

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS
FOR
PROPOSED BUILDING STANDARDS
OF THE
DIVISION OF THE STATE ARCHITECT - STRUCTURAL SAFETY (DSA-SS AND
DSA-SS/CC)**

**REGARDING THE CALIFORNIA BUILDING CODE
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 24, PART 2**

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

UPDATES TO THE INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS:

DSA did not receive public comments during the 45-Day comment period. DSA made editorial changes to the Final Express Terms package as follows:

**Title 24, Part 2, Volume 2
Chapter 16A – Structural Design**

Table 1607A.1 – Editorially added footnote “m” to item 19, “Reading rooms” as this is an errata to the 2013 CBC and was approved in the 2013 Final Express Terms package.

Section 1616A.1.19 – Editorially modified “enclosure walls” to “enclosures”.

**Title 24, Part 2, Volume 2
Chapter 19 – Concrete**

Section 1909.2.7.2 – Editorially replaced “test report” with “evaluation report” as this section is intended to reference reports issued by an evaluation service.

**Title 24, Part 2, Volume 2
Chapter 19A – Concrete**

Section 1910A.5.2 – Editorially replaced “test report” with “evaluation report” as this section is intended to reference reports issued by an evaluation service.

MANDATE ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

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

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

DSA did not receive any objections or recommendations regarding the proposed regulations.

DETERMINATION OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND EFFECT ON PRIVATE PERSONS

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

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

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