. My name is Kendra Muller and I'm representing the Disability Rights California Organization. It's the Designated Protection Advocacy Group for all of California, and I am looking forward to serving here.

Um, in my personal capacity, I have several disabilities and I also use a wheelchair. Um, and I'm happy to discuss more about DRC if you'd like, but that is a quick overview.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Kendra. Really appreciate it. Okay. Everybody is, have I missed anybody? Is there anybody else on the call that, we should introduce?

Okay. And let me just one more call out, Dominica, are you there? Okay. I'll give you chances. Come in here and let me answer a question over here from the DSA side. Go ahead, Eric, that, would that be you?

Eric Driever: Yeah. Thank you. I just wanted to take a moment. We will go over the, um, the additional ex-officio members.

I realized that, um, that is a new topic. Um, currently with us today are those, folks from, Building Standards Commission, CCDA, DOR, and DRC. Um, these are the additional ex-officio members, the DSA is adding. Um, and, and I recognize that there were some earlier questions about, um, the reasoning behind that.

Our plan is to go into that in a little bit more detail during the, um, discussion on the charter. That is where those ex officio members are, um, noted. Um, so we'll certainly answer any questions related to that during that portion of the agenda, if that's acceptable.

Brad Morrison: Great. Okay. Thank you, Eric.

Appreciate that. Thank you. Well, thank you for taking the time to do that. I realize we're all still, getting to know each other. Um, and it was really nice to take the time to really hear from everybody and kind of have you all check in. Good to see you all again, for those of you that are returning.

And so now we're going to move on to our next, next slide, which is about the, the, accomplishments, in the 2022 intervening code cycle. So, um, you can see here we are building Standards, Commission hearing 27th and 28th. Turns out that all items were approved, except for one item, which was returned for further study.

So, we'll be seeing that in a future meeting as we discuss that. But you can see the accomplishments there and signs, privacy latch, adult changing facilities on through the rest. All items were approved. And I want to, you know, shout out to the ACC for doing a good job of, shepherding these proposals through, considering each one of them discussing all the, weaknesses and strong points and, helping to create the final draft that went on to the Building Standards Commission.

Let me, go to questions from, how about Ida, you are first and then we'll go to, the folks at DSA.

Ida Clair: Yeah, there is one correction. Not all items were approved. One item was further study, and that is clarifying the correction to, um, the, 36 by36 shower and adaptable units, the reference of the entire section of, of the reference to the entire section of the requirements.

So, this is a little confusing. There was a code provision for the. 36 by36 showers in the adaptable units that made ref, that intended to make reference to the size only in the fully accessible units, but inadvertently by the reference brought in all the requirements for the fully accessible units.

Um, and so there was a confusion between the requirements for accessible units and the requirements for the adaptable units for the 36 by 36 shower, commission recommended further study. So, I just want to correct, correct that. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Ida. Appreciate that. Eric?

Michelle Davis: This is Michelle actually,

Brad Morrison: Oh, Michelle. DSA team. Come on in. '

Michelle Davis: Hey, um, I just want to fill in the ACC, for those who maybe didn't know, a big portion of the work we did in the last go around was, due to the plumbing code changing, the plumbing code is going to allow multi-user all gender toilet rooms. It is an option, it's not required, but because designers can choose that option now, we put in requirements for accessibility in those types of toilet rooms.

And that was, a lot of work. And, we successfully now have requirements for all gender, multi-user toilet rooms. That is something that was relatively new to the code that the concept is, is new to the code. So, um, that was a big portion of our work. I just wanted to let everybody know that was, that is new and was approved.

Eric Driever: And I'll, I'll just, you know, focusing on that last line. Thank you. ACC, we, we received, Excellent feedback from this group. Um, our original proposals, um, early in the pre cycle, um, portion of, of the rulemaking process looked very different. Um, we've added signage to clarify in those all-gender restrooms, um, increased increase the size base requirements.

So there, there was really some significant, um, effort by not just d s A, but this group here, along with a public workshop. I felt like our outreach last cycle was a huge success and the intervening cycle, the, the amount of items that were approved during the intervening cycle, um, was very significant for that type of rulemaking process.

Um, we continue to look forward to having great involvement by the ACC and the public alike. Um, and or as will be announced, looking forward to a, a new public workshop to receive, um, comments or proposals from, from everyone. But, just really wanted to thank this group's involvement in our last rulemaking cycle. It was, I feel a huge success.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Eric. Appreciate that. Okay. hearing no further comments, I'm going to move on to the next item. Okay, so now we've come to the portion of our discussion where we're going to talk about our charter and, um, the charter's, the governing document. I, I hope many of you have had a chance to look at it, a little bit of the background, perhaps the, uc Davis study or the, um, the charter itself, just to read through and understand a little bit more about, sort of our guiding structure that we would, you know, um, that kind of governs how people come make their way to the ACC and, how the, ACC functions and who's the participants and that sort of thing.

So, um, the, let me just kind of read through the, the bullets here. The purpose of this ACC charter discussion is to obtain consensus on the terms, conditions, rules, rules, and expectations related to this new collaborative effort amongst the current members. So, um, so that's, that's our following discussion here is hopefully we'll get some of those, you know, things back here by submitting the application.

Each member agreed to abide by the charter in its current form. Last, DSA reserves the right to return certain aspects of the ACC charter, and these items will be covered during the discussion. Okay. So, um, before we move,

Eric Driever: Do you want me to go ahead and,

Brad Morrison: Yeah, would you please, Eric, let me turn it over to you.

Eric Driever: Okay. I'll share my screen. Is everybody able to see the document? The, the current charter?

Brad Morrison: Well, no, hold on one sec. Let me, um, let me stop my share and see if that helps. There we go. Okay.

Eric Driever: Are you able to see it now? Yeah, it's up there. Okay, perfect. It's not totally evident to us, but, um, so the, the purpose of the charter really is.

This is a collaborative, and the emphasis needs to be on collaboration. Um, DSA has, does not have interest in, um, creating or, I guess forcing bylaws upon a, a collaborative group. Um, certain aspects of this certainly are, are associated to statute and DSA's responsibility. And then there's others that are really, a core part of, um, the UC Davis study that was conducted.

So, to, to a certain extent. And that's really on that last bullet point that Brad had mentioned. Um, DSA does need to preserve some aspects of the charter. Um, but in that this is a collaborative effort. We recognize that this is a new group, and this new group needs to have some agreement on how they'd like to operate as a group.

Um, the, the best way to, um, for a, a collaborative such as this to, to advance is to make sure that everybody is comfortable with their roles, responsibilities, and, and, um, all of these surrounding, I guess, sort of guidelines that will help guide the discussion moving forward. And so is what I have in front of you is track changes form of the current charter, where we've begun to, make some of the changes to this.

And we'd like to enter into a discussion about aspects of, of the, of the charter to make sure that everybody's comfortable with these, in the previous in the slide Brad was sharing, just want to acknowledge that, that everybody did. We can't do a wholesale change. Um, everybody did agree to the terms, the previous terms, but understanding that this is a new group we, we'd like to maybe, um, make sure to, to check back with you to make sure that everybody's understanding and if there's any necessary changes, certainly, the advent of digital participation has changed. So that, that's one aspect that we'll look at updating. But, um, certainly what, what I'd like to do is go through the, the charter and, um, maybe point by point and make some adjustments as needed.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Can we let in, can we let Ann in for a question, Eric?

Eric Driever: Yeah, absolutely.

Ann Riggs: Hi, thank you. Sorry, I was just wondering, and apologies if I missed it. Was this document shared via email or is it possible to view, um, view, um, for us to view a version of this document while we're looking at it together?

Eric Driever: Sure. I believe, so Greg, are we going to be, or if you can sort of on the fly, distribute the, um, PowerPoint presentation as a P D F? Is that possible, Greg?

Greg Hartley: Yeah, I can distribute that.

Eric Driever: Okay. So, and in that PowerPoint presentation, if you're able to access it, um, there, there is a live link to, um, all of the, or to several of the documents that we'll be discussing. You. The, the charter was, is available on the DSA website. If you go to resources and search for, um, ACC, you'll come up with a, a long list of hits on that.

But if you find, um, the, the website or the webpage associated to the, to the ACC, you'll see in the lower right-hand corner that there is a, um, a link to the charter.

Anne Riggs: Okay, great. Yes, I see that. And this is the, this is the, um, proposed changes version?

Eric Driever: Yeah. So, what you have on the link on the webpage is the current version, um, in the, we haven't completed the, the draft. We completed that. We're going to complete that today. That, that we'll distribute this after the fact.

Anne Riggs: Okay. Understood. Thank you.

Eric Driver: Thank you. Okay. So, I'll, I'll start just by a simple reading of the purpose. The division of the state architect has statutory responsibility and authority for proposing to the California Building Standards Commission. BSC amendments to the chapter 11B of the California Building Code, addressing accessibility of the built environment.

DSA has established the access code and collaborative to provide input and work with d ss a to improve the rulemaking process. Um, I, I don't suspect that's, I, I feel like that's, an area where we'll leave the purpose alone, um, unless there's significant comment. Um, DSA role and authority, it is important for the ACC members to understand what authority D S A has and does not have, related to the C D C accessibility regulations based upon California statutes, this creates appropriate expectations about what DSA and the ACC can accomplish through this initiative.

First bullet. DSA does have the authority to write accessibility regulations for the built environment for public accommodations, commercial facilities, public buildings, and public housing in the state of California. E s A is a regulatory agency and is not an advocacy group. Um, though we may have those personal, desires as an agency, um, we permitted from being an advocacy group.

As such, DSA is required to follow statutorily mandated procedures and propose regulations within their scope of authority and consistent with state law. DSA

develops accessibility regulations based upon executive action. Legislative mandate or on demonstrated need identified by DSA or proposed by others.

That's potentially you folks. Um, DSA is required by building standards law to evaluate the impact of accessibility regulation on zone, excuse me, on all stakeholders. DSA is an enforcement entity only for public schools, community colleges, state buildings, California State University, and University of California.

Representatives of those, I believe, are, in our membership today. All other buildings and facilities are enforced by other entities, usually by local building departments, um, and our outside d s a statutory authority, authority, enforcement authority. Um, I think that speaks to one of the concerns Richard was bringing up earlier, and DSA assists many stakeholders and local authorities with technical assistance and training.

So, the, the portion, probably start getting into some areas where, um, we'll look for some feedback. The ACC has been established, excuse me, has been established to work cooperatively with DSA to support DSA rulemaking processes. The ACC is a consultative or advisory body without formal decision-making authority based upon commitments made during the ACC members selection PRO process.

All approved ACC members have agreed to work collaboratively with DSA and other ACC members to meet the goals of the ACC, whose purpose is one, to offer input and feedback regarding proposed amendments to the CBC, help create transparency related to the discussion of proposed amendments and recommendations made by the ACC for the rulemaking record.

Offer code change proposals for consideration by DSA that may address the diverse needs of code beneficiaries, people who need an accessible environment, and the clarity sought by code users, people who design, build, own, operate, or regulate the built environments. And four, to identify opportunities to strengthen public awareness, engagement, and training to support regulatory development of CBC Compliance is the intent of the ACC members to the best of their ability, represent the interests of their broad, broader stakeholder group, not solely their own interests or, or those of any specific organization.

The ACC is encouraged to work with their representative group to identify necessary code changes. Um, so I'd like to pause there and see if there's any questions or comments by members of the ACC. I will highlight, um, and maybe use this as an opportunity to, um, discuss one of Richard's concerns, and that was of, having the public, be a part, an active part of, of these meetings.

Um, the ACC is by its nature or, the members of the ACC by their nature were selected because they have really broad outreach, um, so broad that, um, it actually extends DSAs, um, ability to reach folks who may not otherwise be involved in the rulemaking process. Um, and we significantly value that, that outreach that they provide.

And there is an expectation. Um, it, it was part of the, it it's a large part of the selection process, the ability of each of you to, to conduct outreach. We asked for a plan, um, to be presented in your application, and members were selected in part because of that outreach. Um, the, the time spent here in these meetings is critical for us to hear specifically from you as it relates to your broader outreach.

Um, we will be, we have in the past and we'll continue to expand on our outreach in sessions such as what we'll discuss the October, um, public workshop to receive, um, proposals from the public. And there are a number of opportunities for the public to provide comment, not just in the actual rule banking process, which, you know, happens after the code advisory committee, but leading up to the code advisory committee meetings, um, that that's all precycling.

We will continue to expand on our, on our outreach during those moments. But the ACC is, is really an opportunity normally for us to target our discussion and feedback from this group. and so that, that's a little bit of explanation why the, the public is asked to attend and listen in. Certainly, we don't want to not be transparent in our discussions with the ACC, but in order for us to most efficiently reach membership of the ACC and your input, we limit the ability for the public to provide comments in those moments.

So, I'll, I'll be quiet for a moment and, and ask for any comments or questions from the group. It looks like Richard has his hand up.

Brad Morrison: I'm sorry, I was on mute. Richard, could you hold on one sec? I just want to bring in a couple of comments from the chat. Just really quick here. I, I see from, um, participant Andrew has suggested that the header still references Governor Brown. So, I'm not sure what document, that was happening, but check that out because...

Eric Driever: That that will be part of our normal review process.

Brad Morrison: Thanks. Okay, cool. Okay, good. And then Nubyaan added a link up there for, to be able to access the, the charter, um, according on the website. And then also Greg's added a link up there, so a box link so you can access the charter quickly. That way these are for people who may, may be preferring to follow on their own screen as opposed to the document that we're sharing in the, in the presentation.

Okay. And Nate, we'll, we'll get your comment after this discussion just cause it's a different topic, but I'll come back to that later. Okay. Richard, go ahead. Why don't you start with your comment, please?

Richard Skaff: Thank you, Brad. Um, and thank you Eric for the clarification. Um, I would ask, recognizing your reasoning, Eric, um, and I accept that, um, would d s a consider allowing the public to part not participate by speaking during ACC meetings, but at least being able to part be at the meetings via Zoom? So, at some point they can respond to those of us on the ACC, with their concerns? I, you know, I

understand what you're saying, Eric, except I do not carry the world of disability in my mind. Nor am I, well, I don't think anybody is capable of understanding all of the, um, aspects of, disability.

Um, even me with people with similar disabilities may have issues that I don't understand. Um, and I'm not able to, and I don't believe any of the me members of this committee are able to have as broad a, an interaction with the disability community as we need to have. And I'm, I'm not blaming anybody. I don't think it's physically; we are physically able to do that.

So, if there are people in the public that are not ACC members, I would ask that they be allowed to observe, at least observe.

Brad Morrison: Richard to your, so that, Richard, to your point, I, I, I believe that there, that's happening right now. I just, let me clarify that.

Richard Skaff: Well, I don't know that I,

Brad Morrison: well, yeah, I can't,

Richard Skaff: If they're, that's fine.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. I can't identify, there's 41 people on the discussion right now, so that's way more than our committee and participants. So let me just check really quick. Eric, do you, can you provide an answer for that? But I believe that's happening right now, correct?

Eric Driever: Yeah. If you click, and you're all welcome to view the participants, there, if you select participants, a, a separate window will appear.

And there are two tabs at the top. One for panelists, which is all the ACC members and the ex-officio memberships. To the right of that is a tab for attendees. And you'll see there are 21 attendees of the public that are currently, observing the zoom meeting. There is also a call in. It does not look like there is actually, there is one person who's calling it who's a phone number. I suspect Jean, that is Jean Lozano, who is also listening in. I believe I recognized the phone number. So, they, they can observe currently. Richard, thank you.

Richard Skaff: Well, okay. Thank you, Eric, for, and, and Brad, for clarifying, I didn't realize that when I went onto that, um, that list of participants, what I saw was the panelists. I didn't, I that was my fault. I didn't pay it close enough attention to see that there were two clickable items, attendees, and panelists. So that clarifies one part of this. I would ask then that in all of DSA documentation about the ACC, it include a statement about the public's ability to participate by observing, so that the public is clearly aware, um, of that option.

Again, that's my fault. I wasn't aware. I am now, and I will, I will be informing the people I'm in touch with about that, but I think DSA must make that point clear, um, so that members of the public can observe members of the public that aren't members of the ACC can observe our meetings and then get in touch with members of the ACC.

Brad Morrison: Sounds good. Thank you, Richard. I, I got your point down too, so it'll be reflected in the minutes. Um, Eric, do you want to go ahead and finish up, since we're on, we have a queue starting up here. Why don't you go ahead and, add anything that you'd like right now, and I'll go to the queue after that.

Eric Driever: So, I'll, I'll just, um, Kendra, I know your hand's been up. Thank you for your patience. I see Jorge Sam's up as well. Um, Richard, thank you for the comment. I think, um, we, and, and I need to revisit just to make sure that we're highlighting it. Um, we mentioned that I believe in our announcement for the meeting, but, um, if we are not doing a good enough job at that, at highlighting that, um, public participation option in terms of just joining the, the webinar, we'll, we'll make sure to highlight that in future announcements.

Brad Morrison: Great, thank you Eric. Okay, so, we have Kendra followed by Jorge. So, Kendra, would you like to go ahead and then Ida coming in third? Um, so this is sort of funny because me and Richard haven't talked about this at all, but we have very similar, I, I second Richard's comment. Um, and I think it would be great because two different people have been thinking about this, um, independently.

So, I think it's maybe time just to put it in the charter. So, nobody keeps asking you these questions, Eric. Um, and I have some language that I can propose. I think, um, I'll put it in the chat as well, but the ACC allows for general public to observe ACC meetings and allows for public written comment to be submitted.

Um, if that's in the charter, it'll just bring everybody up to date on, on the participation guidelines that the public can also, provide.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Kendra. Appreciate that. Thank you for the, the, the language in the chat as well. Appreciate that. Jorge, would you like to go.

Jorge Rivas: Yes. Thank you. Um, I just, this question basically for Eric, actually, um, after you were listening to you there for a bit, all the code that is created here, and it sounded, and it sounded basically like a lot of the stuff that we do and create the codes are a lot for the UC school systems, the schools and so forth.

But are those codes also, um, for upcoming new buildings outside of the, the schools and, and California buildings?

Michelle Davis: Yes. That is a great question. Yes. The California building code governs commercial construction, state buildings, schools, obviously it, it's all construction.

Jorge Rivas: So basically, the code that we write here, everyone is supposed to follow that new code from here forward. It's just that we don't enforce it. Someone else enforces it. Correct?

Michelle Davis: Correct.

Eric Driever: Local authorities adopt the California Building Code as a minimum standard. They have the ability to amend for, more restrictive requirements, but local officials do adopt the California building code, including Chapter Carolina as the minimum.

Jorge Rivas: What, what, what do you mean, Eric, by they're able to amend the code? just depending on what the building is, going through. If they can amend things or how, how does that work? I'm sorry.

Eric Driever: They can adopt more restrictive requirements than, but 11B is the minimum requirements. And I, I see Ida shaking her head up there on camera. I'll allow her to jump in there and, okay, you're muted.

Ida Clair: Thank you. And, um, I did have my hand up to make another comment, which I'll wait to make sure that Jorge's done with his initial comment. While I'm responding, um, there are specific regulations in the code that address a local jurisdiction to make more stringent requirements. I don't know that accessibility is one of them. However, programs can make more excessive requirements. Like tax credits allows 10% of units instead of five. Um, anything that's amended at the local jurisdiction needs to go to the Building Standards Commission. They need to be notified. And I need to check, but I'm not sure accessibility is one of those conditions in the context of the building code. So I am, I just have to confirm that.

Jorge Rivas: Okay. Thank you, guys, so much. I just, just a question that was kind of in my brain.

Brad Morrison: Okay, thanks. Thanks, Jorge. Go ahead, Ida. Go ahead and ask your, other question.

Ida Clair: Um, so, um, clarifying that other requirement, um, that I just commented on was that local jurisdictions in the context of the code do on a project-by-project basis, have the opportunity to address an alternate means of equivalency equivalent facilitation that meets or exceeds what's provided in the code.

So, I want to clarify, they do have the authority to do it on a project-by-project basis, whether or not they have the ability to amend their code entirely. Um, you need to check with the Building Standards Commission. I know that prior to, um, the require prior to the requirements for destination elevators being in the code City of San Francisco did have an ordinance that addressed, um, destination elevators.

Of course, that wasn't intended to be different or in excess of the code, it was intended to clarify the requirements. So, it wasn't a change. They didn't make a change specifically to 11B. It was, um, an enhancement for items that weren't sufficiently covered. So, um, I think that is really a question for the Building Standards Commission, more so than it is for, um, DSA because those approvals are handled, those that engagements handled from the local jurisdiction of BSC, not through DSA.

Um, do you want to clarify that. Um, I think it's, we have always allowed the public to observe, so I think it's great to put it in the charter. I think it is creating transparency. I think that it's, um, important to recognize that the public needs to know who their constituency representative is on the ACC.

And so, I think it's, um, might be something to add that when we, you know, that we either add clarity as to, um, introductions and the representative at the beginning of every meeting in case we have new people attend so they can see your face and your name and know how to get ahold of you. And then, um, we do need to discuss later in the charter about how to get ahold of you if your email is public.

If it isn't, we require in your applications when you, um, or I shouldn't say we require, when you submit an application to the ACC, you're acting as a representative for the group you represent. And we ask you to tell us how you have that network. And, um, all of you have explained that. And so, the purpose of the ACC is, um, for the public to connect with you as well.

That's why the transparency in the meeting is important. For the public to be able to listen in and participate. But I think it would be great, and that's my recommendation to the charter if everyone's agreeable that at the beginning of every meeting, not that we need long, um, introductions at every single time like we did today, today was getting to know each other, but at least that each representative says, "I'm Kendra Muller. I represent so-and-so. I am April. I represent so-and-so", so that people know and can connect with you and somehow, we'll get contact information out. Um, but we need, obviously I know that some of you have emails that might not facilitate, or your employer might not facilitate you making that public, so we'll need to deal with that.

But something to add to talk about later. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Thank you Ida. Appreciate that. Kendra let's go back to you.

Kendra Muller: Okay. I just wanted to follow up with Ida's great idea. I think that, um, I'm happy to provide my contact information and if we could have a public internal contact list, I think that would be great, or externalized allowed by, um, everyone's different possibilities.

So, I, I think that would be wonderful. I don't think we can have to put that in the charter, but I think having a contact list is really important. Um, and then I also wanted to put a, maybe a little, um, additional language going back to our original comment on the general public. If for instance, for some reason we do need a very

specific expert on the topic that we are discussing, um, I think it would be great to include language regarding maybe a, a guest expert, presenter where particular expertise might be helpful.

Obviously, they would not have a vote. But I think that would be helpful to put in this charter if that comes up, um, in our future meetings. And that pre, I mean, that guess could be anyone, regarding the large amount of different code that we're going to be, reviewing for the 2024 cycle. So, I, I wanted to address that.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Kendra. Great. Thank you.

Eric Driever: Yeah. So, Brad, I don't know if we want to get, um, some agreement by the folks on the, the blue underlying edition.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Let's see. We have the language in the draft here. let's just go over it really quick. This is, proposed by Kendra and the ACC meetings allow for general public to observe, but not provide verbal comment during the meeting.

Written public comments may be provided to DSA. How does that sound? Kendra? You're, it looks like you're nodding. That must mean it's okay, right? Or is that that a recent or,

Kendra Muller: Yes, that looks good.

Brad Morrison: Representation. Okay. Good. Okay. Larry says perfect in this chat.

Kendra Muller: Should we take a vote of hands?

Eric Driever: probably be good, but I'll leave that up to Brad. You're the,

Brad Morrison: yeah. Let's, I'll tell you what, let's do this. Um, you know, rather than, than call out a vote, let's just say, does anybody have any disagreement with this, in this language as it's presented? Let's start there.

And if anybody has any disagreement, let's start there.

Ida Clair: Um, Brad, I'm sorry for interrupting. If I may make a suggestion. I agree. I think it's nice to add for disagreement. I think at the end we should review the entire charter and the additions and then have everyone agree, um, at the end. But just to be clear at the end that these will be included, I think it's important to determine whether or not element that's going to be included is included as a general, like does anyone disagree? But then at the end call for agreement on all of them once we read all.

Brad Morrison: and all change and proposed. Yeah. Okay. That's a very good suggestion. I know that to be very clear too. So, let's just go ahead and do that. But

right now, let's see if there's any, any, obvious kind of problems or, um, challenges to this language here.

Okay. And, um, Greg, we're getting some comments in the chat from, from non-ACC members. Could you check those out and, respond? I'm not sure. Um, what's what they're asking. Thank you. Okay.

Eric Driever: It's my intent to not have public input either verbally or through the chat. I recognize the chat's there, so, I think we're challenged in capturing those, but I'll ask Greg to maybe take some screenshots of those and we can consider those in future. The, and there's some,

Ida Clair: Wait, wait, wait. I want to hold off that if they are commenting on the charter, the charter's, the agreement from the members of the ACC, the public should not be feeding information into the charter. Thank you.

Eric Driever: Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, thanks everybody. And there's some, there's, they're asking some questions there, I just really couldn't answer, so if, I was just hoping to, to pass it off that way. Okay. So, I'm not hearing really any disagreement with the proposed language in here. So, I, I, I suggest that we just kind of move on down through the document and follow Ida suggestion and we'll ask for approval from the members once we're completed. We've completed the document here. So, Eric, you want to move on with, structure?

Eric Driever: Correct. Yeah. And, Kendra, I'll make, what I'll do is consider your special guest here in this section.

Brad Morrison: Um, okay, good. So, the form. Yeah.

Eric Driever: So, ACC is comprised of 13 individuals who represent a cross section of stakeholder groups. And two, this should be revised. We're suggesting that we revise this to six and we'll give the reasoning of that, um, here in a moment.

Um, members whose purpose it is to ensure DSA is considering a wide range of views and representative and perspectives, excuse me, in developing CBC regulations, addressing accessibility as is required by building standards law. The following indicates the stakeholder groups represented on the ACC, and the number of representatives.

Um, and sorry, and the number of representatives and, and those are in correct below. So, I'll give you the whole there as it states. There are 13, and then we, um, will mention that ex officio below. But we have, four individuals with disabilities, two disability advocates, one design professional, two building and facility owner representatives, two code enforcement representatives, certified access specialists of one.

There's two code enforcement and building and, and construction representatives at one is set at one. Um, and then I'll just continue on, we'll proposing the six ex-officio consultative members, you'll see rather than using the, the repetitive non-voting. Um, and, and that's also a, a nod to the fact that we don't technically vote.

We look for consensus and Brad can go over that, if needed. but there are six ex-officio members who will also participate. DSA, um, is one as an agency, Housing Community Development. They have always been there. Um, we've added Building Standards Commission. I, I think that's for obvious reasons. If there are questions related to the building standards, code codes, um, or the process, it's really important that we have a consultative member who can, um, actively speak and, and, um, give us advice on that process.

We have added the California Commission on Disability Access and DOR. Um, those were sort of defacto, um, members prior, um, but did not actively participate as ex-officio. But of course, um, as you know, they are the two agencies that assist DSA in the selection of members. Having them involved, in a meeting-by-meeting basis, allows them greater insight as to the, um, operation and opinions of this group and will help them better assist us in, um, future selection processes.

And then the last is, um, the Disability Rights Advocates. And I, again, I'll acknowledge that Richard had an earlier comment on the Disability Rights advocates. Excuse me. That's a, that's a type of it should be Disability Rights California. Um, let me just make that correction. Sorry about that Kendra.

And, um, the, the reasoning for Disability Rights California is that they are actually statutorily, um, mandated by the state and the federal government, um, as the, um, the single disability rights legal advocate. For California and having them as a consultative member for this group, um, going forward, was really important for us to recognize.

Um, I also acknowledge that, um, Richard had another comment relating to other organizations, and it's, we're primarily focusing on disability rights of California because of that statutory mandate. Um, recognizing that in law they are recognized as the advocate. Um, whereas certainly there are very valued organizations throughout the state.

Um, yours, Richard included. Um, those are not statutorily mandated advocates. And we really are depending on this group, this ACC group to, um, connect with those types of organizations. We've got a number of members on the ACC, which are directly connected to various advocacy groups. Um, and we look to, um, you to continue that correspondence with those groups and ensure that you, you're reaching out to those constituencies and those organizations as part of this.

But the reason for the disability rights, California is primarily because of the statutory connection to their advocacy. So, with that being said, I'll, I'll open it up to this part of, um, let zoom out of the organizational structure. Ida, you had a comment. You're muted, Ida, you're muted.

Ida Clair: Thank you. I'm just making a suggestion to defer the discussion about guest, special guest participation in the meetings section of this and not the organizational structure section, because this section talks about the membership and guest presenters are not members. So just tabling that discussion because I know you said we, we, you may have discussed it in this section, so thanks.

Brad Morrison: Okay. That's a good segue for our next step here. So, we've, we've been asked to look over the organizational structure section, and consider, the changes. Sounds like Ida proposed that the change be moved from that section organizational structure down to the meeting section.

So, we'll, how about this? We'll take that language and plop it in down there and then take a look at the organizational structure without the change to see if there's any comments from the members, particularly if there's any disagreement in the language. Does anybody have any comments?

Eric Driever: Richard, I hope I addressed your concerns. I, I don't see your hand, but considering your other earlier comments, I wanted to make sure I recognized that.

Brad Morrison: There's Richard, here he is. Go ahead, Richard.

Richard Skaff: I'm being allowed to speak. Thank you very much. Eric, you did, I was not aware of the state and federal mandate that DRC had. Thank you for clarifying that.

Eric Driever: You're welcome.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Um, thank you. Okay. Not hearing in any, disagreement or comments or any further comments on the organizational structure. Let's move on to the next section. And Eric, if you wouldn't mind, can you expand the document into the frame a little bit so that you increase the size of the font?

There you go. A little bit bigger font there so everybody can read it easily.

Eric Driever: Okay. The last part of this has to do with you, Brad. Um, the ACC has facilitated. By an independent facilitator. The facilitator works directly with the ACC and DSA to plan meetings, agendas, and next steps. A planning committee.

A planning committee comprised of three ACC members, will be established to work with the facilitator and DSA on scheduling reporting, and group dynamics as needed. Um, this, this last sentence, I believe it was originally set up there was a, there may have been a planning committee originally.

Um, there has not been an active planning committee that to my knowledge, Brad, unless you can correct me, um, recently on the ACC.

Brad Morrison: No, not my time here. Ida, do you have a comment?

Ida Clair: Um, when we first started, we did have one. The intent was that if there was, some kind of agreement to do some work outside of our meeting time collectively for the group, a planning committee would be that person who kind of coordinates behind the scenes, um, or three members to get the group's opinions, feedback, work, process it together.

So it was, an opportunity to have the group, um, provided as needed. So, it was DSA scheduling reporting group dynamics. I, the language is kind of odd. We did use it once or early on, was, you know, we'll, we'll get more information on this and we'll see, cause some people would say, oh, I have this, or I have this, or I have this.

And then that person would say, okay, we'll get that information together and get that to DSA. That was kind of the intent of the planning committee. Also, it was also to Elise, a little bit of the workload on DSA in the sense of scheduling. But, um, I don't have a preference either way, really. It is a group that assists the entire group in advancing, it's the voice, of, of if DSA needed feedback from the ACC, it was an opportunity to get the voice of three in terms of scheduling and what might work instead of the voice of all 13. But since that time, we've done Google polls, which we didn't use to do, or doodle polls, which we didn't use to do, and we haven't had a lot of work that required background work.

Um, so I just want to throw that out for information. That was the reason why it was in here. As we proceed, it's up to the group.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank you, Ida. Okay. Richard, did you have another question or is that the hand up from the last comment?

Okay, sounds good. Thank you, Richard. Okay. Okay. Now not hearing any disagreement on this section. I'm not seeing anything in the comments or, um, anything that would change our discussion. let's go ahead and move on.

Ida Clair: I, I would like to get some comments on the planning committee idea to determine,

Brad Morrison: Yeah, sorry. Sorry,

Ida Clair: If you want to leave it or not. Sorry.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, sorry. Sorry. Yeah, you're right, you're right. I shouldn't have closed it off so quick. Go ahead. Does anybody have any comments on the planning committee idea?

Larry Grable: This, this is Larry Grable. I, I would say strike that sentence. I, I don't think it's necessary at this point, especially with the Google polls and, other, technology available.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Okay. Larry's proposing that we just strike the, strike the comment from the language. Does anybody have any problem with that? Okay. Not doing any dissension here.

Ida Clair: So, I have my hand up. I don't know. Oh, I, okay. Or not Brad, but I was going to.

Brad Morrison: o, that's okay. I'm just calling, making the call out. Go ahead, Ida.

Ida Clair: No, it's okay. I just want to say that even though it struck if a group of volunteers, you know, as we, something comes up, wants to say, we'll take that on. That does, that's not prohibited. So, I'm just saying it's not like we're, you know what I'm saying? It's like we can still do that, but it's not prohibited.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Sounds good.

Eric Driever: So, I'm just suggesting perhaps I see Richard's hands up, but we could, with a simple, strike of the pen, change the word will to may and give some flexibility so we're not prepared to establish it today.

Brad Morrison: Okay. That's a, that's a good proposal there. Okay. But thank you Eric. Richard, go ahead.

Richard Skaff: Eric just answered my concern and, um, may is just fine. I, I think we should have that in there so that, um, it's an established concept that can be used if the committee, um, believes it's necessary.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Great. Thanks, Richard. All right. So, it looks like we stand with a slight amendment here in that language with the may in there. Does anybody have any disagreement with that or any issues that, may be of concern?

Okay. Not hearing any. So why don't we, Eric, why don't we move on to the next section. And just to note here too, I'm seeing, comments come in, in the chat, that we may not be able to respond to. we're trying to open this up for the ACC members, but please, leave your comments and we'll see if we can do something with them, maybe at the end of the meeting.

Okay. Thank you. Okay, so let's start off with the membership section here.

Eric Driever: So, membership, selection, and length of service. Um, DSA will accept applications for membership on the ACC on a continuous basis. Future members of the ACC will be selected by DSA and representatives or partner agencies, California Commission on Disability Access CCDA, and the Department of Rehabilitation, or from the applicant pool, with the objective of maintaining diversity, striving to select individuals who are members of more than one stakeholder group and ensuring a balance of representation from different disability communities.

Once an application has been submitted, it remains valid indefinitely, and the individual is eligible for, for consideration of membership, is the responsibility of the applicant to submit updated contact information and relevant experience to DSA by submitting a new application. Um, and I, I believe we, we've had that in this past, um, round of applicants that we had applications, and they were updated for, for each selection period.

The length of service for stakeholder representatives on the ACC is staggered initially to ensure overlap of, among members for continuing for continuity and institutional memory. After the, after the initial terms identified below, each representative will serve three years. Um, so I, I might suggest that this is irrelevant at this point in time.

Um, we have a whole new membership pool, and the initial term is somewhat irrelevant, excuse me, irrelevant. Um, and, and covers the staggering aspects of it. So, we, we could, um, just retitle this to be group A for lack of a better way of, differentiating between the number of individuals, um, which would consist of these, two individuals with disability, disability advocates, design professionals, building facility owner, and code enforcement representatives, all with one representative.

Um, I think there seems to be a strange gap in this. Um, and we could change this to be group B, and that again would have two individuals with disabilities, um, a disability advocate, a single building owner rep, code enforcement rep, a certified access specialist, and building construction industry representative. And, so I think this is probably irrelevant as well. Um, so, I'll open it up and I, let me see if I can't, change this to simple markup so that it gets it on a single page maybe for you.

Yeah. Okay. So, let me do.

Ida Clair: I think it's good to see the edits, Eric, even if it's, even if it's formatting off. I think it's good to see the edits.

Eric Driever: Okay.

Brad Morrison: Okay, so just, just recap really quick. So, Eric has changed specific language in the charter that refers to a group, forming at a certain date in the past. And he's simply simplified that by calling the different groups group A and group B, and then suggesting that specific representation on each group A and B, follows in those bullets that, below each title.

So, so that's our change to this section. Ida did you want to go ahead and make a comment? have your hand up there?

Ida Clair: Yes. Thank you. Um, back to the language at the top. not at the top, of this section. okay. Wait. So, right there. Length of service for stakeholders, delete initially, and then to ensure overlap among members for continuity after the initial term. I think we can say after the initial terms identified below; we can delete that.

And then, my recommendation if, when we go down to group A, so we have timed the terms to the, um, code cycles. And so, I think it's important that in the charter we recognize when terms expire and it expires either in July of an intervening code cycle or in December of an, of a triennial code cycle, and that's how they're staggered.

So, I would address group A whose term expires December 31st of a triennial code cycle. We, we can clarify the language and then group B whose term expires at the end of an intervening code cycle process. So, what, again, my language is not refined, but those are the recommendations. I, I make.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks, Ida. Good, good, good specificity there. Um, Richard?

Richard Skaff: Yes. I, I still have to say I'm, I'm concerned about Can you go back up to the or here? It's, no, you're okay. Go back there. I wanted to see the listing of the numbers of each group. I'm still concerned that we don't have a majority of people with disabilities, um, required to be on the ACC. Um, I understand that this, you know, um, DSA has a responsibility to assure all parties, all affected parties have an opportunity to, um, speak about proposed code changes or code additions.

However, it is the disability community that's most affected by this issue. And, um, it's, it is, it, it means they will either function or not function in the built environment. So there, in my mind there, you know, to make this a valid process, there must be a majority of people with disabilities that are able to speak to all the disability related issues. Um, and I realize in that process there will be, um, either some or substantial disagreement with the need for access, um, whatever the proposed code, addition or code changes. Um, and I accept that there will be those disagreements. Um, and I have no problem with others. Building owners, architects, engineers, building officials, um, all the others that are involved in the process, having a, um, having their opportunity to speak either in favor of or opposing a proposed code addition or change. But in the access collaboratives, I just can't accept not having a majority of people with disabilities represented. So, thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay, thank you. Richard. Comment, comment's been noted. Ida, would you like to go?

Ida Clair: I just wanted to address that, um, the membership selection was, um, determined as part of the entire process with UC Davis. It was also, crafted specifically, um, for that balance. It does have a voice of majority of e of individuals with disabilities and disability advocates. And I want to call that, I want to let you know that while it's a representative stakeholder group that, reaches out to a specific stakeholder group, um, many of our participants hold many hats.

They are either a CASp at an individual with a disability, has been the case in the past. Um, many of our, or some of our ex-officio members have a disability. Um, so, you know, I, I think what's important to understand is that. The people who choose to participate in here are coming with the perspective to listen and understand.

Our goal is to, especially for the positions of individuals with disabilities, get a balance at least of one of, you know, someone with a who's blind or, um, has a vision impairment. Someone who's deaf or hard of hearing, someone with a mobility impairment, some with a cognitive impairment. Um, it's what's difficult, Richard, and I'm not, um, I'm, I'm understanding your concern, but I'm, I'm trying to allay it in the sense that there's, the people who choose to participate in this group have a passion to ensure accessibility happens. And so, they wear many, many hats. Um, my, my concern with increasing the number is having a number that's very difficult to manage in a discussion that's, of a representative organization. And, um, secondly, it's, um, to, um, understand that the to illuminate the common goal that we all have here.

We're not here to, that this isn't an, this isn't a position where that's why the charter's so important, where we're not listening, and we're not concerned. We also have challenges in getting applications of each representative group of individuals with disabilities. And I think I want to charge that all of you, also try to solicit from your representative group that representation for future ACC.

Invite them to listen in so they see the workings of the ACC. I'm, I'm concerned that if we expand it, we're going to have trouble filling some of those roles to have a representative group that actually represents, um, you know, individual disability experiences such as. Blind, deaf part of hearing.

And I, I, I'd like to, my goal would be more to focus on getting representatives that represent those constituency groups than just increasing the numbers, of individuals with disabilities for this group. Because the intent here is to be a representative organization. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Ida. Richard.

Richard Skaff: Um, Ida, I hear what you're saying, and I understand, um, having been on so many advisory committees, in the last 40 years, I've lost track. Um, however, I, I've got to say that I, I believe very strongly that we need to be clear, and I, it has nothing to do with the present membership. I hear from each one of those that spoke today.

All of you that spoke today, talking about your background and why you're on the ACC, I respect that. You have all joined the ACC because you really care about the rights of people with disabilities, whether you are a person with a disability or you have family members or whatever. That's great.

Um, my concern is for future, um, membership that may not have that same outlook on access in the built environment, um, I've been to through too many in the last 40 years. Committees, um, that have had people that have become people with disabilities. I can think of one right at the moment who were on the Building Standards Committee Access Advisory group. That was a person that uses a wheelchair now after 40 or 50 years of advocacy against access. Who continues to advocate against access. So being a person with a disability, it doesn't, or having a

family member doesn't necessarily, Ida, assure that that person will in fact approach access, um, with the intent of protecting the rights of people with disabilities as it relates to the built environment.

So, I, I'm really, really concerned. I understand the difficulty, the larger the committee, the harder it is to get through an agenda. Boy, do I understand that? I, I accept that. I'm willing to work through that. I'm hopeful that you'll consider adding maybe one more person. Um, we need to have, um, an advocate, we need to have people with disabilities on the committee that not only know code and know the process of adoption and develop or development and adoption of code but are clear on their role as a disability rights, um, access advocate.

Um, and they must be that to be on and actually have some understanding of, of the process. So, thank you.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Thanks, Richard. Okay. I have, April in queue here. You want to come in? April? Thank you.

April Dawson: Hi, this is April. Well, I just wanted to add that it, that it is possible for, um, someone who is in those other, groups to also be people with disabilities.

So, you could also be, you know, a code specialist with a disability. I don't have the list in front of me because it's, it's, you know, you could be a design professional and have a disability or a code enforcement representative and have a disability. So, and, and, and having participated in the, you know, the selection process, it is, it's not uncommon for, for people to rep to, to, um, assign themselves to more than one group because we're all, none of us are siloed and we're all intersectional people.

So another way to get, um, more people with disabilities as a part of the ACC, without increasing the number of designated advocates and individuals is to just encourage design professionals or, building facility owners or code enforcement reps who have that disability lens, to share that on their application or, you know, to share that if they have a, a lens related to disability, that they share that part of their diversity.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thank, thank you April. Appreciate that. Let's see, who is it, Ann?

Ann Riggs: Um, thank you and I apologize, someone else may have had their hand raised before me, but I was going to echo what, what April just said. Similarly, um, that encouraging, you know, and possibly, I'm not saying that's necessary to give priority, um, to individuals who do have lived experience with disability when considering applications, but that certainly is a, an option to encourage or even prioritize participation from, from individuals with lived experience if the committee would like to do that.

Um, the other comment I was going to make was just on the, the added language that was being added, and I know this is a whole can of worms and a bigger issue for even federal, um, federal guidelines and, and state. Um, you're mentioning a series of, examples of different disability communities and mentioning mobility, hearing and visual disabilities.

Um, you know, I think that our current regulations do not frequently address other types of disabilities such as cognitive, um, disabilities, which are also a community. Um, so I would. I, I would perhaps either try to include that or maybe just try and be less specific about the different communities and be more inclusive of, multiple possible disability communities that, that may not be currently identified.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Anne. Appreciate that. Okay. Um, somebody on the DSA team coming up, coming up next,

Eric Driever: I'll defer to Jorge. but Ann, thanks for bringing up the, the language here. Um, I certainly am open to feedback was just sort of first draft, um, at a possible solution to Richard's concern, about the, the membership. I, I will, before Jorge goes, I will say that we do currently look, um, to folks as previously stated with more than one stakeholder group.

That that is something that we do actively do in selecting them. But, um, we'll, we'll get some input on this language. Go ahead, Jorge.

Jorge Rivas: I, I just feel like, I, I feel like I understand what Richard is trying to say is he's basically saying that, um, and this happened in another committee that I was part of, is that a lot of the, a lot of the folks from our disability communities do not come up or step up.

And what the, what happens is that you find a committee like this that is scrambling to find people to fill roles. And I, and sometimes the people that, that, that come are really people that don't really understand, disabilities or things like that. But it's just, I guess he's hoping not to have the role filled by someone like that.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank you, Jorge. Appreciate that. Richard.

Richard Skaff: Well, just to clarify, this is not to speak negatively about anybody. I, I, that that wasn't my purpose. I'm not speaking about any of the present, um, ACC members, or any of the future ACC members who I don't have any idea who they will be. I have a twofold concern.

Yes, I am concerned if the committee ends up having membership that doesn't understand existing access codes or how those existing codes were created and what effect they had on the community. Um, it, it's, it's, and you know, we don't have any process. This is something that I talked about earlier with Eric, with when there was a woman by the name of Holland IL with Department of Rehab.

There was a program that she created called Community Access Network. Um, and before she passed away, we were talking, she and I were talking about maybe recreating that she was no longer of course with, um, department of Rehab, but we were going to recreate it because of the lack of knowledgeable, technically knowledgeable people in the disability community, the broader community of people with disabilities.

Um, and without that, um, we're in danger. Um, because there are plenty of people that are technically very proficient that really are there to, and, and I understand their reasoning for being there. They're there to advocate against access because in many building owner, business owner positions, access is a, a cost, unless you're building a new building.

If you're remodeling a building, there's a huge cost to, could be a huge cost to that remodel. And a major part of that cost will be the requirement that that accessible. Um, and, and to, to balance that very effective, very well-funded advocacy on the part of building owners, business owners, AIA CALBO, and all of the rest that are more focused on preserving.

And, and I, I understand the reason for it, but we are a country that is based on profit making. I, I'm not opposed to that. I, what I am opposed to is that taking precedent over people having their rights protected. And so, I'm, I'm really sensitive and concerned about having a, a clear and strong representation that is clearly people with disabilities not representing something else, but they have a disability.

That's okay. You know, I, I'm not opposed to them being on the ACC at all. And they will maybe bring in some really important points of view, but at the same time, the access committee should be made up of a majority of people with disabilities. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank you, Richard. Ida? You're muted. Ida. You're muted, Ivan.

Ida Clair: Thank you. I wanted to share a little more light on the history and purpose of the ACC that was determined by the study that we had, which interviewed a significant amount of people who were involved in rulemaking, including a significant number of, um, individuals with disabilities.

And if you haven't read the report, I know it's long and extensive, but it does support a lot of what we are doing here. And I understand your concerns and I hear your concerns, Richard, but I'm, I, am I, I'd like for those who, who've listened in the past to the ACC who've participated on the ACC if we have them, um, here, um, in this group, or, or if not at least under, having discussions with past ACC members to determine if what we have in the makeup of the group doesn't work.

Um, I understand that, you know, your concern about, um, the voice of individuals with disabilities having a voice, and I think if you were to ask those previous ACC members, um, that those voices have been heard, it's not that they have fallen on,

um, people who were unwilling to bend, in fact, the ACC in the past, its main goal is to create a forum of respect, which is why we have a charter and to hear concerns.

This, this group is here to listen to each other and be open to, um, understanding the concerns of each of the constituency groups. The voice of individuals with disabilities is greater on this group than the representation of, of the others who are not representing a disability group. And it's, it's there, it, it, it fosters open dialogue and respect and greater understanding.

So first, before we say this isn't working and we need a greater voice, I'd really like to have an opportunity for all of you to talk to previous ACC members to determine if that didn't work. Um, second, because I, I believe they tell you otherwise, but I'd like for you to hear from them. Secondly, um, another purpose of this group was to increase varied voices.

And so there is no requirement to be familiar with the standards. What people bring to this group is a lift perspective on how, access compliance either affects themselves, their built environment, their engagement in the community, or implementation in the field, which is why we have the varied membership that we have.

Um, there is no ability here to, um, attack others. The charter prevents that, um, it fosters mutual respect, and it just fosters an ability for that discussion if everything is based. Um, and, and through that discussion, if we invite people who aren't well versed on the standards, they become well versed on the standards.

And that's important, um, because that fosters the work we do. So, I don't, I disagree with you on that aspect. Um, Richard, that people should be well versed in all standards. We do ask that question, um, in the application. We also ask the question in the application, what groups you're, what group, what groups you can represent because of the lived experience you have.

So, you're only slated for one group. But we are aware of the multiple when we choose. We are aware of the multiple disabilities or representation that an individual can have when they come to their membership. But I want to, um, I, I don't want to say that the ACC is an advocacy group for individuals with disabilities.

It's, it's meant to assist DSA and its rulemaking development to ensure that what we advance is within our authority. We determine that, um, having a, a comment on how everything we advance, um, you know, everyone who's affected by them and needs to be involved in the rulemaking process per building standards law has an opportunity to comment and for others to listen.

So, um, I, I, I understand your concerns. I agree with your concerns. I just ask that, um, prior to changing that fundamental structure, which was based on a lot of interviews and, in-depth discussions to engage with previous members and determine if what they got from it, we had that opportunity. A lot of people had mentioned that when they said their goodbyes, what didn't work, because I'd like to

know that that didn't work before we actually change a fundamental, um, balance of what has been provided.

Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay, Ida. Thank you. Kendra?

Kendra Muller: Yeah. Just going back to the actual language of if you could scroll down just a little bit to the numbering maybe. Alright. Do you think you could put both of them together? So, so I can see group A and group B together just for one minute.

Eric Driever: Yes, I can. One moment I'll put back onto track changes. So, I'll changes here in a moment.

Kendra Muller: Alright, just getting back to, um, the charter itself. I, I see that there are, four individuals with disabilities listed and then I count, um, seven people who are representing, building our code enforcement professionals. And so, I guess I'm wondering even if you did add in the disability advocates who are not necessarily people with lived experience, that's still six versus seven people that are building owners.

So, um, I just want to address that there is still does seem to be a minority of that view. And maybe having, um, the addition of one more member that we know would be an individual with a disability for sure in future code cycles might balance that out a little bit more. It wouldn't be a majority, but it would just be an equalizing, of the two groups.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank you, Kendra.

Eric Driever: Brad, can we maybe get some input on that aspect? Okay. Would anybody like to comment on that idea, Ida?

Brad Morrison: Others can comment as well.

Ida Clair: Thank you for that comment, Kendra. Um, a little bit just of perspective, the Certified Access Specialists generally are, um, um, who participate generally are very sensitive to the needs of individuals with disabilities. I agree, they may not have a lived experience. Um, some do who have participated in the past.

Um, and so, I just wanted to add that there is some, there are some like that representation, it kind of crosses both and creates that balance. Um, I'm not trying to, I'm just trying to add that as a perspective, not as an argument by any means of adding. One more. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Nate, would you like to go?

Nathan Dison: Oh, thanks. If there was a, I just want to say if there was a UC Davis study completed that looked at the numbers of members and, and which groups should be included, I think it might be helpful if we all read that prior to asking to change the numbers. I think it would be good to get that information as background, even if we still feel strongly.

Um, I think that would help.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank you, Nate. Appreciate it. Richard. Richard, do you want to,

Eric Driever: In response to that, what I can say, Nate, in, in the PowerPoint presentation that you were provided, there should be a link to the uc Davis study. I forget the slide number it was on. you can pull that up. It is also available on online.

Um, having read through it, pretty well, there is, um, no specific, um, language on the number, of each stakeholder group. there is a recommendation that the ACC or at least those interviewed, um, would, could, the group sizing, um, could be anywhere from 10 to 14 with an emphasis to, to not make the, the group so large that it's, you know, hard to get consensus. But the recommendations out of the study were, somewhere between 10 and 14 members.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank you, Eric. Richard, would you like to go?

Richard Skaff: Um, why don't we let, Jorge go first since I've spoken, but I, I, I, I don't, I sorry that this has become a huge topic, but I do want to say something after Jorge, if that's possible.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Okay. I'll come back to bringing it up. Okay. Jorge. Jorge, would you like to go?

Jorge Rivas: Yes. I, I, I think this is, um, let me, let me get my words correct here. it looks like what I'm hearing here is that there is an unbalance in our committee, folks that are, don't have disabilities, and they might have a more sway on how things change when we are deciding to create the new codes. Um, but, but you know, I understand that accessibility, to a building is very costly for someone that is building, but there are ways around the cost and creating accessible space for everyone, um, reducing that cost.

And I think that's one of the reasons why I'm here, is to create and help create code, for the new buildings that are coming up, or new projects that are coming up, and understanding the cost of that as well to reduce that, that way that there's no pull from anyone saying, oh, we can't do that because it's not cost effective.

Well, no, yes, you can do this by doing this. And I think that's why I feel that you guys are trying to, or some folks are trying to create a more balance to our, our voting. If that's the case, we could, that could be changed by us understanding more of the

construction and, um, coming down to, saying this could be done this way in a more cost-effective way. That's all I have.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank you, Jorge. Appreciate that. Okay. Richard, do you want to add your comment?

Richard Skaff: I will stop after this. I think I've maybe said too much, and I want to just end it, end my comments with this. Um, I, again, want to make it clear there is nobody on the ACC presently that this is about, this is not about an individual.

Um, I am not pointing fingers at anybody. I am talking about a history, that I've been part of. I've been part of building standards commission, um, advisory committees, both fire and other, and access. And on those committees, there were people that had disabilities that spoke directly in opposition to proposed, um, access codes.

So just having, you know, if you are there because you have been representing other entities besides a disability community group, um, that's probably going to take priority over any disability related issues you may, as an individual be concerned about. That's not an accusation, it's an experiential statement from my years of doing this with many other people on many advisory committees relating to access.

So, with that, I would just ask that we, as a committee, consider adding, at least to make it an equal number, but having some, having people on this committee with disabilities, representing a group of people with disabilities that understand code and regulatory, um, adoption process and, and existing code and what it does to make the built environment accessible or doesn't effectively make the built environment accessible.

And that should be the priority of this ACC if, if it isn't Ida, then as I've said to you in the past, we need to have an access advisory committee at DSA one that specifically is there as, as DSA has always had that speaks directly to and only about access from the disability community's perspective.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Richard. Um, okay, let's go up to the DSA team. Was that you, Eric, or, another member of the team?

Eric Driever: There it is. thanks, Richard, for the comments. Um, I, I would really, um, well, I'll, I'll take a moment just to recognize those that have spoken. I really appreciate the input. Um, we do strive to get consensus in this, in this group.

Um, I'll also want to recognize that we haven't heard from everybody, so I want to suggest, um, I know we have participants that are listening in, but this is a safe, respectful place for everybody to share their, their opinions and the opinions of their representative stakeholders. So, um, if, if we can get some consensus on this particular topic, I would greatly appreciate it.

Before we move, move on too much, I'll suggest that group A has six members. Group B has seven. Um, we do have the potential to, um, consider Richard's proposal of adding a, an individual with disability to group A. Um, and which would, as was suggested earlier, provide seven, or excuse me, six total individuals with disabilities.

And the totality of all of the other represent representative stakeholders, would be 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Am I counting right? Not counting disability advocates. I guess we should pull those out. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Um, and then disability advocates could go either way. So, I, I think it has the potential for creating balance between groups and a greater potential balance between individuals with disabilities and the other stakeholder groups.

Brad Morrison: So, Eric, just to be clear, you're proposing that in group A we add one more person to the first bullet, individuals with disabilities, is that correct?

Eric Driever: What I'm hearing is that was a proposal from Richard Skaff to, to add an additional person with disabilities and that the, the balance between group A and group B is not there. So, we could potentially add one individual with disability to group A and those two groups would then be balanced.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Okay. Sounds, sounds reasonable. Thank you. Ida, do you have a comment on that?

Ida Clair: I do. Um, I just wanted to address, Richard's comment on a disability advisory committee, um, that, um, DSA does have other stakeholder groups, and so I wanted the group to know that this is not the only group that we have that engages with the disability community.

We do have focused task forces and groups that are not limited to specific individuals. Um, we did that for destination elevators. We did it for electric vehicle charging. We did it for adult changing facilities, um, and detectable warnings. We, we've, we do have other means to get, um, varied perspective into our rulemaking.

The Access Code Collaborative is, um, is, part of our regular rulemaking process to really provide input on a lot of the, um, proposals that DSA advances through the typical code cycle. And that's why the, the perspective is varied and balanced. Again, this is not a comment to say no, I'm just providing, I think the group needs to decide together if they want to add one more.

That's why this is up for discussion. Um, I'm just want to ensure that everyone knows that, that the entire context and that we do have other methods, um, to engage. And that, um, we've also decided that we would have an opportunity, um, to have a public meeting in advance of advancing proposals with the public to propose in a hearing code development, um, or code proposals. So just throwing it out there so you have the entire picture as you make your decision on, on, adding one more or not.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Ida. back to the DSA team. You guys, have your hand up. Do you have another comment?

Eric Driever: I'll lower my hand.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Okay, so let's see. We've completed this section. Um, let me, um, and in, in, within this section, we've got a proposal on the table to, um, increase the number of people in group A, from two persons with disabilities to, three persons with disabilities in an effort to kind of create more of a balance.

Does anybody have any disagreement with this proposed change?

Ida Clair: Can I just clarify that, um, in this proposed change, that would mean that we need to add someone to this group, and if that intent is there, is that do we need to jump right on it? So, we should clarify is, I mean, I'm assuming it's with this group, so we would have to identify who that person is through our available applications and get them up to speed.

So, because this is a charter that we all agree to work with, so I just want to make sure that everyone's agreeing that right there will be a new person introduced into this group if we do that, and, and we can get on that. I just wanted to be clear on that.

Brad Morrison: And we could also propose a timeframe for that as well. So, let's, we, there's a lot of options here for that. So, let's, we'll be, we'll be sure to clarify that though. Don't worry.

Ida Clair: Or actually, yeah, I mean, it could be that what we want to do instead is to make the three in the previous cycle, or wherever the cycle where we elect them at the next break, which would be 18 months from now, so that we don't have to provide the training, get everyone up to speed again.

Brad Morrison: Right.

Ida Clair: We might be able to do that 18 month from now, which is still in the middle of the term of the people who just joined, but it would be introducing someone. So, I'd like to clarify that in the charter where we're doing that if that's what we're doing. So that's my suggestion. It just needs a little more clarity if we're adding one more person.

Brad Morrison: Thank you. That's a very practical suggestion there. Um, let me, let me go on with Mark. Mark, what was your comment?

Mark Zambon: Hi, Brad, really quick. You know, just looking at it on the surface, what seems so obvious to me is, you know, the need picture is so vastly different, you know, depending if it's a, a mobility impairment or cognitive impairment or an intellectual impairment that just to have an individual, you know, who's checking the box lives with a disability, but perhaps, you know, we're not catching a broader, um, variety of the, you know, mobility, cognitive, intellectual disabilities. So, the broader range of disabilities are advocated for. Are there any thoughts on that in trying to, you know, achieve a balance, um, amongst that number?

Brad Morrison: I believe that's part of the discussion. Mark. Let me, but I will have the DSA folks come in and clarify that. Richard, do you want to make a comment before we go to the clarifying point?

Richard Skaff: Well, I said I wouldn't say anymore. There you go. Um, you know, Ida, I, I would be willing to wait. I, I'm concerned about waiting, but I hear what you're saying as far as bringing somebody in now could be more disruptive than beneficial. Um, and I'm willing, I guess to wait until the, you know, what, what you're saying is 18, 18 months over a year and a half. Wow. That's a substantial amount of time for what I see to be a problem. Um, so I, I'm, I'm going to say I think we need to talk more about that.

Ida Clair: Well, okay. And I would like to offer that if we do expand it, that person does not have an also an opportunity to inform the charter, which they will then have to agree by. But that always happens anyways. If someone steps down and someone steps in, they have to assume that they're going to abide by the charter. Cause we only do this at the start of every 18 months when there's a new group. So, thank you for that, Richard.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks Ida. Thanks, Richard. Okay. So, can somebody from DSA clarify, on Mark's point about, considerations, for, for members ACC members? just give a little background there. I think, I think I've heard it before, but I'd like to hear it from those who go through the process.

Eric Driever: So, um, on, on the timing, I'll, I'll address that first. I don't think it would be too terribly problematic or disruptive for us to do potentially, a, an advertisement for, um, for applications.

Um, that, that's extremely possible. We could, um, use the existing pool with applications, which would. Whether we advertise or not still be, as we read earlier in the charter, would still be, um, considered. Um, and, and so I, I suspect it's really not all that disruptive to the process. We could provide the training to the individual.

Um, we, we will be discussing later in this meeting, the October, um, the October public comment. So, um, or the October, sorry, the October public hearing for, for proposals. It might be beneficial to have that person selected prior to that meeting so that we could encourage them to attend that meeting as well.

Um, so I, I guess we're open to all options to Mark's comment earlier about, um, broad, representation, we do actively, I will say it's more of a performance basis through our selection that we look to, um, include as many, um, stakeholder and constituency groups as possible. It's not prescriptive in the charter.

Um, if that's something we are going to consider, I do suspect that it could limit our ability if there were prescriptive requirements in the charter to, to select folks. But we, we certainly would encourage, um, and you see some of the suggested language here. I appreciate the earlier comments. Um, for inclusivity, um, simply emphasizing all disability communities and then adding the potential sentence, following in blue and selecting members of the ACC and emphasis will be placed on applicants who are members of more than one stakeholder group and disability committee when possible.

Um, so those, those. That would be my response. Um, if, if you're looking to expand the prescriptive requirements, that just might caution that we might have a hard time filling those unless we have some flexibility in the process.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank, thanks, Eric. Appreciate that. I, Ida, do you, um, have another comment here?

Ida Clair: I do. I, I want to just correct a little bit and remind Eric that our selection process does involve two other organizations who have volunteers, who volunteered their time to do a review. And so, I, I wouldn't want to speak on behalf of them and their time. Um, so I also want to, um, because according to the charter, this is not a vacancy, this is something that's a new position selected, and it should have been afforded the opportunity.

So, um, my recommendations to wait 18 months for a lot of reasons we're onboarding two new people on our team. Um, we've already begun. Um, and I also, from the applicants that we already have, um, we were not able to have that varied interest. We used to have individuals, two individuals with, that were either blind or visually impaired.

We have none. That's because we had, I believe, no applications from them. Um, we don't have anyone from the hearing community. And so, if we are going to increase, really, it'd be difficult to have it from the existing applications and try to fill that, that void of not having that representative voice.

I'd encourage that in the next 18 months. We try to get that, those applications in that can bring that varied voice so that when this person gets onboarded in 18 months from now, if that's what the group decides to do, to wait till 18 months, we can start to preserve that balance. But, you know, our request is those who have been on this group and those who represent constituency groups, that they help solicit the involvement of individuals with varied disabilities onto this group.

And that hasn't happened for this session. So, I just want to call it to that attention. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Ida. Thanks for introducing that information. It's really, sort of adds a level of complexity here. Um, Kendra, would you like to go next?

Kendra Muller: Yes. I was just curious to know who the other two groups who review these applications. And then I, I thought that there was somebody who was visually impaired on the committee. Speak up if you are, but, um, yeah, I was, I thought I was aware that there was one person.

Brad Morrison: Would, is there anybody who could speak to Kendra's question?

Eric Driever: I'll answer the first part. DSA, um, is joined in the selection process by the CCDA and DOR. Um, they, they provide their own internal review panel, um, with, and then provide us with their selection, um, their selections. Um, CCDA does the same thing, provides us and DSA does that, ultimately DSA reviews all, um, slates provided to us by those two agencies along with ours, and makes the final determination based upon, um, where possible majority, alignment.

And then I, Brad, I'm just noting the time. I know, I, I really, you're way over on time.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, I was going to talk about time, but I wanted to get through this item first. So, I'll, I'll come up to time after we finish here. Cause we're almost, I think we're close. Okay. And I appreciate that, rich or, Eric. So, let's, we'll get to it next.

Um, first of all, let's get to the second part of Kendra's question about visual impairments. Does anybody have, any comment or anything they'd like to share about visual impairment?

Jorge Rivas: Um, well, this is Jorge. Um, I'm visually impaired actually, and so I'm representing that group if you guys, great, thanks Jorge.

So, but I got, I got a ques quick, quick thing is I've, um, I agree with Ida is I think we should, we should definitely wait 18 months because I, I see the panel, I've, I read everyone's, um, background. I think this panel is, is great, and we can move forward, and we can work together to come up with, the accomplishments that we need to do.

So, with that said, I, I think we should table this and move forward with business.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Jorge, appreciate that. I, I also, from what I've heard today, I think we have a rich and varied, um, panel here and with, quite a bit of depth in the area of, disability, including the lived experience. So, I think, I think, um, your comments well taken. Thank you, Jorge. Ann, would you like to go? I'm sorry, April. I'm sorry.

April Dawson: That's okay. Just don't call me late for dinner, Brad. Um, this is April. So, I just wanted to just speak around from the perspective as someone who, from CCDA, who has put together, the, the selection panel. It does take a lot of work and,

and effort and, and just looking at the, the workload of, of CCDA and who the potential, members of the selection committee would be.

I would recommend waiting 18 months just so that we can honor the process. not trying to create a, a bureaucratic slowdown, but just being honest that from, from my perspective, um, and seeing how much it took for us, to, to create the, the committee and look at all the applications, I think that waiting 18 months would, would honor what the proposal is trying to do and allow us the time to, to put that together.

And then, and I also think that it, that trying to do it now, um, wouldn't meet the objective of the proposal. It would, it would create more disruption. So just from, from an operational standpoint, I think the 18 months would, would be best for, speaking for us. Great. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thanks April. Appreciate that. Okay. Um, okay. let's see here. Okay, so let's seeing no further questions here. We've got a proposal on the table to add one person to the disability. Um, then group A to the to the individual with disabilities. Group in group A. Do that would bring a total to three actually. It's, yeah, so, so strike the two and, a new total of three.

So, our proposal is, is, is that we will add that person as part of this section. the other comment that's come up is that, um, we've had, um, some who've expressed that it's very, it's really a complex situation where other agencies are involved. There's quite a bit of, of process that that has to be, upheld in terms of who's selected and how they're selected.

And then in addition to that, bringing them into the committee at a late date could present more complications. Then, um, then we would appreciate, so for very practical suggestion, the, suggestion has been made to, um, to extend the timeframe to deliver that position to the 18th month interval that would happen with the next selection of a, of an ACC, um, cohort.

So, um, I'm going to, suggest that we make the proposal inclusive of the 18-month deadline and to see if there's any disagreement with the fact that we add the, add the position, but yet wait the time period and see if there's any disagreement at that point with that suggestion. Um, Ida, do you need to go before we make, ask people for their, um, feelings on this?

Do you have any other comments that you'd like to add before we go on to that decision?

Ida Clair: I just wanted to add that, this comment that Eric is writing right now should fall into the previous, group B If this is group A, it should be in group B because it should be the triennial code cycle ends in December. And so, the one that, that's what we're starting now. So, if we want to bring them in at eight months, it should be the other group. And so, the individuals with disabilities should be recognized somewhere. There needs to be a balance. And if we're going to do it seven and

seven, we should look at that balance. But the new person we're adding on needs to be referenced in the right group, is my point.

Eric Driever: Well, so it's really the group you're referencing to timing more than the, the balance of the group. Correct. So, um, it, it seemingly should for, for, for efforts and selection, it would be best, I think if Group A, , or sorry, group A had the same number of individuals as group B, which would mean they need to be added in Group A here, but, um, so is it a timing issue that you're concerned about, or, um, that's been, their term is tied to group A?

I think it should probably a point. Right.

Ida Clair: Got it. Yeah. you know, the, that's fine. It's not an issue. We'll, we can have it unbalanced. It's fine. The continuity exists, so it's fine.

Brad Morrison: No, this, this would make it balanced. is what would, would happen as the result of this in Group A. It increases the number in group A. so I, I don't think it's,

Ida Clair: So, then the, the person would come in would only have an 18-month term until they would get another, select, another three options at another three months. Is that what you're suggesting, Eric?

Eric Driever: Correct. Got it. Okay. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Okay. Given that, let's, let's, see if anybody if we were to propose this as an a, an amendment to the charter, does anybody disagree with this idea, recognizing that it's going to take 18 months to deliver that position? Any disagreement to be heard?

Eric Driever: Little less than 18 months, but yeah. Okay.

Brad Morrison: So, okay. Nathan, Nate, come on in. You're on mute.

Nathan Dison: I think it would be important to try and find a way to get representatives from other communities on board, whether it's the vision impaired or, um, hearing impaired.

Brad Morrison: Okay. And I so you're, you're speaking, you're speaking in terms of the consideration for, for who that candidate might be.

Are you okay with the timeframe?

Nathan Dison: I'm okay with the timeframe and I don't object to having an equal number of representatives from the disabled community.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Okay. Thanks Nate. Appreciate that. We got, we heard your comments on the, on the inclusion there too. Okay. Others? Anybody disagree with this?

Okay. So, what I'd like to do is to have you all raise your hands, all the members of the ACC. Could you raise your hands, and we'll take a poll and see what, um, in terms of the vote on the, on this and see if we reach consensus. But basically, we want to see, a, a hand raised by every ACC member, unless you really can't live with, it's this decision.

Okay. Alright. So, what do we have here?

Ida Clair: Can I just clarify one thing on the, um, above section?

Brad Morrison: Yes.

Ida Clair: If we're doing the whole, I need to see the, the, there was an addition of different all disability community. Oh, right. No, before, right there. Stop. If we're, this is the entire section that we're, um, getting input on.

Um, I, we need to clarify different all, I object to all. I don't know that we can actually cover all disability communities with five positions, but we can cover different, so I think that should be eliminated.

Brad Morrison: Okay, so let's,

Ida Clair: well, I think different is more appropriate than many.

Eric Driever: That that's what was there prior,

Ida Clair: right. So that, my point is, is that sufficiently capture what we're trying to do?

Nathan Dison: I don't think so. I mean, should it, should it specify each specific community, so we know what they are? It feels like it.

Ida Clair: Just understand it. We may not get that participation.

Nathan Dison: I understand that. Priority, priority being the emphasis here, given to the selection.

Ida Clair: I'm fine with varied. It's very similar to different, I just don't want to cover all, which is all encompassing or specify. Cause I think that creates an obstacle for us filling those roles.

Sean McNamara: Is there a there's agreement with, you know, specifying, ensuring a balance and then for varied, if we're trying to strike a balance, but a balance of diversity, it, it seems incongruent in the preceding section of that sentence.

Brad Morrison: Oh, I see. The balance, the term balance. I get you ensuring a balance. Representation, varied disability, community, varied disability.

Eric Driever: I think balance is critical.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Yeah, I think that that makes sense. The varied disability communities,

Eric Driever: I would agree varied is maybe a direct synonym for different.

Brad Morrison: Alright. Is everybody okay with this language?

Nubyaan Scott: Hi, this is Nubyaan. Can you hear me?

Brad Morrison: Yes. Nubyaan, come on in.

Nubyaan Scott: Um, so to my memory, we, we don't. Ask any information about the particular individual's type of disability on the application. So, I just, um, and, and I'm not saying that's necessary, but just a, a component of this is trying to be clear on how we're going to actually accomplish the varied representation.

Um, like is that, how do you all get that information essentially, is what I'm trying to ask.

Ida Clair: It's on the application, it asks, I think we identify cognitive hearing, vision, and mobility. Correct. Eric, but probably not. And then other.

Nubyaan Scott: Okay. Awesome.

Eric Driever: Yeah. I'm going to pull up, an application really quick, but you can continue with the comments, Brett.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, let's, let's keep going here. I think we're pretty close. Okay. So, I'd like to see, I'd like to see a hand for those of you that are okay with the, the language as proposed as we've changed just a little bit. and then the addition of that community member and the recognition that that community, member may take a while to get here.

18 months is the sort of, the idea now. So, recognizing all these conditions, whether we can go ahead and, and approve this, um, this section of the, of the, of the charter.

So, it looks like we are getting, yeah. Okay. So, I think, I think, somebody would check for me, but it looks like we have votes. Oh, I, Sue, are you there?

I'm not seeing a response from Sue. She might be away from the, the screen at the moment. okay. Okay. Alright. Looks like, it looks like we do have consensus from the group, with the, um, you know, recognizing that Sue might be away from the screen right now, I can't really see any others. Kendra are you in agreement or Kendra, you're, you're actually, you're non-voting.

Kendra Muller: Sorry. Um, yeah, sorry. I It's okay. I was a little confused cause I just said we could comment ex-officios right now, so Yeah. I, I am in agreeance, but I'm not sure it's at vote is necessary.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, you're, you're, yeah, you're okay. You're not of ex officio. So, we, we let that go. Okay. So, we just, we just need to hear from Sue, whether or not she disagrees with this, but as it looks right now, it looks like we have agreement from the ACC to, to add these changes to the charter and move on with, this section.

Ida Clair: And I, I just, if I may clarify. Yes, this is the charter. Everyone, even the ex-officios need to agree to the charter so that we're all on the same page with the charter. So, you can provide your input onto the charter. It's really when we're doing our work for regulatory development that you will not be asked to, provide a position on whether you support or don't support a, you can, you can feed information from the lived experience and everything, but you as you wouldn't be asked to provide a position on behalf of your constituency group.

So, I just wanted to clarify the difference of the ex-officios from the charter versus our other work.

Brad Morrison: Thanks. Thank you, Ida. Appreciate that clarification. Okay. So, I think we, we've heard from the group, let's move on and we'll check in with Sue, later in the meeting to make sure she's on board as well.

Eric Driever: And Nubyaan question.

Brad Morrison: Oh, Nubyaan. Oh, Nubian. Are, are you, is there any, anything in this agreement that, um, you disagree with?

Nubyaan Scott: Oh, no, I, I think Eric was just going to answer my question about the application.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Go ahead.

Eric Driever: Correct. I'm sorry. I checked the application. There is a check box for, um, Persons with disabilities to select either vision, hearing, mobility or other. and then if, if other, then they would stipulate what another constituency group that is awesome.

Nubyaan Scott: Thank you, Eric. Okay. All right.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks for the clarification there as well. Okay. Can we move to the next section of the charter and see where we are? And we'll take a check-in in terms of time and, other things. But we're, it looks like we've completed this one. Eric, can you move it up to the next section? So, I think we got, is that it? Oh, so the meetings came before I thought the meetings. There's more. Here we go. Yeah, we go more. Okay. So, I, okay.

Meetings? Yes. Meetings are our next section or there's more in this section here, but, um,

Eric Driever: This is fine at this moment for a potential break.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. I think we're way past our break. I apologize it's my fault. I never considered this would, would go this long and, we got into it. um, so I think I propose that we take a 10-minute break now, and come back and, we'll have to agree to some more time today. We're, we're about, we're, ooh, we're a little over an hour, beyond our timeframe here. So, let's take, let's take a 10-minute break starting, starting now, 1141. We'll reconvene at 10 or 1151. And we'll discuss remaining time of the day before we go on to the next, portion of this agenda item.

does anybody have any comments before we break?

Eric Driever: No, at this point, I guess. Okay. Let's, let's do it.

Brad Morrison: Let's take that break and, oh, we've got some comments here. Okay. April?

Eric Driever: No, no. I think their hands are just still up from the, from the vote. Oh, from the vote.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Great. Okay, let's take the break. Let's take the break. It's now 1142. See you at 1152. Okay. All right. Thanks everybody. Talk to you in a few.

Eric Driever: Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Eric, are you there?

Ida Clair: I don't believe he's in the room yet. Brad, do you have a question for me?

Brad Morrison: Oh, no, I was just wondering. Yeah, we're, um, we're running about an hour and a half behind the scheduled agenda. It's kind of hard for me to tell, how much time to ask for, because we haven't even got to the EDWAC um, discussion.

Ida Clair: Um, it shouldn't take long. It, it's really a report. It's not really to comment. Um, oh, okay. Are we mute here? So, let me discuss with Eric. It's just, yeah, that'd really reporting on the status, so Yeah, that'd be great. I, as long as we finish the charter, then it's just reporting on the status. There's nothing for Okay. Um, comment. I guess I should say that I see on the EDWAC, it's just mainly a report of where we are.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Well, I booked a lot of time for that, so we can probably get through by 1230 if, yeah,

Ida Clair: I don't know how much time Eric needs to present that though. He would best Okay. Provide that information. Okay, great. Okay, let me know. Okay, thanks Ida.

April Dawson: Hi, Brad. Are we on a break? I'm sorry. This is April. You,

Brad Morrison: April? Yeah. We took a break for a couple more minutes. so Okay.

April Dawson: Thank, thank you. I just was like, am I on mute? You were, yeah. You were just ahead of us. Yeah, we went way too long. Sorry about that. No, that's okay. I was like, oh, no. Didn't see that coming. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Thanks.

Eric Driever: We are back in the room.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Eric, what do you think about the Ed w discussion? How do you think, how long, how long do you think that, will take you to present that?

Eric Driever: So, um, hard to say exactly except that what I would say is, well, I just want to emphasize that that's sort of a report. it's not really a, a discussion item. There will be a separate, group set up to, um, to deal with, with that aspect of our statutory requirements. Um, I certainly want to make sure that the ACC is aware of those efforts that will take place. So, we'll, we'll simply report, um, and Okay. Discussion at that time.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Yeah, maybe we could do that. Maybe what we can do is hold questions until the end of the presentation part too, and that way we can, um, get the questions at the end and kind of go from there. I think that'll help us to kind of, um, get done at a reasonable time.

Eric Driever: Yeah, and I, I would, you know, we, we are at noon now, so I think it's important to work through the, um, through the, um, charter and make sure that everybody's on the same page with the charter. Have a good robust discussion around that, making sure that appropriate lunch is given. Um, I know we set an expectation or an anticipation that we would finish by noon, and clearly that's not

going to happen today. Um, we originally thought that it would, extend to three, and that's probably a little more realistic, somewhere between two and three, depending on how long the lunch break is.

Brad Morrison: Okay. That sounds good. Okay. Thanks for your input there. That's good.

Ida Clair: Will there be a lunch break? I'm just wondering cause nine to three, were all these people without lunch?

Brad Morrison: Yeah, that's what, that's what we just, yeah. Just heard from Eric and sounds like Yeah, we, it's probably best to include a lunch break in there. Um, we could go with a 30 minute one.

Eric Driever: Would you say minimum 45 minutes? Um, it can be difficult for folks, I realize.

Brad Morrison: We are, getting out to, yeah, getting out to places Gotcha.

Eric Driever: Refrigerator there. But, um, not everybody has that advantage. Um, okay. And may need to go get, yeah, okay. I, I, I'm open to discussion on even that, but I, I would suggest 30 minutes seems a bit short for a group this size.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Sounds good.

Eric Driever: Do you want me to share, the, the document again or are we, are we, yeah, it looks like we've still got some people out here.

Brad Morrison: So yeah, go ahead and put it up there and I'll, I'll monitor on the, um, on the visual. Go ahead and go ahead and add the document.

Eric Driever: Okay. Are you able to see the document?

Brad Morrison: Yes, it's coming through nicely.

Eric Driever: Excellent. So, I, I suspect that we'll probably fine tune some of this language. I have a comment in, in there, you know, just in terms of the, the actual term, um, that I, I think we'd like to make sure that that's accurate. Um, but we certainly have the intent that we'll be waiting until, um, July 20, July 1st, 2024, to add that member.

Um, and that they will be added to group A, um, we have an emphasis early on of, varied stakeholder and constituency groups. So that, that's all-great feedback and we'll carry through that intent with the funnel charter. Certainly, we'll distribute this, um, afterwards so that everybody can have a copy of it.

Um, but let's, I guess continue. Are you, do you feel we're ready to continue on Brad?

Brad Morrison: Yeah, I'm not seeing a whole lot of, um, I'm not sure if, if, if everybody's back yet, could everybody, turn your video on if you're here, just so we can get a sense of everybody's back. We'd like to talk a little bit about the remaining time of the day, and so it'd just be good to have everybody, as many people as possible in here for that discussion.

Eric Driever: Maybe you just have them raise their hand and pull.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, and I just got a comment from Nate. He's, he's on, he's off screen because his Internet's spotty. So, Ann, Larry, let's see. Nubyaan. Michelle, if you could turn your video on really quickly just so we can see who's present, that would be great. Or just let us know, in the chat.

Oh, there we go. Oh, Sue. Yeah, Sue, you're back. Good. Sue, we proposed some changes while you were away from the screen, um, regarding the membership for the, um,

in the membership section of the charter. And, we pretty much reached consensus, but I just didn't want to finalize that until I heard from you. So, if you could just let us know if you're fine with the changes as proposed, which is one more person with a disability, individual with a disability to the group A. and then there's some other, language changes, regarding the, um, the in, in sort of engagement of disability communities. We added the language varied, um, dis disabilities and, um, some other, some other, you can see some other, cross outs. Is there additional language? There we go. So, Sue, if you could just take a quick look at that and just indicate in the, oh, you do, you were listening.

Okay. You don't have a problem with the changes. Okay, great. So, we have reached consensus on the membership item, and it sounds like there may be some final tweaks that need to be made. So, if we can schedule it for the next ACC meeting, we can just take a quick look at it and everybody can give their blessing to it once it's in final form, but we have the information we need to, to proceed ahead with the changes as proposed.

Okay. So now we're onto the meeting section. Um, and we'll go there. Let's see. Um, still Sure.

Eric Driever: Brad, we, we haven't covered term yet.

Brad Morrison: Oh, term, okay. Yeah. Okay, we're on. Um, I'm, I'm still waiting to see, I'm still waiting to see who's back from the break. Eric, just to, just to check in about time. Um, so we might, we might end up, just, let's just see, who's coming in and, we'll, there we go. And Mark. Okay. Tim, are you there? Jorge? Larry,

Larry Grable: I'm here. I'm sorry.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. I'm just asking people to turn their video on, just, just so we can get a sense of who's here, um, because we need to discuss the remaining time of the day. Ann, Jorge, are you there? And Great, thank you. Jorge, are you there?

Nate? We know you're there. You got some spotty video. Nubyaan, are you there? Can you just click your video on if you are?

Nubyaan Scott: Yes, I'm here.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Okay, great. You don't have to click the video just as long as I know you're there. Okay.

Jorge Rivas: Sorry, I've been here. I just wasn't able to turn on my video for some reason.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Well now you're. oh. I think you have two. I think there's two links in there. Jorge, I see your name twice in the, in the, um, screen, so maybe it was the other control that you were looking at. Um, okay. So, we, we've come to a point now where, we're, it's at noon and we've, um, we've gone over our allotted time, um, for the day.

So, we will probably need to extend this meeting probably with the remaining discussion that we have on the, the items left in the charter and with the EDWAC, discussion coming up. Um, I think we're probably looking at a time closer to two o'clock. Go ahead, Eric.

Eric Driever: Yeah, I just want to clarify, we, we did not have an end time that was published. I know there was an anticipation to finish earlier, but that we did not have an end time of noon published.

Brad Morrison: Right. Okay. Right. Okay. Yeah. So is everybody. Yeah, it, it was, it was a promise made in the early, in the hopefulness of the early morning. But, as you can see, we've kind of, we've kind of, gone past our, our, um, our ideal schedule and we're moving into a little longer schedule for the day.

So, one of the things that's come upon us is that it's, it's the lunch hour and we know that people need a certain amount of time to get out and get lunch if you're in a, in, in, you know, like in an office location. So, um, what we, what we're going to propose is that we take a break, um, at some point, a 45-minute lunch break, and come back and, and finish the remaining items once we take the lunch break.

So, um, what, let's see. Well, it looks like what I propose that we could do. So, so Eric, of the charter, what do we have left? Do we have the terms and the meetings?

Is that what we have left of the two, the, those remaining items? Two, the terms. Yeah. Okay. And then the, and meetings. Is the last the last part of the charter?

Eric Driever: No. Um, we have meetings. Okay. And ground rules. Okay. Those would be important. We have decision making.

Brad Morrison: Decision making. Okay. Yeah, we should, we should probably, um, take a break and we have change proposals submitted by ACC members as well as removal from the ACC, which is also critical to understand. Yeah.

Important, important concept. Okay. So, um, let's, let's do this. Let's take our lunch break. 1245. Um, let's actually make it 1250 now that we're looking at, um, it's a little bit after 12. So, let's take the lunch break, get out and do what we have to do, relax a little bit, and reconvene at 12:50, to finish the charter and then move on to the EDWAC discussion.

And it's likely that we're going to go till two or two thirty today, so just want to kind of make you aware of that. Let you know that our original timeframe that we proposed this morning isn't going to work out as well as we thought. And we'll take, um, take a break for lunch now, and then come back and finish the discussion.

Um, following our break, does anybody have any questions or comments before we go? Okay. Not hearing any, um, let's take that break. We'll see you back here at 1250 and we'll start up with our remaining just charter discussion.

Eric Driever: Brad, can, are you having a hard time hearing me?

Brad Morrison: No, no, no. I, I just wanted to finish my comment. Go ahead, Eric. Okay.

Eric Driever: I'm sorry. Um, it looks like Richard's had his hand up. Has her hand up. And then I might, as an alternative, I might suggest we just had a break. Um, we might be able to work through some things for the next half hour, 40 minutes, and then take a lunch. I'm, I'm open either way to it, bill. Okay. okay. Richard, did you have a comment about current situation, the break or anything like that?

Richard Skaff: Um, yeah. I, I, I, I'm, I won't push any more, I guess, but I'm, I'm still concerned. I don't, I don't think there's still equivalency and, and, um, too many times where because of that, the disability community has not ended up with what it needs and, and I, I, this, you know, I, I, that's all I'm going to say. I, I just feel we need, we, we need to be the priority here.

People with disabilities needs to be the priority here. Um, we, we have very few venues, yes. DSA has done, I've been on each one of the special committees for EV charging and um, gas stations. I was told we can't make gas station pumps, accessible to people with disabilities. They'll blow everything up and, you know, when they have their cell phone and, and so we can't do that.

So, well guess what? We made them accessible. Um, we, we started out with DSA saying, well, there are no accessible, accessible electric vehicles. So, what's the point in making electric vehicle charging stations accessible? Um, and parking, not parking, charging station, vehicle spaces accessible. Well, now we have all kinds of vehicles.

Um, so, you know, we're, we're, we're always, we, people with disabilities are always, um, having to push up instead of. Being recognized and the state agencies, the five write code writing agencies recognize our needs and write the codes that we need to have access in the built environment. I'm dealing, for example, with, outdoor experiences, we're still not getting what is needed there.

Um, and it's because people with disabilities are not in a place of power, um, and not in a place of with money, um, where building owners, business owners, um, others are capable of, um, controlling codes and standards because they have the money to make it happen. And we don't. And so, we need to have, and that's why I was very concerned about not having a regular ongoing access advisory committee like we've always had.

Um, you know, I, I don't want to come to a meeting. I, I mean, I'm doing that here when we, when, when we have disability related needs, we shouldn't have to come to a meeting to compromise. We should be coming to a meeting to get access. and, and I don't see that. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank you, Richard. Ida.

Ida Clair: Um, thank you Richard for your, input. I appreciate it. I do, um, want to clarify that, um, you know, the ACC is specifically designed for that respectful. Conversation. The ACC does not vote or advance a specific requirement. They provide feedback to DSA that's written in the charter, and that's the way it's designed. And I, while I, I understand your concerns.

I believe DSA has evolved. I've tried to evolve DSA to bring in more voices, more balanced voices, more respect, um, more engagement, more still needs to happen. And, you know, we are working on that in the confines of our, of what we can do. But, um, I, I just, I want to stress that there is a uniqueness to the ACC that has, um, occurred here.

And I believe that it is not intended to, um, take charge of the process and provide that change because we can't, we have an authority in laws that we have to work within. So, I just want to stress that if any of you have concerns with the way ACC has operated in the past, to reach out to past members and get their feedback and their input prior to implementing, um, fundamental changes where they can be changed in this charter.

Um, and one of them that can't be changed is the authority that we have in statute to effectuate the regulatory process with consideration of all stakeholders. So, this is

not intended to be an advocacy group, it's not intended to be an advisory group. It's intended to be a feedback group to execute those provisions.

We move forward, and again, before we have fundamental change, we need to know why it didn't work before we propose any changes to why we need to fundamentally change it. Because it's contrary to the efforts and the work of historically what's happened to bring this group, into existence and to say that it's not enough.

When, and excuse me, Richard, I don't recall you avidly participating in the conversations when we've had them open to the public like people are today. Maybe you have a few, maybe my memory's wrong. I don't mean to attack, but I'd like for every single person here to find out that if they feel this needs to change, that they should reach out to the previous members who agreed by a charter, worked on the charter like you all are, and get that input. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks Ira. Okay, let me, um, in the interest of, figuring out our timeframe here, let me go back to you, Eric, and your suggestion was to stay in the room for a little bit longer. can you clarify that a little bit?

Eric Driever: Yeah. Per, perhaps we can at least cover the sections and topics that we've addressed today or so far in the meeting. So that would take us, I know we had a special guest, recommendation earlier. that would take us through the meetings section and then we could start after lunch perhaps on the ground rules.

Brad Morrison: Okay, but we're still, it sounds like we're still, with Richard's comment, we're still not through with our members, um, section.

So can you scroll up to the members section and let's, let's get, Richard's input here. Um, it sounds like we're going to be in the room for a few more minutes, everybody. So, we'll, um, we'll, take it a few more steps here and then see, and then see about taking that lunch break. So, Richard, um, given your past comment, are you saying that you, can't really agree with the decision that the rest of the group, um, has put forth?

Can you let us know, can you clarify your sentiment on the changes that are proposed in the last, in the membership section?

Richard Skaff: Sure. thank you. Um, and I'll be very quick. Um, I, I was the one that brought this up. I was the one that was talking about, um, and a, um, a partnership with the disability community by having a, an equal number of people with disabilities as members of the ACC at least in equal numbers to ACC members, not part of the committee as people with disabilities.

That doesn't mean they may not, they, they may have disability disabilities, but they are there representing other, um, interests, building and facility owners, code enforcement, et cetera.

Brad Morrison: Mm-hmm.

Richard Skaff: Um, we're still not equal. I think somebody made the count and I can't see the two groups, but, um,

Nubyaan Scott: Richard, my understand this isn't, sorry, I just wanted to make sure I'm tracking your, um, comment. To my understanding, the, the suggestion that was made would make the disability advocate. People with disabilities equal. So are, are you saying you're, you want, it's specifically not to include advocates. You'd want equity within the one category of people with dis that accurate.

Richard Skaff: You count the, the different groups into two groups. Individuals with disabilities, disability advocates are one group and building facility owner representatives, code enforcement, um, design, um, um, professionals, certified access specialists, um, in another group. We are still short one if we're going to talk about equality being, being equal in numbers. And, and you know, I'm not saying that those people that are on the ACC that aren't there representing people with disabilities are bad people or that they're against access.

I didn't say that. I don't know what will come up in the future as far as who will be on and how they will represent the group they are on the ACC representing. Um, so I want to see that there's parity. Right now, we still don't have that. When I first brought this up this morning, it was my statement that we should have at least equal, if not a majority.

Thank you. I think, I think we've reached the equal point.

Brad Morrison: Richard, if you, if you look at the, the,

Richard Skaff: I'm sorry. If, if that's the case, then I, I don't have anything else to say, but I, that I couldn't get the total numbers there. So, could you please, Brad gimme a total? Yeah, unless I, unless I'm misreading this.

Brad Morrison: I can see that we have in group A, we have four, including people with disabilities at three plus one disability advocate. That would be four in group A and in group A. We, the remaining professionals, um, would be three. So that's, that's a, a four, three mix in group A. And then in, in, in group B, we have, individual disabilities, at two, and disability A advocates at one.

So that's a total of three. And, and, and the professional, the remaining professionals in that group are four. So, so, um, basically it's, um, it's equal at this point in terms of, of, of representation. And so, that's what we've all kind of looked at and agreed to. and, and I'm just concerned that you're, um,

Richard Skaff: Brad, you make it clear something has changed.

Brad Morrison: Are you okay with the no equal representation? I'm, I'm fine. Okay. That's okay. I'm okay. Great. Okay. Good to hear. Okay, good. Yeah, that's kind of what we've been proceeding on. I can see with all the back and forth that may be a little confusing. So, so right now it, as proposed, it would be equal representation once that other member is added, which pragmatically may take a little while.

So that's, that's the, but basically the best thing we have going right now is we've got equal representation. So that you are okay with that though, right? Correct.

Richard Skaff: Yes.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Okay, good. So, so that's, that's what we've been thinking in terms of the membership, so I'm going to consider that, that you're okay with that now, and then we'll move on to the next section, which is, is coming up. So, um, let's, let's move on to the next one. Oh, Eric, did you have a comment?

Eric Driever: Sorry. Yeah, and it, it might be mood at this point, Richard. Thanks for your consensus. Um, and, and I apologize for the sort of gap between the, the two sections there when we were in track changes mode. Um, I'll, I'll, I will highlight, having reviewed the original study, and again, y'all are welcome to review that.

There's a link to it in that PowerPoint we distributed. Um, there, the concept of equal or majority, um, really wasn't part of that study. It was more focused on diversity, and inclusion of a broad stakeholders. So those were the sort of conceptual ideas. I acknowledged the, the desire from, from Richard and, and probably from others that, um, that there'd be a majority.

I think this does, um, as you have all stated, your concurrence with, I, I think it meets the intent of the original study by providing a broad stakeholder group. Um, it does correct what might've been an imbalance, um, in, in specific individual, representation for individuals with disabilities. So, I'm really proud of, of the work you guys have all done to come to that consensus, and I, I, again, I think it meets the intent of the original study.

Brad Morrison: Okay, thanks Eric. Appreciate that. Okay, so with that, let's, let's move on to the next section here and, if nothing else, we'll. We'll see where we are, in the, in the document itself. Okay. So, move down a little further. Keep going.

We're, we're through, we're through this section, and now we're going to start, the next section up would be meetings. So, the question is, do we, oh, I'm sorry. Let's, oh, yeah, let's, let's take this on right now and then we'll, we'll let the meetings go. Okay. So, let's talk about membership terms. ACC members may serve two consecutive terms, after which they must wait one three-year cycle before being considered again for membership, unless the stakeholder group they represent has not advanced new prospective members, which would retain the balance and breadth of interested of interests represented on the ACC.

If a member is unable to complete their service, they shall submit a letter of resignation to DSA. The resigning member may designate an alternative to serve the remainder of, of his or her term, provided in the, the delegate alternative has an application or membership on file with the DSA and is approved for membership in the DSA.

After completing service of term DSA will select replacement from the applicant pool. If the delegated alternative is selected from the applicant pool, the delegate alternative is eligible for one term of service only having served me, having served the immediately preceding term. is everybody okay with the language as it's presented here in terms of membership terms? Richard?

Richard Skaff: No. I, I just failed to take down my hand. Sorry about that.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Okay, Nubyaan?

Nubyaan Scott: Hi. Um, I guess we, just for clarity purposes, I feel like it would be more accurate to say that the person may suggest a delegate or an alternate, because saying that the resigning member may delegate implies that their decision is not going to be cross-referenced.

Like a DSA has the ultimate determination. So, um, okay. I just think for accuracy and maybe that suggest, suggest, yeah.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Great. Okay. That sounds good, Ian. Thank you. Okay, so we have one change to the language. Any others? Any other comments on this section? There's another delegated after that sentence to that prop.

The suggested. Okay.

Ida Clair: Divided the delegated alternate the delegated alternative in the last section there.

Brad Morrison: Sentence two more.

Ida Clair: One in the next sentence. Oh. And there, there's one, two alternate to serve the remainder of the term provided the suggested alternate has an application for membership. There's one more in the middle.

Right above it. Yeah. And then also above it too.

Eric Driever: One more?

Brad Morrison: Yeah, there you go. Is there another one? Yep. Third line down. Oh, yeah, there it is. Right there. Right there.

Eric Driever: I almost want to create an acronym.

Brad Morrison: Let's not get too complicated here. Okay. Sounds good. all right. So, okay. Okay. We have some changes in the language here. We're really moving to suggested alternative, um, alternate. And so that's pretty clear from the language. is this, okay? Does anybody have any comment to be made about the switching the language here from the delegated to the suggested alternate?

Okay. Not hearing any comments there? We'll go ahead with moving beyond suggestion. Um, what do you think? Should we take this on, or should we take the break?

Eric Driever: I. I, I think it is. I think we can take it on. I, I don't, I don't suspect most meetings Okay. That we can make edits to in terms of, quick adjustments to how we meet, um, but also include the suggestion to include a special guest speaking.

Brad Morrison: Right. Okay. Sounds good. Yeah, we have that suggestion from prior that we're about the special guests. The expertise is needed. we'll have that in here somewhere. Let's take a look at the reading here, the section. Um, and do we need to read through, or can people see this well enough on their own?

Eric Driever: I'm just adding a paragraph to the end.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, that's okay.

Eric Driever: Yes. Didn't need to get anywhere above.

Nathan Dison: I have a quick question as you're typing, please. Yeah, go ahead. Um, if I were to put up another, CASp or CASp that is at my firm as the representative, is advanced notice required?

Brad Morrison: Are you going to suggest, are you suggesting to, an alternate for your position? Is that what you're thinking?

Nathan Dison: If somebody had to show up for a meeting that I just to listen and I'm just reading that language from Oh, oh, good question. Yeah. If I were not able to attend for some reason and someone could listen in for me, yeah.

Brad Morrison: We've had that happen before. Let me ask, let me ask Ida or Eric for clarification, or e or somebody on the DSA team. Okay. anybody can chime in here, but I know we've had, we've had people, come in for,

Eric Driever: We would, we would need to be able to effectuate a specific, um, panelist link for them. So, a couple of days' notice would be, would be good courtesy for us to be able to, to make that happen for you.

Nathan Dison: Okay. Yeah. It probably won't happen there, but there is another CASp at my office that could do it and so I just read that and wanted to know. Thanks.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, thanks Nate. Appreciate it. Okay. okay, so why don't we take a look at this section here and see if the language is okay. It's, pretty much the existing charter language with this one edition down at the bottom and, um, and

Eric Driever: If you wouldn't mind, perhaps we could read through this section and make sure that everybody's on the same page with the types of meetings that are conducted and how they're conducted.

Brad Morrison: Oh, okay. Alright. Let's see. Meeting dates will be scheduled at the start of each code development cycle to optimize coordination with the ongoing regulatory process. There are two types of meetings. The first code development meetings are pre cycle activities where we work on code development proposal proposals. DSA has identified as proceeding through the rulemaking process are presented to the ACC for input and feedback. Code development meetings are designed as face-to-face events; however, video or phone conferencing options may be provided as needed.

Well, we're all, we're all there now, aren't we? Okay. Um, the, the other type of pre-development workshops are held after code change amendments. After code change amendments have been submitted to the building Standards Commission for formal rulemaking pre-development workshops allow last minute review of minor edits to code language, if necessary, we'll review the potential code change proposals by ACC members, planning for upcoming pre cycle activities, orientation of new members, reflection on past code development meetings, and miscellaneous information Issues that are not determined to be material relevant to code development meetings will be addressed either in pre-development workshops or in a written format and uploaded to the online repository.

The ACC DSA Box last paragraph, most meetings will be one day in length, re oops, no reimbursement for travel parking accommodations and meals will be provided for by a CCC members attending in person according to each ACC member's contract terms. So, so that's for the in-person meetings, which we may get to in the future.

And reading on the next paragraph, if an ACC member cannot participate in an ACC meeting, he or she may appoint an observer to attend. The observer may participate. If adequately prepared to represent the ACC member who, which includes having a depth of understanding of the issues, the observer has the responsibility to read the transcripts prior to the meeting of the code development cycle prior to participating in the ACC meeting and agrees to abide by the ground rules of the ACC charter.

The ACC member has the responsibility of reading the transcript and, of the missed meeting prior to participation in the following meeting. So, Nate, that answers your question pretty well. It's, you, you can have somebody come in, there's a process for it. Person has to be prepared and capable of understanding issues, and then you as

a member just have to catch up and read, read what's happened, in the interim since you've missed the last meeting.

So that's, that's really kind of the, um, that's really the gist of it there.

Nathan Dison: Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. And the last but not least, we add our special comment. Oops. You look like you're adding more language in order to provide, I was just going to add some language about the 48-hour notice, but it, it's really more of an es courtesy, Nathan.

Um, I, I, we probably don't need it to be in the Yeah, just keep it in mind that there's somebody who has to do some work on the other side, so to make that happen.

Nubyaan Scott: I, this is Nubyaan. I don't think it would hurt to say just include language, like as a courtesy, just so people have, it's documented somewhere.

Brad Morrison: Um, okay. Okay. I agree. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. It's, it's good to, nice, nice way to put it as a courtesy too. Yeah, that's, that's a good way to kind of do it.

Nathan Dison: Um, but I don't think I'll miss a meeting. Thanks. Okay. Okay, great. And that's, that's great. Just so I'm clear, so if the person is well prepared that also mean to participate, that also means they can participate in a consensus vote, right? As if they were the member.

Eric Driever: Correct.

Brad Morrison: Correct.

Nubyaan Scott: Okay. Yes. Sorry, I had one more question. Earlier. We said something about people can be reimbursed according to their contract terms. Um, I'm just thinking about how I, first of all, I don't know what the contract terms. But in the context of an individual who may be not part of an organization, let's say it's just a member of the community with a disability, um, to make it clear for them how they would, if they're entitled to compensation and all that, like, is it necessary to have that?

Brad Morrison: The last part of your comment broke up, Nubia, can you just repeat the last sentence or so?

Nubyaan Scott: I was just asking if it's necessary to keep, according to their contract terms, in the... Um, documents because that might be confusing to an individual. That's not right. You know, part of an organization.

Brad Morrison: Okay, let's bring in either or Eric on that question.

Eric Driever: So, uh, thank you, Nubian. Um, I would echo the concern that this language here is, is not clear. Um, it is my understanding, and I may need to lean on Greg to do his research, um, with Jessica or Ida on her previous experiences. It's my understanding that all ACC members, uh, have the ability to, um, have their travel expenses reimbursed. Thank you.

Ida Clair: Uh, sorry. Um, I will tell you it's a result of our contracts, folks. Um, previously, if you were acknowledging yourself or holding yourself out as an ACC member, previous contracts, folks considered that a, um, designation that had some kind of, weight with it. And so therefore it needed to have a contractual term of use. And so other things were added subsequent contract individuals. And this is not within DSA. This is our contract folks determined that because they're only providing input and they're not you're not providing a concrete service in the sense of a tangible, um, deliverable. You're only providing a vocal opinion that, uh, a contract's not needed and that, um, reimbursement for expenses, uh, can be provided without a contract. So that's the status we are right now. So, I would delete according to the contract.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great.

Ida Clair: Members contract terms until of course, someone else decides they're going to change their mind again. Okay. You would make a good lawyer, Ida. We've got explanation. Yeah, you had me worried there for a minute, but yeah, great.

Brad Morrison: Great save at the end. Okay.

Ida Clair: I would caution, all of you can say you're a member of the ACC, you don't have a contract for it, you don't need to, however we would request that if you were no longer on the ACC that you cease in doing so, but we're not going to execute contracts for that because that's a nightmare.

Brad Morrison: Okay, that's good. Okay, so I just want to bring your attention to the bottom there, just so we have a We'll understand what's going on. So, let's just read through the last two parts here that have been added as a courtesy two-day advance notice is requested to provide DSA. If a member, um, it is appointing an observer to attend in their absence. Attendance by an observer does not constitute an absence by the ACC member. So, so if you're, um, be worried about an additional absence, it, it Um, having an observer there does cover your absence, having a, uh, attend a delegate or attendee or whatever we suggested attendee. Uh, anyway, so, and then the last discussion. Okay. Oh, yeah. Hold on one sec. Let me, let me just read this last sentence and we'll go with it. Go to the comments as needed a special guest speaker may be necessary to help inform the ACC. Those guests may be invited as panelists on those occasions. So, we know that from the earlier comment, but that's where it's going to rest in the document.

Okay, let's start with Nubyaan. Maybe on. Do you have a comment?

Okay, maybe your hands just all right.

Nubyaan Scott: Could you repeat what you said? Do you have a comment on this last two on the last two sentences here? No, I should have lowered my head. Oh, it's okay. That's okay. Thanks. I okay.

Mehdi Shadyab: Yes, I would like to request respectfully request that opportunity to attend virtually be provided for every meeting just because traveling can be difficult. Um, you know, they are trying to curtail on. You know, out of city or travel. Uh, so, and instead of saying the word may, maybe say will, uh, be provided. I, I believe this would provide better and more attendance to our meeting. So, I would like to request respectfully to, for a virtual opportunity to be provided for every meeting we will hold. Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Okay. So, maybe you would like to see an additional Uh, sentence in here. Mehdi, uh, put it at the end until we figure out the best place for it, or?

Mehdi Shadyab: Press the word may as he will, and that will take care of it. May.

Brad Morrison: Okay Great. Okay, Mehdi, I think we have the language there. Uh, video or phone conferencing options will be provided as an alternative to an attending, to an to attending in person. So, it sounds like we got the gist of your comment in there.

Eric Driever: Can I, can I suggest that actually recognizing that this language is in the code development and pre cycle activity tech meetings and not that. I'm going to suggest I have that language up here.

Brad Morrison: Sounds good. Perfect. Yeah, sounds good. Okay, great. Mehdi you want to take another look at that. It looks like we're going to just put it in a little different section, but I think it's there. I think the, the comment that you suggested is there and, uh. Just let us just acknowledge that you I'm good. You're okay with it. Okay. You're good. Thank you.

Mehdi Shadyab Thank you so much. Thank you for your concentration.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that. Okay, let's go on to Sean.

Sean McNamara: All right. Well, 2 of my items just got cleared up. So that's great. The last 1 is more of a format issue. Um, we say, you know, there are 2 meetings and then go down to 3 bullet points. You know, the 2 are obviously the 2 meeting types. The 3rd 1, I'm wondering if that should be looped into the predevelopment or dropped from the bullet to list that described the meeting types as that's just kind of additional information, not a meeting type. Either way on it, but yeah,

Brad Morrison: Get it out of that row of bullets and just put it in as a separate paragraph. There you go. Looks like that. That was it. Okay. Boom. Done. Thank you, Sean.

Okay. Okay. Ida Did you have a comment?

Ida Clair: I do. Okay. A couple things. Um, first of all, um, the section that says predevelopment workshops, if we can come up with something other than predevelopment, because it says, Allow for last minute review or minor edits to code language. Well, then they're not predevelopment so I don't know if there's a better language, but I don't want to misconstrue I know it's just the name of the meetings. Um, I would say uh Maybe we just call them workshops and that's it. Okay, let's do that. I would delete predevelopment There we go. So, they're either code development meetings or their workshops.

Brad Morrison: Sounds good.

Ida Clair: And then uh down a little farther down a little farther. Down a little farther. The guest speaker. I would like to add in there that DSA will have some requirements that we know who it is at least two weeks in advance of the meeting, and then be provided with what they're going to discuss, and that we can designate how much time they have to speak with negotiation because we need to. We can't have them speak for like hours on end on a meeting. So, uh, we can work with them and the person who invited them, but I'd like to say put some language in there that this is not, um, Open ended and they just show up because we need to be able to control time and work.

Brad Morrison: How would you propose. How would you propose that we write that up. Give us a little thought about

Ida Clair: That get DSA must be notified of special guests at least how long Eric, what do you think?

Eric Driever: I'm on the fly, just sitting here trying to think. Three weeks? Maybe, because two weeks the agenda goes out in advance, right?

Ida Clair: Right, right. Do we have a time for when the agenda goes out?

Eric Driever: Um, typically we try to, we try to get it out two weeks in advance.

Ida Clair: So then three weeks at least, and so that we can negotiate, uh, the, um, time, length of time to speak and understand what they're going to be speaking to, so we can include it on the agenda.

Eric Driever: Yeah, I would be a little concerned about one week to make that happen. I would request that we maybe say a month's notice, just to give it a round number and to allow us a couple of weeks. Okay. One thing I've recognized, uh,

having been there a little over a year and a half, maybe now, um, is that sometimes rulemaking deadlines really take precedent, uh, in terms of workload assignments. So, I need to be able to have some flexibility and a week just doesn't seem, uh, long enough to address those 30 days?

Brad Morrison: Okay, 30 days.

Eric Driever: 30 days.

Brad Morrison: Anne do you have a comment?

Anne Riggs: Yes, thank you. I'm sorry. Maybe so my understanding of the suggestion, um, which I believe came from Kendra to potentially include a special guest was that if there's a topic being discussed, such as a proposed code change that specifically affects or benefits individuals with a certain disability type of disability that we might reach out to someone from that stakeholder group so that we can get a more knowledgeable, um, opinion of that topic in the meeting to compensate for any potential lack of representation from that group on the ACC. That was my understanding. So, if we don't have the agenda yet, or we don't know what code changes are being considered at that meeting. My understanding was not that this guest would be. Just, oh, we'd like to hear from this topic today. I thought it would be specific to the agenda. Um, so I don't know if that person, how that would be determined. In advance of the agenda being issued

Eric Driever: That's a fair comment, Anne.

Anne Riggs: And I'm not sure if everyone agrees that that would be. I thought that would be 1, at least 1 purpose of having a special guest, not to preclude that there could be other reasons to do so.

Brad Morrison: Thanks Anne appreciate that. Yeah, it'll, it'll have to be worked into the process to see how it. How well it works, um April.

April Dawson: Hi, this is April. I guess I just wanted to caution us, um, since this, since this is a charter and it's not a procedure manual, we may not want to get too in the weeds about things like, you know, must have 30 days' notice. I think, in my opinion, just saying, you know, a special guest may be needed, you know, legitimizes that in the charter and allows that since it might not be something that's It's, you know, clear that that's allowed but I don't know that we want to get in the weeds of 30 days or for the reason of the fact that we, I could see that going down the road of getting too weedy and in a, in a, in a governance. guiding document. Um, and I think a lot of that can be handled organically with the parties. Um, and then also, I think that it's kind of, I think that it was sufficient just to say that, you know, you might need a guest to inform a topic from time to time. And that's okay. That's just my opinion.

Brad Morrison: Thanks. Thanks, April. Appreciate it. Okay, Ida.

Ida Clair: Um, in response to April, maybe a suggestion that states, uh, all guest appearances must be coordinated with DSA in advance. So that way we at least we have control of the agenda and the time and the knowledge, and we can discuss the details derail an agenda that we have important work to do.

Brad Morrison: Okay, sounds good, Ida. April, are you okay with that? Meet your suggestion.

April Dawson: Yes.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Great. All right. Sounds good. Uh, Tom, Tom Martin.

Tom Martin: I was muted. Can you hear me now? Yeah. Okay. So, on your second sentence, Eric says those guests may be invited as panelists. You might want to specify guest speakers. Just a suggestion.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Thanks, Tom. Appreciate it. We got it in there. Nubyaan. Um, you have a comment question.

Nubyaan Scott: It's a comment. It's about a prior item, though.

Brad Morrison: I thought so. The comments kept coming in above your name. I didn't know if your hand was still raised up. And so, you have a, you have a comment about the which, which item.

Nubyaan Scott: So, the one we were talking about as a, so the word, I think the appropriate word we were trying to Here. The question. Okay. Chooses alternative rather than as an alternative, right? Right. Suggested alternate. Yeah. No, no, no below where it says, um, options will be provided as an alternative.

Brad Morrison: Oh, you mean the, uh, the type of media?

Nubyaan Scott: Yeah. Okay. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. And what was your comment? I mean, we, we have the options, and their conferencing options will be provided as an alternative to attending in person. Is that no, no, you, you just, uh, responded to my comment. You changed alternate to alternate.

Brad Morrison: Oh, he's already ahead of me. Yeah. Okay. Great. Thanks. New. Yeah. Appreciate it. Looks like we got it fixed. Okay, great. All right. Let's go through this section here. This meeting section. We have several changes and let me ask you, um, Yeah, we can get that out there. Okay, great. So, we've, we've changed the, the conferencing option to be, you know, possible for every meeting code development meeting. Our pre cycle activities, which work on the code development proposals, DSA is identified as proceeding through the rulemaking process are

presented to the ACC for input and feedback. That's the code development meetings. The rest of the language has been struck the workshops. That's our other language for the, for the type of a meeting.

That may not be a conference or code development workshop or code development process. Workshops are held after the code change amendments have been submitted to the Building Standards Commission for formal rulemaking. Here we have predevelopment again, but I'm thinking workshops allow for last minute review of minor edits to code language, if necessary, for review of potential code change proposals by ACC members, planning for upcoming pre cycle Activities orientation of new members reflection of past co development meetings and miscellaneous information. So, the new term workshops are there to replace the predevelopment idea. And that's the change in that section. And then, moving on down to the, um, uh, oh, and the issues, um, issues were actually meant to be a separate paragraph. Um, I think that that was pointed out. Somebody asked that that not be a bullet in that line.

Eric Driever: That's showing us right through the bullet. So, it's a strike.

Brad Morrison: Okay, gotcha. Okay. Okay, then, then, the in the next section, most meetings will be one day length reimbursement. The reimbursement contract issue has been eliminated. It's just reimbursement will be. There for members attending in person. That's been that's that struck out.

Uh, then the next section, uh, we have just a courtesy in there for the suggested alternative, uh, alternate for the meeting. Just give the essay two days' notice, uh, so that they can set up the, um, the code, uh, for that person to be online or at the, uh, at the meeting. And also, that if you're if you have an observer attend for you, it does not count against you as an absence. So just to keep that in mind. And as needed us last change paragraph here as needed special guest speaker may be necessary to help inform the ACC guest speakers may be invited as panelists on those occasions, guest speaker attendants will be coordinating with DSA in advance just to make sure we can coordinate it all with the agenda and everything else.

Okay, great. So, uh, let's is anybody have any issues with this language in this section? So, the meetings language section. Okay, let's see, Sean,

Sean McNamara: Just 1 last, uh, there's 1 predevelopment, uh, hanging in the bullet that was dropped. Right there

Brad Morrison: Sneaky. Okay, good. Good. John, thank you very much on that 1. Nubyaan. Okay, we'll just lower your hand. It must have been raised. It was raised before I yeah, but I lost I took my eyes off, and I lost track there so no problem. I just, I just lowered it. Okay, so it looks like, uh, I, I don't hear any comments, um, against the language we've developed in the meeting section, so I'm going to assume that, uh, we're going to move ahead to the next section, and then we'll approve the entire document when we're done formally, but right now we're just going to take it to the

next section, but I'd also propose that we take our break for lunch, so let, uh, Eric, can you Scroll down so everybody knows where we're leaving.

So, the next section we take up will be ground rules when we return from lunch. We're going to take it's 1250. We're going to take a 45-minute break, if that's okay. So that should put us back in the room at 1:35. Okay. So, let's take the break. Uh, we'll return again. 1 35. Uh. Eric or Michelle or guys.

Eric Driever: And obviously this is taking a fair amount of time so out of respect for everybody. If you have the ability, I don't want to dictate but if there's maybe some lunch homework for you. You can review the, the current charter online. Again, perhaps. Make yourself some notes on things specific language that you'd like to see introduced into the charter so we can be vicious that we're not having to Specifically read through and apprise everybody of what the current charter says You're going to prize yourself over lunch while you're enjoying your sandwich or taco or whatever. You're going to enjoy it.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Thanks, eric. Appreciate that. Okay So we'll pick up with ground rules when we return. See you all at 1 35. Thanks again.

Eric Driver: Hi, Brad. How are you doing? Are you back?

Brad Morrison: I am. Hello. Hey, Eric.

Eric Driever: Beautiful.

Brad Morrison: Okay, looks like everybody's wandering in over there too. Okay, so slow but sure.

Eric Driever: Oh, yeah. Yeah, absolutely. I'm going to get some really hot, fresh air.

Brad Morrison: Well, I'm glad I am where I am and you are where you are because at least at least 15-degree difference, I think.

Eric Driever: So, what part of the world are you in again?

Brad Morrison: Petaluma.

Eric Driever: Oh, yeah, that's right.

Brad Morrison: But I can't tell you how many days I've come home from Sacramento and, uh, you know, it's, it's just, uh, coming this way. It's just cooler and cooler as you drive, you know, so it's just, it just gets hot over there in a way that, um, you know, it doesn't here at the coast. It gets hot here, but not, not like Sacramento, you know, with the 100 degrees plus days. Okay

Eric Driever: Did you at least get outside, Brad? I did.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Got outside, got some food. I'm, I'm doing well. I think I've got, I'm good for the duration here. Yeah. How about you? Oh, you got outside cause you wanted to the heat.

Eric Driever: Yeah, I walked up to the Capitol and back. Not, not too far, but just enough to kind of get outside.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Yeah. You're in a great location there actually. That's really nice.

Eric Driever: I agree. Yeah. Although I will say that the Zig is nice.

Brad Morrison: Oh really? Oh yeah. Well, that's uh, that seems like a pretty cool place too, but a little bit more isolated. You know, it's hard to.

Eric Driever: Yeah, a little further to go for, you know, for the cafes and things like that is your right.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, I had a contract with the community colleges for a couple years. And so, I got used to go into that building on Q Street there. Yeah, it looks like we're getting critical mass here so I think we should go ahead and start and just take our time and go slow here. Thank you.

Looks like most of us have come back from lunch. So, we're going to go ahead and pick up where we left off with the ground rules, and we'll go through here and see if there's any proposed changes to these ground rules. But at the same time, we'll be reading through them to make sure everybody understands what they are and what they're there for. Let's take one more look. Okay, great. How about this? Eric, would it be okay if I just read through the ground rules? I'll just read the whole section.

Eric Driever: Thank you.

Brad Morrison: And we'll kind of take it up and take comments after we get through the section here just so we people have an understanding of what it is. Okay. We're closer here. Okay, the ground rule's purpose of the ground rules is to. Ensure an opportunity for the ACC members to have an opportunity to engage effectively in the process. They are intended to reinforce the collaborative nature of the process. The following ground rules, once adopted by the ACC, will be the responsibility of the facilitator to administer.

So, the ground rules, the bullets are as follows. Um, number one, listen intently and understand. accurately the views of others. Be respectful of each other in the right of each individual to each individual to, to openly express their point of view, even if it's different or in opposition to your own. Third, seek to understand the interests of others. Fourth, test assumptions rather than assume you have a full understanding

of another's perspective. Fifth, allow room for each person to have an opportunity to contribute to discussions. Six, ask for a brief break rather than engage in sidebar conversations. If you need to speak to another member of the ACC during any discussion. Seventh, silence or turn off your cell phone and refrain from texting or other communication during meetings. Eighth, ask any and all questions and be respectful of the different levels of code knowledge of the members. And nine acknowledge the need for disability sensitivity.

So those are the ground rules that we operate under it. They're there. They're meant to reinforce the collaborative nature of our work together. So let me just leave those out there and ask if anybody has any comments on this particular section of the ground rules. Any changes that anybody would like to see any other clarifications.

Kendra Muller: Kendra, I just want to know, I don't have any changes to the ground rules, but I, um, I just wanted to clarify. We've gone over the meeting section yet and whether I missed that because we were going to propose language regarding the outside consultants.

Brad Morrison: Oh, uh, yes, we did. Okay. Yes, we did And, uh, we did, uh, adopt some language in there and we, we kind of moved off that section right before the end of the break. Perfect. That was great. Can, can you see the language Okay. And everything? Fine. Thank you. Okay, great. Any, any comments on that, just go ahead and offer them, but I think that's, that's where we kind of landed before we took off for lunch. Okay.

Ida Clair: Ida. Thanks. Uh, hold on. Let me get my video going. Uh, in a back to the ground rules, correct? That's where we are right now.

Eric Driever: Correct.

Ida Clair: Um, I would say, um, uh, where it says ask for a brief break rather than engage in sidebar conversations, I would say for those in in person attendance because obviously we have the chat. And I don't know if we want to regulate discussions in the chat, so that we're not distracted by reading the chat while we're attending virtually so I'm just throwing that out there I don't have a preference either way I just want to clarify. That this should be obviously for in person attendees because there's no way to really engage in sidebar conversations, unless it's the chat. Okay, clarify appropriate use of the chat if we're going to be participating virtually.

Brad Morrison: Okay, thanks. It looks like Eric's got it in there so looks just fine. Thank you. Nate, do you want to go.

Nathan Dison: I'd like to understand voting requirements and, you know, how that works and whether or not.

Brad Morrison: That's our next, that's our next section.

Nathan Dison: Okay, I can, I can wait.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Okay, cool. Thanks a lot. We'll, we'll bring it up in just a bit. Nubyaan.

Nubyaan Scott: Hi, um, I don't know that it needs to be in the charter, but I did want to bring it up just because it's relevant to some of the language in this portion. Um, when. People there's certain types of assistive technology software that people who are low vision or blind use where it reads aloud to them what's being said in the chat. And so that's just something to keep in mind because it can be. I haven't seen it today definitely but in the past, I've seen circumstances where let's see someone who does use the software was speaking, and then people were actively talking in the chat so you could barely hear the person. Because the chat was going while they were speaking.

And then there's there. So, there's just a lot of scenarios that can come up where sometimes it's helpful to like, given just a general advisory ahead of meetings that people use that software. And if you're in the chat, you know, it can be disruptive to be. Chatting back and forth while people are speaking because then the person has to balance what's being said aloud.

Um, allowed in the chat with what's being said aloud, you know, by the speaker. So again, I don't know that it's a something to be included per se, but I did want to just throw it out because it may be something to address.

Brad Morrison: Okay, that's it. That's an interesting Problems on the end. So, you're suggesting that we, uh, we not use the chat. Uh, as much for communication to limit the, uh, the kind of interference that would be poised to somebody who is relying on that chat to communicate. Is that being that the gist of it? I don't have a I don't feel like I'm in a position to make a suggestion because I don't know where you go ahead Jorge.

Jorge Rivas: I, thank you, I was going to bring that point up because I do use, I'm using voiceover on my phone. So, when everyone's chatting, I'm listening to that conversation. Plus, the 1 that's going on in the meeting rooms and some people have some long signatures and. It kind of gets distracted.

Brad Morrison: Yes.

Jorge Rivas: And then so if you start chatting a lot, then I'd be, I'm going to be listening a lot to you to the chat, opposed to the meeting as well.

So, unfortunately, that's just part of the accessibility where I have to listen to not only. The meeting, but then the folks that are chatting on the side, plus my phone when I'm trying to get to raise my hand and do all that. So, it, it gets really distracting.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Okay. So, um, and having to experience that distraction, what, what would you suggest, Jorge?

Brad Morrison: What would, what would be helpful to you in, in that circumstance? Probably minimizing the side chat.

Jorge Rivas: Okay, and if someone does need to say something, go ahead and say it, but if they could reduce their signatures, because some folks have their signatures as so and so he, she or blah, blah, blah. And it, and those signatures are very long.

And so, I got to, I listened to all that and I know those signatures are important for some folks, but at the same time, it just gets really long.

Brad Morrison: Okay. All right. Yeah, sounds good. So, so, uh, brevity would help and also limiting what's, um, what's shared in the chat, like how much information is shared, correct?

That's correct. I mean, Everyone, what about that? You state your name each time you make a comment with the tracking of who is speaking backslash. Oh, like that one right there. That was fairly long. I mean, I paused it.

April Dawson: That was me. I'm sorry.

Jorge Rivas: Oh, no, it's okay. But I, I, it normally doesn't bother me unless there's a bunch of folks that are sending all kinds of stuff at the same time.

So, if 1 person sends a message here and there, it's, it's good. It's okay. It's just when someone starts getting into a big, heated debate, then that's going to be an issue as this meeting has happened. It hasn't been an issue yet.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Okay. Maybe, maybe there's something we can add, like, be mindful of the chat. Uh, because some people are relying on it for communication. And, um, I'm thinking I'm just trying to come up with something. I don't know if anybody can come up with some language to help us here. But, uh, what kind of what would be helpful here to just be able to kind of minimize the use of the chat in order to help people who are relying on it.

Jorge Rivas: You just said, just be mindful of the chat. There are folks that are using. Technology that it's to help assist a reading or something like that.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Okay. Sounds good. Um, oh yeah. Okay.

Jorge Rivas: So, I, oh yeah. Great. Also, say if someone wants to chat with me, I'm not really going to be able to chat with you, uh, when we're on a Zoom meeting. So, if someone sends me a message, don't, don't, uh, don't, don't take it to heart. I will

communicate with you after the meeting or sometime other than the meeting. Cause it's just a lot easier for me just to not, not communicate via chat or if I need to.

Brad Morrison: Sounds good. Yeah, no worry. That sounds really good. Yeah, thanks. And I think he's, uh, Eric has got the comment in here as an addition to the last bullet. So let me read it out here. Um, acknowledge the need for disability sensitivity, and then period web-based reader software in virtual chats are extremely distracting to those who use this software.

Nubyaan Scott: I, I would suggest, um, hi, this, can you hear me?

Brad Morrison: Yes, we have, we have, go ahead.

Nubyaan Scott: Hi, this is Nubyaan. I mean, I would suggest, because that's not the only sensitivity, right? So, I would suggest maybe starting it off with something like, for instance, um, it's useful to minimize, you know, the usage of chats in virtual meetings, and then like finish the sentence with the rest of what's there.

Nathan Dison: Okay. It looks like I thought the chat was more helpful. This is Nate Dyson. Um, but hearing what Jorge's saying, um, I'll, I'll stop chatting and try to speak more.

Brad Morrison: Yeah.

Nathan Dison: Okay.

Brad Morrison: I think, I think it's just being mindful of it, recognizing that, um, sometimes you will put a lot of information in the chat and then that can really, that can really, uh, distract somebody who's trying to listen to the conversation at Yeah. That's a new one for me too.

Nathan Dison: Thanks everyone.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Let's go. I've lost count here. I've lost track of Jorge. Uh, do you have a comment?

Jorge Rivas: Oh, no, sorry. I, uh, I'll take my hand down. That wasn't my comment.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Thanks. I appreciate it. We got it. I think we got the language in there to this time. Okay.

Okay. Eric others.

Eric Driever: Yeah, thanks. Thanks. I would just, I don't know, I think Greg's probably on and he can confirm this, but I believe we struggle with being able to capture those chats in any official form. Okay. Um, there are aspects of Zoom that we can capture the data and download a file associated to it, but I'm not sure that chats are available to us to capture them. They can be useful, uh, little pieces that was used earlier when someone's sharing a link or things like that, but discussions shouldn't be in chats. Discussions should be had, hopefully, more openly here. Verbally in these meetings or in person meetings rather than sidebar chats at all.

Brad Morrison: Thanks Eric. Okay. Let's see Nubyaan.

Nubyaan Scott: Sorry. I did not mean to still have my hand up. Okay, no problem. I got it.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Greg, did you have Greg, is that you or did I get the DSA LMS.

Greg Hartley: Yeah, sorry to interrupt.

Brad Morrison: Okay, Greg.

Greg Hartley: I don't I don't want to take the option away from anybody. Um, because obviously chat could be useful in some situations. But it is possible to make it so attendees can't chat at all. And I know that we do want some public participation, whether that's just viewing or listening, but we can make it so attendees can't chat with anybody, and that panelists can only Chat with hosts and panelists.

Um, I don't know if that would be less accessible to Individuals that are outside of the panelist group that are attending to see what the ACC want to do, but that's just an option.

Eric Driever: So, in keeping with our previous discussion, Greg, chat should be limited to only Those palace members the ACC members.

Greg Hartley: Sounds good.

Brad Morrison: And Nubyaan. You want to comment? All right. I'm sorry. April. Go ahead. April.

April Dawson: Hi, this is April and thank you. Jorge. I definitely learned something today because sometimes when I see a lot of hands up, I'll put something in the chat thinking I'm being helpful not to have the backlog of not to add to the backlog of hands, but to and if my comments not urgent, but I'll uh, I'll think twice about that next time. Um, but what I wanted to say was perhaps a, a ground rule could be state your name each time you make a comment, uh, because that is an access feature to help, uh, those with vision impairments or who are blind track, who is speaking.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, April. Good one. Nubyaan.

Nubyaan Scott: Yes, thank you. Um, I was just going to say that as far as participant coming or members of the public participation. Um, I think that's still an important thing to make available so that people aren't just limited 100 percent to observation only. So I'm wondering if for future reference, um, I think there's a way you can create, I know you can create Q&A's where people's questions go into a separate um, I think and I'm wondering if maybe we could do that as far as let's say members of the public are observing and they have questions or, um, things like that, and we want to be able to engage and direct them to the appropriate resources.

It may be useful to maybe have a Q&A format, and I think that might be a way to avoid those questions being repeated aloud by the voiceover software at the same time as people are talking, I think.

Brad Morrison: Nubyaan. Is that a Q and a feature part of zoom? It's not one that I'm aware of. It is. You just have to set it up in the settings. Okay, let me let me bring in Greg and ask him. He's our technical resource person here. Greg, could you, you know, would it be possible to set up a Q and a box?

Greg Hartley: Yeah, so we for our cast one on one classes. We do have a Q and a section for the attendees of that session. So, um, I'll look into it for the future for our next ACC meeting.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Thanks. Great. Appreciate it. Okay. Nubyaan. Looks like we could do that. And that that's probably a really good suggestion to sort of limit, limit the dialogue in the chat. You know, we can kind of go from there. See how it works. Okay. That sound good to you.

Eric Driever: Brad?

Brad Morrison: Yes. Yes. Okay. Brad. The, the official line on that will, is that DSA will take it under consideration. Oh, gotcha. Okay. Sorry. Yeah. I don't mean to, don't mean to take away, um, that's okay. I just certainly discuss it internally and be Yeah. You guys, yeah. Figure it out. Let us know. Please report back the next meeting. I'll make a. I'll make a little note. So that's in the notes. Thank you.

Jorge Rivas: I mean, you guys just limit the chat. I'm not saying not to share links or anything. That's important like that. Please do go feel free to do it. Um, if the chat gets really. Really, um, heavy or something like that. I would say something. But other than that, I think it's important to share those links that you guys have been doing and some of the stuff that you guys have been sharing. So, it's fine. It's just, um, as long as everyone's aware that it can be bothersome for some. Yeah, that's a good point.

Brad Morrison: Thanks. I too, I'm just learning about this too. Okay, there we go. Okay, so any other comments on this section? Looks like we've, we've marked it up

pretty good. One comment on the sort of being mindful of the chats. We'll have to wait for a little bit more information, but it looks like we're moving on that pretty well and recognizing that sometimes the distracting side discussions or chats can be a problem on the on this. In the in-person meetings. Okay, Tom.

Tom Martin: Yeah, I believe there was a suggestion to state your name before any comment that you make so that people can follow. I didn't see that get added in there. Okay, good.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, good thought. Okay, so maybe we could add that on as an additional an additional spot there. It looks good. Great, that helps. Yeah, that helps with the identification for people who are using the zoom. Can't really see the visual. All right. Okay, so it reads when speaking please state your name prior to each comment. So, we'll add that rule in there see how we do.

Okay, are there any other comments on this section on the ground rules.

Nubyaan Scott: Um, this is Nubyaan is, I think we typically when we have normal meetings where we're going to do code proposal reviews, etc. I think you tend to Brad have the ground rules on the screen and remind folks is that accurate.

Brad Morrison: I have before. Yeah, we're in usually been meetings in the room. We used to have them up on the wall, but we could have them available for the meetings in some way. Would that be helpful.

Nubyaan Scott: Well, particularly about the accessibility pieces like the chat usage and the, the other one we just came with the announcing your name. because it's really easy to forget, especially because we've just heard that it's a new thing for a lot of folks. And so, in, in my experience, it's been useful to announce that at the beginning of the meeting. And that's helped, um, you know, like muscle memory reminder folks. Mm-Hmm.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. Okay. That sounds good to, yeah. Yeah. I'll make a note to, uh, to kind of add that to our process a little bit. Okay.

Nubyaan Scott: Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Especially this, yeah. This new rule too. This is good. Um, okay. Okay. Okay.

Eric Driever: So, Eric. Yeah, I was just going to suggest that, um, I know you typically do send us, um, previous presentations for the ACC, um, meetings, so perhaps there could be a template, um, lead in slide, um, that addresses some of these rules for every single meeting. Okay. And it doesn't have to be in the charter, but just as a lesson learned moving forward.

Brad Morrison: Yeah. And helpful reminders. There we go. Okay. Sounds good. Okay. Any disagreement with this section at all. Hearing none. Let's move on to decision making. Okay.

Decision making the ACC will operate using a collaborative approach to decision making. It will strive to reach unanimous support on recommendations. However, if unanimous support is not achieved on a specific issue, the meeting transcript will reflect the full range of perspectives held by the majority as well as the minority. An executive summary will be produced by the ACC Planning Committee within 10 days after the ACC meeting, uh, for inclusion in the rulemaking record. So that all viewpoints can be documented in the rule making process paragraph to any decision by DSA regarding proposed amendments to the CBC not aligned with the ACC's recommendation will be acknowledged by DSA and the written rationale for the decision will be provided to the ACC and reflected in the statement of reasons submitted to the Building Standards Commission paragraph three.

During each BSC code adoption cycle, there, there are several opportunities for public comment on proposed code amendments. These opportunities include the BSC Code Advisory Committee, CAC meeting during the 45-day public comment period, and the BSC meeting scheduled for review and approval of the proposed code amendments. Kendra, did you have a question?

Kendra Muller: This is a really small administrative or clarifying note. Um, but for accessibility purposes, I think it would be really useful to have, um, for instance, after every agenda item. Uh, clarify the second sentence to state that there'll be a vote or something for voting members. So, we have a list in the minutes of five people voted for five people voted against. Um, I think that's what the, the second. Um, yeah, the first it starts with however if a unanimous support is not achieved. I think that's what the second sentence is alluded to, but I think you could just clean it up a little bit by putting boat in there somewhere just to we have a final vote.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, Kendra I think voting is sort of an alternative decision-making process for primary method here is collaboration. And so, collaboration means, uh, basically that you can live with it, whatever the decision is. And, and really in collaboration looks to find, um, sort of, it's sort of looks to uncover the descent a little bit better and sort of clarify the descent.

So, I think in the dialogue process that we go through with collaboration, it will be clear. What the point of view is and what the oppositional point of view is. And I think that in most cases, there's no real need to vote. We I really, I've been doing this for a few years, and I haven't really, I've Seen maybe one issue that maybe came to a vote, and we had to sort of use a voting process as an alternative to the collaboration method.

But so, I think that it stands apart in its way that it's it shows up in the dialogue is kind of what I'm saying. If it ever comes to a vote to like I would accept your point and

then recognize that that. That it could be articulated and maybe a little bit more rationale. And I also want to know that everybody to know in the process that there's several sets of notes generated from our meetings on, um, on the zoom. We have zoom recording. We also have a life, a, uh, an interpretive. Uh, you know, like an interpretive. Um, it's like a Google interpretation of the speech. So, there's that there's that is another method. And then also, I have to do as a facilitator. I do a set of a sort of executive summary of the notes and try to recount the major decisions and kind of articulate what was going on and why, why those, you know, that dialogue took place. So, there's several places in there where we can capture, um, capture what actually happens in the meeting and just want to let you know we weren't letting it go by. And as a result of kind of the way we've adopted the consensus model, voting is really an alternative decision-making method.

It's not our primary method. So, some of you have asked about votes and what you know how we're going to do votes, but I think votes come if the if the collaboration failed. Basically, if the if the consensus process fails, then we then we really move to a vote, which sort of lays out. You know, uh, a few, maybe more than one, uh, you know, a few sets of viewpoints usually.

Okay. So, uh, let me, let me move on to April.

April Dawson: Hi, this is April. Uh, regarding the, uh, ACC planning committee, I just had a question of do, is that still accurate? Does the ACC, ACC still have an active planning committee down in decision making? Sorry. It's moving. In the decision making. It was, uh, I'm sorry.

Brad Morrison: It was there. I saw it too. It was in the first paragraph.

April Dawson: Do we still have a planning committee and how does that committee get, how did the committees. Get, uh, get formed. Maybe I missed that.

Brad Morrison: We talked about that already. Let me, uh, cue up, uh, Ida. She's coming up next in the queue. And I just have her answer that question first, because I think what happens is the ACC planning committee is put together for a particular purpose. And, uh, and so, so far it hasn't met, uh, for, for several years. So, so it's not really an active ongoing committee, but Ida, go ahead. Can you just answer that, um, question for people?

Ida Clair: Sure. Sorry about that. First of all, I do want to really acknowledge that members don't vote. They offer feedback and their feedback will be pulled for an opinion of support or not support. That just indicates how individuals feel about what is being advanced, not that they are voting whether or not it should advance or on any specific changes. They are providing feedback. DSA determines whether or not proposals advance as determined earlier in the ACC. So, I'd like to change the conversation from Vote to feedback to be reflective and I believe this charter has does not mention vote. Um, secondly, um, the planning committee was really to assist DSA communicating with the group. It obviously in this section assists DSA in providing the record of the different viewpoints so that DSA doesn't have to do it.

Again, I don't believe Uh, previous planning committee actually did this part of it, though. They did coordinate. Um, a smaller. You know, I don't recall which, I'd have to look back, but they did review some items offline and assist with scheduling. So, if there is interest in a planning committee, um, and maybe we don't need to do it today since it's something new, we can Take proposals as to how we were going to define what a planning committee would do. That's just a suggestion. I'm for this because it helps us and saves us time. So, I'm good leaving it like this since we've left the planning committee up there and it says as needed. It doesn't mean that we need to have the planning committee decided today who the members are. But if we need this to happen, we can then create it then and. Advance it in that direction. So just some thoughts.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Nate.

Nathan Dison: Thanks. So, if I understand correctly, this is an advisory committee. And as we vote, or as we collaborate, it's not binding to DSA. Is that correct?

Ida Clair: That's correct.

Nathan Dison: Okay,

Ida Clair: We're here to offer feedback and to guide us into considering, you know, we receive proposals that we discuss, and we feel have merit, bringing it to the ACC refines those proposals, it informs whether or not the merit, you know that it does have merit. And, but DSA makes the decision as to what proposals they will advance, and when they will advance them.

Nathan Dison: Okay, so we provide. Guidance as a collaborative and then DSA has the final say on the decision. So, votes here are non-binding, right?

Brad Morrison: They are non-binding. It's also, um, remember what we're doing here. Our, our decision model is consensus and the whole idea of consensus is really you hear everybody out and we really, we sort of press. Um, for, um, for sort of what what's holding us back. You know, the whole idea is consensus is we're really trying to develop an open dialogue about what's going on.

What are the points of resistance and articulating as much as we possibly can. And by doing that, it gives I think gives DSA the most information they could possibly use in order to kind of inform their decision. So, it kind of fits really well with what's going on.

Nathan Dison: That's super helpful. Yeah. So, it's an advisory committee that feeds back into DSA's decision making process.

Brad Morrison: Right, right.

Nathan Dison: And so, yeah, as we, as we collaborate and decide on things, DSA will make a final decision, but here we are to, to collaborate and get input from all the stakeholders.

Brad Morrison: Correct. Exactly. And really go deep on some of the issues and spend the time on them. That's, that's really kind of the purpose.

Nathan Dison: Thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Nate. Appreciate it.

Ida Clair: Sorry, just to add in, so I don't mean interrupt. One thing that really helps us is if after we hear all your feedback, right, because we come to you first before we even go to a public meeting on our initial proposals, we need to know. This is entirely like you've misunderstood or, you know, the feedback you provide as to how it affects your facilities, how it affects you as you navigate your, um, uh, built environment, that's the perspective we're looking for the impact of whatever it is we're advancing. And if, if it's something that's impractical or not logical or whatever, just that feedback. Thank you.

Nathan Dison: Right. And so, there's a format here. That would allow the disabled community to say, yes, that would give me better access. And there's a format here that would allow the built environment community, um, designers, building owners to say, wow, that would, that would be too much.

And we can dialogue about it here, rather than, well, there's nowhere else. Right? So that's why this is.

Ida Clair: Technically, it's actually in front of the commissioner of the CAC. It's why we want these dealt with. I mean, you can still do that, but your first opportunities here to improve regulations, as opposed to commenting later when it's because of the standards process, very difficult to change.

Nathan Dison: Yeah, there's so many examples that I see that would be better to just talk about, you know, toilets being on center at 17 and 18 inches has been such an improvement. The built environment. Um, and so, you know, there's probably going to be more examples that we can talk about as we get into this. Yes, I'm looking forward to it.

Brad Morrison: That's right. That's right. We're here to really delve into some of those deeper discussions. Thanks. Okay. Up to, uh, up to the DSA team.

Eric Driever: So really great discussion. I appreciate it all. I would say that, um. Going back again to recent history, DSA takes great weight on the comment that ACC provides to us. And so, an example of both, um, alternatives, uh, exist in the last rulemaking cycle. We, we developed really some great language, um, as it surrounded all gender, all gender topic, and the other issues. But DSA felt strongly

last cycle that there is still a discrepancy, a conflict within the code. We did hear from the ACC objections. We also heard the CAC objections. Ultimately that by the commission was rejected, but and we will again try to clarify that conflict in the code in upcoming cycles.

But DSA made that final decision, um, because there is a conflict that exists in the code, not that we were ignoring the input that we received. Um, but ultimately decided to advance that red, try to advance that regulation that the building standards commission, all of the other, um, points of, uh, input that we received from DSA, we strive to include, and I, and I think that every member here can agree that.

There were significant changes made in the process because of the ACC input. Um, and there was never a vote. It was all really good, hearty discussion. And everybody came to excuse me, came to an agreement on the language. In those discussions. So, I'm thinking back to recent history. I'm really proud of the work that was done last cycle by this group and members of the DSA, and we really strive to continue that process here in the ACC charter.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Eric. Sue?

Susan Moe: I had to unmute myself there it took me a second. Um, so I asked this question before. All right. So, as we go through this process, and you start to talk about what you're proposing for changes, and part of the reason we're here, if I'm not mistaken, is to disperse this information to people who might have served that might participate like in our, our email group that we have.

Or whoever, you know, we have contact with that we can share the information. So, when we do that, any of the responses that come back or any of the comments, it seems to me that it would be best that those comments go to the division of the state architect and not be filtered through any one of us. So, do you have a way that you want that to be handled and would you prefer that it be handled that way? I mean, I'm more than happy to do an email blast and I'll send it out to all of the subscribers. But, um, I was just wondering how you want the information to come back to DSA.

Brad Morrison: Good question, Sue. Eric, do you want to step in?

Eric Driever: Sure. So, uh, Sue, historically, as you probably remember, DSA has set up a separate email account each code cycle, so that folks can provide us with comments, proposals, etc. anything relevant to that particular code cycle. We continue that. That practice and we'll be sharing that email address as soon as it's created. So certainly, they can send us those email comments. and potentially remove any filters. I I'm in favor of redundancy and in certain aspects. So, um, if they also share those concerns with you, that is truly the intent of the ACC Is for us to be able to disseminate that information, but also hear from the ACC. As well. So, you certainly wouldn't mind some redundant communication and process. To make sure that we're capturing all of the true intent behind their comments.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Eric. Nate. Do you want to come in?

Nathan Dison: Yeah, Eric, can you elaborate on what was valuable about the communication regarding multi stall or all gender multi stall restrooms, and we've been following that closely because we do a lot of airports, places where All gender multi soul restrooms happen.

Um, I'd love to hear what was valuable about that.

Ida Clair: We need to take that offline and have that discussion separately so we can stick to our agenda. I'm just sorry for interrupting but we're delayed so we can share that nice. Nathan, that was unique, and I think it's just not today. We're pretty far behind the agenda.

Brad Morrison: And that was a long discussion, by the way. But anyway, okay, we'll get back to you on that. Okay. Okay. Uh, Nubyaan.

Nubyaan Scott: Yeah, I can reserve my comment just because of time. Okay. All right.

Brad Morrison: Good. Okay. So, let's take a look at this decision-making section. We've added a couple things. We replace the ACC planning committee with moderator, which is the facilitator my role. The other in the bottom paragraph we have. Uh, the DSA public workshops, uh, added in there as an additional point of, uh, contact. Uh, I'm not sure if there's any, is there anything else in that section? Scrolling down. No, I think that's it. So, uh, given these changes, can everybody live with this section?

Is there any disagreement with anything we've got written down here?

Okay. I'm not. Okay. Anne, would you like to step forward?

Anne Riggs: I was just raising an agreement.

Brad Morrison: In agreement. Okay, great. Good. Okay. Sounds like, uh, it sounds like we we're okay to move on, and I think what we'll do is we'll do a, a, like a, uh, a poll at the end just to kind of get a sense of our collaborative effort at the end here. But we're, we, sounds like we're not really seeing here in any disagreement with this section so far. So, let's move on to the next section.

Eric Driever: Brad, I see Nubyaan's hand is up.

Brad Morrison: Nubyaan is up still. Go ahead, Nubyaan. I didn't mean to ignore you. I thought you were going to wait for the next...

Nubyaan Scott: No, no. On my end, it's not raised, so I don't know. I'm not sure why it's showing.

Brad Morrison: Yeah, I don't know what's going on there, because I noticed your hand, um, drops below whoever's speaking. So, it's like, it's a phantom. Okay. Uh, anyway, we'll, we'll figure it out. Um, okay. Next section. What do we have here? Communications. Okay. Containing the contact information of all ACC members will be established at the start of every code change cycle to ensure all members have information on a timely fashion. The listserv is to be used, however, only for ACC sanctioned communications. It will not be shared with anyone outside the ACC and DSA.

Um, DSA will share meeting information via link to its online repository, DSA box or via email. ACC members may not, must not share the link with the DSA box, but may download documents and share them with others. Every effort will be made to provide the agenda and meeting information a minimum of seven days before scheduled meetings.

If an ACC member wishes to share information with the remainder of the ACC, she or he should send that information to the DSA HQ principal architect for email distribution to members or upload to DSA box. Upon acknowledging that it pertains to ACC issues and discussions, ACC members are discouraged from initiating contact with the media regarding issues discussed at ACC meetings.

If contacted by any media organization related to the work of the ACC, ACC members must clearly state that they are representing their points of view only and will refer questions about any general recommendations developed by the ACC to the DSA. ACC members shall refrain from characterizing the views of other ACC members.

ACC members must report to DSA all contact with any media organization. Okay, any comment on the communication section? Ida?

Ida Clair: Um, so, the requirement regarding the media is our direction from the Department of General Services. Can't really be amended. You must be very clear that it is your point of view, only not DSA's. Um, and let us know, uh, second of all, I know we discussed earlier about the listserv and emails and, uh, having people introduce themselves and how they can be contacted.

We can allow that to happen for those who participate at the beginning of the meeting. We can let the emails. I don't want to post the emails online, but we can ask people to send an email to DSA's, uh, code email and then we will share with that person, your email so it's an individual share, I know that creates a little work for us, but I do want to respect that you're not inundated or that you're getting, you know, anything.

else that isn't ACC related just because we share the list. So, I do want to have an idea of how your constituency group can find you and it to connect with you and how

you prefer that to happen. So, I'd like to, I know it's going to take some discussion, but I think it's important.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Ida. Okay, Mehdi.

Mehdi Shadyab: Yes. Good afternoon. I have a two-part question. First of all, um, is there working having worked for the government for the last 35 years? I understand. And the media and one wanting to know further information. Is there a public information officer by name that if we are ever contacted, we can refer all media to that public information officer. That's the first question I have. The second question I have, whether or not the communications within this body, are they privileged? Or can they be shared internally? Let's say with by building official or other internal staff in order to get better understanding so we can be more helpful and better contributing to the meetings or whether or not they're subject to Public Records Act.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Mehdi. Okay, let's get some answers. How about, uh, Ida. Eric.

Ida Clair: Uh, sure. So, everything we do here subject to public records act request. Um, this meeting's being recorded. It can be requested under a public records act. Um, this is not protected conversations. Um, the with regard to contacting our public information officer. Um, we could give you that name, but if you contact us, we're going to send it to her. So, so we're not going to respond, but it is, um, uh, the DGS public information officer is Monica Hassan, but it might be just easier to send it to us and we'll refer it to Monica and then she'll manage it.

Mehdi Shadyab: Thank you, Ida.

Brad Morrison: Appreciate that. Thanks, Ida. Okay. Okay. Any other comments on this section? Can we move on? Okay. Hearing no complaint, let's move on to code change proposals submitted by members of the ACC. DSA welcomes members of the ACC to commit code, submit code change proposals and encourage such proposal to be vetted by the constituency group prior to submission.

The following delineates the following delineates the procedure for ACC-to-ACC members to submit a code change proposal to DSA. Number one, the code change proposal may be submitted at any time. Code change proposals must be submitted prior to the onset of the code development meetings for a particular code change cycle, if they are to be considered for code development in that cycle.

So, you have to understand the cycle you're in. Number one. Okay. Number two, code change proposals shall be submitted Using DSA form 665. The proposal is not required to fill out. The proposer is not required to fill out the entire form for providing as much information as possible and beneficial to DSA, who must consider all items on the forum and the rulemaking process to substantiate a proposed amendment.

Okay, is there any more to this section or is that is that a new section down below. I can't, I can't see ahead. Eric, can you, is the next page a new section. Okay. No, we have more here. Okay. Number three, DSA will evaluate the code change proposal to determine if the proposal is within DSA statutory authority appropriate for the building code and does not violate federal laws and regulations or other state laws.

Number four, DSA will request a meeting either in person or by teleconference to discuss the proposed code change with the proposer and DSA's intended action. Okay. Proposed code change will proceed for the code cycle in which it was submitted. B. Proposed code change will be considered for the next 18th month code cycle and the information or documentation needed to proceed is explained.

C. Proposed code change will be considered for a future code cycle because a task force is necessary to be convened. And D. Proposed code change is not able to proceed and why. Number 5, the proposer is welcome to present the proposed code change to the ACC for the discussion for any proposed code change that DSA is determined will not proceed.

This discussion will occur only at pre-development workshops. As the authority, DSA reserves the right not to proceed with any code change proposal. For every final determination, DSA will provide a response in writing to the proposer. Number seven, DSA shall make every effort to provide an acknowledgement of a code change proposals and initiate Response to the proposer within 30 days of receipt.

Okay, so that's the section on ACC submitting code change proposals to the DSA. And let's have some discussion. Richard, you want to start.

Richard, are you on mute?

Eric Driever: It says he's connecting to audio. Okay. He might be with us now. Hi, Richard.

Brad Morrison: Richard, no problem. Let me, let me go on to Ida and we'll, uh, we'll come back to you following her comment. Okay. Ida, go ahead.

Ida Clair: It's okay. I put my hand down, but I do want to thank everyone for participating. I do need to go to another meeting, so thank you.

Brad Morrison: Thanks, Ida. Appreciate it. Thanks for the help today. Richard, you want to go. You're muted, Richard. Looks like you're connected to audio, but maybe muted. Okay, he's unmuted. Not hearing him, though. There he is. Okay. Are you with us, Richard? We got video. Now we just need to hear your audio. Your audio is not coming across. Okay, Richard, we can't. I'm not sure what the what the issue is, but we can't hear you.

Eric Driever: Brad, in an effort to maybe fill some of the space and consideration of time, we didn't truly intend to be done by three. It's looking like it's going to be a challenge. So, um, I'm going to propose that this word shall Um, is changed to be referred to be submitted are preferred to be submitted. Um, I recognize we recognize that that form is pretty, um, difficult to fill out if you are not a practice, um, code user or code writer.

Um, so we certainly, um, would prefer to 665 and limits the amount of effort and the, uh, the tracking of those proposals internally. But, um, I, I don't believe we need to require it to be submitted on the 665.

Brad Morrison: Okay. Okay. Sounds good. Thanks, Eric.

It looks like Richard might have logged out to come back in. So, um, okay. So, are there any other comments on the code change proposals submitted by members of the ACC?

Eric Driever: And also use this time. Um, it looked like Richard did have a comment. Um, just to suggest in the next agenda item or in one of the subsequent agenda items. Um, we are going, we are going to be holding a public workshop. In the last part of October, early November, one of those weeks in there, um, I forget the specific dates that's in the PowerPoint presentation, but, um, we absolutely would love for the ACC members to participate, um, as you can in that, um, workshop.

And we would love to hear your proposals, um, during that workshop. This is something new that DSA is undertaking this year, um, and we're excited to be able to have some really strong participation by the ACC.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks, Eric. Nate? Eric, um, can you send out a specific invite so that we know, uh, when that is and would love to attend and comment?

Eric Driever: Yeah, absolutely. So that there, uh, there will be public notice made. Um, if you're, we'll make sure to send specific invites to the ACC. They will be invites just like, uh, all of the other public. Participants. Um, but certainly we can target a specific email to this group as well. And Greg, I'll trust that you took note of that. And the time frame right now, the date hasn't been set, but it's between the last week of October and the first week of November. Somewhere in there. Okay. Okay. I'm not hearing any more comments on this section. Um, I don't see Richard in the queue. So, I'm thinking that maybe he logged off to log back in, but we'll take his comments when he comes back on board.

Brad Morrison: Why don't we move on to the next section? Okay. Removal from the ACC. Let me read you this one here. Sorry, removal of an ACC member will be considered for a violation of any one of the following in accordance with the initial terms of membership of the ACC. The member on a consistent basis does not act in good faith and does not demonstrate a willingness to work in a collaborative manner.

Number 2. The member misses more than 1 code development meeting and more than 1. Workshop meeting in each 18-month cycle, according to the following terms. Attendance via teleconference will be considered as a meeting in which the member was in attendance, if the ACC member is engaged in the discussion.

Attendance via videoconference will be considered as a meeting in which the member was in attendance. Attendance by an observer selected by the ACC member. At one meeting or a workshop will not be considered as an absence. However, subsequent meetings attended by an observer selected by the ACC member will be considered a missed meeting or workshop, unless the ACC members ACC member tends over half the scheduled meeting that day.

So, so there we have some guidelines about what's considered to be attendance. And. What's considered to be acting in a collaborative manner to two conditions that could cause the removal of a member of the ACC. Is there any dialogue below this page. Okay, here we have number three, the member consistently arrives late is unprepared to participate, does not abide by the ground rule, and does not is able to follow through on assigned volunteered tasks.

DSA shall make an effort to meet with the ACC member being considered for removal to discuss the potential violations and on any potential mitigating circumstances before action is taken the essay with approval from the Department of General Services makes the final determination of membership termination.

Okay. See you April. Come on in.

April Dawson: Hi, this is April. I just wanted to clarify the intent of C because I noticed that Eric added on a particular day but if you took that out. So, I think that I was just curious about is this to discourage people, such as me, from, from, which is fine, from have from overusing designees.

So that they actually you actually get the point of view of the member, you don't want them to rely on designees you want them to feel like the meetings important right and so am I making sense, I know it's after 2:30. But just trying to clarify the what you're trying to get through with see because if you change the wording to on a particular day.

I feel like it changes the intent of see because when I first read it without that last. I heard it as okay, you don't you want to make sure that the ACC member, you know, respects their commitment and at least attends over half of the meetings as themselves.

Brad Morrison: And I think you gave a pretty good answer to the question because I think the whole idea is that it's that the members are holding the positions and giving their opinions and participating in the dialogue.

So, I think overuse of the. The select, you know, the selected attendee is probably a good way to look at it as you described, but I'm going to let Eric, uh, kind of follow up on that. Eric.

Eric Driever: So I will freely admit that I believe the focus on this group is to the ex officio memberships. But I also agree that Brad, when you spoke the words on a day, I typed that out. But in doing so, I'm not sure that's the true intent. So, I believe actual intent is that you're attending over half the meetings. If there's some clarifications that this group again, this is a collaborative effort to come to an agreement about what should constitute removal. I want to also maybe just add that this is really important. This item number one is probably of the utmost importance to this group and that we all operate a good faith, demonstrate a willingness to work in collaboration. And this. Uh, administration of, of the ACC and DSA believes wholeheartedly that, um, we desire input. Um, and of course we need to have some guide rails on that, but, um, we, we definitely desire input and look to work collaboratively with this group. Um, so I just want to emphasize item number one is really important to this group.

Brad Morrison: Great. Yeah. Good point. Awesome. Thanks, Eric. Yeah, and I like the way you changed the last word meetings. Uh, that makes it a whole different meaning to me as I read it one way and then I think I understood it the other way. So well done. Okay. Not hearing any, uh, any further comments on this section. Let's move on.

Eric Driever: That's it. We reached the end.

Brad Morrison: Yay. Okay. Okay. Now, just to express our sentiment on the document that we just spent the last few hours working on. Let's just go through with a raise of hands and see if we have our consensus that we're looking for. And if not, I'm going to kind of go back to the members who aren't on board yet to find out why.

So, let's just see how we're doing. Thank you everybody for raising hands. A lot of hands going up there. Good job. Okay, good, good, good. So, so we need a hand. Okay, it looks like we're on board. We do have Richard who's not present he must have clicked off because he was having technical issues so we will circle back to Richard, and looks like Sue we don't have a visual on you so there's no. There's no hand up. Um, so, uh, we'll circle back to you two before the meetings over just to get a final do a final check in.

Okay. Thank you, everybody. Appreciate your time on this. Looks like we did reach our consensus pretty much. We'll see what the final result is. And, um, we'll, uh, Eric, what's the process going to be on the, uh, on the charter here? Are we going to bring it back to a meeting in the future or post it up online?

How do you want to go? Close this, um, process out with all the corrections and changes once they've all been made.

Eric Driever: So, my understanding of the consensus is that, um, they agree in content or in concept, um, with much of the specific language work out, we still need to fine tune some of the language. So, my preference would be to, uh, for DSA to make those minor adjustments.

And send that out. Um, if this group prefers it to be a final draft, it's sent out. Um, we can certainly do that and then readdress any finer points in the next meeting, but you know, we've already spent considerable amount of time on this, and it is important, but I'd be also just as happy to make minor adjustments. Without affecting concept, uh, and send that out as the final.

Brad Morrison: Okay, great. Great. Okay. Thanks Eric. Appreciate that. And we'll see all of a sudden, I to computer mic. Okay. Richard apparently has a message in the chat. He's unable to speak through his computer mic, not sure what happened there, so we'll, uh, we'll have to circle back to him indirectly. Um, okay. Sounds good. So, uh, so. Um, Eric, it sounds like you're going to prepare what may be a first draft and circulate it out amongst the members.

Is that, is that the final draft? You want to do a final draft? Okay, we're going to circulate out a final draft to the members. Okay, great. Okay, great. Okay, that's how we're going to leave this one here. Okay.

Eric Driever: On the next agenda can be just consensus on the final draft and move through.

Brad Morrison: Perfect. Okay. Okay, great. And we'll put that on for the next meeting then. Okay. Sure. Okay, so let's move on to our next discussion item, which is the EDWAC. Let's see where we are with that. Let me see if I can start to share my screen.

Eric Driver: 2025 code cycle is next, is it not?

Brad Morrison: Yeah, I think you're right. I think that's right. I forgot the slides here. Let me get the presentation up and we'll go right to it. Okay, here we are a discussion and the background and here we go. Triennial code. Okay. Here's the triennial code cycle. Um, is, does anybody from the team, the DSA team want to, uh, kind of run us through the cycle?

Eric Driever: Sure. So, uh, what, what you have in front of you is something that many of you, if you've been involved in, in the code cycles. Um, it says final draft on it or final. Um, published. Um, when I received this, I'm not sure that was what was sent to me. However, it's pretty similar to every other triennial code cycle. And as you see, we are super the yellow arrow suggested above when we would have our public workshop. Um, which the date is yet to be determined somewhere between October

27th and November 10th is when we intend on holding that, um, but the, and I believe you all have this so we probably don't need to focus too much on the dates, but you can see the month and the dates. Uh, essentially there's a pre cycle, um, section, uh, early to the left of that little, what they call the cigar, um, and then there's a, which is in green, and then you're, there's a purple section, which is, I believe, the coded, uh, no initial submittals, um, hold on, yeah, initial submittals. the adopted code changes. And then there's following that there's a 45-day public review for any of the proposal proposed amendments. Um, there's code advisory meetings. Sorry. I'm sorry. There is following the purple up at the top. There's the code advisory meetings. Then following the code advisory meetings, there's 45 days cycle.

Our final submittals are due, uh, somewhere around, uh, November 24, um, and then, uh, in December, uh, to January, there will be permission hearings, and then there's the, the publication period where we work through, uh, co uh, the, the final documents, and that's about six months, and then another six months, uh, is the statutorily mandated hearing. Thank you. 180-day period between publication and the effective date. So then ultimately the 2025 California Building Code will become effective January 1, 2026. So, it's a fairly long process. Uh, but we are at the very beginning of it. Um, well, I guess beginning next month is when the first, first sort of pre cycle state agency workshops, um, can occur. Ours will be October 27th through November 10th, and then we'll, prior to co advisory meetings, we'll have another ACC meeting, um, to go through those specific proposals after we receive them at the workshop. Again, I want to encourage you all to attend the public workshop in October, November sounds good.

Brad Morrison: Any questions. Any comments. Everybody got the cycle down. All right. Okay, let's move on to the next step. Okay, so now we've moved into discussion of the day on the EDWAC. Uh, here's a little bit of a background on detectable warnings. So, I'm going to turn it over to Eric again to kind of help us with this one.

Eric Driever: Yeah. And again, just recognizing the time I want to be respectful of everybody's time it's been a long day. So, this is intended to be a bit of an update and there's some history included here which, which goes back quite a ways. So, uh, AB 685. The author was Assemblyman Thompson, and I think he was joined by a couple others as well, but back in 1999, that bill was introduced and signed into law, and it required DSA to, um, Created, uh, uh, to employ a, well not employee, but hire an independent entity, um, and select them to come up with, um, testing criteria.

And actually, it's, it's really intended to, um, create a list. So, the intent, and there's a little bit more, um, on the next slides, but create a list of approved detectable warning surfaces and, um, uh, directional detectable warning and directional surfaces. Um, and that we would to, we would proceed in consultation with Department of Housing and Community Development, um, when they're to be mandated in residential housing. So, Veronica is with us today, which is a bit serendipitous, which is, uh, an ex officio member of So that we can continue that collaboration and we have reached out in our recent efforts to HCD and they're certainly willing to partner with

us on this effort. Next slide. So that that link that I have up at the top of legal info link is to the, the bill on online you can follow that if you're interested in reading the bill. Um, but the product approval was to be a two-year approval, um, again, listed online, and there were some qualities about the, um, materials that needed to, um, be tested, um, and, um, that the independent entity needed to be recognized as having appropriate expertise in determining whether those products met, met the California Building Standards Code. The, some of the qualities are shape, color, vastness, confirmation, sound on cam, acoustic quality, resilience, and attachment. So those are the specific qualities that were listed in the law or assembly bill. Next slide.

So, to conform with Uh, not to overuse the word, um, to conform with the law, the bill that was passed, um, DSA had hired United Laboratories UL to work with what was then formed Uh, evaluation and detectable warnings advisory committee. Um, there was, there are, uh, members past and present of the ACC that were involved on that committee. And over the course of about two years, beginning in 2004, uh, the committee had several meetings, um, with UL. And really from what I've. Um, anecdotally heard great participation by that group, good input and ultimately work their way through four drafts of, um, proposed testing, uh, methods, uh, that, uh, fourth draft of the proposed standard test methods is online.

There's a link there to it. You can also get to the EDWAC homepage through that link up at the top, but unfortunately, we're halted in 2006 due to some insufficient funding. to extend UL's contract. Um, and there it sat until, um, more recently, next slide, when, um, DSA, uh, in February issued, uh, an RFP to, um, finalize those, um, early drafts. Um, it went out for approximately a month, and much to our dismay, um, we received no proposals. Um, which, uh, left us, left DSA in a bit of a bind, uh, to make, to, because we are committed to continuing the work of the EDWAC and finalizing The, um, testing program, um, and the testing protocols for detectable warnings as required by statute.

It's been long overdue. So, DSA started looking for alternatives. Next slide. Uh, where we came across, um, happily came across some, um, more, uh, advancements. Nationally, uh, on this similar topic of detectable warnings. Um, so in 2010, what you see in front of you is some history of what's gone on since the EDWAC. Um, I will mention that the national studies. Uh, uh, report that report 670 that was conducted by the National Academies. Um, actually mentions the black as being early. Um, uh, I want to say a doctor, but an early committee devoted to, um, this effort. Uh, and so the National Cooperative of Highway Research Program under the National Academies.

Came up with a report 670 recommended procedures for testing, evaluating detectable warnings, and it was, uh, notably sponsored by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, AASHTO. I say that because AASHTO then picked that study up. And, um, created a follow up report standard test method for detectable warning systems TP 103 - 13 that was published in, um, 2017, although I think it was originally conducted in 2015.

They also then created a project work plan for the national transportation product evaluation program. That's, uh, what it's called today, NTEP, N T E P, I think is, I'm still struggling with that acronym, being the P together. Um, but, um, they, they created a work plan that utilizes that standard test method. And then they also created a standard specification, which admittedly is fairly, uh, broad. Um, and that was published in 2020 and are, are currently under underway on a revision to that work plan to make some changes. I do not have specific information on what those changes would be. Next slide. Um, so what is, that's what was happening nationally.

And so, what is happening here in California with DSA is that we're doing a gap analysis. Um, as with any very detailed testing, uh, criteria. Um, and this is these materials are fairly rigorously tested. The first, both in the original EDWAC proposed test standard test methods and in these final ones that are under the NTEP program. Um, do, um, material testing prior to, um, prior to putting the materials through a set of rigorous, um, uh, advanced environmental, um, I'm searching for the term, um, sorry, uh, where they, they sort of, uh, expose them to environmental conditions that would advance the wearing and weathering of those materials. Um, and then they test them again at the end to see how much degradation has occurred, but they also are testing them for specific code, um, for specific code dimensional qualities, um, as well as color. Um, so those. Um, uh, currently DSA is conducting our gap analysis between what was originally proposed by EDWAC versus what is being conducted, um, and, and used nationally, um, through the NTAP program, um, and we'll ultimately be able to have a better idea of what needs to still occur so that DSA can comply with, um, with what our state law requires us to, um, test, uh, the, in, in order for us to be able to affect some potential change to the NTEP program, um, which might be necessary.

Um, we have been coordinating with, HCD and DOT, u to, to advance the, what will be a future EDWAC 2.0, um, uh, committee, uh, that will be geared towards Um, using the national testing program to help DSA create a California specific certification. Um, DOT, the nuance, one nuance to the AASHTO, um, organization is that DSA is not a transportation regulator. Um, so DOT is needed to be able to join that. So, DSA is going to join us a data mine member only, which will not have, uh, the ability to vote on the subcommittee. But DOT will have that voting capacity. And we have early agreement with them that they will, uh, are willing to join on our behalf and then also convene in regular meetings with what will be an EDWAC committee, EDWAC 2.0 committee, to consider the gap analysis that we, that we're conducting. Um, there, there's a lot of detail in both reports. Um, and, um, considering the fact that the original testing requirements were based upon, uh, UL's ability and standard test methods available in 2006. Versus what's available now by AASHTO and there, um, testing procedures, um, there certainly is some gap there, um, but it's, I don't think it's insurmountable gap, and DSA is really committed to um, um, moving forward.

Um, in concert with what's happening nationally so that California regulations are not specific to California. They're in line with a testing protocol that is being used nationally. Um, so there's a lot there. Um, and the intention here is certainly we can answer questions if you have them well. Um, but, um, the ACC We're announcing this to the ACC. For a couple of reasons. Obviously, there's members here that that

would have interest potentially and being on the EDWAC 2.0 Um, and there are members that were on the EDWAC 2.0. Um, we will certainly, um, extend the invite to those members and, um, to other members. Once we sort of, once DSA has fine-tuned what that committee will be, it certainly, um, will look much like what the original committee was, in that there were agencies involved, um, both local agencies, As well as state agencies involved in that committee, and there are certainly code use or excuse me, users of detectable warnings that are critical to that discussion and that analysis as well. So that is my very brief summary of what's happened since 2006. So, I'll open it up to questions.

Brad Morrison: Okay, looks like we have Kendra here.

Eric Driever: Hi Kendra.

Kendra Muller: Hi Eric. I was just wondering if you have any estimation of when the gap analysis would be completed? Is it like the end of the triennial code cycle or would it be sooner?

Eric Driever: No, I, uh, triennial code cycle. So, if you know, uh, I'm hesitant to commit to a date simply because there are other entities involved, but we've we actually have had some good movement on our gap analysis. Um, I would suspect that by the end of the year, we would be able to at least provide a first draft on that to the public court. Perhaps the ACC or EDWAC.

Brad Morrison: Great. Thanks. Thanks, Eric. Okay. Other questions about the EDWAC? Anybody? Any questions? Any issues? Okay. Well, I think it's, it's, we've come to the end of a long day, and I thank you all for hanging in there with us. 3:02. Uh, and to think we thought we were going to end it. Well, at least I thought we were going to end it doing, but so there you go. I won't make that mistake again. I promise. Okay, thanks, everybody. I appreciate it. And we'll look forward to getting the notes out to you in a few or probably in a week or so. And look to the DSA box for information to be populated up there so you can get it when you need it. Are there any other questions, final questions on any topic before we close down the session.

Eric Driever: I would just, um, like to thank everybody that, uh, hung with us today. I know it's been a long day. A lot of information there. Um, please do, if you're interested in the end, like, please reach out to me or Michelle. Um, also, there, there's a quite a bit of information and study that has been done since 2006. Please apprise yourself of that. There's a lot of detail there, um, and, and certainly all of the, uh, fourth, uh, draft. Proposed test methods are available online as well. And so hopefully this presentation will provide as a resource for you.

Brad Morrison: Thank you, Eric. Okay. Anybody else? Okay. Thank you. Everybody really appreciate it. See you very, very soon in that public meeting. Hopefully. Thanks again, everybody.