

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS
FOR
PROPOSED BUILDING STANDARDS
OF THE
DIVISION OF THE STATE ARCHITECT**

**REGARDING THE
2013 CALIFORNIA PLUMBING CODE
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 24, PART 5**

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))

There are no revisions to the Initial Statement of Reasons below (pages 2 through 3). There were no public comments received during the 45 day public comment period.

STATEMENT OF SPECIFIC PURPOSE, PROBLEM, RATIONALE AND BENEFITS:

Section – 2013 edition of the California Plumbing Code

DSA proposes to repeal the 2009 edition of the Uniform Plumbing Code (UPC), and to adopt the 2012 edition of the UPC (published by the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials) for codification and effectiveness as the 2013 California Plumbing Code (CPC). DSA proposes this action in order to comply with state law requiring state agencies to propose adoption of the latest edition model codes within one year of the publication date.

Building standards proposed by DSA-SS for adoption would be applicable to public elementary and secondary schools, community colleges, and state-owned or state-leased essential services buildings.

This proposal will also make effective the 2012 edition of the UPC as the 2013 edition CPC, for application by DSA-SS/CC (Division of the State Architect – Structural Safety/Community Colleges) to community colleges, which a community college district may elect to use in lieu of standards promulgated by DSA-SS per Education Code Section 81053.

The 2012 edition of the UPC Preprint changes are shown in ~~strikeout~~ and underline.

No new amendments to the 2012 edition UPC are being proposed DSA-SS or DSA-SS/CC. State administrative amendments contained in CPC Chapter 1 are being continued with editorial changes proposed as noted below.

CHAPTER 1 – California Administration
Section 1.1.1 (Title)

Editorial amendment to bring up-to-date; reference to the 2012 edition of the UPC by deleting reference to 2009 UPC.

CHAPTER 4 – Plumbing Fixture and Fixture Fittings

Table 4-1

TABLE NUMBER: Editorial amendment to bring up-to-date; new numbering format of the 2012 edition of the UPC by changing Table 4-1 to Table 422.1 (Minimum Plumbing Facilities). The 1ST paragraph under this table is also amended to reflect correct table number.

2ND PARAGRAPH: The 2nd paragraph is amended to adopt the entire sentence as a CA amendment. In the 2010 CPC only the words ‘Occupant Load Factor Table A” was CA language – the beginning of this sentence “The total occupant load shall be determined in accordance with the ...” was 2009 UPC language. In the 2012 edition of the UPC this sentence was deleted. This sentence is necessary to carry forward existing unamended CA amendments.

FOOTNOTES: The footnotes under the table are amended to bring up-to-date; new numbering format of the 2012 edition of the UPC by changing Footnote 18 to Footnote 4. In the 2010 CPC the 2009 UPC had 17 Footnotes with 2 additional CA Footnotes. Renumbering of the Footnotes is necessary to coordinate with new numbering format of the 2012 UPC.

Chapter 6 – Water Supply and Distribution

Table 6-4

Editorial amendment to bring up-to-date; new numbering format of the 2012 edition of the UPC by changing Table 6-4 to Table 604.1 (Materials for Building Supply and Water Distribution Piping and Fittings).

Chapter 12 – Fuel Piping

Section 1211.18: Editorial amendment to bring up-to-date; new numbering format of the 2012 edition of the UPC by changing Section 1211.18 to 1210.18 (Earthquake-actuated Gas Shutoff Valves; which is printed in Chapter 12 for simplicity and the reader’s convenience. Amendment is not applicable to the DSA-SS or DSA-SS/CC occupancies (public schools, community colleges and state essential services buildings).

TECHNICAL, THEORETICAL, AND EMPIRICAL STUDY, REPORT, OR SIMILAR DOCUMENTS:

None required, as Section 18928 of the Health & Safety Code mandates this proposed action.

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATION FOR PRESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS:

No new prescriptive standards are proposed.

CONSIDERATION OF REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

The Division of the State Architect has not considered any reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, as this action is required by state law.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES THE AGENCY HAS IDENTIFIED THAT WOULD LESSEN ANY ADVERSE IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESS.

The Division of the State Architect has not identified any reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, and no adverse impact to small business due to these proposed changes is expected.

FACTS, EVIDENCE, DOCUMENTS, TESTIMONY, OR OTHER EVIDENCE OF NO SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON BUSINESS.

The Division of the State Architect has no evidence indicating any potential significant adverse impact on business with regard to this proposed action.

DUPLICATION OR CONFLICTS WITH FEDERAL REGULATIONS

The regulations proposed for adoption do not duplicate or conflict with federal regulations.

MANDATE ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

(Pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(2),

The Division of the State Architect has determined that the proposed regulatory action WOULD NOT impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts.

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

(Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(3))

No objections or recommendations regarding its Part 5 proposals were brought to the attention of DSA during the Rulemaking process or during the public comment period.

DETERMINATION OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND EFFECT ON PRIVATE PERSONS

(Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(4))

The Division of the State Architect has determined that no alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulations, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provisions of law.

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

(Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(5))

There are no rejected proposed alternatives to identify. This proposal will not have an adverse economic impact on small businesses.