

SUMMARY OF ONLINE SURVEY AND INTERVIEW FINDINGS

Pre-Meeting Input from the Access Stakeholder Community

Produced for the Division of the State Architect (DSA)

**Compiled by Marina A. Piscalish, Ph.D.
UC Davis Extension Collaboration Center**

August 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PROJECT OVERVIEW	1
II.	ONLINE SURVEY FINDINGS	2
III.	INTERVIEWS FINDINGS	5
IV.	CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS	9
V.	APPENDICES	
	A.	
	Complete Survey Results	10
	B.	
	Detailed Interview Results	41

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Division of the State Architect (DSA) is forming a new consultative group named the “Access Code Collaborative” (ACC), to offer feedback on the DSA’s new and amended proposed accessibility regulations for Chapter 11B of the California Building Code.

DSA seeks to convene a group of individuals and organizations that together:

- Reflect a range of experience with the code change process and/or related DSA activities - some new to this work and others with long-standing involvement;
- Represent the broad spectrum of stakeholders whose points of view are essential to successful code change; and
- Is comprised of individuals capable of and committed to working collaboratively.

DSA hired the UC Davis Extension Collaboration Center (UC Davis) as a neutral facilitator to gather input from the broad Access stakeholder community to inform the formation of the ACC, including its organization and operation.

Between May and July 2017, UC Davis conducted:

- A 12-question online survey, using Survey Monkey, with 250 respondents; and
- 26-targeted telephone interviews with 29 total interviewees.

In August 2017, UC Davis compiled the survey and interview findings in the following report. This report provides a summary of the data collected and recommendations proposed by the Access stakeholder community through the online survey, one-on-one interviews, and small group interviews.

DSA is using these survey and interview findings to help define a nomination and selection process for members of the ACC. UC Davis is using these findings to design the ACC’s orientation materials, training of all members, and ongoing operations.

The information gathered in this report is critical to shaping the path forward. The UC Davis Extension Collaboration Center is grateful to the many individuals who completed the online survey and participated in the interviews. We also thank the DSA Access Team for their assistance and support of this important effort.

II. ONLINE SURVEY FINDINGS

ABOUT THE ONLINE SURVEY

On June 9, 2017, DSA emailed its Access Listserv a link to a 12-question, UC Davis online survey in order to better understand the public's experiences with DSA stakeholder engagement in the code development process for accessibility regulations. 250 persons completed the online survey.

The following is a summary of the salient points of the data collected. For each survey question, a summary of the overall response is shared, followed by a comparison of Code Beneficiary and Code User responses. In this report, "Code Beneficiary" refers to: any individual not identifying as a person with a disability or their advocate. "Code User" refers to: those identifying as any person with a disability or an advocate for people with disabilities. Code Users includes: design professionals and contractors, building officials, plan reviewers or inspectors, building or construction industry representatives, or individuals who work for a state agency, with access-related responsibilities.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS

1. About the online survey respondents.

Of the 250 respondents:

- 212 respondents (85%) self-identified as a Code User.
- 64 respondents (26%) self-identified as a Code Beneficiary.
- 26 people (10%) identified as both a Code User and a Code Beneficiary.

2. Previous participation in DSA task force groups and pre-cycle stakeholder meetings related to code development of the CBC accessibility regulations.

- All Respondents: 57%¹ of the respondents have not participated; 9% respondents have participated to a great extent.
- Code Beneficiaries: 53% have not participated; 10% have participated to a great extent.
- Code Users: 57% have not participated; 9% have participated to a great extent.

¹ Note: In order to share comparative data between Code Beneficiaries (CB) and Code Users (CU), individuals self-identifying as both a CB and CU were analyzed as part of both data sets. As a result, the totals shown for "all respondents" may not equal the combined statistics for CB and CU, in some cases.

3. Common words used to describe respondents' own experiences with the DSA stakeholder engagement.

- All Respondents: Frustrating, confusing, collaborative, professional, ignored, disappointment, expert, difficult, interested, and concerned.
- Code Beneficiaries: Confusing, frustrating, ignored, insufficient, and not effective.
- Code Users: Collaborative, advocate, disappointing, difficult, educational, frustrating, informative, interesting, limited, minimal, and productive.

4. Personal experiences with DSA stakeholder engagement.

Respondents reported that personal experience with DSA stakeholder engagement has:

- All Respondents: 47% responded it has had no effect on their desire to participate; 35% reported it has strengthened their desire to participate; 19% reported a dampened desire to participate.
- Code Beneficiaries: 38% reported no effect; 34% reported a strengthened desire to participate; and 28% reported a dampened desire to participate.
- Code Users: 47% reported no effect; 36% reported a strengthened desire to participate; and 17% reported a dampened desire to participate.

5. DSA's effort to improve stakeholder engagement.

When asked if respondents support DSA's effort to improve stakeholder engagement and would like for stakeholders to work together in a new way to strengthen the code development process for the CBC accessibility regulations:

- All Respondents: 80% agree or strongly agree; 8% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Beneficiaries: 74% agree or strongly agree; 17% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Users: 83% agree or strongly agree; 6% disagree or strongly disagree.

6. Use of a neutral, professional facilitator

When asked if respondents support the use of a neutral, professional facilitator to support all parties in this effort:

- All Respondents: 79% agree or strongly agree; 7% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Beneficiaries: 76% agree or strongly agree; 10% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Users: 81% agree or strongly agree; 5% disagree or strongly disagree.

7. Online survey and interviews.

When asked if respondents support the UC Davis facilitation plan to collect recommendations and diverse perspectives through the online survey and interviews regarding the best approaches to form the Access Code Collaborative (ACC):

- All Respondents: 72% agree or strongly agree; 6% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Beneficiaries: 69% agree or strongly agree; 11% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Users: 72% agree or strongly agree; 5% disagree or strongly disagree.

8. ACC Diversity.

When asked if respondents support the idea of creating an ACC made up of diverse stakeholders to discuss and inform DSA about proposed amendments to the CBC accessibility regulations:

- All Respondents: 78% agree or strongly agree; 8% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Beneficiaries: 69% agree or strongly agree; 20% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Users: 81% agree or strongly agree; 5% disagree or strongly disagree.

9. Training on the CBC code development process.

When asked if members of the ACC will benefit from training on the CBC code development process and its possibilities and limitations:

- All Respondents: 81% agree or strongly agree; 7% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Beneficiaries: 81% agree or strongly agree; 12% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Users: 81% agree or strongly agree; 5% disagree or strongly disagree..

10. Training in collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution.

When asked if training in collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution for all ACC members and DSA will benefit this effort:

- All Respondents: 74% agree or strongly agree 10% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Beneficiaries: 64% agree or strongly agree; 22% disagree or strongly disagree.
- Code Users: 77% agree or strongly agree; 6% disagree or strongly disagree.

The online survey findings indicate that the majority of respondents support DSA's efforts to build and train a diverse and representative ACC to strengthen stakeholder engagement for proposed Code amendments. Perhaps of greatest interest is that the results are relatively consistent, across both Code Beneficiaries and Code Users, with small differences noted.

Note: Appendix A of this report includes the complete survey results, including participant comments.

III. INTERVIEW FINDINGS

ABOUT THE INTERVIEWS

Input received from the online survey helped identify a list of possible persons to interview, as well as criteria for selecting interviewees. Accordingly, DSA adopted the following guidance to identify persons and groups invited to interview:

- Familiar with Code application Access issues.
- Familiar with DSA Code Change process or related activities.
- Contribute perspectives representative of Code Users and/or Code Beneficiaries.
- Wears “more than one hat” or sees things from more than one perspective.

The Division of the State Architect (DSA) then sent an email invitation to selected persons and groups from the broad Access community, asking for their participation in a confidential interview to help guide the formation of a new Access Code Collaboration (ACC) to work with the DSA Access Codes and Standards Team. UC Davis, acting as independent facilitators and process advisors, designed and conducted the interviews.

Between June 21 and July 31, 2017, 26 interviews were completed with a total of 29 individuals. The following list includes the names of all persons interviewed.

1. Barry Ryan, Supervising Architect, Division of the State Architect
2. Bill Zellmer, Certified Access Specialist, Accessibility Architect, Sutter Health
3. Chet Widom, State Architect, Division of the State Architect
4. Chris Downey, Architect, Architecture for the Blind
5. Christy Foreman, Certified Access Specialist, Senior Plans Examiner, City of Santa Barbara
6. Dara Schur, Litigation Counsel, Disability Rights California
7. Erick Mikiten, Architect, California Building Standards Commission Member
8. Eugene Lozano, California Council of the Blind
9. Gary Layman, Certified Access Specialist, Chief Building Official, City of Oroville
10. Gilda Puente-Peters, Certified Access Specialist, Architect, GPPA Architects
11. Glenn Gall, Architect, Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development
12. Hollynn D'Lil, Disability Rights Activist, Coalition of Disability Access Professionals
13. Irene Walela, Deputy Director, Department of Rehabilitation
14. Jay Whisenant, Architect, California Building Standards Commission, Code Advisory Committee Member
15. Jim Terry, Certified Access Specialist, Architect, Evan Terry Associates

16. John Paul Scott, Certified Access Specialist, Disability Access Coordinator, City and County of San Francisco, Department of Public Works
17. Jonathan Adler, Certified Access Specialist, Access Compliance Services
18. Kaylan Dunlap, Certified Access Specialist, Healthcare Accessibility Specialist, Evan Terry Associates
19. Kurt Cooknick, Deputy to the State Architect, Division of the State Architect
20. Mia Marvelli, Executive Director, California Building Standards Commission
21. Michael Gibbens, Certified Access Specialist, Gibbens & Associates
22. Michael Paravagna, ADA Consultant, California Commission on Disability Access
23. Peter Margen, Certified Access Specialist, Margen + Associates
24. Richard Halloran, Senior Building Inspector, Access Appeals Commission, City and County of San Francisco
25. Richard Skaff, Executive Director, Designing Accessible Communities
26. Robert Raymer, Senior Engineer, California Building Industry Association
27. Marybel Batjer, Secretary of the California Government Operations Agency
28. Shawn Huff, Assistant Deputy Director, California Department of Housing and Community Development
29. Steve Dolim, Certified Access Specialist, Stephan J. Dolim, Architect, Inc.

Of those interviewed:

- 55% (16 of 29) are either a person with a disability, a disability advocate, or both.
- 31% (9 of 29) identify as an individual with a disability or a Code Beneficiary (7 with mobility disabilities and 2 with vision disabilities).
- 28% (8 of 29) identify as people without a disability, who advocate for people with disabilities.
- 52% (15 of 29) identify as Code Users.
- 24% (7 of 29) identify as both a Code User and a Code Beneficiary.

Each phone interview (one-on-one or in a small group) lasted approximately 50 minutes.

Interview questions asked for guidance on:

- The need for and purpose of the ACC.
- Representation and member attributes.
- A proposed nomination and selection process.
- An ideal group size, meeting format, meeting schedule.
- Expectations for the ACC and its members.

The information gathered from the interviews will guide with design of the Access Code Collaborative (ACC), the nomination and selection process, as well as content for a draft Charter for the ACC.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW FINDINGS

1. Interview input reinforces survey findings.

Results of the interviews, by and large, reinforce online survey results. Most persons interviewed believe that steps should be taken to improve the relationship between the disability community (or parts of it) and DSA, related to the regulatory Code amendment process.

2. Creation of the Access Code Collaborative (ACC).

The creation of a standing, diverse representative ACC to offer guidance to DSA is generally supported. Most interviewees recognize that DSA will need to be very clear and unambiguous about the ACC's role, responsibilities, and limits of authority, given that DSA itself is statutorily accountable for Code revisions. In the view of many, unclear or inconsistent expectations will sink this effort.

3. Number of ACC members.

Nearly all interviewees believe that keeping the ACC small enough to be effective, but large enough to be representative is a challenge. Overall, most interviewees support a group of 10 – 14 members.

4. Representation on the ACC.

There is broad agreement among interviewees about key constituent groups to be represented on the ACC. Many believe that adding new voices and points of view to the ACC, beyond those previously engaged in the regulatory process, may be helpful. Most believe that the range of disabilities represented in the ACC should go beyond ambulatory needs to address the full range of disabilities with access-related needs. Also, interviewees raised the need for proportional representation of Code users and Code beneficiaries in the ACC.

5. Meeting format and frequency.

Feedback received suggests that ACC meetings should be face-to-face, as a rule, with options available for remote, technology-supported engagement, when necessary. Most believe in-person meetings, three or four times a year, will be needed. Many suggest that remote meetings with supportive technology, between regular meetings, will be useful for subcommittee work or technical work, as needed.

6. Meeting accessibility.

Most interviewees believe that regular ACC meetings should be held in highly accessible facilities in locations with accessible public transportation and parking adjacent to the venue.

Most interviewees also recognize that costs of transportation and accommodations will be an issue for some participants if not provided by DSA, especially for those representing the disability community in a volunteer capacity (not related to professional responsibilities).

7. ACC purpose, term limits, participation, and facilitation.

Nearly all persons interviewed believe that the ACC would benefit from term limits (most support for 3-year term limits) and clear expectations for participation (including attendance, preparation, etc.) and formal leadership (such as Executive committee; Chair/s, etc.). Also, there is unanimous support for the idea of using of an independent, impartial facilitator and meeting scribe to support the ACC. Interviewees also recommend that DSA distributes a statement of the ACC's purpose and the limits of its authority.

8. ACC member nomination and selection.

Most interviewees advocate for a broad, inclusive, and accessible nomination process, using multiple listservs as the primary method of outreach to key constituent groups. People appreciate the idea that anyone could nominate themselves or others and provide the information needed about the individual to ensure consideration. Regarding selection of group members, most advocate for a process that involves DSA and a small number of other key, reputable, representative organizations; then together they review nominations received, deliberate, and recommend a group of individuals for appointment to the ACC, by DSA. Interviewees also recommend the DSA clarify its role in the body (for example as a full member, as an ex-officio member or other).

9. Orientation and training.

Those interviewed like the idea of a kick-off orientation and training workshop designed to build a sense of team, strengthen relationships, and orient ACC members to their new role. Also, there is strong support for training and education for members in the Code change regulatory process, collaborative problem solving, and consensus building. Interviewees said these trainings will be essential to the ACC's success by addressing both substance and process.

Interviewees provided an incredible wealth of input for consideration. DSA is using findings from both the interviews and survey to help structure the design, launch, and operations of the ACC.

Note: Appendix B of this report includes numerous, detailed ideas, comments, and recommendations from interviewees.

IV. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

This brief report summarizes stakeholder input gathered as part of DSA's larger effort to strengthen community engagement in amending Code related to Chapter 11B of the California Building Standards. This overview reflects results of both the online survey and interviews conducted by the UC Davis Extension Collaboration Center, on behalf of the DSA. A total of 250 respondents completed the online survey; and 29 individuals completed interviews.

Findings from both the online survey and the interviews lend support to DSA's initiative to launch an Access Code Collaborative (ACC) comprised of diverse Access stakeholders willing to assist DSA in the regulatory code amendment process. Moreover, the survey and interview findings will inform the next steps in creating the ACC, as well as its operations.

Specifically, results from the survey and interviews will inform:

- DSA communications with the Access Stakeholder community.
- A nomination and selection process for ACC members.
- A draft Charter to guide the organization of the ACC.
- The design of and materials for an ACC new member orientation and training.
- DSA's and ACC's next steps in engaging the broad Access Stakeholder community.

We, at the UC Davis Extension Collaboration Center, express sincere gratitude to members of the Disability Access community, both Code Beneficiaries and Code Users, for their input, ideas, and recommendations shared throughout this report. We hope this summary proves helpful in guiding the next steps of the ACC and more broadly to strengthen community engagement in Code amendments. We greatly appreciate the opportunity to be of service in this worthwhile effort.

V. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: COMPLETE SURVEY RESULTS

Appendix A includes:

1. All 12 survey questions.
2. The survey responses tabulated by:
 - All respondents
 - Code Beneficiaries
 - Code Users
3. Participant comments to open-ended survey questions.

QUESTION 1: Which category best describes you?

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. I am an individual with a disability who needs construction related access.	15%	N/A	N/A
B. I am an advocate for individuals with disability who need construction related access.	16%	N/A	N/A
C. I work for a state agency.	15%	N/A	N/A
D. I am a design professional or contractor.	38%	N/A	N/A
E. I am a building official, plan reviewer or inspector.	23%	N/A	N/A
F. I am a building or construction industry representative.	5%	N/A	N/A
G. Other	22%	N/A	N/A

QUESTION 2:

I have participated in DSA task force groups and pre-cycle stakeholder meetings related to code development of the CBC accessibility regulations.

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. Not At All (1 Star)	57%	53%	57%
B. (2 Stars)	17%	12%	17%
C. (3 Stars)	10%	18%	9%
D. (4 Stars)	7%	7%	7%
E. To a Great Extent (5 Stars)	9%	10%	9%

QUESTION 3:

My own experience with DSA stakeholder engagement in the code development process for the CBC accessibility regulations can best be described using the following three words or phrases:

Respondents' Comments about the Strengths of the Process

- Collaborative
- Engaged
- Complex
- Original
- Informative
- Listening
- Problem Solving
- Quality
- Thorough
- Helpful
- Exhaustive
- Motivating
- Pro-Active
- Solution Oriented
- Allows broad range of participants
- Allows discussions
- Attentive
- Careful
- Caring
- Challenging
- Collaborative
- Complex
- Comprehensive
- Cooperative
- Detailed
- Organized (x2)
- Organized
- Original
- Knowledgeable
- Informative (x4)
- Necessary
- Motivating
- Neutral
- Informed
- Inclusive
- Helpful
- Familiar
- Pro-Active
- Problem Solving
- Productive (x3)
- Open (x3)
- Passionate
- Practical
- Prepared
- Ever evolving
- Engaging
- Satisfactory

- | | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| ▪ Satisfying | ▪ Professional | ▪ Unbiased |
| ▪ Encouraging | ▪ Exhaustive | ▪ Non-painful |
| ▪ Educational | ▪ Quality | ▪ Inclusive |
| ▪ Effective | ▪ Transparent | ▪ Thorough |
| ▪ Important | ▪ Specific | ▪ Worthwhile |
| ▪ Interested | ▪ Supportive | ▪ Thoughtful |
| ▪ Promising | ▪ Very good | ▪ Surprising |
| ▪ Productive | ▪ Useful | ▪ Technical |

Comments critical of the process, in general terms

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| ▪ Frustrating | ▪ Boring | ▪ Unresponsive |
| ▪ Unsuccessful | ▪ Inconsistent | ▪ Non- proactive |
| ▪ Useless | ▪ Directionless | ▪ Very little |
| ▪ Overwhelmed by minutiae | ▪ Disappointing | ▪ Lacking |
| ▪ Unsurprising | ▪ Confusing | ▪ Misaligned |
| ▪ Insufficient | ▪ Curious | ▪ Minimal |
| ▪ Disappointing | ▪ Overly complex | ▪ Required |
| ▪ Hurried | ▪ Not very accessible | ▪ Pro forma |
| ▪ Highly jargonized | ▪ Unpublicized | ▪ Non-existent |
| ▪ Difficult to participate in | ▪ Expensive | ▪ Often limited due to Legislation |
| ▪ Repetitive | ▪ Slow | ▪ Distant |
| ▪ Not effective | ▪ Vague | ▪ Limited |
| ▪ Bureaucratic | ▪ Tedious | ▪ Vacuum |
| ▪ Lengthy | ▪ Time consuming | |
| | ▪ Grueling | |
| | ▪ Not effective | |

Comments critical of the process related to perceptions of the inclusion and authenticity

- | | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| ▪ Ignored | ▪ Secretive | ▪ Difficult |
| ▪ Dishonored | ▪ Disingenuous | ▪ Contentious |
| ▪ Skeptical | ▪ Dismissive | |
| ▪ Sneaky | ▪ Disengaged | |
| ▪ Disturbing | ▪ Alienated | |
| ▪ Petrified | ▪ Ignored | |
| ▪ Pain | ▪ Conflicting | |
| ▪ Unwelcome | ▪ Reactive | |
| ▪ Oblivious | ▪ Tense | |

Comments regarding perceived power, influence and control issues with the process

- Over protective of the business sector
- Profit-centered
- Non-level playing field (Attorney's and Construction types over those directly impacted by lack of access)
- Weighted towards advocates and not constructability
- Over protective of the business sector
- Building-centric
- Exclusive
- One-sided
- Non- inclusive
- Counter Revolutionary
- Tyranny of minority
- Elitist
- Driven by advocates
- Hi-jacked by special interest
- Derailed by special interest
- Special interest controlled
- Unreasonable

QUESTION 4:

My personal experience with DSA stakeholder engagement in the code development process for the CBC accessibility regulations has:

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. Dampened my desire to participate	19%	28%	17%
B. Had no effect on my desire to participate	47%	38%	47%
C. Strengthened my desire to participate	35%	34%	36%

KEY for respondents' written-in responses below:

- Arrow Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Beneficiaries.
- Circle Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Users.

Supportive and Neutral Comments regarding Experience in Stakeholder Engagement Process

- Never participated.
- I often work directly with Facilities Management on access issues on a university campus.
- Providing equal access to public facilities fosters community building and feeling of inclusiveness; a primary objective in any grounded organization.
- I participated in the disabled access task force for EV Charging Stations on behalf of DeWayne Starnes, CBO of Sonoma County
- I have helped municipalities develop city codes.

- I intend to continue to attempt to engage the DSA and work towards reasonable solutions that represent the larger interests of Californians.
- As an installation company for restroom products we needed badly the 2013 variances in order to better the overall participation.
- I will need to complete additional schooling and/or years of jurisdictional employment prior to testing for the CASp certification. I am motivated to do so; my son needs these services he is an individual with disabilities.
- I believe that I am compelled as a practitioner / stakeholder to avail myself to the code development / optimization process.
- Somebody has to do it.
- I have collaborated with DSA in the code development process since the early 1980's. The most successful model occurred in the 1990's when an ad hoc group of stakeholders met (without facilitation or direction of DSA staff) to develop code change proposals. The outcome was that all parties were invested in the process and the proposals developed were approved unanimously by the Building Standards Commission.
- I know the history of states involvement and the hurdles they have faced.
- I enjoy reaching out to DSA staff to discuss code interpretations and arrange effective training opportunities.
- Have enjoyed working with the professional staff at DSA and would like to continue with the new proposed process.
- Would like to participate due to no past experience in the process.
- Providing equal access to public facilities fosters community building and feeling of inclusiveness; a primary objective in any grounded organization.
- I have no personal experience with DSA stakeholder engagement.
- I appreciated feedback from my suggestions in the past.
- I have had no engagement in the process, other than reading the updates on the web site.
- To bring product availability and product development perspective to deliberative process.
- As a state agency representative, it is necessary for me to be familiar with DSA's code development efforts I have a full understanding of the all interested parties' involvement.
- I have no experience, but am interested.
- I find that it is important to maintain dialogue as compliance and accessibility can sometimes not be the same.
- My wife is now mobility disabled which increases my desire to participate.
- Did not participate in the stakeholder engagement.

- I have no experience with DSA stakeholder engagement.
- I have opinions and would be interested to hear other opinions.
- Professional responsibility and civic duty to participate.
- Just as motivated as ever.
- My desire to participate is solely affected by the amount of time I have available to do so.

Comments regarding Guidance on Improving Community Engagement

- I would like to increase DSA's responsiveness to disability access issues.
- I've found DSA staff smart, engaging, and very thoughtful. However, I was disappointed in the most recent cycle to see that items the Commission sent back for "further study" remained unchanged with insufficient explanation. I greatly appreciate how DSA reaches out to stakeholders, but I don't see that outreach reflected in the proposed code changes.
- The only awareness I've had of this process is through activist community notices from other local disabled folks. I'd like to feel more included and involved since access and the law is very important to me as a wheelchair user.
- I often know the kinds of access barriers I face and the kind of access I need, but know neither book, chapter and verse for legal situations, nor specs of relevant guidelines and codes. I feel that there is an expectation that the wonky language of DSA docs is a given, and that one is supposed to somehow intuit what is meant by the circular logic and obtuse phrasing. I am a down-to-earth activist who just wants things to work without constant struggle. I must, therefore, trust the legal eagles and policy wonks with disabilities (and our occasional allies) to see to the details.
- A response to comments provided would be helpful and encourages more participation from the non-disabled community.
- Times are inconvenient and lengthy.
- BSC/DSA really needs a broader spectrum of participants in the code development process.

Statements of Dissatisfaction regarding Experience in Stakeholder Engagement Process

- What I said was diplomatically ignored. I feel very discouraged, as if effort and time was wasted.
- Spitting into the wind with few results other than a wet face.
- No one listens and few seem to care.
- Code involvement since mid 1980's experiencing many code challenges pre/post ADA. Last seven years have been a great disappointment.

- It is necessary to respond to the erosion of disability rights with an increased level of advocacy.
- Why are you taking our rights away? This feels like an effort to say some people have been consulted while you discount what we say about the rights to equal access you are taking away.
- They (DSA) discouraged dialogue all together.
- It seems like it is made so difficult for people who already face challenges to participate in the process that adding the difficulty to the challenges makes participation impossible.
- Lack of clear, accessible ways for individuals with on the ground experience to provide meaningful input.
- No need for "guidelines." Follow ADA rules!!!!
- I signed up. Got no email or other responses.
- Even DSA staff called their stakeholder engagement sessions "listening sessions." Dialogue was discouraged.
- Watching the current regulations get weakened, while so few locations have been made accessible drives my desire to participate.
- I was surprised at how petty state officials' comments in stakeholder minutes could be.
- I perceive that the DSA does not want to hear from us; it is trying to water down the regulations to levels that violate Gov Code 4450, and it considers us road bumps in its process.
- See lots of negative email.
- Strikingly hopeless.
- The State unjustly weakens the strong access regulations for our disability community, when it allows the State Architect to water down ever so subtly the once robust policies that allow the inclusion of more disabled in the community activities of the public square.
- Paid disability advocates were overly represented and used the "disabled" card frequently when discussing technical matters, rather than staying on point.
- Where is the representative(s) for mentally challenged and disabled individuals? Are there even any spokespersons invited to current, ongoing stakeholder meetings?
- Vocal stakeholders want everything or nothing.
- There are stakeholders sabotaging the process.
- I participate because my job requires it.
- I feel that without my kind of measured, expert involvement, the discussions may result in codes that are built on feelings rather than science.
- Desire to participate has not occurred to date.

- I understand that this is a difficult process but feel that plan reviewers have valuable insight and should have more influence over changes to code language.
- We are in a busy time for construction. Participation is limited by workloads.
- The process is "insider" driven by paid professionals.
- Unfortunately, politics still play a role in common sense regulations.
- Under Chet Widom, all advisory committees, including access, we're dropped. On a number of occasions, I have requested that DSA re-instate the access committee
- What is "DSA stakeholder engagement". Are you asking about how DSA solicits stakeholders, who they believe are stakeholders, and how their stakeholders are engaged through DSA?
- Too combative. DSA does what it wants in the end.
- Seems very time intensive due to bureaucracy; dominated by advocates.

QUESTION 5:

I support DSA's effort to improve stakeholder engagement and would like for stakeholders to work together in a new way to strengthen the code development process for the CBC accessibility regulations.

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. Strongly Disagree (1 Star)	6%	11%	4%
B. (2 Stars)	2%	6%	2%
C. (3 Stars)	11%	9%	11%
D. (4 Stars)	15%	13%	15%
E. Strongly Agree (5 Stars)	65%	61%	68%

QUESTION 6:

I support the use of a neutral professional facilitator to support all parties in this effort.

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. Strongly Disagree (1 Star)	5%	8%	3%
B. (2 Stars)	2%	2%	2%
C. (3 Stars)	15%	15%	14%
D. (4 Stars)	23%	13%	25%
E. Strongly Agree (5 Stars)	56%	63%	56%

QUESTION 7:

I support the UC Davis facilitation plan to collect recommendations and diverse perspectives through this online survey and through one-on-one interviews regarding the best approaches to forming this alliance.

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. Strongly Disagree (1 Star)	3%	8%	2%
B. (2 Stars)	3%	3%	3%
C. (3 Stars)	22%	20%	23%
D. (4 Stars)	22%	15%	23%
E. Strongly Agree (5 Stars)	50%	54%	49%

QUESTION 8:

I support the idea of creating a consultative alliance of diverse stakeholders to discuss and inform DSA about proposed amendments to the CBC accessibility regulations.

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. Strongly Disagree (1 Star)	6%	15%	3%
B. (2 Stars)	2%	5%	2%
C. (3 Stars)	14%	11%	14%
D. (4 Stars)	21%	11%	22%
E. Strongly Agree (5 Stars)	57%	58%	59%

KEY for respondents' written-in responses below:

- Arrow Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Beneficiaries.
- Circle Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Users.

Supportive and Neutral Comments regarding Creating the Access Code Collaborative (ACC)

- Yes, if DSA will really be responsive to concerns, and not just ignore suggestions.
- When prior State Architects supported a collaborative process with meaningful deliberation many successful outcomes were achieved.
- I think it is especially important to have significant input from individuals with disabilities to understand how these regulations affect their daily activities.
- Building a coalition of professionals and consumers with diverse experiences increases the chances of developing "usable" and coherent codes.

- Diverse representation by those with disabilities, or designing on behalf of those with disabilities, strengthens our profession.
- Transparency is important. Sharing and hearing information is helpful.
- The best way to develop access codes that really serve people with disabilities is through open discussion with all points of view heard.
- Answers are in the mouths of the stakeholders along with history. These historians and strong commonsense thinkers and should be the nucleus of the consulting alliance.
- Knowledge and expertise should be distributed evenly and should not be hoarded by the public servants who betray their trust. The disabled community should have access to proper training on the rules, regulations, plus the opportunities to watch and make sure the systems are accountable to the disability community it is serving.
- I believe individuals with the most varied and long term experience in various fields will be best suited.
- Building a coalition of professionals and consumers with diverse experiences increases the chances of developing "usable" and coherent codes.
- I think this is a very proactive and fair approach.
- I think for the most part DSA has done a very good job of trying to do this. It has been a few vocal accessibility proponents, who have hijacked a good process; not meaning it can't be better.
- I look forward to providing feedback on access needs for travelers with disabilities in an airport environment.
- Diverse representation by those with disabilities, or designing on behalf of those with disabilities, strengthens our profession.
- Experience and objectivity are needed in developing CBC accessibility standards.
- Transparency is important. Sharing and hearing information is helpful.
- Good to discuss the differences between ADA and CBC and how it impacts building permit plan reviews and field inspections.
- Surprised at the animosity of the disabled community towards DSA. This alliance may help towards better understanding for all.

Comments Advising How to Help the ACC be Effective

- I would agree that this would be a good idea if the process includes a mediation framework, where there was an education component, a short joint meeting followed by a separate meeting of interest groups, then a straight mediation process where the interest groups are separated. If consensus is required to forward a recommendation to DSA this process could be effective at making stable changes to the existing code.

- If by "diverse stakeholders" you mean that you will prioritize the needs of people with disabilities accessing buildings where they work, live, play, and otherwise participate in society, following the ADA requirements, then yes, I agree.
- Only if equitable. Only if persons with disability are provided access (transport to/from) and training. Otherwise, the paid attorneys and others representing builder interests will overpower disabled folks who are the most impacted and who generally have fewer resources.
- Please have stakeholders that understand access not just for themselves but for others in varied environments. Have worked in a cross functional team- respect each other's opinions - have folks that are out of the box that have first-hand knowledge and have initiated innovative strategies to remove barriers but may not know all the regulations.
- Need to be from all parts of the State and diversity of disabilities - from mountainous rural communities of low population to that of flat big cities with large populations! From communities of little public access to cities of very many access provided.
- This already is required by law. There is a process written into the law. I support this only insofar as it tracks that process and gives PWD the role that the legislature directed they have.
- It all depends on how really seriously and meaningfully this participation is seen. I worry about token attempts.
- If we're really taking the lead from Federal / ADA, I could reasonably make the argument that we should just be following federal requirements. Didn't the CA Attorney General make a ruling just a few years ago that determined that is what the state should do, that in turn precipitated the current CBC 11B?
- I further support monitoring and accountability to verify that the input sought by DSA is legitimately and substantively incorporated in a material way into the final rules; and not simply DSA taking steps to achieve the "appearance" of an open process for legal purposes. Merely the appearance of inclusive participation in stakeholder forums without a sincere intention or substantive inclusion of stakeholder input has been alleged in the past, including allegations made by current and former government agency staff. This is not to suggest that such disingenuousness is currently a factor, it is suggested that verifiable mechanisms can and should be implemented such that the process is objective and has effective monitoring to verify that legitimate and valuable input is traced to tangible outcome oriented results.
- Rotation of members of the alliance.
- Please include representatives and stakeholders of the mentally challenged, other segments of the population with disabilities, too (blind, physical handicaps, veterans, hard of hearing, etc.)

- Diverse stakeholders should also involve those outside the access community and knowledgeable with code enforcement, costs of compliance, etc.
- It all depends on the make-up of the group. In the past, many of the working groups have been comprised by an overwhelming proportion of advocates from the disabled community.
- Recommend that schedule and location considers the participants ability to attend.
- I do have reservations about how changes will be decided on. Impacts should be reviewed carefully and fully.
- It is important to not only hear from the disabled community on what changes should be made to the current code but also to have design professionals and code experts there to help to understand how the changes will affect the able-bodied community in negative or positive ways.
- Leadership in these alliances needs to be able to identify when personal agendas are in the way of progress for the whole community. There needs to be a holistic approach to information gathering.
- The consultative alliance has to be unbiased.
- The design and code enforcement aspects and input to the CBC development have not been adequately tapped into and should aggressively be sought. We are the ones who try to create and enforce the CBC accessibility features, and some of requirements of California amendments are unrealistic and frankly, are excessively restrictive.
- While I support DSA's effort to improve stakeholder engagement, it's difficult to assess the UC Davis facilitation efforts because the process has not begun. Perhaps a survey is necessary once the process begins or ends so stakeholders can assess its value.
- It all depends on how really seriously and meaningfully this participation is seen. I worry about token attempts.
- The disabled community should have significant involvement. Their points of view represent the real-world impact of the accessibility portions building codes.
- Broad involvement is critical to the success of these regulations. When controlled by a smaller group, regulations typically become less enforceable and less effective.
- It's important to engage a wider group instead of just outlier advocates.
- 50% of the stake holders must be building owners with a balance of small business, large corporate campuses and government agencies. Inspectors and IORs are just documenting failure, not solving issues. Architects must be involved.
- While I fully support an environment that is accessible to all, I believe that modifications to the code should allow for some flexibility to meet the code to take into account construction tolerances and creative ways to meet the intent.

- Proposals need to better balance the interest of persons with disabilities, what is reasonable to expect during construction and what design options exist to meet the design intent in more than one way.
- Take a look at the CASp Implementation Committee 2004 – 06.

General Statements of Doubt re: Creating a Consultative Alliance

- Pitting representatives of people with disabilities against paid attorneys and lobbyists whose goals are to decrease access requirements is an injustice to people with disabilities. The only way to make participation by people with disability equitable is to provide travel funding and PRIOR training in order to be able to understand the code development process and to be knowledgeable of federal and state laws that require accessibility in the built environment. They must have training to know how the current state access codes are organized and what they require currently, and how they differ from the ADA Accessibility Standards. They must be provided travel funds in order to be heard in an equal manner with paid attorneys and lobbyists and other professionals for whom travel to Sacramento is a business expense.
- Handpicking desired advocates is not collaborative method of inclusion either.
- Define "Neutral." Who chooses?
- The fact that this survey needs to say that a professional neutral facilitator is needed says it all for me--it wouldn't be needed if the process actually listened to us; diverse stakeholders are less needed than people who actually need and use access.
- At the end of the day, it will be about the outcomes. Are building codes and therefore buildings, more or less accessible to those with all types of disabilities and is the process transparent?
- What is at stake is people's lives. How do you price that?
- "Facilitated" discussions have largely been a source of exhaustion and frustration for me. Those games are often loaded against the average person, yet we continue to fight because failure to do so means we are not represented at all. The only way I have seen the game successfully balanced is when we flood the board with our troops. If facilitation means that opinions are really taken carefully, used to inform the process and given equal weight as the opinions of those with more of the usual kinds of power, it might stand a chance. Else it will end disastrously for us. It usually does.
- We don't need TABs (Temporarily Able Bodied) telling the mobility impaired what they need or don't need. People with mobility impairments have very specific needs and we do not want those with EVIL economic intentions to have say over our ESSENTIAL ACCESS NEEDS thus VIOLATING OUR CIVIL RIGHTS!
- Although important, disabled access activists frequently bring unbalanced viewpoints to these discussions.

- I don't know what this is, a "consultative alliance". What am I agreeing to?
- Time bandwidth
- The state has consistently ignored individual stakeholders in the recent past. Will this just be a way to make it easier to ignore them, by only having a single message to ignore or deny?
- So many times, this has been done...I'd like to see Michael Mankin's responses to these questions.
- Seems like all the so-called professionals get together to make all the regular business owners and individuals pay a heavy price in having to implement many regulations.
- DSA already does this but gets no credit only grief.
- DSA once had an Access Advisory Committee. The committee was disbanded by the current State Architect and should be reinstated. I don't think we need yet another "new" forum to accomplish this.
- This has been previously attempted and not supported by State Architects. I question UC Davis's selection, you are not known as an advocacy group for access
- Based on previous experience, I'm not sure it will work. Stakeholders sabotaging the process need not be included in this consultative alliance.
- The advocates have monopolized the dialog, resulting in the over-exaggeration of importance on some issues and under-appreciation for others.
- This is a waste of time and resources. The alliance concept is a Band-Aid, not a solution.
- DSA does not take a neutral stance. They make their decisions without input. It is more akin to a dictatorship than a state agency that is obliged to work with constituents.
- Although Important, disabled access activists frequently bring unbalanced viewpoints to these discussions.
- I do, but my concern is that DSA will reject stakeholders' proposals.
- Only disability groups and architects should have major input. Others don't usually know what they are talking about and represent financial interests.

QUESTION 9:

Members of the new consultative body will benefit from training on the CBC code development process and its possibilities and limitations.

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. Strongly Disagree (1 Star)	3%	6%	1%
B. (2 Stars)	4%	6%	4%
C. (3 Stars)	12%	6%	13%
D. (4 Stars)	20%	18%	20%
E. Strongly Agree (5 Stars)	61%	63%	62%

KEY for respondents' written-in responses below:

- Arrow Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Beneficiaries.
- Circle Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Users.

Supportive / Neutral Comments re: Training on the CBC Code Development Process

- The complexity and scope of disabilities are to be educated
- The training component will only work for CA's disability community if funds are provided for taking the training, which must be conducted on site at least once a year, in addition to online training. Recognition must be provided for those who complete the training. Professionals from the building and business communities already receive monetary compensation and/or professional development recognition. People with disabilities must be provided incentives to volunteer the extensive amount of time required to be trained and to participate in what is mostly a hostile environment, a battlefield to protect and preserve disability civil rights laws and regulations that are under constant attack. Being provided a business card that states that the holder is a certified accessibility consultant for the State of CA would be a form of recognition.
- Most know far more than the "professionals" will acknowledge and almost always talk down to those who deal with the barriers daily. (and I am one of those "professionals" but also a PWD)
- I think many of us are familiar with the process and its limitations, but also believe that some of the limitations imposed by DSA are artificial and fixable.

- Each member's knowledge, skills and abilities are paramount given such complex code. Without an accessible built environment, the reality of 83% +/- of persons with disabilities will remain unemployed and dependent on tax supported programs!
- Yes, it is important to make the scope of the process clear. It is also important to make this information public, in a format that is easily understood by the average member of the public.
- Recognition must be provided for those who complete the training.
- Professionals from the building and business communities already receive monetary compensation and/or professional development recognition. People with disabilities must be provided incentives to volunteer the extensive amount of time required to be trained and to participate in what is mostly a hostile environment, a battlefield to protect and preserve disability civil rights laws and regulations which are under constant attack. Being provided a business card that states that the holder is a certified accessibility consultant for the State of CA would be one form of recognition.
- Any educational process should include a routine component where the implication of proposed changes is clearly drawn out and expressed. This should emphasize legal analysis of the issues, which are provided in advance and can be responded to by outside attorneys.
- This action would level the playing field for the disabled community.
- Education helps lead to transparency of the process. When it is done in a black hole, it only frustrates participation.
- Taking short cuts in the development of the building industry will lead to disaster and loss of life.
- This could be very helpful.
- Yes!
- Understanding the creation of a code is beneficial understanding how it became code is good
- Some barrier removal creates barriers of differing categories; i.e., truncated domes and thin wheeled wheel chairs creates a barrier for some, while assisting folks with sight difficulties.
- The consultative body should be the disabled, especially the mobility impaired.
 - The knowledge gained should trickle down to the masses.
 - More importantly can provide valuable feedback.
 - I am willing to travel around California to attend workshops and seminars.
 - It is imperative that all stakeholders be provided opportunities to benefit from and collaborate in meaningful participation.
 - Clear expectation of the goal of the CBC code development upfront

- Most outside input comes from those that have their own agenda, and know little about code.
- The training component will only work for CA's disability community if funds are provided for taking the training, which must be conducted on site at least once a year, in addition to online training. Recognition must be provided for those who complete the training.
- Although I don't support the idea of a new consultative body, there needs to be training on the CBC development process and building standards law so that anyone who wants to participate can. Right now, it is so complicated that most people, with the exception of lobbyists or code experts can't really participate in a meaningful way.
- While offering diverse perspectives, a consultative body needs to engage this task from a set of
 - This is a must.
 - This will be very beneficial as it is important to know the process and its limitations.
 - Excellent idea to have code experts (Building Officials), advocates and public discussions to assist in understanding. Will assist in supporting the written regulations by DSA.
 - This response is based on decades of frustration wherein some of the most vocal advocates from the disabled community have a curious lack of understanding of the current code provisions and a serious lack of understanding of the administrative adoption process...which has changed very little in decades.
 - I look forward to being considered for the consultative body.
 - Some of the most vocal advocates don't actually use the CODES, they use the BUILDINGS that result from the codes. They further exhibit a disregard for the practical problems that code text may create.
 - I would open this training program up to the public, not just the consultative body. The consultative body creates a "clique" that excludes the public from the code process.
 - Training from both Code and also BSC.
 - Common orientation and training will improve the process.
 - The accessibility portions of the Code have been driven by the disabled community and have not been balanced by the construction, design and code enforcement input.
 - While I agree with this concept and hope the result is the consultative body will be better informed, time will tell.
 - Members could gain insight and history of certain code changes and can disseminate the information to colleagues, applicants, city council, business and general public members to demystify the process.
 - People outside of the architecture and engineering communities often have no idea how building codes are developed or the processes involved.

- Understanding of the actual scope of the code and enforceability is key to the success of this proposed body.
- Absolutely. The best education comes from being involved.
- The group should be open to suggesting new processes for developing code standards.

General Statements of Doubt re: Training on the CBC Code Development Process

- I suspect interested parties already know all of what training would include, and more.
- Requiring training limits access.
- What is a "consultative body"? Who's doing the training? What is the objective of the training? The questions assume that a group of people don't understand the possibilities and limitation of something - democracy, law, regulations, - or the structured forum of hearing proposed regulatory amendments?
- I think a general dialogue is a better first step ... rather than whittling a round peg to fit a square hole.
- Already fully committed
- Who is paying for this process? It cannot be the CASp program...it is already ridiculous in cost. It should not be added to permit fees as they too are getting costly.
- The people should not need training. Otherwise you get the access advocates who delve into qualitative tirades as opposed to analyzing code, and developing code. Training should be limited.
- How will members be selected?
- Requiring training limits access.
- All members should know all accessibility standards prior to being part of the consulting body.
- Perhaps this code process is kind of broken and this approach with a 3rd party is not the answer.
- Don't know how to answer. If they don't know what it is, they shouldn't be involved.
- Focusing on limitations appears to be an excuse for providing clarity in the code.

QUESTION 10:

Training in collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution for all members of the alliance and DSA will benefit this effort.

RESPONSES:	ALL Results	Code Beneficiaries	Code Users
A. Strongly Disagree (1 Star)	6%	16%	3%
B. (2 Stars)	4%	6%	3%
C. (3 Stars)	17%	14%	17%
D. (4 Stars)	19%	13%	20%
E. Strongly Agree (5 Stars)	55%	51%	57%

KEY for respondents' written-in responses below:

- Arrow Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Beneficiaries.
- Circle Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Users.

Comments re: Support for Collaboration & CR Training for Alliance and DSA Staff

- Yes, if the training includes DSA staff committed to making changes themselves.
- True collaboration should be a primary goal of this process.
- People have to understand and act respectfully, listen to all comments and ideally understand it is a conversation not a debate.
- Transparency will help. Facilitation will help.
- Talk among everyone involved.
- Training could be helpful. But I am concerned that, as in the past, the monied interests will always prevail. And the "collaborative" part will be ignored.
- I cannot agree strongly enough. Not only can well organized conflict resolution prevent stagnation, but can enhance creativity in resolution.
- Especially if the state can be brought to the table and appropriately participates. That is different than listening to all and then acting only by ignoring PWD access issues.
- Good to have this skill also from the start. Good to review.
- Training brings out "Think Tank" forums of discussion, which tends to allow us to move us to make fair, level headed, and informed decisions.
- The legislative branch of our state is doing the right approach by having the DSA office ask for participation in the governing process by which codes are introduced and reviewed.
- Autocratic practices have continued to be employed far too long given the evolution of the Unruh and Americans with Disabilities Act civil rights standards. Civil rights on behalf

of one class becomes an undue burden by other competing classes. Meaningful collaborative problem solving utilizing effective conflict resolution methods could maximize successful code development outcomes!

- The interactive process of effectively navigating the complexities of existing and emerging trends in regulatory authorities, codes and standards (and their implementation and enforcement) invites us to practice and optimize effective and interactive methods. Problem solving need not always be fraught with adversity and opposition posturing (as is far too often the case). With effective facilitation, genuine collaboration can yield not only optimized outcomes (effective applicability and enforcement of codes and standards) but promote professionalism in the exercise of standards of care reasonably expected.
- My experience with collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution is that the requirements of federal and state laws are ignored. Instead, representatives of people with disabilities are pressured to accommodate the pocket books of the building industry and the view of the CA Chamber of Commerce, which is opposed to providing architectural considerations of the needs of the human populace when experiencing a disability. Because people with disabilities experience constant devaluation and are easily intimidated, and because there is constant media retaliation against people with disabilities who ask that their civil rights be enforced, a training in conflict resolution will result in the conflict being resolved by the representative of the disability community giving in to the demands of those opposed to access.
- Good to have this skill also from the start. Good to review.
- People just need a venue to discuss ideas, problems and solutions. DSA should provide funds to allow non-professional stakeholders to participate in the process. Agency staff and professionals need to interact respectfully with people with disabilities and really listen to the "stakeholders" who will benefit or suffer from the outcome.
- Problem solving and conflict resolution is an important part of my job. Additional training is always beneficial.
- This is a key element. Many people, still do not support the need for regulation as set forth.
- Excellent idea to have code experts (Building Officials), advocates and public discussions to assist in understanding. Will assist in supporting the written regulations by DSA.
- Training brings out "Think Tank" forums of discussion, which tends to allow us to move us to make fair, level headed, and informed decisions.
- Many of us in civil service already work in problem solving teams and have learned about conflict resolution. A facilitator can give a short presentation on the rules of the team.

- A “partnering” approach has worked well on construction projects where I was the Inspector of Record. A collaborative effort involving all the stakeholders is necessary to gain the broad approval and support of the disabled community.
- Conflict resolution training is always useful when dealing with sensitive subjects such as disable access to the general able body public and can be useful in educating the public on awareness of accessibility access issues.
- Frankly, this needs to be aimed at the advocates who are angry and disruptive. The rest of us 'code geeks' generally are afraid to say anything because we are being bullied by the advocates.
- People who can't or are unwilling to see someone else's point of view are unproductive.
- It cannot be worse than present conditions

Comments re: Advice About Making This Work

- If all you are doing is talking between the members with the alliance, you will never solve the problem.
- Business models and language pushes away many persons with disabilities and many building officials need to keep it simple and down to earth
- Training should make sure that the history of the Disability Movement is correctly understood and properly highlighted.
- Align expectations.
- Solutions need a confirmation. They go to another experienced common sense thinker.
- Who is paying for this process? It cannot be the CASp program...it is already ridiculous in cost. It should not be added to permit fees as they too are getting costly.

General Statements of Disbelief and Doubt About the Training, the People and the Process

- The issue is not that people can't solve problems. It's the lack of understanding and knowledge of needs in the disabled community that cause the current predicament.
- My experience with collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution is that the requirements of Federal and state laws are ignored. Instead, representatives of people with disabilities are pressured to accommodate the pocket books of the building industry and the view of the CA Chamber of Commerce, which is opposed to providing architectural considerations of the needs of the human populace when experiencing a disability. Because people with disabilities experience constant devaluation and are easily intimidated, and because there is constant media retaliation against people with disabilities who ask that their civil rights be enforced, a training in conflict resolution will result in the conflict being resolved by the representative of the disability community giving in to the demands of those opposed to access.

- This protection of the interests of those opposed to access is insured because it will be DSA paying for the conflict resolution training. DSA paid for a facilitated meeting on the disability community's concerns about new regulations on the Certified Access Specialist program. The meeting was provided after the disability community protested that they had not been informed of the changes proposed for the CASp. DSA's paid facilitator allowed only three people of the five people attending the hearing in person to speak at a time on each issue, only three of the 15 people attending by telephone and then for ONLY ONE MINUTE EACH.
- Will it benefit the rule makers or is it a way to nullify the voices of the protesters?
- Autocratic practices have continued to be employed far too long given the evolution of the Unruh and Americans with Disabilities Act civil rights standards. Civil rights on behalf of one class becomes an undue burden by other competing classes. Meaningful collaborative problem solving utilizing effective conflict resolution methods could maximize successful code development outcomes!
- The disability rights community has been manipulated this way in the past and support for a DSA controlled process is viewed with suspicion. Therefore, a real "COLLABORATION" would have to be demonstrated before there is unconditional support can be achieved.
- We have to remember that the building industry/CA Chamber of Commerce are against access for persons with disabilities.
- It's not a question of communication style. The fact is, the DSA is undermining the strength of CA disability access protections.
- DSA has an agenda, authority, and limited resources. They can complete their staffed mandates without any participation from the public. A few staff in DSA, and a few exclusively selective consultants (without competitive bidding) have all the control over the entire proposed provisional amendment process.
- There is no incentive for DSA staff to seek public input.
- While I think it important that people with disabilities ask, and when necessary, fight for the accommodations they need to successfully participate in these kinds of community processes, I just as strongly feel that agencies/orgs facilitating such processes should make more than token efforts to make sure accommodation needs are discovered and met.
- This question also presumes that DSA is not a part of the alliance, and - what is "this effort"
- In a collaborative paradigm, group think (often against one's own interest) is employed and enforced and one must remain constantly alert and vigilant. This is exhausting! Furthermore, most facilitative AND collaborative systems employ tools that have the assumption of vision at their base. I am totally blind, so must, in addition to fighting

whatever battles/issues are at hand in the scenario, fight for federally required programmatic access as well. I am also concerned for people with disabilities who do not do well in a word-heavy environment...those who either have cognitive disabilities that impede inbound and/or outbound verbal communication, or those for whom speech or hearing is an issue. Most collaborative processes and facilitators give no thought to such accommodations. Out-of-the-box thinking is required, and they are incapable of such.

- This "alliance" is a huge waste of state funding
- Unsure, there are some folks on both end of this subject matter (over 30 years) that are very entrenched in their views and positions. At times civility has gone to the way-side.
- The problem is not getting everyone to the table.
- There is no incentive for DSA staff to seek public input.
- Training cannot always overcome personal shortcomings.
- See a time sink here
- Sounds like a bunch of flip charts, Power Point presentations and gobble-de-gook to me.

QUESTION 11:

After reviewing the results of this survey, UC Davis will conduct a series of one-on-one interviews to further inform this effort. Do you know of individuals or groups who you recommend we interview? Remember, to be selected for an interview does not imply that you will be asked to serve on the alliance. Feel free to recommend yourself, others who share your views, and others whose views differ from yours but who you trust will be able to work together in an alliance to promote an effective code development process that is respectful of the input of all stakeholders. We plan to interview 25 individuals and your help in identifying key voices will be greatly appreciated.

Note: Responses received to this question were used in selecting the 29 individual who were interviewed.

QUESTION 12:

To strengthen DSA stakeholder engagement efforts in the CBC code development process I offer the following recommendations:

KEY for respondents' written-in responses below:

- Arrow Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Beneficiaries.
- Circle Bullets are used for respondents self-identified as Code Users.

Communication

- Please listen and do not assume that you know everything about the needs of the disabled due to your own limited experience.
- The meetings must allow discussion and dialogue of proposed access code changes before they are published.
- DSA should interact in a meaningful manner in the development by, with, and for the stakeholders that disabled access codes impact, the end user.
- Don't just talk "to" the users LISTEN to the answers
- In order for this to be effective, DSA needs to be willing to listen and respond with significant actions to increase accessibility in state codes.
- Clarity, Simplicity, Transparency. The goal is to create communities that welcome all, by not creating barriers to access.
- Talk and involve users (actual disabled individuals) in making changes - No one disabled individual is the same, even though they may have to disability - it is good to have multiple representatives of disabilities - especially those who look out for other disabilities besides their own.
- DSA can only provide input on DSA projects.
- Plan by asking people with disabilities what barriers they feel should be removed or altered

Stakeholder Selection

- Ensure a broad scope of knowledge of all disabilities.
- In addition to reflecting the diversity of stakeholders, DSA should ensure that all groups (individuals w/disabilities, advocates, developers, etc.) are represented equally and have an equal opportunity to participate in the process.
- To have equal representation of individuals with disabilities and industry professionals.
- The majority of the stakeholders should be people with mobility impairments
- Recommend interviewing more than 25 people, since this will affect every person with a disability whoever comes to CA to do anything.
- Select a group with extensive experience across US, and not just CA.
- Include members of the local disability commissions.
- DSA should not have any input in the selection of the members of the alliance.
- Get more contractor, design professional and code personnel involved in this, as they are all involved directly in the implementation of the rules...some of them are rather over the edge and very difficult to implement.
- I would just express the importance of developing a group of well rounded, interested, individuals with no special interest.

- Look to diversify the stakeholder efforts and bring new accessibility advocates to the table. Groups that represent a large constituency.
- Stakeholders disrupting the process should not be allowed to participate.
- Please get at least some advocates from the accessibility community who understand the code (past and present) and understand the code-adoption process. They are out there, but the long-standing advocates from the disabled community always want to be in charge. It's very perplexing... they object to the time commitment but are rarely prepared for the discussion???
- Facility managers should be part of the stakeholder engagement group.
- Have representatives from manufacturer's (plumbing fixtures, windows, doors). Some of the approved codes cannot be implemented because the fixture does not exist.
- Involvement of local building officials will help DSA understand the challenges we face in implementation of accessibility regulations in real life. Often times the code provisions seem clear and direct until you try to apply them to projects, especially existing buildings and facilities.
- Remove DSA staff from the decision-making process, or at least make their ability to determine results limited.
- Get input from users and facility managers in particular.
- Start with having individual discussions with the main groups: Designers, Contractors, and the disabled population. Understand each side of things prior to making decisions, then bring everyone together if possible in some sort of larger forum.
- Limit stakeholders. Most of these groups only represent special interests unrelated to disability and universal design, and are grossly biased.
- Invite stakeholders with understanding of codes and statutes, individuals with disabilities, disability advocates, and attorneys familiar with disability laws and procedures.
- Develop a good working relationship with municipal building officials.
- Aggressively seek construction, design and code enforcement community input for the modifications of accessibility provisions of the code to try and balance the currently disabled community input. Parts of the code have been driven by one sided input without looking at on the ground "how to achieve the goal" and feasibility aspects
- Involve industry experts to have input on available technology and products to meet existing and proposed codes and regulations, as well as to have input on need for existing and proposed codes and regulations, and their impact on owners and manufacturers
- Engage CBSC as well: They are the actual California department legally responsible for code writing for the state.

- Establish an independent, objective stakeholder group that can serve a multitude of purposes not necessarily limited to code development. Other benefits that the emerging stakeholder group could potentially provide is serving as an appeals board, interpretation of code application (case-by-case peer review) or in the investigation of misapplication of building codes/standards.
- Identify key associations of stakeholders for persons with different types of disabilities, contractors, civil engineers, architects, developers, building owners, school districts, hospitals, hotel management, shopping center, movie theaters, concert halls, museums, etc. and get an appointed representative. Make the committee as big as needed to get all input. Get US-DOJ Civil Rights Division if possible. Will require 60 persons-it can be managed and this will greatly reduce the problem of unintended consequences of code changes.
- In part, identify organizations which will submit nominations for representation

Meeting Structure/ Organization

General Comments

- Develop formal policies, procedures and "rules to meet by" defining acceptable practices and personal behavior. Perhaps even develop "Mission" and/or "Vision" statements leading to successful goals/objectives code development outcomes.
- Stay focused- look at big picture - set clear goals from the beginning that all agree to.
- A construction-experience and end-user-experience committee should supersede the stakeholders and make all accessibility code recommendations.
- Annual or quarterly review boards to examine the level and effects of contractor competence on access improving understanding and use of standards.
- Clear objectives and timelines for participation. Considerate outreach and an emphasis on the fact that disabled accessibility affects everyone at some stage of life.
- Keep it focused, have an agenda for all meetings, keep ALL participants on topic, use technical experts and keep it professional (not emotional).
- A series of meetings with strict agenda and topics. Allow all conversations to happen (not let an individual takeover), and to maybe have a "recap" or "roundtable" at the end of each meeting (maybe 10 minutes total). Lastly, the meeting should be no longer than 1 1/2 hours long. No exceptions.
- Look at historical stakeholder groups and what was or was not accomplished and why
- Use a facilitator for all efforts.
- Provide effective industry updates
- The advocates should be required to limit their comments into the context of specific code proposals...just like all of the rest of us have to. Possibly allow a portion of the process that is for general statements; and let the advocates say whatever they want,

but then CLOSE that part of the process, and open the part where we discuss specific code proposals.

Support for Stakeholder Participation & Access

- Dedicate both human and fiscal resources to manage and facilitate participation of all participants
- Provide travel funding for attendance at these meetings.
- Provide training for those who wish to participate in the access advisory committee meetings.
- Engage people in the process of developing code by giving sufficient info and background, rather than providing what may be seen as a finalized proposal that does not allow for any discussion and input to develop it
- Use DoR to help engage stakeholders and CSU 23 campuses each have student disability services managers.
- Provide access to the process.
- Provide enough time to fully craft recommendations.
- Bring forward concerns related to modifications to existing facilities, with pre-existing site constraints; allowing for more flexible options for removing barriers.
- Develop a good working relationship with municipal Building Officials.
- Providing an interpretive service on accessibility standards for public accommodation.
- Please contact the Access Board to ask about advisory group and public involvement development. They have done a good job of bringing diverse representation together, especially with the Public ROW Access Advisory Committee (PROWAAC). The group included individuals with disabilities, advocates, design professionals, code developers, and transportation industry reps. <https://www.access-board.gov/guidelines-and-standards/streets-sidewalks/public-rights-of-way/background/advisory-committee-members>. Scott Windley 202-272-0025 was the staff support for PROWAAC.
- Demystify for the regular disabled person what code development and code compliance are in a very practical step by step process that's a joy to learn and enforce.
- Provide many opportunities for both the disability and business communities to really share their experiences in more meaningful ways in real life situations.
- Start making universal design more of a priority
- Bring forward concerns related to modifications to existing facilities, with pre-existing site constraints; allowing for more flexible options for removing barriers.

Meeting Logistics

- Host events at accessible facilities: Ed Roberts campus, Magical Bridge Playgrounds in San Francisco, etc.

- Calendars for cycles and interim cycles are unclear.
- Do not have meetings in Sacramento, San Diego or Los Angeles. Most school district staff will not attend
- Always allow call-in and plenty of notice to calendar way in advance
- Make the hearings more available in terms of times and length. People with jobs cannot allocate an entire day to hearings as important as they are. Make the hearings regional.
- Use the incredible potential of the internet and social networking to fill the geographic gap between the Northern and Southern California areas.

Other Suggestions/Comments

- The idea of making short cuts to people with disabilities will be a failure, there are so many people this will be chaos
- Strengthen the laws.
- Enforce the laws.
- Continue the alignment with Federal ADA and clarify standards that will be related to new cannabis legislation such as U/Greenhouse access standards related to work stations/work areas etc.
- Align CA code with Federal.
- Align the code language more with the 2010 ADA Standards, and put the common-sense exceptions and definitions into the CBC.
- Rural areas have very different barriers than city dwellers.
- Several individuals unclear who the Alliance is?
- STOP TAKING AWAY OUR ACCESS!!!!
- Why don't the disabled chose the priority amendments - not DSA.
- Coordinate with construction professionals to build accessible features.
- I'm fairly new to CA; but nothing I've written has ever been responded to.
- Not always clear how/if stakeholder comments affect the process.
- Create an interactive consumer-driven monitoring system.
- I believe DSA plan checkers for ACS have a checklist for items they check on all plans. It would be helpful to provide access to this list so manufacturers would be able to review criteria to be specifically checked. It might be desirable to allow a response column for same checklist to provide with submittals noting where the referenced item is shown on plans. Quite often we receive comments on plan check comments which are shown at different location in plans provided. Comments upon answering result in redundancy and larger sets of plans but still have what is originally shown on submittal.
- Anticipate better, prepare more, don't engage in clever word play just because the code is written that way. Don't perpetuate. Don't just prepare to mitigate. Be pro-active and work with the CBSC in a more meaningful way. Stop just going through the motions.

Provide better field engineers who are more involved and better educated in the actual construction that they are overseeing. Be more real and less convoluted. There are some suggestions for your think tank.

- Currently the building official in Santa Clara accepts the money for the CASp certification process however she discourages anyone from going to training for the purpose of training related to test preparation and studies. She also has said she was grateful the building departments were not assigned the ADA requirements by the state legislative body governing the CBC. I strongly disagree I want to become CASp certified and have actively started participating in the process of ICC Certifications related to building and life safety. I will include current code ADA requirements in my studies. Having the DSA office provide training to individuals who have not qualified by means of an educational background but have the experience and are actively seeking the certification would be helpful and most certainly appreciated because at the jurisdictional level I am hitting a wall and am very frustrated, I can only imagine how frustrated individuals with disabilities are becoming, if their voices are not heard from and incorporated into the code process.
- Ease up the requirements for the CASp certification to cultivate knowledge and commitment to the compliance process
- Few seem to be on the streets trying to implement the codes. Those who are know there are many subjective ways to interpret the codes. You see it in courts of law litigating the laws by seeing both CASp witnesses can have opposite points of view on same issue. Suggest having some who actually build, are disabled, who know the code and are CASp certified
- Be reasonable
- Let people get to work without pre-determined outcomes. I suggest reading the book "Community" by Peter Block.
- This is a long overdue effort, you must be willing to hear what you need to know but may not want to hear. CCDA must be included in this process too.
- Follow up with individuals who provide feedback.
- Don't create this little group. I believe that this effort is an attempt to shut down disruptive members of the public that have attended meetings in the past. Engage and educate, don't disengage.
- A process which allows those who generate a question or suggestion to view and possibly participate in a forum addressing the issue.
- This may help but it ignores the true problem. The lack of enforcement by building officials and inspectors.
- Coordinate with CALBO.

- At the state level by those who manage the various projects. Nothing will change until that issue is addressed. More laws and better discussed codes don't do anything without the will of enforcement.
- Diffuse the input of special interests. The code process appears to be driven by full-time "code people" who do not have to implement the codes they come up with.
- CA should align itself with the ADA & stop writing their own rules.
- Knowing the CBC code development process can only help in using the CBC during the review of plans for a municipal agency.
- Keep politics out of the process.
- Consider options and/ or alternative provisions for certain existing field conditions that currently are not addressed in the code.
- There should be some kind of ombudsman or clearinghouse-type service to answer questions about what is or isn't in the code. This would go a long way to reducing the amount of misdirected anger -- many folks just want a forum to voice their concerns.
- The move to adopt the 2010 ADA Standards as a "model code" for Chapter 11B was brilliant, but subsequent code revision cycles have started to greatly depart from that intent. DSA should be cautious about radically altering the 2010 ADA Standards.
- DOJ "certification" of the CBC as equivalent to the 2010 ADA Standards should be a top priority as a means to assure business owners as well as design professionals that compliance with the code is good for more than just California requirements.
- Make the improvements practical and effective in the environment we live in. So many of the regulations are not applicable.
- Be conscious of construction tolerances and limitations.
- It is important that code review and code development functions be separate. A separate and impartial group to assist in code language and development would be of great benefit to the citizens of California.
- Please bear in mind that when you change the accessibility provisions of the CBC, you open new doors to new civil rights litigation against businesses and building owners.
- Eliminate CASp program, because it's providing too many opinions that create confusion. The only guide book is the CBC. Keep it simple.
- In general, the accessibility code requirements are a difficult fit in the building code. The CBC is for the life and safety protection for a body of people. These access requirements 1) place the individual on an equal plane as the body of people; 2) have enforcement requirements can be to a 1/4"; 3) are civil-based associated with numerous lawsuits.
- Make the process to offer comments or corrections to the code easy rather than so formal.

- Make sure you factor in cost of architectural barrier removal. Often times we are spending a fortune on little-used features (e.g. 60" radius in publicly funded affordable housing mobility unit bathrooms) when it would be less costly to provide residents with improved mobility aids.
- Continue to provide guidelines and clarifications. It's helpful to have documents showing how IBC, CBC, and USDOJ info correlates.
- Not allowing one stakeholder community to scream over the voices of all other stakeholder communities.
- Please stop changing the code so much every three years! Nobody is keeping up.
- The State Architect should immediately re-establish the disability advisory committee he abolished in 2012, (with absolutely no notice or indication of appreciation to those who had served on the committee for years.)
 - Regulations should be at forefront not lagging
- Regulations are difficult to understand, and often more stringent conditions are enforced due to misunderstanding
- Shocked at the degree of anger from the advocate stakeholders
- Singular focus as opposed to universal design
- Very difficult to find documents such as marked-up code on the website
- Something between amusement and sadness at misdirected anger
- Try to integrate accessibility without impacting able bodied spectators
- The code in general is a record of our mistakes
- The regulations have become a burden on small businesses held hostage by enforcement agencies.
- There are many gray areas in the code that need to be addressed.

APPENDIX B: DETAILED INTERVIEW RESULTS

Appendix B provides detailed findings from the Access Stakeholder community interviews.

This includes:

- Interview questions.
- A brief summary of findings per question highlighting key themes and points of agreement and noteworthy differences in interviewees' responses.
- Participant comments.

KEY for interview findings

- Square Bullets are used for UC Davis' summary of interviewee input.
- ❖ Star Bullets are used for participant comments.

QUESTION 1:

Tell me a bit about your involvement, to date, in the DSA's regulatory process for amending the accessibility provisions of the California Building Code?

Generally speaking, those interviewed have had direct experience with the DSA's regulatory process. Those with the most extensive experience in DSA's regulatory process have professional responsibilities related to Code development as a design professional or have responsibilities as an advocate for those with disabilities. Several individuals had both technical experience developing Code and personal experience living with disabilities, either their own or a loved one's. Specifically:

- All but one individual interviewed (28 of 29 people) have been involved in DSA's regulatory process to some degree.
- Two of those interviewed report limited involvement or casual participation (i.e. occasional attendance at Building Standards Commission meetings, participation as an observer and/or issuing comments during processes, providing subject matter expertise).
- Most of those interviewed report high engagement in the process and experience with revising and/or drafting regulation and Code changes.
- A few individuals were former members of an earlier DSA Access Advisory Committee.
- Several individuals mentioned that they themselves, or a loved one, have a disability.

QUESTION 2:

Do you believe steps should be taken to improve the current Code Amendment Process?

A majority of those we interviewed (20 of 29) believe steps should be taken to improve the current Code Amendment Process. Nearly all those replying “yes” to this question went on to describe a need to improve the relationship between DSA and the disability community. Few comments related to other aspects of the process, and nearly a third of those interviewed reported that they do not believe steps need to be taken to improve the process. In summary, most think the relationship between DSA and the disability community (or parts of it) needs improvement, although a full third do not believe that the process, itself, needs improvement.

Comments on improving the Code Amendment Process

Twenty individuals interviewed stated yes, steps should be taken to improve the Code Amendment Process; although there is a diversity of views about how to achieve improvement. Several people believe a lack of technical knowledge of the Building Code and/or the Code writing process by individuals with disabilities is a key factor to improving their relationship with DSA. Other comments relate to suggestions for strengthening engagement by the disability community:

- ❖ Provide travel funds for participation. Electronic meetings are not ideal for engagement. Pay people to participate.
- ❖ DSA should assume the responsibility to write in plain language the effect of the change (e.g. an Initial Statement of Reasons), saying that Code cannot always be plain language but explanations should be.
- ❖ DSA should update State Architect’s Interpretive Manual.
- ❖ Extend the timeline beyond an 18-month process in order to support more thorough engagement.
- ❖ Help the public understand that the time frame for change is 3 – 5 years. Knowing this would improve the process and relationships.
- ❖ Improvement was suggested in the process of substantiating the facts and document needed for a change (e.g. what are the legal, technical facts substantiating a change to the regulation, or a necessity for the change in the regulations?)
- ❖ DSA should provide real-person staff support to answer specific questions, rather than responding with technical, pre-scripted FAQ sheets.
- ❖ Misinterpretation of technical information and/or inaccurate sharing of information among members of the disability community can cause confusion, frustration, and disruption in relationship building. Support education of this constituent group.

- ❖ More active engagement with the disability community is recommended, including more participation opportunities, enhanced communication and a reduction in “technical jargon.” Generally more inclusion is needed.
- ❖ If stakeholders could more effectively and knowledgably discuss technical aspects of the Code, relationships may be improved.
- ❖ Some questioned whether advocates understand that the regulatory scheme is meant to accommodate multiple interests (stated by a disability advocate).
- ❖ One person suggested that an advisory committee be formed; follow the Code and privilege needs of those with disabilities over the concerns of Code users.
- ❖ Consider creating prototype mock-ups of proposed changes so that people can experience the intended change and assess impacts and consequences before officially implementing changes into law.

Comments about the current Code Amendment process being satisfactory

One person remained neutral in their response. And eight interviewees believe the current Code Amendment Process is satisfactory, saying that DSA does a decent job with process and perceives that the process has gotten better over time, with one person saying that the DSA’s public engagement process is comparatively better than any other State Agency. Cited strengths of the current process include: multiple layers of process, pre-cycles, a large budget, and a willingness by DSA to work on things over more than one cycle, taking years.

Relevant participant comments include:

- ❖ DSA has a broad process, and there are many access points for the community to contribute input.
- ❖ The problem is not with the process, but with the relationships.
- ❖ DSA has already tried a number of different methods to engage stakeholders in the amendment process.
- ❖ DSA’s process and approach to public engagement has never been better (*from a mobility advocate*).
- ❖ The process is perfect.

QUESTION 3:

Do you think steps should be taken to improve the relationship between DSA and the Access community, at large?

Nearly all interviewees report that positive steps should be taken to improve the relationship between DSA and the disability community. While nearly all say change is needed, there are differences of opinion about where responsibility lies for the current challenges in communications. Many believe that DSA and the members of the disability community will both need to invest effort, if change is to occur. Others see the relationship problems as stemming from DSA's approach to working with the disability community. Still others believe that the relationship challenges are the result of actions and behaviors engaged in by members of the disability community. No matter the source of the problem, practically everyone believes there is a problem that needs to be addressed and resolved.

Comments about improvement needed on both sides of the relationship

- ❖ The disability community does not feel their voice is being adequately heard or represented.
- ❖ There must be a re-establishment of trust that has been lost over the last several years.

Comments about behavior of some Access Stakeholders

- ❖ Some people in the Access Community are often too unreasonable, inappropriate and occasionally aggressive, which inhibits relationship building.
- ❖ Highly vocal individuals may turn their disagreements into personal attacks [some framed this as "bullying"].
- ❖ Several folks mentioned that if relationships with a small group of vocal advocates could be improved, overall relationships would also improve because the behavior of a highly vocal subgroup of Access Advocates is unreasonable and not representative of the broader Access Community.

Comments about DSA's actions and behavior

- ❖ The disability community does not feel their voice is being adequately heard or represented, and that the DSA is slow to respond to comments and recommendations.
- ❖ A historical abuse of power results in litigation that inhibits relationship building.
- ❖ There may be a feeling by some that since there has not been a single point person at DSA responsible for heading up the DSA regulations in 10-12 years, relationships between the DSA and access community have suffered.

Participants' comments about improving relationships

- ❖ Both groups should behave less defensively towards each other.
- ❖ The current effort by DSA to gather feedback could help.
- ❖ The struggle to comply with Code somehow gets disconnected from the broader goal of helping people with disabilities participate more fully in life.
- ❖ In the profession, we lose sight of the fact that the tool is the Code, the goal is meaningful and broad engagement in life, to fullest extent possible, for people with disabilities.
- ❖ There is so much good that we could do to improve the Code, but because it has become so volatile of late, it is really hard to get people to do the work together.
- ❖ One person reportedly, at the center of the divide, sees people's intentions are good on both sides, and fears expressed are unfounded, by and large.
- ❖ One person suggested that the correction to the problem is the creation a group, like a union, to represent the disability community -- paid professionals to read and watch and stay on top of Code changes.
- ❖ Tremendous progress was made when ADA first launched and quite naturally, over time, things got more nuanced and technical, with fewer big changes. The feeling that we lost momentum might be incorrect; instead, the current process is a new and different phase.

QUESTION 4:

For such a group to work well, which groups/points of view/stakeholders need to be represented when considering amendments to the Code?

There is no shortage of key perspectives thought to be helpful in considering Code changes. Most individuals mentioned the following groups, generally:

- Individuals with disabilities
- Advocates for persons with disabilities
- Building officials
- Architects and building design professionals
- State agency representatives with Code change responsibilities
- Facility owners and business owners

Interviewees' comments about specific groups or possible stakeholders

- ❖ Disability Community & Disability Advocates
 - Disability Folks with Technical Knowledge and Expertise
 - Disability Leaders– Sharon Togi; Richard Skaff

- Disability Representatives – wide array
- Persons with Cognitive Disability – We have some folks w cognitive disability. At first people are frustrated trying to understand them but in time, it gets easier and you realize that when one struggles to speak they choose their words wisely.
- Young people with developmental disabilities
- Traditional categories of the disabled from wheelchairs to vision, blind, hearing impaired and deaf. Acknowledge and represent the variations in disabled category types too: some are in wheel chairs because they aged in a chair, others have been in an accident after 40 years of walking. People who never ____, used to ____, (saw, see; heard, hear).
- Individual disability groups (Cerebral Palsy Center; Lighthouse for the Blind, A state level rep from each different types of disability).
- Comment: The group of folks with disabilities should not be out in a group where they have to pit their views against paid professionals. Most people with disabilities don't know about 4450 or 4459. There is a huge educational disadvantage here. Simultaneously, their involvement is essential.
- ❖ Accessibility Proponents
 - From the top of their organization; knowledge of the communities they serve; able to think “big picture”
- ❖ ARC
- ❖ Architects
 - Architects who specialize in access – Janis Kent
- ❖ Attorneys
 - Folks who handle accessibility cases on both ends.
 - John Rodriguez (attorney)
 - Someone knowledgeable about Federal Law ADA compliance. If not there all the time, on-call as needed to apply legal expertise.
- ❖ Builders and Building Owners and/or their Representatives
 - Residential/Community
 - Commercial
 - Institutional
 - Representatives of High-Rise Buildings
 - Community Colleges and Universities
 - Affordable Housing Providers
- ❖ CA Association of the Deaf
 - Look for someone who is an access person. Mia can provide names, if needed.
- ❖ Caregivers/ family members of those with disabilities
- ❖ CBCA

- ❖ California Council for the Blind
- ❖ CDRI
- ❖ Centers for Independent Living
 - Comment: They are critically important. They are where the rubber hits the road in terms of people getting services; they have partnerships with many groups, builders, buyers, businesses.
- ❖ Certified Access Specialists
- ❖ Cities, Counties & Public Utilities Representatives
- ❖ Code Enforcers
 - Building officials, commercial, residential and public
 - Those with authority to interpret and apply Code
 - Inspectors
 - Plan Reviewers
 - Public Works Inspection (sidewalks, lighting, curb ramps)
 - San Francisco Public Works (comment: they are forward thinking and lend to the discussion both practical ideas along with the politics; they are ahead of us and see implications we might not see)
- ❖ Code Users
 - People who are closer to the work, implementing or enforcing these things, not someone political at the top.
- ❖ Code Writers
 - An expert in the Federal guidelines
- ❖ Construction Industry
 - Contractors (a practical eye on what is achievable)
- ❖ Corada.com (comprehensive on-line resource for accessibility products)
- ❖ County Officials
- ❖ CRA
- ❖ Design and Construction Industry and Experts
 - AIA, civil engineers, landscape architects, etc.
 - Highly technical experts, such as Door Lock Industry, as needed
- ❖ DBTAC Pacific ADA Center
 - Federally funded to offer assistance on compliance with ADA. Berkeley folks are fantastic. (Erica, Don Risdol)
 - There is a lawyer there, whose name is Jan Jarrett is a disabled person, lawyer, access specialist, gives lectures on the Code all over the country. She is knowledgeable about Federal and State.
- ❖ Disability Rights California
- ❖ Engineers

- ❖ Hale Zukas – He is important to the disability community. He has good thoughts. He got curb ramps through the State legislature, the first around. Technical expert in Code.
- ❖ HLA
- ❖ Industry Associations
 - BOMA
 - American Institute Architects California Council
 - CA Restaurant Association
 - CALBO
 - CASI
 - A legislative person
 - Attorney
 - CBIA – Property owners
 - American Institute of Architects
 - Any architects who specialize in Universal design, and or are disabled themselves.
 - IIDA
 - ASID
 - League of California Cities
 - California Association of Counties
 - International Code Council ANSI A117.1
 - Retail Merchants’ Association
 - Hotel and Health Care Industry Representatives
- ❖ Landscape Architects
- ❖ Liability Insurance interests
- ❖ Lighthouse of the Blind (their architect – Chris Downy)
- ❖ Manufacturers of Accessibility Products
 - Max Ability
 - Lift U
 - Hogan manufacturing
 - Safe Pass
 - Open Sesame
- ❖ Non-Profit Organizations
- ❖ Pacific ADA Center
- ❖ Paralyzed Veterans Association
- ❖ Research Community
- ❖ Robert Black (author about access issues)
- ❖ Schools
 - Higher Education Representatives

- ❖ Signage Consultants
- ❖ State Agencies
 - Housing and Community Development
 - CalTrans
 - State Fire Marshal
 - CCDA
 - DSA
 - Building Standards Commission
 - Department of Rehabilitation
 - DMV
 - OSHPD

Other comments expressed in response to this question about representation on the ACC generated thoughts regarding the group’s authority, the balance of representation between those with and without technical or Code-development expertise, the need to make it easier for non-professionals to engage the process, and the need for broader representation from across all types of disabilities.

Relevant participants’ comments

- ❖ A challenge is making sense of Code from the point of view of the various disabilities, the overlap, contradictory solutions, and complications in solving a problem for one without creating a problem for the other.
- ❖ Advocates don’t understand that DSA has the authority to write the Code.
- ❖ Weight the group membership in the direction of Code geeks.
- ❖ A lot of people who are not part of that public comment were very sincere about wanting to have a voice, not knowing how to and not having the resources to cover expenses of participation.
- ❖ Reach every faction of the disabled community; every advocacy group you can involve, the good, bad, the ugly, every flavor of the population.
- ❖ Building and development community have historically had significant influence in the department with token influence from the disability community. It needs to have all stakeholders who care about access issues; folks who understand existing legal framework; include people with significant national expertise around compliance with accessibility tools. The needs of those with different disabilities need to be represented.
- ❖ In a perfect world we would choose intelligent, empathetic members of the communities who are sensitive to the needs of the other communities. We need people who can see more than one side of these issues.

- ❖ The people on the committee representing the other interests also have to have an open and balanced perspective. Anger inhibits communication.
- ❖ There is not a lot of representation for the building industries in this process.
- ❖ Have people at the table who have experience with Code processes AND people who are not so familiar with Code change but have to live in the built environment.
- ❖ Consider having the ability to bring specialized individuals or experts in on an ad hoc basis, such as persons who manufacture detectable warning devices.
- ❖ It is a problem when we refer to the disabled ‘community;’ it is not a community. We need a clear defined voice for disabled persons.

QUESTION 5:

Research suggests that groups of 7 to 15 participants are ideal for decision-making and problem-solving meetings, citing the following advantages: “All participants may easily be involved; everyone’s thoughts may be communicated; it is small enough to be informal and spontaneous and also large enough to allow for a facilitator and a scribe; and it seems to be the size which best creates synergy.” Do you have any thoughts about the size of the group?

General agreement by all interviewees that 10-15 members is an effective size provided there is adequate representation for all essential stakeholder groups. Many folks cautioned against a group too large (15+) claiming that conversations become less effective at that size. Additionally, several folks were supportive of the formation of sub-groups.

Interviewee’s comments about number of members serving on the ACC

- ❖ 10 – 12 is ideal.
- ❖ Really large groups are not effective. Seven is too small but you don’t want to get too big.
- ❖ Considering the variety of perspectives to include, maybe the larger side of that range, like 15 members, would work best.
- ❖ Limit the group size but use working groups to advise where needed to add additional expertise. Let the group decide if they need a subcommittee.

QUESTION 6:

It is thought that the ACC would hold face-to-face meetings with videoconference options for those not able to attend. Do you have any thoughts about face-to-face meetings? Or where those meetings should be held?

All persons interviewed prefer and encourage in-person meetings. Several individuals suggested providing an option for video teleconferencing when in person meetings are not available. Several comments were also provided regarding how meetings should be operated. For example: the meetings should have a designated Chair; should be publically and fully accessible; and should be facilitated.

Comments about in-person meetings

- ❖ In person meetings are strongly preferred as it helps to build stronger relationships
- ❖ It is absolutely essential that the meetings be face to face for this group.
- ❖ Anything that will result in a consensus needs a face-to-face meeting, perhaps supplemented with phone or video calls or emails to move work forward in the process. I am a big believer in face to face.
- ❖ Sometimes there is more civility and respect for each other when you sit face to face.
- ❖ This is a critical. It helps encourage efficient use of time and you can see expressions of people's faces, which can be important when discussing sensitive issues.
- ❖ Face to face is important. Most people are pressured for their time so they multi-task when calling in. People should be in the room for the conversation. If it is important enough, they will be there.
- ❖ Face to face is preferable but not always practical. Video conferencing is getting better and better and should be used when possible. Hold a meeting in the room and also arrange for video conferencing.
- ❖ Another idea is to have two in-person sites and have them video-conference each other.
- ❖ One person suggested that the group should use Roberts Rules of Order and have a designated Chair
- ❖ Every single meeting should be fully accessible and folks able to participate with captioning and sign language.
- ❖ Wherever the meeting is, it should favor those with disabilities. Easy access with public transit is best, such as an airport.

Question 7:

In considering the options for how often and how long the ACC meets each time, three different possibilities are:

- a) Quarterly for a full day
- b) Every other month for a half day
- c) Each month for 2 or 2.5 hours

Do you have any thoughts about how frequent or long the meetings should be?

The majority of interviewees agree that meeting quarterly should be the minimum frequency, with in-between conference calls/webinars to conduct work. Those interviewed believe that quarterly meetings may last 1-2 days, depending on how much work needs to be accomplished. Nearly half of the individuals suggested organizing meetings around the Code Cycle itself.

Comments about ACC meeting frequency

- ❖ Quarterly meetings that are 2-day forums.
- ❖ Meetings should be scheduled out for the year ahead. The group could deal with issues coming up in the next Code cycle. BSC produces a map that lays out the 18-month cycle. Then you work backwards, using that map, identifying topics for the two different cycles.
- ❖ Quarterly works. There may be a need to follow-up between meetings or have special meetings, remotely. That is a minimum. There will be other practical needs.
- ❖ Only schedule one meeting at a time, at the end of each meeting, schedule the next.
- ❖ No set number of meetings; meeting dates and length are based upon the task to be accomplished. I think that process can work. Maybe before heading into a new cycle, consider two meetings in the Fall/Winter; then two meetings in Spring to react to work done by DSA over the winter.
- ❖ Most feel that the meetings should be on a regular, perhaps quarterly basis, but as much as possible, should be cycle sensitive suggesting the idea that the group meet for a few meetings to identify priorities before the first meeting of the Code cycle.
- ❖ Meetings have to be keyed to the Code cycles. That will not be quarterly. Every two weeks to every three weeks over a three-month period. Then a full day every three to four months. It could be almost like a charrette. So maybe three meetings of this group before putting forward recommendations; the public hearings; then DSA putting their recommendations forward to building commission.
- ❖ The intervening Code cycle should be for corrections and emergency legislation and editorial fixes. It should be not be creating new things every 18 months. Cities and municipalities have their own accessibility requirements to work on and comply with.

Question 8:

It has been suggested that members' terms of service could be three years, which coincides with one full Code change cycle. What are your thoughts about length of terms for this group?

All persons except one were agreeable to term limits, and nearly all were supportive of the proposed three-year cycle with the ability to be reappointed for one or more additional terms. It was recommended that term limits coincide with the three-year update cycle. One person was of the opinion that three years is too short of a term to fully understand the issues and provide highly informed recommendations.

Other comments in response to this question show that meeting facilities should be accessible and meeting locations must have accessible public transportation and parking. Costs of travel and accommodations should be considered, especially for those serving in a volunteer capacity (not tied to professional, paid work). Most believe that moving the meeting around the State is wise, if the membership is drawn from across the State. Many express that meeting location should reflect the needs of the disabled and the membership of the group.

Beyond the general agreement, there were a number of novel ideas about how to structure the membership and deal with member performance, turnover and continuity.

Interviewees' comments on term-limits

- ❖ A three-year term with half being assigned 1.5-year term. Most report that the three-year term sounds reasonable; staggered length matters to support knowledge transfer and institutional memory.
- ❖ Tie it to the Code-cycle.
- ❖ Continuity between the cycles will be important. People should be able to re-up.
- ❖ Once a person has exceeded their term limit(s) and must cycle off, they can still supply public comment and participate because once you have been on that committee, you have cache increasing the weight and value of comments made in regular public comment.
- ❖ Three-year terms, two terms assumed. 1/3 staggered off at any given time.
- ❖ Consider a way of determining if a second term automatically extends or is offered through some sort of evaluation. Renewal should be a possibility, but not expected.

Additional comments about ACC meetings

- ❖ Require fully-accessible meeting rooms for in-person meetings.
- ❖ The meeting location should be rotated across the State: Sacramento; SF or Oakland; Central Valley; North; San Diego or Los Angeles. Sacramento is not easy to get to via public transportation.
- ❖ No matter where you meet, the disabled public will be challenged to attend if the meetings. Meeting in different locations is a challenge. There seems to be a tremendous number of participants in the Bay and LA area. To ask the disabled to travel is not an easy request.
- ❖ Provide travel funds for participation.
- ❖ Offer a per diem to cover transportation, lodging, and meals for committee members residing outside of the Sacramento area.

Comments on member participation

- ❖ Have a method to address inactivity or unpreparedness of members. Plan for substitution, if not meeting the obligations of participation.
- ❖ If an individual is to be re-signed to another term, a process for review needs to be established for that.
- ❖ How does this process impact the current other approaches to public input? Is this in addition to? Instead of? Will current approaches be modified?
- ❖ First meeting is mandatory. Everybody should have to show up for the first meeting if they want to be on this group.
- ❖ Materials should be given to members 30 days in advance and they have to be responsible for reviewing all materials.
- ❖ It's not going to be a Brown Act group.

Question 9:

In nominating participants for the ACC, DSA is considering opening that process to everyone, and inviting people on the DSA listserv to nominate himself or herself or someone else. Do you like the idea of being able to put forward nominees? Do you see another way of identifying potential group members?

Most persons interviewed are agreeable to the idea of an open-nomination process. Some folks feel the DSA list-serve will not provide the range of representatives needed and that DSA should do outreach beyond the DSA list serve for open nominations (e.g. include CCDA, CALBO and CASI list serves). Some question the wisdom of inviting individuals to self-nominate and yet others express concern about inviting individuals to nominate anyone but themselves. There

are also differing opinions about: whether the group should recruit individuals to the role or organizations; and whether members represent their own views or represent the views of a constituency group. Several commented on the importance of being clear about expectations of participation and the importance of requesting that nominees have experience with and understanding of the regulatory Code change process.

Comments related to the nomination process are below

- ❖ Cast a broader net than the DSA list serve: CALBO, AIA, industry, private consultants, Access list serve, VETS, AARP to bring in new folks. Hit the core constituencies and those who have not been as well represented in the past process. Get to that broader pool, maybe through professional organizations, and go out through their membership to get the best and the brightest. Groups who have a membership group, like the “Architects’ Board.” The Contractors’ Board -- put a ticker on their web-sites and use their list serves. Use the BSC stakeholder list as well.
- ❖ The disability groups can help you get the word out. Put out a description of the role, the reciprocity details, requirements of participation, and then go out to key groups like ADAPT, CDR. You could even advertise in the newspaper. Centers for Independent Living reaches all the subsets equally and Department of Rehabilitation list serve should capture a broad range.
- ❖ Be clear what the expectations are for participation during the nominating process, the make-up of the group and what is needed in the way of representation.
- ❖ Maybe offer people a script and advice on how to recruit folks. Encourage people do some outreach for promising participants.
- ❖ Start with organizations that represent disabled and technical folks and list out the top 5 of each; pick the prominent players to pick out a team. Then ask if they want to be considered. DSA would choose the organizations and the individuals.
- ❖ Consider having the stakeholders choose their representation.
- ❖ Nomination paperwork should include their credentials to serve, showing some level of experience and understanding of the process.
- ❖ Do you see the members filling a “seat?” representing a certain stakeholder perspective?
- ❖ People serving on it should not represent organizations. They should represent themselves. It makes it more charged when the issues of power and size of organizations comes into play.
- ❖ Be aware of organizational priorities/ political agendas and whether those we choose are at odds with members of their community they represent.
- ❖ There should be an ability to do a focused recruitment when/if some group is under represented (e.g. hearing impaired).

- ❖ Choose people who are willing to work for the betterment of everyone.
- ❖ Repeat the nomination announcement every other week until the nomination process is closed. Nomination process needs to be open long enough.

Question 10:

What criteria do you think should be used to invite nominees and select members?

The criteria interviewees most often mentioned regarding nominees were that the person(s):

- Should be knowledgeable in the Code process
- Have life experience or work experience with access issues in the built environment
- Have the capacity to work collaboratively with others
- Be committed to the process and willing to work and learn together.

Participants also provided suggestions as to the range of stakeholder groups that should be considered for nomination (e.g. Code experts and persons with disabilities). There is a diversity of view regarding whether individuals should have to represent an organization or group, officially, or whether an individual, with relevant experience, knowledge and qualities can serve the group without having official responsibility to a constituency group.

Comments related to criteria for relevant Code-related expertise

- ❖ Have a basic understanding of the Code process.
- ❖ People with Code writing expertise.
- ❖ An understanding of how to manifest the goal of an accessible environment into the built environment and/or Code.
- ❖ People who were involved with the actual process in the past.
- ❖ Knowledge of Code; history of Code; legislation behind it, why things are what they are.

Comments on expertise related to access issues for those with disabilities

- ❖ People with disabilities. End user Knowledge of how Code works, living with disabilities.
- ❖ Make sure you have representation from all the disparate groups and types of disabilities. Vision, hearing, cognitive, environmentally sensitive, mobility.
- ❖ Practical insights into the issues; not necessarily someone who can write the Code, but one who understands what is needed.

Comments about commitment to the goal, the group, and the work to be done

- ❖ They need to want to be there – Everyone, including the various code users.
- ❖ People who have a commitment to improving the access to the physical environment.

- ❖ Commitment to active participation, leadership and meaningful work.
- ❖ Willing to put in the hours and do the prep and follow up work; willing to participate, show up; willing to work hard to do difficult things; and willing to be held accountable.

Comments about being collaborative and committed to working well with others

- ❖ Willing to show up as collaborative people.
- ❖ Willing to play by rules of engagement.
- ❖ Able to discuss and problem solve with others who have different needs and hold different points of view.
- ❖ Works well with others
- ❖ Communicate without hostility
- ❖ Thoughtful and deliberative (opposite of hot headed)
- ❖ Forward looking (willing to move past the past to a better future)
- ❖ Strong people who can accept that solutions don't have to be perfect, but instead that we are doing the best we can do right now.
- ❖ No bias and open minded.

Comments about members' representation of their own or their constituents' views

- ❖ People who represent their constituent's views, not just their own.
- ❖ Are they an official representative of their stakeholder group? Have they been asked to represent or are they representing themselves?
- ❖ Nominated folks should be able to represent a range of viewpoints from their consistent groups, and they should not be fearful of pushback from their stakeholders if they are making an effort to collaborate and compromise with all interests.
- ❖ If they could take issues back to some constituency, to gather feedback. This is especially true of those with disabilities. They need to show that they have entree to a public that can be used to vet their particular interests.

Question 11:

Do you have any thoughts about who should be part of making that final selection of ACC members (based on criteria discussed in the previous question)? Or how it should be done?

The feedback from interviewees is mixed on whether DSA should be involved in making the final selection. Some folks thought DSA should have the final decision; some thought DSA should be a participant on a selection committee; and some were resistant to DSA's participation in the selection. Regardless of the process, it is widely recognized that the selection criteria and process need to be transparent and perceived as fair.

More specifically:

- A small minority feel that DSA shouldn't have anything to do with selection of members, and suggest instead that representatives from DRC, CDR, ADAPT, Easter Seals and other organizations of people with disabilities, and maybe AIA and CALBO, be involved.
- A few people express the view that DSA should make the selection, saying that DSA is building this body to assist DSA who has accountability for the Code.
- The majority of people interviewed think that DSA should conduct the selection process with assistance or advice from outside voices. Many believe that representation from the disability community is essential in the selection process.

Interviewee's comments on DSA being assisted by other group in selecting members

- ❖ Equal representation from the access, building and design or enforcement community is important. Avoid domination by any single group and groupthink.
- ❖ Ask other state agencies about how to make the selection, how they do it. Pull from state agencies and a few independents as having an interest and insight into accessibility; constituent groups. Share the obligation of this decision. Deflect the criticism away from DSA.
- ❖ Maybe the commission that advises the building standards. May not be necessary but perception may justify this kind of support.
- ❖ DOR and DSA could collaborate on the selection - bring different knowledge sets to the table and it spreads around the responsibility or blame.
- ❖ The city uses a panel; maybe two people from agencies and then someone from the outside, a stakeholder. The panel recommends to the DSA. Applications are winnowed down to 5 applications for each available seat and then interviewed by the panel.
- ❖ Have DSA and Building Standards, DOR and CCDA do it.
- ❖ DOR, CCDA, DGS, some outlier, Department of Public Health (someone who doesn't know the players), and one industry representative, maybe an individual architect (not from AIA).
- ❖ Have a few representative groups pick a slate and make a choice. CALBO, property owners, individuals with disabilities, DSA, Department of Rehabilitation. Property owners should be added to the group.
- ❖ Not just DSA. Centers for Independent Living if there is a state level group who can help choose; CALBO; AIACC; Department of Rehabilitation.
- ❖ Have 2 – 4 partners take all nominations and put forward a slate. Have the slates compared and then have DSA decide after a consensus building effort.

- ❖ Selecting folks will be an issue for about two or three particular people who will find any process questionable. Having DOR, Housing Authority, and DRC offer their thoughts about the candidates.
- ❖ Brian Bassen – Director Light House for the Blind
- ❖ Jesse Lorenz – ILRC
- ❖ Jay Salazar – CALBO, Building Official in Vacaville
- ❖ The process will be damaged if it is publicized that DSA along with a few other group representatives like Dept. of Rehab., and CCDA as an example, are conducting the selection.
- ❖ If DSA is to play a strong role in selection, Building Standards commission should not be another agency and a neutral third party could be involved to avoid bias.
- ❖ We have to make some assumptions. 50% of the group PWD or advocates; 25% city building Code enforcers; 25% who create product affected by these regulations. Let's say in each group 2/3 have to be representatives of an organization, putting forward their name and their organization – they have three references each. This happens as well for individual members, three references and a resume; a ranking on whether someone knows how the Code process works.
- ❖ Each ACC member with a disability have a back-up representative.

Question 12:

DSA is planning a workshop in Fall 2017 to welcome the new ACC members, orient them to their role and support them with training in two critical areas: (1) the Code development process and (2) collaborative problem solving and conflict resolution. Do you see value in this orientation and training, as part of supporting the group for success?

Everyone interviewed saw value in the idea of an initial gathering of the group for orientation and training to help prepare the members for their role and to build positive relations. Additionally, training is viewed as likely to be helpful, though some see it as merely potentially helpful and others viewing it as vital or necessary.

Comments on ACC member orientation, training, and meetings

- ❖ The group has to develop an understanding that this work is a benefit for everybody. Sometimes the developers consider the advocates always pushing forward and the advocates always pushing back. This notion that we are all pushing in the right direction, together, is a mindset that is essential.
- ❖ Many want the group to be able to shape or even generate priorities for amendments to Code, not merely (or only) react to DSA's priorities.

- ❖ A learning curve should be factored in. As new groups form, an orientation should be provided.
- ❖ An orientation to the structure of the Title 24 would help. i.e., cross –referenced Code. How the Codes interface so that people understand re: access requirements, you may run into problems elsewhere. Need to understand the complexity of the Building Code.
- ❖ How does this group compliment or replace the requirement for 4450 to consult the disability community before going to the Building Standards Commission?
- ❖ The group should be facilitated and professionally recorded. Comments suggest that a facilitator would be instrumental to making the process be fair and inclusive -- someone in that business and outside of DSA.
- ❖ Consider allowing the meetings to be open to the public, while managing public participation.