State Historical Building Safety Board

Strategic Plan Committee Meeting Minutes November 21, 2002

The meeting was called to order by the Executive Director.

Introductions and roll call: Dan Chudy, Calbo, Chair; Alan Dreyfuss, CPF, Vice Chair; Steve Farneth, Secretary, AIA; Jose Gallegos, SFM; Ron Bergeson, HCD; Tim Brandt, DPR; Mike Paravagna, DOR; Joe Hall, AICP; Deb Denne', ASLA; Loring Wyllie, SEAOC; Bob Mackensen, League of Cities; Fred Herman, SSC; Tom Winter, DSA/Executive Director.

One visitor was in attendance: Douglas Myers, Senior Plans Examiner from the City of Pasadena, Fire Department.

The Executive Director introduced Jan Sutton and Stacie Sormano, Department of General Services, Office of Planning, Research and Measurement.

Item 1. Strategic Plan

The meeting was turned over to Jan and Stacie who worked from their meeting agenda. Their handouts are attached (Item 1A).

The DGS Mission and Vision were viewed as the "starting point" for the SHBC planning. The DGS vision is "Service, Solutions, Success".

Stacie had grouped and organized the comments from the mailed questionnaires. The group moved through the Purpose, Process and Stakeholder Expectations. With the SWOT analysis the group modified some of the wording to better reflect the group understanding. All of the strengths and weaknesses were reviewed and revised as noted. Potential strategies were discussed, added and finally reduced to a few that could be accomplished in priority order.

Item 2. Proposed SHBC Technical Clean-up Legislation

Staff presented a draft legislative proposal that has been accepted by the DGS to advance to Agency (and then if approved on to the Governors office) that provides a "technical clean-up" of the SHBC statutes (H&SC 18950-61). The administration has not moved many pieces of legislation, however, this advances the proposal within the administration, and brings "state level" concurrence as it moves forward.

The majority of the language in the technical clean-up clarifies what is defined as a "qualified historic building or structure" within each section of the statute. It brings up issues of the membership of the Board in relation to current statewide historic building trends. The issue of funding for the program is also addressed.

Some discussion was held over any changes in the membership. Several members expressed concern over eliminating either of the consulting engineers, a suggestion was made to add a fire engineering slot, and questions over what a "sustainability" member would add to the board were brought up. Staff asked for volunteers for a committee for this legislative proposal and requested to table the discussion to committee. Dan Chudy and Joe Hall volunteered for this new committee.

The current SHBC statutory authority limits our ability to generate fees to the cost of providing copies of decisions and reimbursement of costs of appeals. That language limits our ability to sustain the program excessively. The legislative proposal includes language to allow the Board to propose to assess fees for any activity of the Board. It is the intent of that language that any fee proposal would require regulation to set amount and the service to assess.

The DGS deputy director was supportive of efforts to bolster the SHBC program, called it an important program in support of the governors sustainability and revitalization priorities. It was also requested that DSA provide DGS with other possibilities to support the program.

Staff presented an early draft on the funding analysis. The SHBC divides the "historic building world" into two segments, the first local jurisdictions and private ownership. The second is the state, state agencies and public money.

Within the private sector, an educated guess (the Fed tax credit program has been about \$100 M for several years) puts preservation building activity in "local jurisdiction construction dollars" at about \$150 million statewide, state agency jurisdiction may add 10% or less to that figure, statewide. Therefore, the smallest per dollar fee would be at the local level, where the greatest amount of use is concentrated. Both Fred Herman, B.O. Palo Alto, (SSC) and Dan Chudy, B.O. Riverside, (Calbo) expressed strong concerns over such a fee. Staff noted that any program to assess permit fees through the locals would be met with stiff resistance. However such a program puts the cost on the user, which is ultimately "fair". This charge also puts the fee where the most energy has been spent by the SHBSB over the history of the code.

The SHBSB has attempted to enforce its mandate to review state preservation building projects, usually with resistance to the reviews. Assessing fees on those reviews is not allowed in current statute. Because the state preservation program is relatively small, the fee would be greater and in many budget years might not sustain the program. To make the program work, additional personnel are also required which defeats the purpose unless the program is large enough to support both the review staff and the local SHBSB program.

Also presented we ideas over getting SHBC into bond acts, looking again for grant funding of particular projects (the 1998 code revision was funded by a \$150,000 FEMA grant), training programs, interpretation books and information.

There was general expression of dismay that the state would not provide General Fund for SHBSB activities, like "so many other agencies". Staff noted that most agencies are not general funded, and those that are, have a fee for service component. State Parks as an example lowers fees during good economic times and raises them back during lean budget years. State Parks staffing, which is largely general funded, fluctuates with funding from the general fund and bond act funding. State Parks number one issue of the past 16 years has been to secure a "stable" funding source.

Purpose

This document summarizes strategic planning information for the State Historic Building Code Board (SHBCB). Research, Planning and Measurement (RPM), Management Services Division, at the Department of General Services (DGS) compiled the summary information using a questionnaire sent to members of the SHBCB.

This document includes:

- An overview of the SHBCB strategic planning process
- List of all SHBCB members that returned the questionnaire
- List of stakeholders and their expectations
- List of the SHBCB's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT analysis)
- List of strategic issues
- Draft goals
- Draft objectives
- List of potential strategies

Process overview

The scope of the SHBCB's strategic planning effort is limited by time and money. To minimize the amount of time and money expended on the strategic plan, SHBCB will use the following process:

- SHBCB develops an SHBCB Strategic Planning Committee
- RPM distributes a questionnaire to all SHBCB members to gather input for the SHBCB strategic plan
- RPM summarizes the results of the questionnaire and develops draft goals, and objectives
- RPM facilitates the SHBCB Strategic Planning Committee in creating goals and objectives, identifying strategic issues and ranking strategies to effect the issues
- SHBCB Strategic Planning Committee brings the draft strategic plan to the full SHBCB for adoption
- SHBCB's Executive Officer develops action plans for each strategy
- SHBCB monitors the progress of the strategies

Continued

SHBCB questionnaire participants

The following SHBCB members responded to the strategic planning questionnaire:

- Tim Brandt, Department of Parks and Recreation
- Lauren Bricker, State Historic Resources Commission
- Steve Castellanos, Division of State Architect
- Dan Chudy, California Building Officials
- Alan Dreyfuss, California Preservation Foundation
- Steve Farneth, American Institute of Architects
- Joe Hall, American Association of City Planners
- Roy Harthorn, Contractor
- Bob Mackensen, County Supervisors Association
- Mike Paravagna, Department of Rehabilitation
- Tom Winter, Division of State Architect
- Loring Wyllie, Structural Engineers Association of California

Continued

Stakeholders and expectations

The following are a list of the stakeholders (bold) and their needs (bullets) identified by the SHBCB members in its strategic planning questionnaire:

Local government/State agency Officials

- Reasonable level of safety
- Logical and easy to interpret code
- Training in understanding and applying the SHBC

Building professionals: Developers, Contractors, Architects, Engineers/ Property owners/Attorneys

- Consultative services
- Timely appeals
- Training in understanding the SHBC
- Proven alternatives to the regular code
- Building officials that understand the goals of preservation
- Relief from literal code

Lending institutions

- Timely appeals
- Proven alternatives to the regular code

Historical societies/Museums

• Building officials that understand the goals of preservation

Politicians

• Reasonable level of safety

Advocates for access

• Historical structures that comply with accessibility laws

Sustainable use advocates

• Historical structures that preserve resources

Continued

SWOT analysis

The information in this section provides an overview of the internal and external environment that SHBCB operates. This section lists the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats perceived by the SHBCB members.

The SHBCB members identified the following as SHBCB internal strengths:

- Breadth of membership
- Depth of membership
- Expert advise and knowledge is plentiful amongst the SHBCB
- Statewide membership representation
- Qualified and knowledgeable staff
- Solid appeals decisions
- Long tenure of many SHBCB members
- Strong commitment by SHBCB members
- Knowledgeable executive director
- Supportive State Architect

The SHBCB members identified the following as SHBCB internal weaknesses:

- Lack of professional staff
- Minimal budget
- Lack of consistent attendance for some SHBCB members at SHBCB meetings
- SHBCB's inability to clarify its role with respect to elements outside of the standard building code (e.g. parking, zoning, setbacks)
- Lack of DGS policy on preservation activities within the department
- Lack of links to other agencies
- Lack of regular code knowledge
- Marginal institutional memory in the form of records, members and staff
- Need for support for outreach activities
- Necessity for members to travel

Continued

SWOT analysis (continued)

The SHBCB members identified the following as SHBCB external opportunities:

- Promote the code and its ability to help in the renovation and rehabilitation of the increasingly older building stock of California
- SHBC is a national model
- SHBCB's improved relationship with interested constituent groups
- Californians have a greater appreciation for historic preservation
- Tourism associated with historic preservation is the fastest-growing segment of the tourism industry
- California history is enjoying a revival of interest
- CPF has a lobbyist that could further SHBCB and CPF mutual interests
- Administration is favorable to the goals of resource preservation and sustainability
- Current trends in the building industry; Smart Growth, sustainability, transit oriented design and revitalization
- New code authorities and performance codes that challenge the "standard" of regular code
- AB 16
- DSA Historic Schools Program

The SHBCB members identified the following as SHBCB external threats:

- Lack of funding
- Legislation that supercedes the SHBC (see Item 2)
- Shrinking state budget and changing budget priorities
- Legislation that would eliminate the SHBCB
- Focus on Department of Parks and Recreation (Office of Historic Preservation) as the leader of restoration architecture
- Legislation that would convert the SHBC from a "performance" mandate to a prescriptive set of rules and regulations
- Trend (?) that views any risk as unacceptable and any decision making process that addresses risk undesirable
- Catastrophe involving an SHBC structure
- Political atmosphere
- Local and State officials failing to recognize code
- Limited outreach/knowledge of code except by industry professional

Continued

Strategic issues

The SHBCB members identified the following strategic issues:

- Continuity of and increase in professional staff
- Public information and outreach
- Fiscal dependability and stability
- Consistent and regular code change process with Building and Fire Official participation
- Availability of educational materials
- Applicability of the code with practice, and new model codes
- Flexibility of the code in meeting the needs of the safety and historic preservation
- Continue to have the CHBC in CA Building Code

Draft goals

RPM developed the following draft goals for the SHBCB strategic plan based on the SWOT analysis and the strategic issues identified by the SHBCB members:

- A SHBC that provides for the health and safety of the public, while preserving historical structures
- SHBCB stakeholders that are educated in the application and limitations of the SHBC

Draft objectives

RPM developed the following draft objectives for the SHBCB strategic plan based on the SWOT analysis and the strategic issues identified by the SHBCB members and the draft goals developed by RPM:

- Increase the stability of the SHBC
- Maintain the applicability and flexibility of the SHBC
- Increase the availability of education materials related to the SHBC
- Develop resources to improve SHBC service, solutions and success.

Continued

Potential strategies

The RPM pulled the following potential strategies from the questionnaire responses provided by the SHBCB members:

- Expand the web page
- Schedule more meetings outside Sacramento
- Continue California preservation foundation sessions on code, implementation and technical examples
- Develop training programs for SHBCB members
- Share information and expertise
- Expand the identification of specific alternatives to the regular code
- Expand participation on the SHBCB from all identified agencies
- Conduct a user survey to determine how the code could be improved
- Develop listserv capability
- Develop a schedule for code changes and a committee to work on changes
- Actively participate with stakeholder groups and organizations to provide training and consultative services
- Publicize benefits of owning historic property and target developers, politicians and lobbyists associated with preservation
- Incorporate the SHBC into training for staff that work with historic property
- Require buildings permits for existing structures to include a reference to SHBC
- Track preservation issues related to SHBC and develop solutions to be included in future editions of SHBC
- Track use and interpretations of comparable of-of-state HBC-

Results of 11/21/02 Strategic Plan Meeting

State Historic Building Safety Board Draft Strategic Plan

DGS Mission	Working together, we deliver innovative solutions and services with efficiency, economy and integrity to help our customers succeed.
DGS Vision	Service, Solutions, Success
SHBSB Goals	Provide for the health and safety of the public while preserving historical structures.
SHBSB Objectives	 Develop resources to improve service, solutions and success of SHBSB Maintain the applicability and flexibility of the SHBC Increase the availability of education materials related to the SHBC

SHBSB Strategies

- Identify and secure a funding source
- Update the SHBC
 - 1) Develop a schedule for SHBC changes and committees
 - 2) Expand the identification of specific alternatives to the regular code
 - 3) Expand participation on the SHBSB from all identified agencies
 - 4) Conduct user surveys to determine how the SHBC can be improved
 - 5) Develop a task force of users
 - 6) Track preservation issues related to SHBC and develop solutions to be included in future editions of SHBC
 - 7) Track use and interpretations of comparable out-of-state codes

• Education

- 1) Expand Web page
- 2) Develop Listserv capability
- 3) Continue with education and outreach (e.g. California Preservation Foundation sessions on SHBC implementation and technical examples)
- 4) Increase use of SHBC and consultation of SHBSB by state agencies
- 5) Actively participate with stakeholder groups and organizations to provide training and consultative services
- 6) Engage SHBSB to strengthen and promote SHBC