

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS  
FOR PROPOSED BUILDING STANDARDS  
OF THE CALIFORNIA BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION  
REGARDING THE 2022 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE,  
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 24, PART 5**

**(BSC 02/21)**

The Administrative Procedure Act requires that every agency shall maintain a file of each rulemaking that shall be deemed to be the record for that rulemaking proceeding. The rulemaking file shall include a Final Statement of Reasons. The Final Statement of Reasons shall be available to the public upon request when rulemaking action is being undertaken. The following are the reasons for proposing this particular rulemaking action:

**UPDATES TO THE INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS:**

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(1) requires an update of the information contained in the Initial Statement of Reasons. If the update identifies any data or any technical, theoretical or empirical study, report, or similar document on which the state agency is relying that was not identified in the Initial Statement of Reasons, the state agency shall comply with Government Code Section 11347.1.

BSC has not added any data (including technical, theoretical, or empirical studies, reports, or similar documents relied upon) that would necessitate an update of the information contained in the Initial Statement of Reasons.

**MANDATE ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(2), if the determination as to whether the proposed action would impose a mandate, the agency shall state whether the mandate is reimbursable pursuant to Part 7 of Division 4. If the agency finds that the mandate is not reimbursable, it shall state the reasons for the finding(s).

BSC has determined that the proposed regulatory action **WOULD NOT** impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts. BSC does not have authority to adopt regulations applicable to school districts. While the proposed building standard regulations are applicable to—and required to be enforced by—local agencies (i.e., city and county building departments), the regulations within this proposal make clarifying changes to existing standards with no intended change in regulatory effect.

**OBJECTIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS MADE REGARDING THE PROPOSED REGULATION(S).**

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(3) requires a summary of EACH objection or recommendation regarding the specific adoption, amendment, or repeal proposed, and an explanation of how the proposed action was changed to accommodate each objection or recommendation, or the reasons for making no change. This requirement applies only to objections or recommendations specifically directed at the agency's proposed action or to the procedures followed by the agency in proposing or adopting the action, or reasons for making no change. Irrelevant or repetitive comments may be aggregated and summarized as a group.

The following is a summary of the comments BSC received during the 45-day public comment period, BSC's explanation of the reasons for making no changes, as specified:

**1. Martin Cooper, City of Foster City**  
**Item: Not proposed for adoption of Appendix M**

Consider adoption of Appendix M during 2022 Intervening Code Adoption Cycle. Appendix M of the Uniform Plumbing Code (UPC) provides an alternative means to update pipe-sizing methods to improve the water demand load in single and multifamily dwellings. Encourage the BSC, through a proposing agency, consider sponsoring public engagement workshops to consider adoption of 2021 UPC Appendix M into the CPC during the 2022 Intervening Code Adoption Cycle.

**Agency Response:**

BSC acknowledges the commenter's concerns and appreciates their support and participation in the code development process. BSC agrees with the commenter, that the suggested code change referenced in this comment would be more appropriately vetted by stakeholders during a precycle workshop, along with other state proposing agencies, and then brought to the Plumbing, Electrical, Mechanical, and Energy (PEME) Code Advisory Committee. BSC thanks the commenters and may consider the proposed changes during a future code adoption cycle.

**2. Kyler Joaquin (Carter, Wetch & Associates), on behalf of State Senator Henry Stern and Assemblywoman Wendy Carrillo**

**Item: Not proposed for adoption of Appendix M**

Writing to express support for the 2021 Uniform Plumbing Code's Appendix M, Peak Water Demand Calculator (WDC) and urge the CBSC to review and adopt the Appendix during the intervening code cycle for the 2022 California Plumbing Code.

**Agency Response:**

BSC appreciates the commenters support and participation in the code development process. The suggested code change referenced in this comment would be more appropriately vetted by stakeholders during a precycle workshop and the Plumbing, Electrical, Mechanical, and Energy (PEME) Code Advisory Committee. BSC thanks the commenters and may consider the proposed changes during a future code adoption cycle.

**DETERMINATION OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND EFFECT ON PRIVATE PERSONS**

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(4) requires a determination with supporting information that no alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed. In addition, no reasonable alternative considered by CBSC or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of

CBSC would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provisions of law.

BSC has determined that no reasonable alternative considered by BSC or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of BSC would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provisions of law. This proposal makes only clarifying code changes to existing standards with no intended change in regulatory effect.

**REJECTED PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE THAT WOULD LESSEN THE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES:**

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(5) requires an explanation setting forth the reasons for rejecting any proposed alternatives that would lessen the adverse economic impact on small businesses, including the benefits of the proposed regulation per 11346.5(a)(3).

Not applicable—BSC has determined that the proposed regulations clarify existing standards with no intended change in regulatory effect, including no adverse impact on small businesses.