

# Division of the State Architect

## Access Code Collaborative Meeting

### June 21, 2023

**Brad Morrison:** All right. Okay. Welcome to the Access Code Collaborative Meeting, everybody. We both have new and retiring members with us today to kind of share the experience. and we'll go through the basics of the ACC in our, in our meeting today. So, it is an orientation and as a, as an intro to what we'll be doing as part of the access code collaborative process.

So let me go ahead and get started, and why don't we move to the next slide, Greg. You know, and here are our goals. Basically, we're going to honor our outgoing members and introduce our, our current members. We'll work on our shared understanding of the ACC roles and responsibilities. work on some common skills for collaboration and consensus.

We'll clarify the California Code Development process and how ACC plays a role in that. And we'll collaboratively refine the ACC charter to share our expectations and last and not least discuss the 2025 triennial code cycle. So those are our goals for today. if anybody has any questions, let's go ahead and start.

I'll let you, Eric and Michelle go ahead.

**Eric Driever:** Thank you, Brad. I just wanted to take a minute to thank, thank everybody for joining us today. I really look forward to the coming year... years with this group and to get a great collaboration started. as of today, I will refine this, the, the goals the, the charter, while we'll introduce some subjects to be discussed to refine the charter.

That will be actually done during our next meeting in August, which the, the date for that has been set to, I believe it's August 15th. And that is from nine to three. We'll be sending out an invite and notices on that meeting. And I believe there's a moment in this presentation that we'll have the opportunity to announce that, I guess formally.

But, but yes, it, it, it will be in August, and that's where we will actually make the changes to the charter.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Eric. Appreciate that. Thank you. Okay.

Okay. Let's move on to the next slide, if you don't mind, Greg. Okay, great. Okay. So here we are. basically, everybody's listed on one page, and you can see you know, we have both the new role folks who are rolling onto the ACC as well as on the following slide we'll have a little bit more information about the folks who are rolling

off. but you can see a list of complete names here of all of our both DSA participants, the Ex-officio members, as well as the ACC itself. So, I'll, I'll let you go from there and as part of this process, we'll go through and ask people to introduce themselves.

So, we'll be hearing from folks on this list as we move forward. Okay. before we get started, does anybody have any questions or comments about today? Do you understand kind of where we're going with this orientation? If, if not, if you have any questions, please let us know and we'll go from there. Eric, do you want to come in again?

**Eric Driever:** I do. Thanks, Brad. so, the, the, the portion, well, the slide in front of you shows the current members, new members are underlined and their representatives, stakeholder groups are to the right of them as and how under which category they were selected. To the left, we have the current charter ex-officio state agencies listed which for the charter consists of HCD and DSA.

You'll notice below that in the last presentation, there were additional ex-officio positions in indicated on, on the presentation that didn't exist in the charter. And so that's really one of the, the highlights that I'd like to announce is that, that we have the intention of formally listing those ex-officio positions, additional ex-officio positions. in the charter.

In the case of BSC, ACC, DSA and DOR, those are agencies that have already participated I, I guess informally in that capacity. and then we are going to be introducing the DRC as an ex-officio position as well. We do want to collaboratively discuss that in our next meeting, but that, that is, and I mentioned that we are going to be announcing some changes to the, to suggested changes to the charter.

That is what I was speaking about is the additional four ex-officio positions that will be formally introduced into the charter.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Eric. Anybody else, questions, comments before we start?

Okay, let's move on. Next slide.

All right. Well, today we're honoring retiring ACC members. Arfaraz, Jihee, Carol, Eugene, Rob, Dara, and Ernest have all served. Many of them are inaugural members who, basically came to this thing early on to start it out. So, we'd like to honor those folks today. and to do so, we'd just like, for those of you that would like to you know, let us know your experience.

Please, please see how we kind of phrase some questions here. So, what I'd like to do is invite any of the honoring me, or excuse me, any of the retiring members up to share a little bit about who they are, what they do, how they came to the us, the ACC, and what they learned, and how did, how did the ACC benefit their constituency group.

It would be nice to hear if you have any recommendations or advice for the new members. And, you know if you've got any comments particular about the, this whole idea of virtual versus in-person meetings, and we'd like to make any statements there, that'd be awesome if you could help there too.

So, at, at this point, I'd like to you know, open it up for any of those retiring members to come forward and let us know what they think. Eric, come on in.

**Eric Driever:** I seem to be dominating this meeting so far, and I promise I won't do so throughout the entire meeting. I, I'd just like to really, really emphasize this is the last of our initial inaugural members many of whom were instrumental in the UC Davis study conducted by DSA and were instrumental in setting up the charter. The guidelines, they've been, they've, they've had a long history of, of collaboration with DSA and involvement in the rulemaking process.

And I can't stress our gratitude enough for those outgoing members. We, we truly, truly value their input and look for them to be present in meetings outside of the ACC, but in public hearings and workshops, I'm sure they'll remain active as that's part of who they are. And again, just wanted to express my extreme gratitude and if to, to minimize maybe me jumping in at a later date.

Many of you may have noticed that Greg has now taken on the role of helping us administer these meetings and will continue to do so. We are sadly losing the service of Jessica Axman, who many of you know very well and has been involved in the ACC from the beginning. she, with without help of staff internally, we could not make this happen.

And that's certainly the case with Jessica. Just noted, you know, even to start this meeting, we needed some, some friendly reminders that, that we should be recording and, and to start the meeting. So, I'd just really, really like to thank Jessica for her help. And while I'm going to go off my screen, I may pop on her screen we're, we've got a little cake that we'll enjoy here in the office with, with Jessica to commemorate her moving on. She will be staying with DSA and with DSA headquarters, but we are losing her service with the ACC, so just please join me in thanking both the outgoing members and Jessica for their service throughout the past several, many years. Thank you. I'll walk over there. Great. Great.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Great. Thanks Eric. Appreciate that. And thank you Jessica and thank you outgoing members. So please if anybody would like to come forward and Jean, I, I wanted to, I see that we have a phone line up there now, Jean, we're it's an opportunity for the outgoing members to share their experience a little bit, and so if you want to start, that'd be great.

**Eugene Lozano:** Okay. this is Gene Lozano. I've been representing the interests of people with vision disabilities. The ACC has really allowed me to be involved internally with DSA to the regulatory process beginning to end. I have since 1972,

been involved in access on the state and national level and has been a participant and gone through the regulatory process almost every code cycle.

It's, it's, it really helps to understand from the other side. It's, it's really important that, I would say for, to be an effective ACC member that not only do you have the passion and commitment, but that you to the subject matter, but you actually are really familiar with the, the title 24.

And, and I would say, and if we can never, or those of us are advocates I don't think we could achieve being you know, knowledgeable about every section of the Title 24. But I would say at least being really acquainted with the those requirements that directly affect our constituents. Though it's important to have that as well as the interest in other disabilities across disability.

But if you're familiar with like, in my case, things to do like detectable warnings, stair striping, et cetera, it's important that, and to know the research behind those at the same time you really need to come not just for your own personal perspective, but the broader group and be involved in the, actively in the disability community.

So, it's a great experience. I think you'll really enjoy it and the networking with other disciplines, other stakeholders, and you'll learn from them a great deal. And it's a very much a rewarding experience and I plan to part, continue participating in the code cycle. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Thank you Gene.

Gene, I did have a quick, quick follow up question. you've experienced both the virtual and the in-person meetings and just like to hear a little bit about your experience there as well.

**Eugene Lozano:**

I have really, I felt that, well, it's a mixed feeling. I think the in person, the, a lot of the, the really benefits is a lot of times the networking that takes place during breaks, afterwards, where you can get to know other individuals and interact with them and maybe bounce off ideas there. But it's limiting when you're trying to figure out scheduling transportation, getting to coming to Sacramento.

In my case, it's not, that's not a problem because I reside in Sacramento where virtual I, I, I think you'll find participation of stakeholders will be higher than when having to deal with in-person meetings, particularly those who are full-time working. And I think this will allow them more time that they can give to participating.

So, I think I would continue with the hybrid meetings that we have that, you know, that, that we've had a few, but I would say hybrids or virtual. I would Say that I think we've learned that just having in-person limits the number of people participating in,

particularly the public who may want to give input or at least hear the process and, and learn from that. Mm-hmm. so that's it.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you Gene. Appreciate it as always. Yeah. Okay. Is there would another retiring member,.

**Ernest Wuethrich:** I'd like to step forward and Brad, I'll go.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay, great. Hi.

**Ernest Wuethrich:** Hi, I'm Ernest Wuethrich.

**Brad Morrison:** Oh, Ernest. Yeah. Hey, welcome. Come on in. Thank you.

So I was representing certified Access Specialist cast and, believe Sue Moe is taking that. So she's, new to the industry and I hope you could be patient with her,

**Ida Clair:** Be gentle with her, Ernest

**Ernest Wuethrich:** It's awesome to see Sue hopping in there. That's going to be an amazing group. And some of the folks that are in there I, I would say that the experience has been pretty much amazing, you know, getting to be a part of the actual process and seeing what the process, how the process evolved, what the thoughts are from DSA, how they're getting ideas, how they vet ideas through getting to be in a room with people from who have different viewpoints.

I think was great. I think one thing from, you know, where I. Where I come from in, in terms of being a CASp, sometimes I really fall into the technical weeds of things and getting to be getting to hear the viewpoints of other folks, especially folks with disabilities who, you know may be able to explain the how and why is something I don't always get in other spots.

So, this is, that's something that was very valuable to me. There were times where, you know, I've had conversations outside of the room with Gene. He was able to provide feedback on items that I didn't quite understand. I had Kaylin Dunlap with another person that was part of the, ACC.

She provided a lot of feedback to me of how, you know, things kind of worked. So, I, I think that would be the most, one of the most valuable things is actually getting to hear the folks that you're in the room with hearing what their experiences are and how the proposed code changes or amendments impact other industries and other people, I think was incredibly valuable for me to understand, things more holistically than just reading the, the words on the paper and seeing a, number in code.

So, a great experience. I, encourage everyone to participate as much as possible. And ask questions in terms of, I know that you're looking for the opinions about

hybrid or in-person or virtual. I personally got a lot out of the in-person. One thing Gene mentioned was there is the, I think he said maybe networking opportunities for, I, I think it was a lot of the times is where those little sidebar conversations were happening, where we would discuss, you know, during break, a break, you know, grabbing the cookies or the, a coffee, that we would have a conversation that kind of further dialogue and my understanding at least of how things were working. So I, I got a lot out of that. There's a lot of times that you can really hammer things out, especially when we're looking at technical terms and, you know, we're crossing one sentence out and replacing it with another, being able to be in a room and kind of read it together really helped me. But I, I think there is a, a fair point that you might be able to get more folks to participate if you offer that that hybrid type version which I think is going to be relevant for a long while. So that's my 2 cents. Great. But thank you for the opportunity. It was great. And I, I really do hope to continue being able listen in on things and see how things develop.

**Brad Morrison:** Thanks. Great. Thank you. Thank you, Ernest. Appreciate that. Good, good feedback. Anybody else? Dara

**Dara Schur:** Morning, everybody? yes, I was one of the inaugural members.

My name is Dara Schur. And I am Senior Counsel with Disability Rights California or DRC, which the old me, the retired members know and the new members may know is California's Designated Protection Advocacy Agency and, and just also a statewide nonprofit. And I'm very pleased that folks from my office Nubyaan and Kendra will hopefully be able to continue working with the ACC.

I found it. Excellent opportunity to have more informal conversations and collaborate with both the department staff and stakeholders across the board. I think it's incredibly valuable. I think a lot of it's value comes from honest and open discussion. We don't always agree with each other, but we did a good job during the course of a collaborative in finding common ground in most instances.

I found that really, really helpful. I really appreciated learning from many of my colleagues both at the department, but also the retiring members and remaining members of the ACC. I've really learned a lot from them and look forward to continuing to collaborate with those who will be continuing to work on the process.

I process as I will be to some extent so, looking forward to continued work with you. I, there's no question in my mind that working with the ACC helped my constituency group, which is broadly people with disabilities, achieve more accessibility in the state building codes. And that was I, I felt really good about that work, and I think the people we serve will very much appreciate it.

I think if I have a recommendation, it's just be open-minded and see this is an opportunity to learn. I certainly know far more about building codes than I knew when I walked in the room. And don't be afraid to ask questions at all. I asked lots and lots and lots of questions as the department can assure you of, so always a good thing to do.

I echo what's been said about hybrid meetings. I think there is a great deal of value in at least some of the time coming together in person for all the reasons that people have described. Building relationships, networking, just having a different kind of experience. But it is critical to retain a virtual option for meetings for people with disabilities who find it very difficult, often to travel for a variety of reasons.

And it does definitely expand participation in a major way. And I, I don't think sometimes people who don't have significant disabilities have a complete understanding of how difficult it is for people who do disabilities to travel. They often can't do it. They use many need companions.

They may have a lot of technical equipment. They may have limited endurance. They're, I mean, I don't know anyone who uses a power chair who hasn't complained about it getting damaged and lost and arriving someplace with no mobility, cause somehow the chair got damaged by the airline or the train. So I do think it is important to maintain a virtual option while recognizing the value of being in person to the extent feasible.

And anyway, I just wanted to thank folks. I, Jessica, thank you. I know you're leaving. I, it was great working with you, Sue, you left and came back. Welcome back. It's going to be great. And for, to have you staying on as an active voice in this process. We really appreciated things you did for us in the past and did for the community of the past.

So I think I'll let somebody else say something.

**Brad Morrison:** Well, thank you Dara. That was very nice. Appreciate that. okay, let's see who else? Jihee Lee, would you like to come in?

**Jihee Lee:** Yeah, just briefly. I did an echo everyone who just spoke. and it's been actually my honor, and I just, I learned so much and it was incredible to be around people who are so dedicated and committed in improving accessibility for all Californians.

And I would like to really keep in touch with everyone here and also people who already retired and I do have a contact list safely kept in my files, so I may reach out one day, one of you. So please keep the good work and I do feel that in person at least partially maybe few times at least during your activities be able to at least meet people in person hopefully so you get more connections that way.

Thank you everybody.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you Jihee. Appreciate that.

Anybody else of the inaugural and retiring group? Anybody else want to step up?

**Eric Driever:** I believe I see Carol raising her hand. Carol.

**Brad Morrison:** Oh good. Hey, come on in. Carol, you can have the floor. Come on in.

**Carol Loeffler:** I can find the unmute button. Can you hear me?

**Brad Morrison:** Yes, can hear you loud and clear.

**Carol Loeffler:** Oh, bravo. I found it. I found it. Well, I do also want to reiterate what everyone before me has said it being an inaugural member. And I remember those first few meetings and the challenges that we had, just the whole new process that went into creating something and the people that went into it from the state architects and how you guys orchestrated all of it, and the challenges that it all, that all occurred.

I have a lot of admiration and we, I grew exponentially because of it. I want to just give a little bit about me as I'm an occupational therapist, but I also have physical disabilities and I have cognitive disabilities and hearing disabilities.

I, I wanted to say that not only did I come to this personally, but I came professionally. I've been an occupational therapist for 41 years, and the ability to be able to look at things and process and problem solve and take a look at what has been missed has been what I feel has been the gift that I've been able to contribute.

So, what I would like to just ask all the people that are part of this collaborative not only the new people, but the people that are continuing, is please keep your eyes and ears open. Think and imagine every situation in which your place that. You could make a difference with how you could make code changes or make suggestions for people to look at and hold onto the back of their head for what might occur.

Something as simple as when you're washing your hands and you're going from one location to get your hands dry and all the water that's on the ground caused me to slip and everything was according to code, but there's human nature that goes along with it. And that's the other part that I would like to express is that I had the opportunity because we were in person for people to listen to me, to get my perspectives both here and in the Building Standards Commission, both as a disability access person as well as an occupational therapist.

But I think the biggest gift was that it wasn't just the sidebar conversations and, and I appreciate that one, but it was the conversations when people would say to me, "Carol, I can see that you have a point. Let me spend some more time with that." Or "I can see that you're you would like a little bit more clarification about this."

And that's what being in person did. It really built that relationship. It built that confidence in being able to ask the questions of people. And it built the confidence in me being able to express this is the opinion that I have. And I felt that. People were listening to it. And even if something couldn't be done at that moment in time, it was



something that they could hold onto and perhaps it might be used five years from now.

So as far as my perspective, I believe that being in person was the biggest gift that not only it gave to me, but I think it gives to other people. But the, I missed the coffee this morning, by the way, the ability to get together with people because of being virtual. So, I would recommend that a hybrid, but with an emphasis on being in person as much as possible and making that as a suggestion for engagement.

Because that's the part that I think really built the code was not just the meetings, but it was the engagement process that in, in infiltrated the whole thing. And I have one suggestion. I would love a reunion if there could be at any point in time because it was incredibly amazing to be at the very beginning of this and to watch the transitions and to, to be part of that process.

And it's sad, it's bittersweet to be saying goodbye. So, a reunion would be just wonderful for me. So that's my suggestion.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Carol. What a great suggestion too. I appreciate that. All right. Thank you for those, those words as well. okay. So, Tim, I see you've had your hand up for a couple minutes.

Go ahead and ask your question. Take yourself off mute maybe. And come on in. Tim. Tim, are you there?

Okay. I'll check back in a couple minutes, see if maybe you maybe stepped out the room.

**Carol Loeffler:** I have a favor. I can't figure out how to mute me, so can somebody mute me?

**Brad Morrison:** Yeah, Greg, could you, could you, you okay. Appreciate that. Thank you, Greg. Appreciate it. Yes. Okay. So, let's see. It looks like I, I'm not sure that we ha is there any more inaugural members present and willing to share not seeing any more names on here.

I'm thinking that maybe with that's it for today. But those comments so far have been great. I really appreciate them. And I think that it's good for the others to know, I think, and, and hear your experience and especially about the whole idea around virtue and virtual and in present meetings.

It's I think everybody's got mixed feelings about them. And so it's good to kind of hear some of the comments and, and helps us all understand a little bit more fully about what we can appreciate about both, both methods. So thank you for those comments as well. does anybody else have anything to say before we move on to the next part of the agenda?

Alright, let's go. Greg, you want to move the slide? Great. Okay. So what we'd like to do now is introduce the new members of the ACC and we'll just ask you to come forward as you're comfortable. but please step up and let us know a little bit about who you are, where you live, your profession your constituency group and what you'd like to accomplish on the ACC.

And too, I'd like to ask your comments as well about the whole idea of virtual or in-person meetings. Okay. So let me jump over to Eric and Michelle and see let them kind of introduce this topic. Go ahead you, guys.

Thank you.

**Eric Driever:** I would like I would like us to actually have everybody introduce themselves for the benefit of the new members.

New members do not know the remaining members. So, it would be great to hear from each and every ACC members so that we can do this as an introduction. I'm noting the, a strong desire for that in-person connection with the ACC. And so, it's, it, since we are initially virtual, and we'll certainly consider changes to that moving forward.

But it'd be great to at least have you each go on camera if possible and introduce yourself. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Eric. Appreciate it. We'll get on that in one sec.

Ida, would you like to say something?

**Ida Clair:** Yeah, I just Eric, I don't know if the older members now that they've shared, if they're welcome to leave, I, I'd like, I'd like to know if, you know, they, they need to be on or it's at their leisure.

**Eric Driever:** It would be at their leisure.

**Ida Clair:** So, in that regard, for all of you who served, thank you. You made it a success and I; I really appreciate it and I hope as I, you know, use all the time. I hope you boomerang back on the charter permits you to wait three years and try again if you want. So, thank you. I appreciate it.

**Dara Schur:** Thank you. And I'm probably little while we'll get off at some point, so thank you all.

**Brad Morrison:** Thanks. thanks Ida. Thank you. Dara. and I following up with Eric's comment, what I'd like to do is just kind of go down the, go down the risk and just have you introduce yourself even if you came on as a, as an inaugural member.

Just to, if you wouldn't mind just reintroducing yourself against, we can go through the process of, of sharing who is whom and, and how they've ended up here. Okay. So let me start as the person who's doing a lot of the speaking today, my name's Brad Morrison and I'm the facilitator for the ACC, and I've been doing this for a few years now.

And the whole idea here is that the ACC is a special type of collaborative group, and the part of their process is to have a, a neutral facilitator to kind of conduct the discussion. So, I'm here to help you speak and that's kind of, I'll be kind of doing a lot of the talking today as far as the orientation slides, but really my role is to help you kind of put the information forward and to, to make sure that the meeting runs on time and as expected.

Okay. So, let's go down the list here. And if you don't mind, I'm just going to call on you from the order of that is on my screen just because I know it's a little different on everybody's screen. So let me just kind of do that and then we'll kind of proceed through. Let's start at the top. we have both Eric and Michelle at the office there.

If you guys would like to just come in and quickly introduce yourselves, we'll do the same for everybody on the, on the, on the Zoom call.

**Eric Driever:** Sure. some of you know me, some may have met me in person, some others just virtually. my name is Eric Driever. I'm principal architect at Division of State Architect.

I've been in this position for not quite two years. I think in October, it'll be two years for me, and I've, I've really valued the, the input we've met several times, either through public workshops or through the ACC meetings. And I, I can honestly say that the input that you've provided has been invaluable to the current cycle.

And we'll go into those cycles throughout this presentation, but to the current cycle. And I really look forward to advancing that input through the next cycle. So, I'll turn it over to Michelle.

**Michelle Davis:** Good morning, everyone. my name is Michelle Davis. I'm an architect and a Certified Access Specialist and relatively new to DSA.

it is a little bit of a role reversal for Susan Moe and I because she used to sit over here and I used to be on the other side.

I, as I said, I'm an architect and a CASp, so I definitely have the construction side perspective, but I also have some personal experiences and familial experiences that allow me more empathy and I try to merge those two things together. And so, I'm delighted to be here cause I feel like this job is just a, a great fit for my past experiences and I look forward to working with all of you.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you. Thank you, Michelle and Eric. Dara, can I ask you to come on screen again and just briefly share,

**Eric Driever:** Dara is outgoing.

**Brad Morrison:** Dara is outgoing, correct? Just see her, she's in the order of my screen, so I'll, I'll come back there just to make, give you an opportunity. Sue, Sue Moe, I would like to introduce yourself to this group.

Probably know everybody here so. Sue, I think you're muted.

**Susan Moe:** How about now?

**Brad Morrison:** Yeah. Perfect.

**Susan Moe:** Okay. So, like Ernest said, I'm sort of new to this whole field of access compliance. My name is Susan Moe. I'm an architect and a Certified Access Specialist, and I can't believe that in another month it'll be two years since I left the Division of the State Architect.

I decided it was time to use all the great experience that I gained from being involved at Division of the State Architect in the headquarters, the access code and Policy unit. When I think back my experience with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and this will kind of give you an idea that I'm one of the older members of this committee.

I was working on a high-rise project for an architect here in Sacramento when 1991, when the Americans with Disabilities Act was signed. And we were right in the middle of doing working drawings for the tenant improvements in the board of equalization building that's here in downtown Sacramento.

So, we had to really get up to speed pretty quickly on what was in the 1991, ADA so like I said, I've had some experience with accessibility for quite some time, and I'm just glad that I had the opportunity to participate, like I said, in all the various rulemaking cycles that I participated in at DSA because Just when you think, you know, what you think, you know, you learn that there's a whole lot that you don't know.

And what I enjoy about this whole field of accessibility is it's a constant learning experience. I was fortunate that the architect that hired me, I was able to serve an apprenticeship at his firm and become a licensed architect. But the thing that I really appreciate about him was that he really pushed this idea that you're always learning, and you will continue to learn throughout your career.

So, I think that's the thing that I really appreciate, is it's this constant research and constant learning. so that's a little bit about me.

**Brad Morrison:** Great, Sue. Thanks. Appreciate that. Good experience. Carol, you're the next one up my screen. I realize you just spoke. Do you want to just come in real quick and introduce yourself again so we, as we go around the room,

**Eric Driever:** Brad?

**Brad Morrison:** Yes.

**Eric Driever:** This slide is primarily for the new ACC members. The previous slide was for the, for the outgoing members. So, I think there's a, the, on a previous slide, there's a list of all the current members Sam's outgoing members, and we should focus on those folks.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay, sounds good. Dominika, I'm still basically running down my list.

Dominika, would you like to introduce yourself to the group?

**Dominika Bednarska:** Sure. my name's Dominique Bednarska. I'm a person with a mobility impairment from birth. I've worked as the ADA coordinator for the City of Berkeley. and I currently work at Health and Human Services for the federal government. I'm not sure exactly when I joined the committee, but I'm a fairly recent addition.

So yeah, and I, I would like to weigh in on hybrid versus you know, virtual meetings. For me, attending in-person meetings with my disability would be extremely difficult and it would probably really limit my ability to participate in the group further. So, I just wanted to state that.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you. Thank you.

**Dominika Bednarska:** And, you know, I joined ACC because I'm extremely passionate about accessibility and I had a lot of professional experience and personal experience in the area.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Dominika. sorry I mispronounced your name, but I'll get it right.

**Dominika Bednarska:** It's okay.

**Brad Morrison:** Thank you very much for sharing with us. Appreciate that. Okay, next up, Mehdi.

**Mehdi Shadyab:** Good morning. Can everybody hear me?

**Brad Morrison:** Yes.

**Mehdi Shadyab:** Good morning, everybody. My name is Mehdi Shadyab. I'm with the City of San Diego. I thank you all for giving me the opportunity to be part of the ACC.

I'm, by profession, I'm a, I'm a licensed engineer in a structural engineer. Started working since 1980. The first 10 years of my career I was a practicing engineer. Somehow destiny got me into the government city of San Diego Code Enforcement. And I've been doing that since 1980, 87 88, somewhere thereabouts.

I think age make you forget things, but that's okay. That's part of life. I just like Sue 1990; we were plan checking a lot of high rises when ADA came into place and we were struggling and doing our best to learn the regulations and how to apply them. And since then, I've been doing that over the years I built a great relationship with DSA and I met a lot of wonderful people Sue Ida with two of the people I admired the most.

And basically, that's why I joined ACC and back in early. Early nineties billing official at the time, and also giving him the feedback on many things we heard from architects, engineers why does the code say that this doesn't make sense? That doesn't make sense. So I remember my, my, my mentor, my building official told me one thing.

He said, "Mehdi if you want to make the code change, you have to get involved, and that's the only way you cannot just sit back and listen and do nothing about it." So as a result, I got involved with the ICC code development process, and I've been doing that for the last 35 years. And also, recently listen, as few years back, I got involved with the CALBO, I'm part of the active member of CALBO Access committee, and I'm currently chairing the ICC Disabled Access Committee.

My hope of being involved ACC is to make that difference, make the code a better docent for industry especially architects and engineers can use and remove the ambiguities that exist and make it pretty much crisp, clear as to what needs to get done, why you should get done. As far as in-person or virtual.

Again, I've been involved with code development with ICC for quite a long time since Covid happened. I have to tell you, the, the number of participation ICC chapter meeting and ICC national meeting have increased tremendously before people didn't show up or because of travels, because of time because of other commitments.

But the ritual meeting basically changed all that. Our, our attendance have doubled in some, in sometimes tripled. we have people who are joining the meetings to give their opinions, give their feedbacks that if it was real in person, we would have never known. So after going through virtual meeting over the course of last few years, I'm, I'm.

Confident that virtual is a better way of handling meetings. Yes, in-person does provide some advantages and networking, but I think by doing it virtual more participation will be happening and more involvement will be happening. Especially for me coming living in San Diego. It is going to be difficult to travel out of the city long distance.

With that. Thank you so much and I look forward to being a participant in the upcoming meetings. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Great, Mehdi.

Thank you very much. Appreciate that. Let's hear. Hey, Mark, how about you?

**Mark Zambon:** Alright. Hey, good morning folks. mark Zambon is my name. Excited to be here today. Incidentally, I met Eric in Lake Natomas years ago, open water, swimming in the frigid chili water. So that was kind of my connection here. So yeah, good times. So, I'm currently down in Los Angeles, moved down last year for law school. So, I'm a rising second year law school student. the hope eventually to work in criminal law on behalf of military veterans with PTSD.

I served in the Marine Corps for 12 years and on my sixth combat deployment I was blown up for the fifth time. Three vehicles. the fourth took off some fingers and the fifth one explosively removed both my legs above the knees. And you know, it's kind of brought me roundabout to this track, in the law route to work defending folks with PTSD cause I had folks I served with personally that we attended their hearings and there was no mention of PTSD, but just, you know, depression or, or, you know, kind of an offshoot symptom of PTSD and feel that's not a fair narrative

But as an individual living with different abilities, I've experienced it both here in the United States and in other countries. The varying levels of accessibilities in cities and in buildings and know that grand difference of buildings designed for accessibility or cities designed for accessibility in those that aren't. And how, like crushingly difficult it can be to try to get around in a wheelchair or manual or prosthetic legs and inaccessible scenarios and then know that just wonderful gift of being in accessible buildings or accessible cities.

And just like feeling that kindness, you know, from all the people that are behind that effort and creating accessibility and how, how wonderful it is as an individual that takes advantage of that. So, hoping to bring in that representation from the broader group of, you know, the disabled veterans and disabled people that, you know, are in my social circles and professional circles to any valuable extent that it may be for the, the DSA here and the ACC collaborative.

And as far as in-person or virtual, I'm open to both. Absolutely. I, I think there's definitely benefits for both. There's a lot of folks have been talking about I used to live in, you know, Sacramento. We were in Midtown on 16 and P right there by what was it, orchidtie. And there was a, there's a what was that spot called right by Fremont Park. I'm getting a mind blank. But anyways love Sacramento coffee at

Weatherstone and of, of course Open Water swims out at Lake Natomas. So, you know, if there's ever a meeting in Sacramento, you know, we're happy to make it up there. But if not in, in virtual serves greatly as well. And you know, we're happy to join in that way.

So excited to be here. Nice to meet everyone and yep, take care.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you, Mark. Thanks for sharing. That's good stuff. Appreciate that. Okay, let's move on down, Sean.

**Sean McNamera:** Good morning, everyone. My name's Sean McNamera. I'm in Walnut Creek so East Bay, not too far out of Sacramento. As far as constituencies, I've touched many over the years, but I spent the, the bulk of my career, in the public sector inspector plan review, building code official started in New York, spent a bit of time in Virginia before moving out to California transitioned to the, the public sector a couple years ago.

And I'm a building regulatory strategy lead for a national retailer with facilities all over the place. Couple thousand. and basically I'm the, the code consultant internally. I've got two daughters that have disabilities, one uses a wheelchair, one has a cognitive disabilities, and so it's something that years ago just drew me in.

It was a natural connection from, you know, code enforcement and, you know, a focus area for me. So it's something that I've gravitated to for years. and you know, it's near and dear to my heart both, both personally and professionally. I've been serving on the A117 committee, you know, for, you know locations nationally outside of California.

You know, on the code development process there for the update. Let's see, decided the, in, I could, you know, indicated help try to bring clarity to the code. I see it often both on the you know, design professional side and on the enforcement side misinterpretation, misapplication generally with best intentions, but you know, doesn't. You know, meet the intent of the code, you know, and can result in facilities that are, are less accessible, you know, even though the, the individuals were thought they were doing, you know, the best they could. And so that's you know I'd like to get involved in trying to remove some of that ambiguity and you know, advocate for more accessible facilities.

I think California leaps and bounds above a lot of parts of the country that I've lived. And that's what drew us out here years ago. cause that's where I wanted, you know, my daughters to, to be as they transition to adulthood. In person versus virtual or hybrid I think hybrid is, you know definitely you know, a, a necessary option or, or virtual you know, just to increase participation. Personally, I love to take the, the drive up to, to Sacramento for the day. I, I like seeing people in person, especially after, you know, years of, you know, only talking to my computer screen here. So I'm, I'm all for it. But you know, I think opening it up, you know, so whoever wants to



participate can you know, in the best way that works for them and I, I look forward to meeting everyone and working with everyone moving forward, forward. I represent facility owners. Like I said, I'm on the, the private side now. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you Sean. Great share there. Appreciate it. Let's go. Machel Healy.

**Michal Healy:** Good morning everybody. I'm Michelle Healy. I'm the director of facility development and planning for Santa Clara Unified School District. So, I represent a facilities owner. I'm also a registered and a licensed architect within the state of California. So, I started out building and designing public schools.

And now I help design them and plan for them on the school district side. So, I really think it's important to have just the opinions of K-12 within the DSA Access group. I think that we represent a lot of what DSA reviews and does. And we have, we do view things a little bit differently because we have to take into account security and safety for the students, as well as the privacy.

So that's just the point of view that I hope to bring to the group. And for in-person or virtual it doesn't really matter to me, but I do, I would like to echo everybody else's; that hybrid is easier. Or just having virtual I think we're all also very busy and that travel time to get to Sacramento can be a little bit of a time, time sap sometimes, especially for me, depending on traffic since I'm in the Bay Area.

But I can go either way, so I'm just happy to be on the committee and I actually was on it a long time ago when it first started when it was in a different iteration. But then I recently joined again last year, so happy to be here. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you Machel. Welcome, welcome back actually.

So good to see you. Okay, so let's see. Let's go on down to, how about Larry?

**Larry Grable:** Good morning, Larry Grable, live in Rancho Cucamonga, California. I run Service Center for Independent Life, one of the six independent living centers in LA County. I also chair the State Assistive Technology Advisory Committee and a member of the state AAD R C Advisory Committee.

I represent the advocacy side. and I joined, you know, we, we hear all the horror stories at the independent living centers and our advocates are always involved with landlord issues. And we'll like to get involved a little bit deeper on that, and that's why I joined. Hybrid versus virtual. I live in, you know, or the Inland Empire to get up to Sacramento, I have to take a five o'clock flight and then probably like a six o'clock flight home.

So it makes it a very long day to travel up for a one day meeting. virtual is great. I can sit in my office, get work done, and you know, then get to the meeting on time. So thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you Larry. Appreciate that. Thanks for sharing. Kendra, can, would you like to introduce yourself?

**Kendra Muller:** Good morning everybody. I am an attorney employed at Disability Rights California, which is the agency designated by the state and federal statute for over 4 years now to protect persons with disabilities. So that's my constituency. I'm based in the San Diego office of our organization, but we span the entire state and I serve in the Civil Rights Practice Group, which challenges civil rights violations by assisting in accessibility and anti-discrimination in the form of litigation and direct services and investigation.

And I've also worked in a consulting role with universities, courts, airports, and other public accommodations for code accessibility. So, I come to this in my professional capacity representing DRC, but also as a consumer as I do use a wheelchair. And I am very excited to be in this collaborative space and work with all of you.

I think these are really important regulatory discussions that we're going to have and I want to make sure they're feasible and accessible and not ambiguous. Then in terms of hybrid or in-person or virtual I would strongly suggest a hybrid mode just to ensure accessibility. I echo Mehdi and Dominika and, Larry with both having the travel be very far away from me, but also because of my disability, I can't travel as easily. So, a hybrid mode is fantastic.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank, thank you, Kendra. Thank you for sharing that valuable experience there too. Appreciate that. Anne, would you like to come in?

**Anne Riggs:** Thank you. yes. I'm Anne Riggs. I represent architect or design professionals. I'm an architect. I'm located in Monrovia in Los Angeles County at, there's a big southern California constituent here today, which is exciting.

Yeah. so yes, as I said, I'm, I'm an architect. I'm also a Certified Access Specialist and I'm also the inclusive design lead for my firm, David Baker Architect, which is an architecture firm focused primarily on publicly funded housing. So, I, I like to think of myself as having about, you know, advocacy, design professional and CASp constituencies that I'm connected into.

Yeah, I decided to join the ACC just in the hopes that I could help contribute to that clarity that a few folks have mentioned on the code since that, you know, the primary focus of this group is specifically looking at proposed changes to the California Building Code. So in that sense, I have joined to be able to provide feedback on where, where in the implementation stage of the code, the design community sometimes runs into, you know, any issues or challenges or points of confusion in the hopes that that feedback can help the final, you know, outcome of, of proposed code changes.

But I also, you know, more broadly my goal is always to, to try and shift the mindset of the design profession away from and sort of adversarial compliance mindset to more of a proactive and positive mindset when approaching accessibility and

inclusive design. Because really it's our, our obligation as design professionals, it's part of our professional code of ethics that we should be striving to create an equitably designed world.

And that includes being proactive in, in making an inclusive, building an inclusive world that incorporates the needs of those with different abilities. and based on my experience yes, obviously I'm also based in Southern California. So unless people want to do the meetings in Southern California, doing the hybrid virtual option makes it much easier for me to attend.

And obviously I, support virtual and hybrid options to make it easier for all people with different abilities to travel to attend. However, I, you know, I'm really, I am a relatively new member myself. I've, I've joined I think less than a year ago. but I had the opportunity. I, so I've, I've met, I think I met Susan Moe probably in 2017 or earlier at a DSA Academy class that, that she was teaching.

And I had just coincidentally had the opportunity to meet in person Dara, Kendra and Nubyaan at Housing California conference, a completely separate event in San Diego. And it was so exciting and energizing to actually get to speak to them in person and have that connection. So, I'm really excited that I have been able to meet in person with so many of the members of this group.

And, you know, I think just watching, keeping an eye out for chances to, to meet in person, even if they're not in our official meeting, it, it's a really great opportunity to, to build those relationships and have great conversations.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you Anne. Appreciate that. Thank you for your comments. okay.

How about Nubyaan.

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

**Brad Morrison:** Yep. Sound great.

**Nubyaan Scott:** Awesome. My name is Nubyaan Scott. I'm an attorney with Disability Rights California in the Civil Rights Practice Group. So I work with both Dara and Kendra. And my role will be changing soon. I am leaving Disability Rights California. This is actually my last week.

I'm intending to stay on the ACC, but I'm just talking that through with my new employer. So, you know, TBD on that. But I look forward to being able to continue the work in whatever capacity, whether it's being an ACC member or, you know, just attending as a member of the public and contributing in other ways.

But I've really enjoyed the time that I've been on the ACC and learned a lot from, from everyone. I really respect the fact that there's a variety of membership and I

think it's really helpful in helping us get through the code process and really trying to integrate different perspectives to accomplish, you know, the most accessibility possible for Californians with disabilities.

So, I really enjoyed being a participant and I look forward to working with all the new members and want to reiterate the thanks to the founding members and previous members who've put in so much work to make things successful thus far. And my constituency group is currently disability advocates.

and I, I'm also a person with a disability. And I decided to join the ACC in hopes that I could contribute to making things as accessible as possible for Californians with disabilities. And I feel like that's something we have continued to strive for, and I think we've been successful in that.

And I don't have a preference, a personal preference between in-person or virtual. But I do think that as other people have stated, it's super important to allow for a hybrid option at a minimum, where if there's going to be an in-person meeting, there's a well thought out hybrid option so that people can participate virtually and it's as integrated as possible.

I know sometimes hybrid setups are not the greatest, but I think they can be done in a way that's pretty integrated and engaging. So, I think if we could maintain an option so that members of the public that have disabilities or have travel limitations for budgetary reasons or things like that which is a lot of our constituency and also people with disabilities regardless of budget limitations oftentimes have a lot of difficulty with traveling.

And, and of like dare mentioned, there's tons of issues with traveling and having your mobility devices damaged and there's really no way to fix it, right? Like, let's say you get off of a plane in Sacramento and your wheelchair is completely in disrepair and you can't then leave, you know, you have to figure out a lot.

So that happens very commonly. Unfortunately, it happens to people on our staff and, and, and community members that we represent. So for that reason, I would highly encourage there to at least be a hybrid model, understanding that there is a lot of utility and ability to build rapport and collaboration when you meet in person.

But there's also other, you know, considerations like the ones I stated and others stated. So thank you and I will pass it back to Brad.

**Brad Morrison:** Thanks, Nubyaan. Great sharing. Thank you very much. Appreciate that. let's go down, Richard. Richard, why don't you introduce yourself and tell us a little bit.

Richard, are you there? Okay, I'll come back to you. Let's go down, let's go down to Tim. Tim, are you there? Oh, there's Richard. I am here. Thank you. Okay, Tim.

**Tim McCormick:** And sorry I had my hand up earlier there.

**Brad Morrison:** no, it's okay.

**Tim McCormick:** That was a mistake. Just let me get my camera to work a little better. Okay. Eric, I apologize.

**Richard Skaff:** Eric, I apologize. I'm here. Richard Skaff.

**Brad Morrison:** We'll let, let Tim go Richard, and we'll come, come back to you. Thank you. Okay, Tim, go ahead.

**Tim McCormick:** Thank you. So, my name is Tim McCormick and I have accessibility consulting practice here in Los Angeles area. And I'm a licensed civil engineer by training my company has both to architects and engineers that work primarily on accessibility and general code consulting.

Once in a while we get dragged into design work, but I do try not to do that very often. Seems really not what we're set up to do. I currently chair the access Code Committee for the California Building Officials. I was a building official for about 13 years, and I spent about 22 years in building departments.

Before that I was also a licensed general contractor. And my experience with accessibility actually began in 1980 as a young general contractor doing tenant improvement work and trying to implement a new state law that for the first time required public accommodations to be accessible. And so, I've looked at this and I'm here representing code enforcement officials in the role of CALBO.

My goal for this, and, and what I hope to see us do here is recognize that the audience, the people that read these codes, need the language to be clear and simple. And as a person who's done a lot of training for building departments up and down the state, I can tell you that. We need to work really hard on all the changes that we make to make sure they're simple and easy to understand.

Because that's one of the consistent themes we have with accessibility. A lot of the users, whether they're building inspectors, or our architects don't always understand the reasons behind the codes, but the more simple we say it, and sometimes even adding language that makes it clear what the, the end in mind is.

What the goal is, I think is something we can do to improve the language. So, my goal is, is to try to help in that regard to look at things from just the experience of things being said to me and trying to get people cooperatively. I work in design teams from the very beginning of a project to the very end.

And what the kind of questions I get as an accessibility consultant from people who are sincerely giving at their best effort to understand regulations that they find are

somewhat confusing and to the extent that we can work together as a group to make whatever we decide should be the standard clear and easy to understand.

That would be great. And one example I'll give you to consider right in the beginning, because this seems to be a recurring theme, is that the longer the sentence is, the harder it is to understand. It's a simple concept, but keeping sentences clear in, in language that just has, you know, subject object verb, basic English grammar rules follow does mean a lot when it comes to code enforcement.

And I would also suggest to DSA that they consider adding an English Language Expert to the group to check our grammar on the things that we propose. I think that's something that would benefit the group overall. Because most of the problems I've seen in a lot of times with interpretations is someone who's written a fair amount of code themselves as a building official.

I spent 20 years writing regulations. And I can tell you that it's tough to write. It's simple and easy. It's tough. It takes several iterations. But the complex, whenever we have compound sentences, people always seem to get confused on what belongs with what. So my key, and what I'm going to try to, to emphasize and ask for everyone's cooperation is let's take a hard look at how simply we're saying what we, what we're saying.

Cause I think that's going to be key to making it enforceable and understandable, and that will do as much to promote accessibility as the standards we actually pick. And second, all I'd like to say that I believe that California should lead the nation in the quality of the accessibility we provide in our codes.

We're always considered to be a forward state. We have a long history that predates the ADA, we, I think we need to own that as a state that we should commit to continue to do that in everything we do. right now, the ADA is relying on the 1998 {indiscernible} standards. Let's own that and let's look for all the lessons that in the last 20 years that have been learned as we've progressed with accessibility as a nation.

And let's make sure our codes are the best they can be today. And, and that's, that's the other half of what I hope to see us do as a group. Not only make it clear but make it where it represents the best state of knowledge that we practice as an engineer. I learned this in college that when we had design standards, whether they were, you know, concrete, steel, wood, whatever, the building code might say one thing.

But we as a professional, were always required to do more than just the minimum. We were required to do the best and rely on the most current information, and it, it was considered malpractice not to do that. So, I think we should consider that. And what everything we do today is this, what represents the best state of knowledge for what we're doing in our codes today.

And hopefully we can make that clear. As far as in-person or virtual being from Southern California, that's an obvious choice; Virtual was a wonderful thing. but I probably will come if, if time permits because I, I value the face-to-face meeting too, but being an employer with the new generation of workers, I can tell you I can't get everyone in my office every day of the week.

So that, that's kind of the new world we're in, and I think it's okay.

Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you, Tim. Very interesting comments. Appreciate that. Richard. Richard, why don't you come on in, share a little bit about yourself.

Richard, are you there? I don't see your name on the screen, so maybe you dropped off a bit. Okay. I'll come back. Nathan, Nathan, come on. Share a little bit there.

**Nathan Dison:** Hey, good morning, everybody. I'm an architect at Gensler in California, and I'm just looking at the list of what I'm supposed to tell you guys.

So, I'm here to represent building owners in the construction industry. I've been working in architecture for 20ish years, and at Gensler I'm overseeing, as I said, my bio, millions of square feet of, of office space and transit space. My passion is making sure that that space is accessible. When it, when it comes to workspace, I find that if we can make space accessible quickly and easily and, and not, you know, building owners and contractors frequently fuss and, and, and complain about accessibility regulations as far as what those costs become, but I think that once they, they learn how to do it appropriately, they're better able to apply the regulations and then, and then building owners and, and employers are better able to employ disabled people.

And I, what I want them to do is you know, increase the employment of the disabled community. So that's, that's kind of my passion. So I'm an architect and my CASp is currently expired because I got so busy with work that my education fell behind or my, you know, continuing education. So, I'm, I'm hoping to fix that soon.

I'm here to help with clarity of the language. I think many people have said that. My wife's also an attorney and I took all of the bar exam tests, the, the practice tests with her and, and really love code language. I really love making things accurate. So, I'm, I'm here to learn from everyone else.

I'm here to, to help make things clear and I, since I'm in the Bay Area, I'm happy to come occasionally to in-person meetings, but virtual is also appreciated.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Nathan. Appreciate it. Thank you for sharing. And let's see what's, see Richard, are you there? Are you with us?

**Richard Skaff:** I, hello. Good morning. I'm sorry I got in late. my apologies becoming 79 and I think I'm probably one of the oldest here today. And I don't mean to be an agist, but it does have an effect on one's cognitive function.

Anyway, my name is Richard Scaff. I am the Executive Director now of a 501c.3 California nonprofit organization called Designing Accessible Communities. I live in Marin County now, although I have been for, since 2012, living in the Russian River area in Sonoma County. I also for almost 20 years was the General Manager of the Franciscan Restaurant on Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco.

I was the Executive Director of the Fisherman's Wharf Port Tenants Association and created the second largest Italian festival in San Francisco called ana. And then I created three positions within the city of San Francisco. I was the Chief Building Inspector enforcing California Title 24. That was in 1989.

In 1991. Oh, in 89. I also was part of the Emergency team that dealt with a Loma Prita earthquake. and 91 I was appointed as the ADA coordinator for public works and oversaw all city projects trained all city building and inspectors plan checkers, architects and engineers and project managers.

And in 98 Willie Brown appointed me as the Deputy Director of the Mayor's Office on Disability, which I opened with another person. I retired in 2006. I'd been on almost every state architects' access advisory committee. I've been on the AHNCD advisory committees as well as the a member of CALBO for almost what, 20 years.

I've done trainings all over the country, including Louisiana. I was asked by the governor of Louisiana after Katrina to go down and train architects who would be designing projects to rebuild the city after the Katrina incident. So, I've worked under five mayors in the city of San Francisco, Newsom, who is now governor, was the last.

I have attempted a couple of things during my years working with DSA and the other code writing agencies in California. And that is attempting to find a way to do a couple of things, get code written in language that everybody can understand, which is still not happening, and to develop a process where people would, with disabilities who are not code professionals, could understand the process and participate in the development of access codes and, and standards that will help make the built environment accessible.

I've also attempted to work statewide with the code writing agencies, CALBO and the county statewide organization and the city statewide organization in attempt to get consistent enforcement of access codes.

That is still not happening, and I'm hopeful that this committee might look at that as an issue because without that we have chaos. I'm presently working with multiple public entities in Marin County to create what I think may be the very first code enforcement for access code and standard enforcement a county ADA office that will



be created with a joint power's agreement among a number of public entities who participate by sharing the costs of this new countywide office.

It hasn't started yet, but I'm hopeful that will be soon and I'd like to see if it works, whether it could be a standard in helping communities where, where there are multiple code enforcement agencies like Marin County or Sonoma County where they could have a single access office that would help all of those, that sign on all of those public entities.

To do a better job having consistent interpretation and enforcement. I think we also have to work on state, the state code writing agencies to find a way to not only write code in a more understandable way so it can be interpreted consistently. But we need to also have all of the code writing agencies do what I was successful in doing, in getting the state architects office to create what they don't call what I call an interpretive manual.

That is a tool that DSA presently has on its website that although again, we don't call it a, an interpretive manual, it provides insight as to what DSA was attempting to do in writing a specific code. My last comment is we have 4459 government code 4459 that says the state architect cannot increase or decrease access code.

I agree with the can't decrease. And in fact, during the eight years of the state architect, prior to, Ida Clair the state architect removed multiple access requirements that had been there for years. As an example, the 5% dining banquet and bar tables there that were for years, required to be accessible.

And his arguent that. The ADA only required tables that are fixed they have to be like a McDonald's fixed table. That's outrageous. We have always, and the pre one of the previous speakers said, you know, we need to be the leader. We have always been the leader. We created the very first state access code.

We need to be the leader. We need to go above and beyond what the ADA says is the national standard. and if that means this committee needs to go to the state legislature and say, you need to change government code 4459, then we should do that whether we do it as ACC members or as a group.

It is outrageous to me that the state legislature believes we have enough access. We, we don't have enough access. The, the, the built environment is not completely accessible. I'm dealing now with tree top hotel like tree houses that are being rented as if they were hotel rooms and they're completely inaccessible.

And, and that company says, oh, they, we can't make those accessible. Well, I have now found about three or four public entities and private companies that have created treetop trails that are fully wheelchair accessible treetop trails. Access, there is no limit to what can be made accessible. It's in the eye of the beholder and the willingness to, to believe that we can create a more accessible environment, that's all it takes.

We will find problems, and then we need to find solutions to those problems. And with the right attitude, there is no barrier that can't be fixed. So I would say one of the primary goals of this committee would be to change 40, the one part of 4459 that says we can't have any more access than we have today.

Thanks very much for letting me speak.

**Brad Morrison:** No problem. Thank you, Richard. Richard, do you have any ideas about the hybrid or in-person meeting that you'd like to share?

**Richard Skaff:** I'm, I'm fine with either one. It's as has been said earlier, this is much easier. and it, it assures that everybody can part, I would suggest most people using Zoom would be more likely to be able to participate than spending one or two days away from home.

And, and part of that away from home being time lost. I, and I don't mean during the meeting, I mean the travel and the overnight stay. So, I, I think I would prefer this, but I would be happy with either. I think what we need is doing the work.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Great. Thanks. Thanks for that. Appreciate that.

Thank you for your comments too. Okay. So, let's move on down. I think we have one member left. Jorge. Are, are you, are you there? I'm not seeing, hello?

**Jorge Rivas:** Can you guys hear me button?

**Brad Morrison:** Yes, we can hear you. Sounds good. How are you?

**Jorge Rivas:** Sorry I'm super late. I don't know what happened with my calendar today.

**Brad Morrison:** It's okay. It's okay. Welcome in. And we have you know, the new members are introducing themselves. And so why don't you go ahead and share, there's the, there's the queues on the screen there. If you want to just kind of go through them and just kind of let us know a little bit about you and where, where you come down on this.

Thank you.

**Jorge Rivas:** Okay, great. Well, my name's Jorge Rivas. Reality is I am kind of new to this environment. I was part of the San Diego Association of Governments, their accessibility committee. And this is where I wanted to join this meeting after I was working with them and found out that we can make some simple accessibility changes without really even changing code to make it easier for blind individuals to travel throughout sidewalks in the city.

And so that's basically it. That's about a little bit about me right now. I'm also part of the San Diego Metropolitan Transit Accessible Board. And we're working on, as you guys probably heard we had a strike down here in San Diego, and Paratransit was heavily affected with that. So, working, working with them to create a solution for the future so it doesn't happen again.

**Brad Morrison:** And Jorge, what would you like to accomplish as part of the acc?

**Jorge Rivas:** So part of the ACC my accomplishment here would be to make. Accessible bathrooms where they're universal for everyone. That's one thing I would love to be able to do and create a code where everyone creates that one universal bathroom, and also making buildings very where architects and engineers love to design.

But they forget a couple of things when you, the building is very live, a visually impaired person has a hard time hearing, so it's hard to travel through a building when it's live. So just, just to incorporate things like that into design.

**Brad Morrison:** That sounds good. how about the hybrid and in-person meeting?

Do you have any preference or would you like to share anything about either method?

**Jorge Rivas:** No, not necessarily a preference. I mean, I guess if you gave me a choice, I, I love to travel, so I'm okay meeting in person and it'll probably be better that way you could talk to people, shake people's hands, also be exposed more to the environment and figure out what more changes could happen when we write code or help write code.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Okay. Well thanks. Thanks, Jorge. Thank you for sharing. Appreciate that. And looking forward to working with you on the ACC.

**Jorge Rivas:** Great. Thank you guys.

**Brad Morrison:** is there anybody any other, any other new members? we're, we're getting a little crosstalk, I think from the voice enabled chat or something, so just be aware of that.

That's little. It just seems to kind of come and go. okay. And are there any other new members that would like to share? Looks like we've covered everybody as far as I can see, but I didn't want to leave anybody out. I'd like to also incorporate introductions for, I, I realize if all the members have gone, I'd like to incorporate introductions for some of our EX-OFFICIO members that are on the line.

Just in, like, as Carol was saying, just in terms of engagement. Just so you know who you're on, who you're on the phone with, we have several ex-officio members here. So, if you wouldn't mind, I'll just go through and just ask them to quickly

introduce themselves for us all. So first of all, and we have a, here, let, let's start with Greg, who's our in the master control room today.

So Greg, would you like to introduce yourself and to the committee here in this, let him know who you are and what your role is at the ACC, or role is at the DSA. Excuse me.

**Greg Hartley:** Hello everyone. My name is Greg Hartley. I work under Eric Driever. I reside in San Diego, but my workstation or my work headquarters would be in Sacramento and I'm an analyst for him working with learning management systems and getting everything onto our DSA Academy. In regards of who I rep represent for the ACC, I would just hope I'm a good administrator and make everything run smoothly. So, if there's anything that you think I could improve on, just shoot me an email.

I would not mind any criticism, just to make sure that we can make sure that it's all accessible for everybody. and, you know, virtual or hybrid or anything like that. My preference, obviously since I'm stationed here in San Diego, I would prefer virtual, but I do have family who live in Sacramento that would probably love to see me.

So, if there is a meeting that is needed in Sacramento, I could obviously travel there. But I look forward to working with all of you and thank you to the individuals that were terming out and welcome to the new individuals.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you, Greg. Appreciate that. okay, I see Veronica on the screen here.

Veronica, would you like to share your role here?

**Veronica Turdean:** Good morning. I will try to be very short. My name is I'm an Associate Construction Analyst and the chapter 11, a access code specialist for HCD. I've been holding the ex-officio member position since last year. Since I am the accessibility specialist representing HCD I will inform the co-development team of any upcoming changes related to 11B and coordinate changes with 11A.

So, you know, they're not in conflict but harmonize with each other. Throughout the years, I've owned various positions in the architecture fields. That's how I met Eric at DGS. I've also worked for the Department of Justice designing courthouses. So I gain a wide variety of experience in the design industry.

Why am I in the ACC? besides of everything that I've stated my older son has severe autism and I am around his friends all day, and 99% of his friends have different disabilities. So, it's something that's very near in the air to my heart, you know, to make sure that those kids will be able to thrive in the society. In regards to the meeting in person or virtual,

I personally like the virtual, you know, besides the fact that I have an accent, English is my second language, you know, when there is no background noise, people can actually understand what I'm saying. So, you know, for me it's easier also not paying the babysitter to stay with my kids cost effective, you know, especially with my older one, I can let him by himself in the house. So that too. And then today I have, I don't know, four or five meetings.

So once I jump off of this one, I can get into the other one. I don't have to drive somewhere, so, you know, no pollution too. So that, that's always a good thing. So I'm hoping that I can contribute, you know, as much as I can to those meetings.

And thank you for having me here.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Veronica. Appreciate that. Appreciate that. That personal insight too. Thank you. Kritikia, I'd like to come in and introduce yourself to the group.

**Kritika Devi:** Hi, good morning everyone. My name is Kritika Devi. I'm a Program Analyst with the Independent Living and Community Access Division at the Department of Rehabilitation.

Today I'm filling in for Ms. Anna Acton, who is the Deputy Director at ICAD with DOR. And this is my first time here and it's great to learn about ACC. And the last question on the screen talks about your experience, whether you prefer in-person or virtual meeting. I believe the contemporary world and beyond COVID 19 have taught us a lot about the hybrid nature of meeting.

I personally, however, prefer virtual meeting because it allows for greater time management in terms of as someone have already mentioned that you can attend multiple meetings in a day regardless of the geographical location barriers. Thank you so much.

**Brad Morrison:** Thanks Kritika. Thank you for sharing. Appreciate that.

Okay. Looks like we've introduced everybody on screen. So, what I would like to do is to offer everybody an opportunity to take a little break. we've been going at this for over an hour and a half. And the next part of the presentation goes into a little bit more detail about the ACC itself and the role.

And, and we'll be going through some of the things you'll see as part of the code process. So, what I'd like to do is, is to move up our break here. This, this section, we spent some time on it. Let's take a break until 10 30.

What? And just take it, everybody can get their refreshments do the bio break, and we'll come back and reconvene at 10:30. To kind of take on the rest of the presentation before we adjourn for this part of the meeting, does anybody have any

questions or comments? As either as far as the meeting today or anything else that might, might have come up while everybody was talking.

Okay. Not seeing anybody come forward. So let's take that break. Oh, wait, wait,. Dominika. Dominika, come on in.

Dominica, did you want to make his comment?

**Dominika Bednarska:** I did. Okay.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Come on in.

**Dominika Bednarska:** I think after all this virtual time, I'd be able to remember to unmute. I was just saying, I know I spoke when we went around, but just on the topic of hybrid or virtual I, again, really don't think I'd be able to participate if like it was a requirement to come in person just for a number of disability issues and cost issues.

But you know, I'm also thinking as people are talking and they're in different geographic locations that may be moving around the meeting might assist some people with their you know, with their desire to attend in person, like if they're in Southern California, to be able to have them meeting in different locations.

I don't know if that's an option for folks. and just again, reiterating that if we do you know, virtual and hybrid, that there's like an equal way to participate. And maybe there's a way to also do you know, something that engages some kind of like note taking or things that we could make available to the public about our discussions to also help increase engagement that way.

So those were some of the comments that I was thinking about. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Thanks Dominika. I appreciate that. And as far as the note taking, we do, we do provide transcripts and kind of summary notes for, for the meeting conversations. Not, not necessarily this one, but for most of our discussions as ACC, you know, sort of the, the sort of the business of the ACC.

We do, we do provide quite a bit of information about it. And, and sometimes in these zoom meetings we are actually able to provide the recording. So just to let you know that. but we'll we can always discuss that as an item at an ACC meeting if you'd like to bring it up and see that we.

Follow through with something like that, and that's fine. So, look forward to hearing more comments about that.

**Dominika Bednarska:** Yeah, I wasn't sure that those were, that those were made publicly available, so maybe I just wasn't aware of that. If that's the case, I apologize.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Yeah, it's, I, it's, it's on the, ACC, usually it's on the ACC website and, and there's also a couple other formats, but I'll, we'll clarify that at an upcoming meeting and be, yeah, be responsive with any questions you might have.

Okay. Thank you.

**Eugene Lozano:** Brad.

**Brad Morrison:** Yes.

**Eugene Lozano:** this is Gene Lozano because I tried to raise my hand, but because I'll be in on telephone.

**Brad Morrison:** That's okay. Gene,

**Eugene Lozano:** I'm sure the thing I'd ask I don't, I can't speak for the other outgoing members of the ACC. I'd like to see if we could be kept on the mailing list and be able to receive announcements of meetings and the supporting documentation sent out so we can stay involved and be a resource to DSA.

and you know, so I, I'd just like to see if that's, that will be a possibility for continue involvement. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Hey, great, Gene. Thanks. Good suggestion. I'll go ahead and make a note of it and we'll kind of come back to it at some point, but I think that that's a really good suggestion and we'll see what we can do.

Okay, thank you. Let's go to Dara

**Dara Schur:** I just wanted to support Gene's suggestion. I think it's an excellent one.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay, sounds good. Thanks, Dara. Appreciate that.

Okay. Looks like we're seeing everybody come back in. Just give it a minute or two.

**Kendra Muller:** Hi, Brad, this is Kendra. I was wondering if we would gain access to these PowerPoints.

**Brad Morrison:** Sure. would you like to, to see the entire presentation? Is that what you're asking, Kendra? Or do would you like to be on this control side? I'm not sure what...

**Kendra Muller:** I was just wondering if after the meeting or before the next meeting we could have a link to the PowerPoint presentation as well as the agenda.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. That sounds good. Yeah, that sounds great. We'll, we'll get that done. Let me write that down also to and you mean the agenda for the next meeting or the agenda for today's?

**Kendra Muller:** Not the agenda, I'm just saying it could be sent over with the agenda and the case.

**Brad Morrison:** Oh, with the next agenda. Sure. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

That's probably, that's probably what we'll do is probably email it out as a, as a file, and then that way we can get it to everybody easily. Okay. link to PowerPoint with agenda mailing. I'll, I'll just today with the agenda mailing. Okay, great. Thanks Kendra. Appreciate that.

All right. Why don't we go ahead and get started. I can see there's a few folks still maybe haven't come back in yet, but we'll, why don't we go ahead and get started with the next section of our agenda. this is the part where we're going to talk a little bit about the background of the ACC and, and our role here.

And in particular how our role is nested within the department of the state or the Division of the State Architect. So, it's, we can clarify some of these points. I'm going to open it up to questions too. So, if you'd like to ask a question on any particular part of the next part of the orientation just go ahead and use the raised hand function and you can just ask your question and we'll get to it as soon as we possibly can.

And you know, as soon as we see it pop up, actually we'll try and jump to it. Okay. So, let's just see. Does anybody have any questions before we start this part of the agenda?

Okay. And, and once again, our, our meeting is scheduled until 12. and we'll do our best to get there and meet that time requirement. So just in case you're wondering, this is, this is where we're going to go, and this is the last segment. Okay. All right. So not seeing any questions to start, let's just go ahead and jump into the purpose of the ACC.

As you can see from the slide on the screen the ACC is a consultative group to offer feedback on DSA new and amended proposed accessibility regulations in the Building Standards code. So, you can see that our role is consultative. our purpose is to offer feedback and largely what we do at the ACC meetings is focus on the code language which we'll be looking at shortly here.

But you'll be able to directly have input on that language make comments. We can have deep discussions. As you've heard, some of the outgoing members, there's a lot of sharing that goes on, a lot of sharing of both experience and knowledge of the codes. And it's a way to really sort of delve into these topics deeply.



So, so that's really our purpose here. And you can see here we're kind of fitting in the role that the DSA has within the building code process, which we'll go into a little bit more. Greg, can you roll the next slide? Okay. So, and, and the assumptions here that the ACC participants reflect a range of experience with code change.

Represent a broad spectrum of stakeholders are capable of and committed to working collaboratively and are able, and willing to engage their constituency group. So, with those four assumptions, let's just say that, you know, everybody here recognizes that they have that experience with code change and the code language.

The idea is that you're all representing a broad spectrum of stakeholders, whether it be from the building and construction community, or landlords or the, the code you know, the code checkers, the folks, I'm not clear on the word right now or, or folks from the disability community. So, so, and, and even, even constituencies within those communities.

So, the whole idea is that we, we, we respect your experience and we look forward to you sharing that with us. And hopefully we can provide a good environment where you're comfortable to bring your information forward. And in particular, that's the, that's the method that we use. The work, the whole idea of collaboration is mean that we're, means that we're all around the table working together and providing input as equals really, to, to really share on what.

What the problem is and how we can kind of you know you know, get that problem solved for the best of all. So, so that's the goal there of our collaborative experience, and we'll talk a little bit more about that what that means in just a little bit. And last but not least, we'd like to be able to have you share this information with your constituency groups, whoever they are, because their feedback is valuable as well.

So if you can share this information or share upcoming meeting information with your constituency group and get their feedback, that can be very, very helpful to what we exchange as members of the ACC. So we would encourage you to do that as much as possible before and after meetings so that you're able to kind of share what you, you've done and what you've learned, and then also to bring other concerns forward at either future meetings or independently if you think that it's necessary to get that information to the DSA.

So, so these are just some of the assumptions that we all work on here, and just wanted to kind of put those out there to share with you for any kind of discussion or comment that you might have. First up, I see Sue, do you have a comment?

**Susan Moe:** I just have a quick question. When we send out an email blast or a notification and give updates to people as to what's happening with the collaborative, would DSA prefer that we include in the email blast that we put out an email address where people could express their concerns directly to DSA, so it doesn't have to be filtered with through us.

We can just, we could do that, you know, just have people respond to us. But would DSA also like that? Like I said, when we send out an email blast, include an email address that they could send their information right to DSA.

**Brad Morrison:** Good question, Sue. Let's, let's ask Eric and Michelle see what they, their comment is Eric, Michelle, Ida.

Would anybody like to comment on that, on the whole idea of a, sort of a direct email address that?

**Michelle Davis:** DSA could discuss that and get back to you on that one, Sue?

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Thanks Michelle. Appreciate it.

**Eric Driever:** Sue. As you know, we, we do have an access triennial, or actually any, any rulemaking. We, we do have a, an active email address And I'm not I really don't think that we would prohibit anybody from emailing us. But certainly, want to keep you connected with your constituency too. So that's, that's really the primary connection that, the discussion that we want to have on that.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Thanks Eric. Appreciate it. Thank you. Sue, does it, you okay with that? Sound good?

**Susan Moe:** Yes. Yep.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay, great. Okay, good.

**Eric Driever:** We'll add that to our agenda for our meeting in August.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay, great. Thanks. Thanks, Eric. Thanks, Michelle. All right. So let's see. Greg, you want to roll the next slide? Okay, so now we're moving on to, so the rulemaking process for accessibility regulations.

And how about the next, in the next slide after this, the DSA role is one particular role within the, you know, the building standards code process. And our work as a collaborative is really, is ensconced within the DSA role. So that's why we're going to spend a little time kind of talking about where, where the DSA comes into the process and the next slide.

You can see we're there's two important code sections that we follow here. For the DSA Authority 4450 state architect shall develop and submit proposed building standards to the California Building Standards Commission for approval and adoption for making buildings, structures, sidewalks, curbs related facilities accessible and usable by persons with disabilities.

In 1995, the regulations adopting building standards necessary to implement interpreter, make specific provisions to this section shall be developed by the division of the state architect for public housing. and the next slide continues on with the, the authorities. DSA has the authority to write accessibility regulations for the built environment for public accommodations, commercial facilities, public buildings, and public housing within the state of California.

DSA is a regulatory agency and not an advocacy group. DSA develops accessibility regulations based on executive action, legislative mandate, or a demonstrated need identified by DSA or proposed by others. DSA is required by building standards law to evaluate the impact of the accessibility regulations on all stakeholders.

And DSA is only an enforcement entity for public schools, community colleges, state buildings, CSU, and UC. All other buildings and facilities are enforced by other entities, and which are usually the local building department. So you can see here that what we've kind of got here is really sort of the authority for DSA to act.

And, and that's why the ACC is here, is to help DSA act more effectively on their responsibilities. But you can see their, their, the discussions that we'll be having are mostly about public, public buildings and public facilities. Even though that the regulations may go beyond that that's going to be our focus in these meetings.

And, and, and relative to this is that DSA is a regulatory agency. So, so it's not necessarily that we're you know we, we want to hear from the advocacy agencies, and that's the role the ACC kind of brings to the table here. It gives DSA another level of input and maybe a little bit more direct with context that you've, you know, gotten from your, you know, feedback with your constituency groups.

That helps to make complete that picture and informs DSA so they can actually do a better job of getting that code language in there in the right way. and then we all know that that's so important. So, let's go on with the next slide. and now we're going to move into the code development process, and I'm going to ask Michelle Davis to help out here.

So Michelle, you want to take on the next few slides about code development?

**Michelle Davis:** Certainly. Thank you, Brad. the code development process is consistent it's on a three year cycle. With a, an intervening cycle that occurs in the 18 month, at the 18 month point. So, so really, it's, we have a big new code that comes out every three years, and then there's a period in the middle where we can and adopt additional regulations or make changes.

The two timelines that are shown on your screen are for the past adoption cycles. The 2024 cycle hasn't been adopted yet, and we are currently just getting to the end stage of the 2022 intervening code cycle. Some of you may know that the Building Standards Commission is meeting next week and we'll hear proposals.

So, it, it is been through quite a vetting process already, and we're getting to the end stage. Where you fall into this process is you're typically, the ACC is typically at the beginning of the vetting stage. We work very hard to not have unintended consequences with the building code. Your input as an ACC member is critical to make sure that there are no unintended consequences.

So, this just gives you an idea of the process. It, it is lengthy. It is lengthy on purpose because we need to hear from all stakeholders. Next slide please.

**Eric Driever:** I could maybe pause on that. So just if you could, Greg, go back to the previous slide. Okay. Thank you. So the, the triennial cycle is to adopt model code, for those of you who are not frequent users of the code, the model code is the international building code, and it is on a three year cycle. And so the intervening cycle is also sometimes called supplementary. And so it, it creates supplements to the triennial code, but the, the three year cycle is primarily to adopt the model code and then we do enter into the supplemental, the intervening code cycle to, to create supplements.

And I think everything else shall send is completely accurate.

Thanks.

**Michelle Davis:** Thank you, Eric. Okay, now we can go to the next slide. So, there are criteria, there are rules that are set by the legislature that, that are in statute that guide our work. We cannot propose building standards that conflict with overlap or duplicate other building standards.

They have to be within the parameters established by the enabling legislation. So when we said that DSA has the authority to, to set standards for certain building types, we have to stay within our authority. The public interest requires the adoption of the building standards, including but not limited to, health and safety, resource sufficiency, fire safety, seismic safety.

Building and building system performance and consistency with environmental public health and accessibility statutes and regulations. So obviously there are specific access regulations that we have to comply with, but also health and safety certainly comes into play as well as fire safety for, for a lot of our proposals, the proposed building standards cannot be unreasonable, arbitrary, unfair, or capricious in whole or in part.

And this again goes back to we have to confer with all the stakeholders.

The standards have to have a cost that is reasonable for the public to incur.

Obviously, that's something that some people think is what one person defines as reasonable is, is different for every other person. but it's based on the overall benefit to be derived from the standards. The proposed standards cannot be unnecessarily

ambiguous or vague in whole or in part we strive for specificity which gets down to the, the code language itself.

Greg, could you move on to the next slide? We are required to apply the appropriate national specifications, public standards and model codes were appropriate.

If those elements do not adequately address the goals, then we're required to make a statement defining the inadequacy. Which is, is mostly at our end here in the office. but the ACC would certainly be informed of that and would be able to provide additional input. If there is no national specification, standard or model code.

Then we prepare a statement that informs the Building Standards Commission, and we submit that statement with the proposal.

Our format is required to be consistent with the standards already adopted by the commission. So, we are not allowed to, you know, just decide we're going to remember the whole chapter 11B all at once. unless there is a good reason, they did that in 2010. and I think we're going to stick with that.

It's a good system. The proposed building standards, if they promote fire and panic safety as determined by the State Fire Marshal, have the written approval of the State Fire Marshal. if you look at our current proposals there was several that covered emergency egress and those had to be reviewed and approved by the State Fire Marshal before we could move forward.

So, these are some, some of the rules that govern our work and provide us guidance in what we can and cannot do. So please keep them in mind as you move forward. And next slide, please, Greg.

There are key provisions in government code section 113460.36 that help us assess the benefits and costs of proposed regulations.

We have to assess non-monetary benefits as well, such as protection of public health and safety, the perfection of discrimination, which is required by statute, promotion of fairness, or social equity.

All of those are covered by statute determining the impact of a regulatory proposal on this overall state economy, on businesses and the public welfare. We are also required to determine the cost of enforcement and compliance to the agencies that have to oversee the regulations and to affected business enterprises and individuals.

That is the end of my section, and Richard has his hand up. Did you have something you wanted to say, Richard?

**Richard Skaff:** Yes, I do. thank you, Ida. the nine-point criteria and the state mandates in many cases are, are arbitrary and in my mind, capricious. They, they

allow for decision making, that can be done without any basis. In fact. And in fact, that is exactly what's been done in the past, not with you Ida, but your predecessor.

I'll again, use the table's mandate that we had for years that was taken out. You have a clear road to bring that before the Building Standards Commission where a federal standard does not exist for non-fixed tables, dining, banquet, and bar tables. It's appropriate to put it there. It has never been a cost issue.

It is something that restaurants and businesses with food tables and bar tables have done for years, never with any concern about the cost. I, I don't know what his reasoning was, and that's just one of many. If this is, as I was saying in my earlier comment, there are a number of issues that need to go back to the legislature.

The nine-point criteria needs to go back and more detailed and, and appropriate language must be incorporated and the arbitrary language removed. That's subjective.

**Eric Driever:** So, Brad. Brad, why we, yeah,

**Brad Morrison:** Eric, go ahead.

**Eric Driever:** I'll just take a moment. So the, that point criteria is not for DSA under DSA authority that is regulated or managed. The rulemaking process is managed and directed towards Building Standards Commission. I, I would suggest, and, and I, I also won't speak to, to maybe what's happened in years past.

I can only speak to what will occur with DSA currently and moving forward. And, and all of those justifications that are provided by DSA to the building standards, relating to the proposals that will move forward are made public. The nine-point criteria analysis, all, all of that is made public and, and certainly this group is happy to review.

It is not something that we typically undertake as a collaborative. that is, those, many of those docents and justifications are offered by DSA. It is, they're not offered devoid of input however in our collaboration with this group. So, we certainly take input during those. But the actual language provided as part of the nine-point criteria, justice justifications, and then some of the financial documentation that's provided to DOF we certainly take under consideration that the discussions we've had through this collaboration, but don't actively collaborate on those docents.

It's primarily the language that we'll be focused on.

**Brad Morrison:** Thanks for bringing that point in, Eric. Okay. Dara I

**Dara Schur:** Just wanted to say one of the things I find very frustrating about the nine-point criteria is there are no criteria that you can check if you're opposing a

change. So, to explain why it's a problem, but just, just to, I agree that they are challenging.

I, I just wanted to say I have to get off, but for another commitment, but thank you all and I look forward to working with you in a variety of context. Take care. Thank you,

**Brad Morrison:** Dara, Appreciate it. Appreciate your, your input over these years. It's been awesome.

**Dara Schur:** Thank you. Bye

**Brad Morrison:** Bye-Bye. Richard, can we follow up with you? Did you hear Eric's comment and can we follow up with you on your comments? Yes.

**Richard Skaff:** I apologize for my interruption there. you know, I, I, I understand that DSA does not control the language in either the state legislative mandate or the nine-point criteria, but I think the state architect can have input to the Building Standards Commission and the state legislature.

And Ida, you do have a way to go to the state legislature when needed. There is a process but first we should be going to the Building Standards Commission to talk about the arbitrary and capricious at, as Dara so rightly described, the lack of why someone at DSA or the other code writing agencies decide they can or cannot do something based on the nine-point criteria or the legislative mandate.

So I, I'm, I'm, I don't accept that we should do just DSA work here and not look any farther. The whole point of this access collaborative should be collaborating on finding solutions. And one of the solutions that has to happen is change in the mandated language that defines how the code writing agencies create and get code access code adopted.

And that presently is an outrageous and I'd say discriminatory and not intentionally on DSA's part, but it whatever. The reason, the nine-point criteria and the other mandates in many cases are allow the continuation of discrimination. And that's not acceptable and I can't accept that.

So, I I'm hoping, I, I'm hoping that the two of you with members of the ACC will approach the Building Standards Commission and then the legislature to find solutions that will actually provide access in the built environment that we do not have right now. And in some cases, we had but was taken away. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay, thanks Richard. Appreciate your comments. And we'll move on to the source, the, the code development process. You can see there's a number of inputs here in the, the sources of the code change proposals. It can come from the state legislature, man or legislative mandate. it can come from a change to federal standards, it can be stakeholder initiated.

And you can see there, there's a link right there at a DSA form 665, which means that any member of the public or individual members of the ACC can initiate changes to the code process. And just by following the process that, that starts with that Form 665. it can be staff initiated by folks at the DSA.

And it can also come about through technological advancements. I just like the one we're, we're working off of right now. And last but not least, a petition and a petition emerging somewhere from, from one of the, the input processes. So, so you can see there's a number of ways that that information gets to the code.

And part of this is really important to recognize is that you have a role in initiating that if you'd like as a member of the public or a member of the ACC and there's a process there for that. At the same time, you can be reviewing this information that has come from these multiple sources.

So just want to put that information out there as part of sort of the, the landscape of how change is initiated to the code in general. next slide, Greg. So, what's the demonstrated need for the co-development process? Well, there's a need for clarity. Clarity of the regulations will be lead to better enforcement and the results of the required accessibility.

And I think clarity was a point that's come up earlier. I think Tim and others mentioned that clarity is key. And so, getting these regulations right is very important. And in the, you know, one suggestion that was made earlier, I think by Tim was the whole idea of having somebody with English language skill to be participant in the process.

So, we can kind of even define the language even better. The need for scoping the regulation identifies the accessibility required and frequently used elements, which the federal standards do not adequately address. So, so the scoping really indicates that where California continues to lead in this area, we can define that and scope it out as best as possible in, in the absence of any other direction from the federal codes.

And last but not least, the need for enforceability, the regulation must be able to be enforced by the enforcement entity. And this is, this is where the code enforcement folks come in and they need to have clear you know, regulations to explain to their consumers and to be able to back that up and to, to take action when necessary, based upon that code language.

So, enforceability becomes key. So, so these are the, these are the demonstrated needs behind the code development process. And it's not just it's not something that's created out of whimsy. There's very, very clear process here, very and these identified needs just really kind of reinforce that. next slide, Greg.

Okay, so you can see this is this, this graphic in this slide here is meant to show the ACC role in the pre cycle activity as it was mentioned earlier. We start out early in the process and you know, and once the, you know, you can see how we can work



from working from left to right, you can see that the demonstrated need is enunciated.

DSA confers and plays a role in developing the proposal. That proposal goes into the ACC process, which is a refinement process to try and determine, you know, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this language? Where can we better you know, make it clear, make it more enforceable? And so all those kind of comments come up in the process.

They go back to DSA, which works on the, the re-defining the regulation and refining it as best as they can. There also is an element of public outreach that occurs so that the public has a opportunity to comment and then it'll come back to the ACC for further, for further, you know, further look and more development if necessary before it goes on to the next stage, which is leaving DSA as a code proposal that goes over to the BSC code advisory committee.

So you can see our role in the process as members of the ACC is really to work on that clarity and, and it's a continuous loop so that DSA has an opportunity to go away, create the language, consider all of the factors that they have to do as part of their responsibility, and then return it to the ACC for further review.

So, you may get one or two looks at these changes before they actually move anywhere, but the process is meant to be thorough and, and really have as much input as possible, including elements of public outreach where that's feasible. Okay. So that's the, that's the, the ACC role. And we just want to make that clear where, where you fit in this process and why the more, particularly why the ACC is designed the way it is.

It's meant to be people who can sit down and really work through this code language and bring a variety of experiences to the table so that as much. You know, as much insight as possible is developed through the process itself. And that's, that's your role. And that's really where I think the outgoing members have shown that they're, you know they not only contributed a lot, but they also learn from the process as well, because it's very, very detailed and very, very thorough.

Not only that, but it's also got lots of different elements where things are revised and returned so that you can actually see what's been changed or what changes are taking place in the interim between meetings. So just to kind of keep you aware of that Greg, you want to hit the next slide?

Okay. And so there's another role the ACC plays a little later in the process as part of the, ACC formal rulemaking. And so comments are received from the BSC Code Advisory committee, return to DSA, DSA contemplates, you know, what's the next action going to be? And feeds it into the ACC cycle for refinement.

As you can see, it's the same loop, it's the same thing that you may see the same code change come back your way one or two times just in terms of this process re of refinement before it actually leaves as a refined code proposal and works its way to

the Building Standards Commission and then becomes regulation as part of that process.

So, you can see we fit within this rulemaking process that the Building Standards Commission has set up. And the information is really kind of our responsibility to refine as best as possible while it's in the, in the jurisdiction of the DSA. So that's, that's the process there. I don't know if you have any questions or if the graphic brings this information to light in a new way, but if you do have questions, please, please offer them and we'll answer them as best we can.

Greg, you want to go to the next slide? Okay. I think I'm going to let Michelle take this on. This is actually what we look at the ACC meetings. This is an example pulled from a language from a code change from a couple years ago. And this is just an idea of like what you might see in terms of revised text.

And there are some intricate parts of this that I want Michelle to explain a little bit better, just so you have an idea of what you're looking at and how best to work with it. Michelle, you want to take that one on?

**Michelle Davis:** Sure. Thanks. sorry we got kicked out there briefly. So, we're back.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay.

**Michelle Davis:** So, when we write proposals up, it has very specific formatting that helps everyone understand what is model code language, what is California's specific language, what is new, what is perhaps removed.

So we always format our proposals by, first we will say the current code language and that will be in the first section of the proposal document. this one had a proposal for residential facilities. I'm not going to read it because it's not all that important. but you can see that the section number and title is in bold.

The remaining the actual text of the code, you'll see that some of it is in standard lettering vertical and some of it is in italicized lettering. The standard lettering is directly from the model code, which in our case is the 2010 ADA standards. So, the federal language and where California has made changes, we italicize that text.

So, for example the model code, the ADA standards is section 203.8, but California, because we have a whole building code we have to place it in a chapter. So 11B or chapter 11B is italicized. So that's how you read the language there. Then in our code proposals, the next section we, we show you what the suggested text of the change is.

We do that by striking through any language that's removed and there at the second end of the second and beginning of the third line of text, you can see that chapter 11 a division four, has been stricken through it, it is proposed to be removed, and the following text is underlined. The underlined text is proposed new language.

So, we were in this case proposing to remove a general reference to Chapter 11A and we were inserting specific references to 11B sections. So that's how you, you read what's happening. And then for just for extra clarity if the code gets adopted we give you a section on what it will read once the change is complete.

And that's the code text if adopted section. So, there we no longer have the ~~strikeout~~ and underline. We simply have. removed the language that we want to remove and inserted the proposed language. This all helps make it very easy to, well, we hope it makes it easy to follow what the proposal is. The rationale for the proposed change is always at the end of the proposal document, we, we tell you something about why this is occurring so that that's how you read it.

This is very consistent. If you go back to old proposals, you would be able to see that it's been done like this for many years and it just, it leads to clarity so that we can all reasonably discuss what we're going to be talking about. next slide. Or, Eric, did you want to say something?

**Eric Driever:** Go back to that slide.

Sure. So again, just recognizing that we have varied code users and experience in the room. The, the center section suggested text to proposed amendment is in the rulemaking process called express terms. and that takes shape in various forms throughout the rulemaking process. It starts out as an IET which is Initial Express.

Thank you. I going for the Initial Express Terms. It makes its way once it goes to the Building Standards Commission as an FET, Final Express Terms rationale. While DSA has in practice always created a, a docent similar to what you're looking at here, where we, we present current suggested and if adopted language along with a rationale.

For the Building Standards Commission, that usually is taking shape in a different format that we that we provide to them and for the public. And it's usually an independent documents the express terms docents, and then the rationale makes its way into what's called a Statement of Reasons docent or an F or an ISOR.

Those are docents that you'll undoubtedly get used to and acronyms you'll undoubtedly get used to hearing. FSOR, ISOR, IET, FET, all of that. We, we kick around pretty regularly here. and I'm sure you'll become accustomed to that over time but know that when we're presenting to you and that actually we provided to Building Standards Commission as well.

A separate docent such as what you're looking at here now. Now it's not in wide PowerPoint format, it's an eight and a half by 11 letter format. But we do present a single docent with all four of these sections in it to make it more user friendly for the public.

**Michelle Davis:** Do we have an acronym analyst that-

**Eric Driever:** I think it's Appendix A.

We, we are actually in the process of, of creating that as a formal form within DSA. BSC Building Standards Commission really has always favored the fact that we have done that. They have stuck short of requiring it as a docent for other, a rulemaking agencies. They, they have to recognize that there are many rulemaking agencies that, that may not have the same practice, but we certainly provided to them and to the public.

Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Eric. Thanks Michelle. Michelle want to go ahead?

**Michelle Davis:** Sure. There are several questions that we have to consider during the code development process. First of all, we have to ask, is it an enforcement, an operational or regulatory issue? We have to ask if advocacy or training can produce the re desired result. To address the need, we have to determine if a building code regulation will actually address the problem.

And is that regulation able to be enforced? Will the regulation create unintended and potentially negative consequences? As I said before, you all play a big role in that. is the regulation reasonable to all who are impacted? So that is why we have a variety of stakeholders here. We, we need all voices involved in the regulation development.

**Brad Morrison:** Hold on one sec. Let's take a, Richard has a question. Let's take Richard's question before we go on to the next slide. Go ahead.

**Richard Skaff:** I, I just wanted, again, note looking at least item five and item six in my mind, both are arbitrary and capricious. Who makes that decision and what are the steps to do that, that are not arbitrary and capricious?

What, what will assure that whoever's making that decision won't be influenced by one or the other party? Involved that just either wants a certain access feature without any care about unintended effects, or somebody who just doesn't want access. And we know that there are a few of those folks, I'm not accusing anybody here at ACC, but I'm saying in industries there are many who would rather Title 24, and the Americans with Disabilities Act standards were never created.

So, you know, I again say we are creating or not creating based on arbitrary and capricious situations. Thank you.

**Michelle Davis:** A great question, Richard. And that is one of the main reasons why we take public comments. It is a very public decision-making process and all the public comments we are required to respond to, and we are required to publish them.

Which is probably something that you should all be aware of, as an ACC member. If you don't know this, if you do make a public comment your name and the comment is required to be published. So that is the process. We have a process where any citizen, any constituent is permitted to have their voice heard if they choose to do so.

**Richard Skaff:** Ida if I may speak again. Brad.

**Brad Morrison:** Michelle. Richard. Richard. Richard. That's Michelle. You're speaking to in this, on this, there's Michelle and Eric are in the same office at the DSA. So, it's Michelle like, yeah, go ahead, Richard.

**Richard Skaff:** I've been doing this for over 40 years. Ida, I, I have been before every State Architect.

I've been part of almost every single State Architects advisory committee. As I said earlier, almost all the code writing agencies I've written code for and been a part of their advisory committees. I, I have watched the few of us that have made public comment because most of the general public, including people with disabilities, as you quite well know, don't get involved.

But to suggest that, oh, well, DSA and the other code writing agencies take public comment and that's what balances everything out, is spacious. That that's incorrect. It does not have any effect, or it has very little effect. It was only when we brought a hundred or 200 people to a building standards commission that we were able to have an effect.

And that was an overwhelming process and not a process conducive to every single proposed code change. There's no way that a few of us can do that on a regular basis. We paid to have those people transported up to Sacramento from the Bay Area. We paid for attendance, we paid for their lunch. I'm not complaining, I'm just stating we had to go to extraordinary measures.

And it was only when there were extraordinary measures that we were successful. We have regularly given testimony at every single building Standards Commission with the Building Standards Commission voting against us, and we have one person out of 11 on the Building Standards Commission representing people with disabilities.

That's not very representative as far as I'm concerned, as it relates to access codes. I don't care about the rest of the codes, but as far as access codes, having one out of 11 people on the Building Standards Commission that might consider voting for what we're asking for, that's not representative.

And for having our ability to get one or two people up to Sacramento to interact with the Building Standards Commission when DSA and the other code writing agencies are making their presentations is, as you've seen, as everybody's seen, not a

successful process for us. We've had to fight for every single thing we've had, and as I've said multiple times today, look at what we've lost during the previous eight years.

Your predecessor was in control in the state architect's office, so I don't accept that. I, I, I'm not angry with you. I'm angry with a process that is, that has been so arbitrary and capricious and stacked against us that we haven't got what we need and what we had, we've lost. Like the shower and the dining banquet and bar tables among others.

And an engineered wood fiber ground surface that, that is impossible to use yet is being put in schools all over the state, even though we've shown over and over again, including a video from one of the manufacturers of it engineered wood fiber, showing kids having problems using it, a video by one of the manufacturers at one of the access advisory committees.

And you were there, I believe Ida, yet that's still there. So that tells you, or tells me at least, that having public comment, the, the ability to comment and give our input has not had the kind of effect we had hoped at all. Thank you.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Thanks Richard. Appreciate it. Eric, Michelle, I see your hands up.

Would you like to comment?

**Eric Driever:** Yeah. I'll, I'll just clear up for the record. Richard, thank you for your comments. again, Ida is not currently in the meeting. I believe she had a separate meeting. To my right is Michelle Davis, supervising architect at DSA headquarters. So, appreciate the comments. and, and I, in the interest of time, probably shouldn't spend too much time going too far off topic.

Certainly, valuable input. I, I will say, just in defense of the process I would hope that Richard and others that have been on the journey through the 2002 Intervening Cycle have experienced. positive changes to regulations. It, it was a pretty extensive process and one in which we hope to build upon and expand as we can moving into the next Triennial Cycle. So for I want to just make note of our time. It is 11:26. We, we do need to get through the presentation.

We will have an opportunity to have robust discussions in our next meeting as it will be planned, as it is planned for August 15<sup>th</sup>, from nine to three. So, we'll have an extended period of time for which we can have a lot of these really robust discussions if needed and have greater, response back and forth in those meetings.

So maybe we could try to stay on track. That would be very much appreciated. and, and again, respectful of others' times.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Thank you, Eric. Appreciate it.

**Eric Driever:** Thanks, Brad.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay, Michelle, go ahead.

**Michelle Davis:** Hey, well the test process and, and some of this you will be involved in, and some of this happens behind the scenes.

We look to see if any proposed issues are already addressed in the building code somewhere, recognizing that people who proposed code changes may not be code experts. That's our job to make sure that it isn't already addressed somewhere, or if it is addressed, we check to see if it's adequately addressed.

So, then we ask would a new CBC regulation address the issue? And can that regulation be enforced by the building department? Richard has brought up dining tables. Unfortunately, loose dining tables are not enforceable by a building department. There might be other avenues, so it has to be something that is within DSA enforcement authority.

When we look at code development we look at who may be the issue to be referred for action. We collaborate with other agencies, the California Commission on Disabled Access, CCDA, the Department of Rehabilitation, DOR, the Department of Education. There are other agencies obviously I mentioned the, the State Fire Marshal earlier.

So there is a collaborative process that happens all the way through the code development process. Next slide.

Typically, DSA shares draft priorities with the ACC for feedback and certainly the ACC may present proposals for DSA to consider. We said earlier that the general public can present proposals as well, so you'd have the ability to tell constituents that they're able to present proposals. It's not necessarily beneficial to have many people propose the same thing.

That tends to cloud the, the process. We do conduct public workshops to consider code proposals. Some of our members who have been on a while have been in meetings where the ACC meetings are public and there are people listening in. DSA will then finalize its priority list for each code cycle and plans for how and when the ACC will assist in development.

We then collaboratively discuss and deliberate the individual proposals and come to a consensus on recommendations. The ACC works to provide input and feedback on proposals as they move through the code cycle. As we said before, the ACC is at the beginning stages so your feedback can inform changes to the language.

That was certainly the case during the current code cycle where the ACC was able to give very valuable feedback and we proposed additional language or we made

changes to the language based directly on the ACC input. So, it's very valuable, a very important part of the process.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Thanks Michelle. Appreciate that. Richard, do you wanna make a quick comment before we get onto the next section?

**Richard Skaff:** yes. I have a comment about what Michelle just said about the fact or her belief or someone at DSA's belief that accessible tables, dining banquet, and bar tables are not enforceable.

I, I, I'd only ask Michelle, have you ever been a building official? I have, I have trained building officials through CALBO as a member for almost 20 years. I have asked building officials to enforce the tables requirement and they have enforced it. I don't know where the concept that accessible tables can't be enforced.

You could, I guess, say that about accessible toilets or door force or striping on stairs, or let's just take out Title 24 because it's not enforceable. I don't, I, I can't believe a statement like that came from a person from DSA.

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

**Eric Driever:** Thanks for, for your comment. We can probably have a more in, in depth discussion about those topics at our next meeting. I, I think you'll be pleased with the agenda for our next meeting once, once we get it out there.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thanks Richard. Thanks Eric. Appreciate it. Okay, so let's talk a little bit about collaboration.

Many of you probably heard the word collaboration and maybe had some experiences working with other groups that were part of collaboration you know, organized collaboratives and it really, the term, when we break it down, really collaboration means working together. so, so here are some guidelines for engagement.

When we talk about collaboration, some of the things you can do to help everybody be engaged in the process and during the meeting is make room for everyone to talk and share the talk time. So, so the whole idea is that everybody's got an opportunity to say what they need to say. And, and so that's certainly part of my role, but it's also part of, I think what DSA is trying to achieve here as well.

That we are trying to get everybody even the most minority of viewpoints to, to be able to kind of express themselves in this process and be able to comment on those code proposals as they come through. So it, you know when, when we do this, it's something we're always looking for and we just want to make sure that you understand that we are trying to make that opportunity real for everyone in, you know, it's good idea in, this context, in the, in the context of collaboration to speak from your own experience.



And so, I think we've heard many people today talk from their experience and, and talk quite well, and you can see how that changes the dialogue in terms of what we're trying to say. And, and not only say to the general folks, you know, the sort of the general experience of communicating at the meeting, but also to relate to one another with what we're trying to say.

So, using your own experience as a grounding tool helps us to really understand better what your perspective is and how we might respond to that. So, and not only that, authentically engaging in opportunities to connect, share, and learn. So, this is really a nice way of saying that we're just really all here to provide the, you know, the best version of ourself and be able to engage, you know, with others to be able to discuss these code proposals and do the best we can with them.

And last but not least, recognize that we share the success of, of a completed. You know, proposal. When that proposal finally gets through and it goes on to the Building Standards Commission and becomes part of the building code, we can all share in that success and recognize that our time and commitment was worth it while we worked through that process.

But in order to do that, we have to, to, to cooperatively engage with the process that's before us. And really, and that is really commenting on those existing codes and what, what is to be done about them in terms of our responsibility. Okay, Greg, next slide. So one of the things that we do here, and this is out of respect for everybody who shares their time on the ACC is that we work towards consensus.

Consensus is probably the most probably the best decision-making method that there is. you know, many people think that voting is a, is a, a great decision-making process and it's a great voting is a great alternative to consensus. But consensus is probably something that you know, it's, it's conveyed in the in a, an environment like ours, which is a, a closed environment.

The ACC is meant to be sort of a, a room full of people commenting on these codes. And we all understand where each other is are coming from, and the whole idea is that we can spend a little bit more time understanding the, the differences that we might have in a particular proposal and what we can do to fix it to make that decision acceptable to everyone at the table.

So, so consensus is something that we will, will spend a little bit more time when it comes to decisions. We'll engage a little bit more dialogue. We'll take what we need to kind of accomplish each and every code, code proposal that's right before us and do the best we can with it. And when you come to a decision in consensus, it's not always about agreeing fully.

You can come to a point where you, you know, if your input's heard and you've seen changes to the, to the original statement that, that you can reflect upon and say, you know, it's not perfect, but I can live with it. That is really one of the ways that we get through the consensus process. So, if you can see an opportunity that you've, you know, made your voice heard and you've tried to you know, have your effect on the

regulation, and maybe it didn't go as far as you would like it to, but it did make some progress, and you can say that honestly, everything considered, I can still support this.

It may not be perfect, but, you know, I can always come back later with my other points and, and add them at a later time and see that that change is affected fully as far as my perspective. But for now, I can let this decision go because I can, you know, I support it the way it is and, and it may be as simply as saying "it's the best solution for us at this time."

So, so that's really what we're trying to do, to do when we really work for consensus. And you may see us taking a little longer on a decision process that this is the end goal. The end goal is to make it work for everyone in the room. And that's why you're here and that's why you're part of this process.

Greg, next slide. And here, you know here are some values about collaboration. Again, it's an abstract term. we're not always used to working in a, in a collaborative way, but really, collaboration really means that we expect full participation. So, we really like to hear from people to bring their perspective to recognize their point of view and to, to recognize what impact it's having on the process as it moves forward.

So, we really want to be able to, to engage fully from everybody. We want to work towards mutual understanding, which is not only what I understand and what you understand, but what we both understand together, having checked that out. So, we can ask questions to do this. we can maybe relate personal experiences.

We can share understanding we can put forward language to, to kind of express ourselves. All these are ways of us gaining mutual understanding. But really that's again, the, one of the, the values behind collaboration and why we spend the time working together in this forum. It's also important that we recognize we're looking for inclusive solutions, which in this case means that they're responsible to the needs shared.

And that's, you know, we, we maybe take a look at a proposed code change and recognize that this is, you know, meant to be inclusive. But we really don't know until we have the feedback from the ACC how responsive it was to the needs share. And there may be that new needs emerge as part of that discussion.

So that's where the ACC is invaluable, by bringing up new information and maybe changing, changing language around so that it is more inclusive. Cause that is really the goal here of our collaborative activity. And last but not least, that really that we all have a shared responsibility in the outcome.

So it's, it's incumbent upon each member of the ACC to speak up and to, to share the information that their constituents have shared with them or that they would like to have, have heard at this meeting. So that, that you're able to fully present that, that perspective and, and put it into the room with the other perspective so that we can all kind of get the best outcome for everyone at this time.

And recognize too that it's a shared responsibility for us all to communicate the information that we have so that we can re private that outcome. So that's, those are the values behind collaboration that's simply there just to kind of, kind of take away maybe the, some of the unknowns about working in this environment.

Okay. Next one. All right. So we have the, ACC has a charter and we're going to probably delve into that a little bit more in the next meeting. So we're not going to take that on as part of this, this orientation, but there is a charter that, that governs the work of the ACC and would recommend that you all take a look at it before the next meeting so that we're able to kind of delve into it a little bit deeper and to make some adjustments as needed and as can be done in that time.

So let me just turn this over to Eric at this point and see if you, Eric, has any comments on the charter and perhaps then the agenda for the next meeting. Go ahead Eric.

**Eric Driever:** Sorry about that. Have to unmute. yeah, I the, the charter is available on the webpage, and I believe in the chat forgetting who, who had posted a link to the DSA ACC website. But on that website there are the transcripts of previous meetings. along with agendas, but at the bottom of the website, you'll also find a copy of the charter.

I would encourage you to, to review it prior to the next meeting, but there's also a uc Davis study that was used prior to the creation of the charter. And, you know, we, we've heard from some of the founding members of the ACC as they were imparting some of their wisdom. they, they were involved some of you were involved in that process and through the UC, Davis, through the ability and the lessons we learned and information we learned through the UC Davis study, the charter was developed.

And so while we are suggesting that we can adjust the charter certainly for current issues such as virtual versus hybrid type meetings that that type of information exists in the charter, we're also as suggested earlier, going

to be adding formally the additional ex officio positions to those agencies that we discussed earlier. But we won't be making broad changes to, to the charter. The, the core intent of the ACC remains. and I, I know we there have been some comments about what the ACC's role should be or should not be. the ACC is not and I want, I want to carefully state this so as to not have it be misconstrued.

The ACC is, is not an advocacy, does not at its core have an advocacy element to it. Certainly, advocacy is what we're interested in learning from those advocates on the ACC and your constituencies, but as it, it does not have a chairperson. it does not, the ACC is not intended to be an organization that supports a letter to the legislature, so to speak.

As individuals, we absolutely support your advocacy and would never support any, any silencing of that advocacy to your legislature. We, we fully support your ability to do that. I'm just suggesting that as a, as a group that is not the intent of this, this

collaborative. we are here purely to receive information and recommendations from this group on proposed changes and look to that really fine collaboration to make adjustments to those proposals as well as hear recommendations from you on, on things that could work better in, in the regulation.

We are absolutely open to hearing that from this group. but I just wanted to make the distinction on, on a couple of things. One, the, the, the core concept of the charter and purpose of the, of the ACC is not being proposed to be changed in our next meeting. and I know we sort of toyed or there were some comments around the period, of whether or not the, or what the purpose of the ACC is.

And, and it's primarily for receiving input on rule making processes and respect all of your opinions greatly. so and, and I'm just, so, I guess I was just trying to set the table for our next meeting. I didn't want I didn't want to set up any false expectations on. what we are intending to do with the next charter.

I think we are going to have a very full agenda for our next meeting. I might suggest that we, we could create a doodle poll. I, I heard everybody's input on hybrid versus telework. If, if you've been following the Bagley Keene, which is the public meeting law, this collaborative is not held to those standards.

However, Bagley Keene, there is a current piece of legislation that is proposing to make adjustments to Bagley Keene. Certainly there was a temporary pause put on public meetings. you know, having open specific in-person meetings. Bagley Keene is moving more towards a hybrid situation. And I, I think we can certainly consider that for this or for this group too.

There's a lot of ways that we could facilitate that hybrid nature. DSA has the ability to host specific satellite locations, if needed. we certainly would be open to folks meeting from the comfort of their home if that's best served. I would also note that in the past, DSA is able to reimburse expenses.

I know there was a couple of comments about cost being an issue for travel. Those travel expenses are included in the charter when you see it. and we do not have any intention of changing that should there be an in-person hybrid solution proposed as part of the charter ions. things for you to consider moving forward, but again, just kind of wanted to baseline our next meeting a little bit.

**Brad Morrison:** Thanks for the clarification, Eric. Would you just repeat for, there was a question that came up in the chat about the UC Davis study being online. Could you just repeat where that is on the website? I saw that Sean has a link down there and I, I just want you to clarify that just before we leave the topic here, the, this is a regards to the UC Davis study before the collaborative was created.

**Eric Driever:** Sure. Let me bring it up on our, on my side screen here so that I can describe it to you. and, you know, I'll, I'll apologize. Michelle is a much better public speaker than I am especially in this context. She speaks very crisply, cleanly, and slowly. I have a tendency to speed up, slow down, fluctuate my, tone a little bit.

One thing I've learned over the past year and a half plus is that, or I'm trying to learn is that for transcription, it's really important as we go into these meetings that, that you speak clearly and with, with a precise pace. So I'll try to be better about that. as I described the, the location to you let me, Greg, I don't know if you have the ability to find it quickly.

I'm just going to have to go to the UC search. If you go to the, the DSA webpage and up in the upper right there's a search bar. If you search for the ACC there's a lot of posts about current memberships, things like that. For me, the, at the very bottom of the first page, there's an access collab code collaborative link, which I follow.

And at the very bottom there, there are some, what we call accordions, which are the blue bars. Which you can expand that have various pieces of information and links. And the very bottom, at the very bottom there is a history of the ACC accordion bar. If you expand that, there's a link to the UC DE study online survey.

I didn't find it, so I believe that is where it's at. Correct? Yeah. So that's uc Davis extension study that was conducted. And you can find that through that link.

I would provide a direct link, however, accordions or not.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. That sounds good. And I think there's also one in the chat too, so I think we're, we're looking, it's looking pretty good there. Alright, thank you.

**Eric Driever:** Yeah, the accordions are not separate web pages and so I, I, we can't provide a direct link to it. although actually I might be able to, I can probably copy the hyperlink and paste it in. Let me see if I can do that. The chat, Greg just did it. Thank you, Greg.

**Brad Morrison:** Great. Great. Thanks Greg. Thanks Eric. Thanks Michelle. Okay, so Greg, you want to just go onto the last slide? And we'll just kind of provide a little context for the charter.

The charter is the governing docent here, and, and really you know, really it's going to act as sort of the guideposts of, of what our role is here. And so you can see the purpose of the charters to act as a contracted engagement between the key stakeholders tells us how to act, how to be, you know, part of the meeting and what we're there to do.

It defines the main stakeholders and the organizational structure as we've, as we've talked about today. You know, you are all here as part of a deliberate process that evaluated qualifications and brought you on as to sort of the best, best person for the position on the, ACC. And then we are governed by our organ organizational structure.

Our process is nested within the DSA role, within the building code development process. So, we have a, we have a, a very defined role. And so the collaboration that

we encourage at the meeting, you know, and working together process is really about how best can we do, can we affect the thing that's in front of us?

And the thing that's in front of us is a code change proposal. It's language. And so that's how we spend our meetings. Is, is on that one slide that Michelle explained earlier, really looking at the docent, thinking about it, is it clear is it effective? Is it enforceable? There's many questions that come up as part of our discussion and, and certainly that's where the conversation begins.

And this can go on for some time for some of these proposals because there's also other things affected by them. So, so the, the idea is to have a rich discussion and really, but keep it within our you know, our defined area, defined by that organizational structure for the ACC. So, we have a lot of support to kind of show the stakeholder efforts.

The meeting notes are there. The, sometimes the recordings of meetings are available. Sometimes you know, we've got an interpreted kind of transcript that comes up. So, we have many different ways to kind of docent those efforts to show that that points have been made. And, and certainly everything heard in the meetings is written down and, and exercised by DSA to the best of their you know, the best of their ability before they bring it back to the ACC for further review.

So, that, is our charter also defines the length of service. You can see that you're here as part of a, a limited term and you know, and that speaks for itself. you know, we expect those folks, as you know, this is kind of what's in the charter, is we expect those folks who are members of the ACC to really you know, engage other stakeholders and bring that feedback to the meetings to, in order to enrich the discussion as much as possible.

Our, you know the charter also provides a shared understanding of what we're trying to achieve as in using this process. And last but not least, in establishes terms of engagement and communication with each other. so, so that's, that's our role. That's where our charter kind of sets us up for.

And so, I would encourage you all to take a look at it before the next meeting and bring any questions you might have, and we'll go from there as part of our, our day of activity on the 15th. And now is an opportunity here for anybody to weigh in and ask questions or to bring up anything else that you think we should talk about before we discontinue the meeting today.

We have about five minutes left. Does anybody have anything that they'd like to say?

Okay. Carol Loeffler.

**Carol Loeffler:** Hi there. one of the things that overriding that I've heard from today when we're discussing the hybrid versus the in-person, I think the other aspect to

concern your is maybe publicizing the phone call number more visible, if that makes any difference as well. Because we, we always had the option when it was in person.

We always had the option to call in. We just didn't have Zoom back then. You know, now we do. But if people don't have access to Zoom and want to call in, so when you're giving the option for it to be, you know, the either in-person or virtual, if you could also really make sure that the call-in phone number is quite visible would be really helpful, I think, for people that aren't able to access Zoom as well.

**Brad Morrison:** Great comment. Thanks Carol. Go ahead. Mm-hmm. I'm going to go ahead and write that down just to make sure we capture it. Okay. Thank you, Carol. Appreciate that.

**Eric Driever:** Carol. Can, can I perhaps ask a clarifying question on that?

**Carol Loeffler:** Sure.

**Eric Driever:** So currently just to baseline where that number exists now, the, the invite that was sent out for the Zoom has a call-in number now, admittedly, it, it might get lost in the, in the sea of text that that is in there.

Is there another w would you prefer we sort of highlight that bolded? some sort of....

**Carol Loeffler:** it would be it. I'm sorry for cutting you off. Yes, that would be really nice. You know, like one of the things that I'm really learning where I'm working is people are doing tabs and so they're saying Zoom access here, and they put Zoom right on the left and then they'll say phone access, and then they'll put that there and then they'll have You know, like in person and then the address, so that what happens is visually you're attending to the title instead of it getting embedded.

It was really hard for me to locate even, I was really fortunate I had two different access points that I could access to get into the link for this Zoom meeting, because one of them I was trying and it wasn't getting me, but the other way that somebody helped me get onto, I was able to get in. So if they, if it could be somehow back to your original question, somehow identified, this is the phone number, this is the Zoom access, and this is the in-person information.

Then it's, it's separate in like a tab format.

**Eric Driever:** Thank you. Yeah, I, we'll, we'll certainly recognize the need for multimodal access.

**Carol Loeffler:** Great. I appreciate you asking that too. Thank you so much.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay, Carol. Thank you. Appreciate that. Kendra.

**Kendra Muller:** Hello everybody. I was just going to suggest a follow up to what Carol experienced and it might be great if I know on the agenda it has the Zoom link, it has the calling numbers as well as it says that there's automatic live transcriptions.

It might be great just to go through and make that advertisement at the beginning of the meeting, just so any members of the public that are joined for the first time or anybody else who doesn't know how to access those different things can know how to access the captioning and transcript or remind people of how to do it.

So, it might be just a good thing to have at the start of the meeting, just like an introduction.

**Brad Morrison:** And you're saying make.

**Eric Driever:** That we can work on sort of an initial slide to administration of meetings and, and have that covered as part of that initial slide.

**Kendra Muller:** Okay. That sounds great.

**Brad Morrison:** And Kendra, you're saying make that part of the meeting as part of like the introduction to the meeting or something like that?

**Kendra Muller:** Yes. Because yes, the agenda's totally, it has all the information on it. but it's nice just to have that reminder for people joining on the meeting.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay. Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that. Other questions, comments? okay. Well, we've arrived at our time, 12 o'clock. I won't hold you any longer than we committed you to.

Thank you all for your part, whoop, quick. There was one more comment coming in. Eric, you want to,

**Eric Driever:** I was waiting to provide closing statements and wanted to make sure there were no other questions.

**Brad Morrison:** Okay.

**Eric Driever:** I would just, again, thank everybody for your amazing assistance. I, really, Michelle and I, I'd everybody at DSA and by the way, I'll, I'll make a quick announcement.

We're really close to having some new people to help us out. So, we're looking, we're forward to a robust 2025 code cycle process and really look forward to collaborating with everybody here and continue the work that we began in the, in the intervening cycle that we're currently closing out.



**Brad Morrison:** Great. Thank you, Eric. Thank you. Thanks, one and all. Appreciate it. And we'll look forward to seeing you all on the 15th of August. Take care. Thank you.