

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**July 28, 2014**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Steve Dolim welcomed everyone and called the meeting of the Checklist Committee of the California Commission on Disability Access (CCDA or Commission) to order at 1:00 p.m. at the Building Standards Commission, 2525 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 120, Sacramento, California 95833.

Chair Dolim reviewed the meeting protocols.

**ROLL CALL**

*Committee Members Present:*

Mike Brinkman  
Stoyan Bumbalov  
Ida Clair  
Kurt Cooknick  
Gary Layman  
Mia Marvelli  
Susan Moe  
Ewa O'Neal (Teleconference)

*Committee Members Absent:*

Dennis Corelis

*Commissioners Present:*

Steve Dolim, Chair  
Michael Paravagna

*Staff Present:*

Stephan Castellanos, Executive Director  
Angela Jemmott, Program Analyst  
Steven Funderburk, Office Technician

*Also Present:*

Jim McGowan, Executive Director, California Building Standards Commission (CBSC)  
Michael Nearman, Deputy Executive Director, CBSC  
David Peters, CEO, Lawyers Against Lawsuit Abuse (Teleconference)

Chair Dolim called the roll and confirmed the presence of a quorum.

**2. COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES NOT ON THIS AGENDA**

No public comment.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

**3. INTRODUCTIONS**

Chair Dolim asked Committee Members to introduce themselves.

**4. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND**

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

**5. TASK DEFINITION AS STATED BY LEGISLATURE**

Executive Director Castellanos read the CCDA's task definition as given by the Legislature in Senate Bill 1608, California Government Code Section 8299.06: "The Commission, as soon as practicable, but in no event later than July 1, 2010, shall develop, in consultation with the staff of the California Building Standards Commission, a master checklist for disability access compliance that may be used by building inspectors."

Chair Dolim stated the Commission, along with the California Building Standards Commission (CBSC) and the Division of the State Architect (DSA), has been given another chance by the Legislature to complete this task. He stated the importance of hearing from those who were previously involved to help the Checklist Committee understand what transpired that kept the Commission from successfully completing a master checklist the first time around. He invited members of the public who participated in the earlier effort to enter into today's discussion.

**Public Comment:**

Jim McGowan, the Executive Director of the CBSC, stated the use of a master checklist is voluntary. He suggested including building officials in the process and in the design because they are the ultimate end user. If it does not meet the needs of building inspectors in the field, it will not be utilized. He urged Committee Members to listen to the counsel of the building officials with respect to what their people will not use in the field. Carrying around a binder of information materials is similar to carrying around a codebook, and on the building site they will not carry that material.

In the initial meeting of the previous CCDA Committee, the California Building Officials Association (CALBO) requested something in tri-fold and simple that they could carry in their pockets. Mr. McGowan stated his counsel would be to create something that building officials will be willing to utilize.

Mr. McGowan stated the previous CCDA Committee considered making the checklist into an electronic type of application, but many local jurisdictions cannot afford to buy their staff electronic devices. He asked Committee Members to keep the main customer in mind while creating the master checklist, because, if it does not meet their needs, they will not use it.

**Committee Member Questions and Discussion:**

Committee Member Bumbalov stated the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) developed a checklist for Chapter 11A for the

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

Commission two years ago. The intent was to provide something that can be seen and touched, with section numbers, pictures, and diagrams, and was pocket-sized. The HCD was unable to make the checklist smaller than 8-1/2x11, although it is downloadable from the CCDA and HCD websites. It is broadly used, but needs to be updated because it is based on the 2010 California Building Code (CBC).

Chair Dolim stated he liked the idea of keeping the checklist concise and compact with a downloadable feature.

**6. TIME FRAMES FOR DELIVERABLES**

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

**7. VISION OF DELIVERABLE**

- a. **Samples of Different Styles of Checklists**
  - San Francisco Port**
  - Richard Skaff/Restaurant Association**
  - Restaurant Association Health and Food Safety Checklist**
  - Codemasters**
  - Even Terry Associates**
  - Builder's Book Store Products**
  - DSA Checklist**
  - CALBO Samples from Layman**
- b. **Discussions of Successes and Failures with Above Styles**
- c. **Other Style Ideas**
- d. **Development of CCDA Deliverable Guiding Definition**

Chair Dolim showed Committee Members several examples of checklists from other organizations to help in the creation of the master checklist. There were books, tri-folds, pocket-books, one-page/one-subject summary sheets, and downloadable versions. He asked Committee Members to share about the materials they brought and about their vision for the master checklist.

Committee Member Layman discussed a seven-page Swimming Pools, Wading Pools, and Spas checklist he put together. It is used as a field guide, and contains a table and check boxes. He noted that, in his jurisdiction, building inspectors do take laptop computers in the field. They can copy and paste the comments, complete with code sections, off of their laptops and onto their correction notices.

He agreed with Committee Member Bumbalov to eliminate the comment lines, which could reduce the size; put the section numbers at the end instead of at the beginning; and eliminate the table, which can be misleading and confusing to lay persons.

Committee Member Layman also discussed a three-page Parking Facilities Checklist he put together. Along with the building inspector in the field, office staff can use this checklist to answer questions from the public about what is required for accessible parking. This checklist lists the requirements for every phase, and, since it is a Word

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

document, staff can print specific sections. He has received positive feedback from inspectors in the field and staff, because staff can use the checklist instead of going to the code, and inspectors in the field can copy and paste from that list for corrections. Committee Member Layman stated the Parking Facilities Checklist could be designed as a tri-fold, as Mr. McGowan mentioned.

Committee Member Layman stated he is currently putting together a form for inspectors in the field to follow what is reviewed at each inspection or at each phase of construction, from what is reviewed at a foundation inspection to what is reviewed at a final inspection. It will also have copy-and-paste capabilities, and is a simple comment list as well as a checklist. It can also be designed as a tri-fold.

Committee Member Clair asked Committee Member Layman what building officials used prior to his checklists. Committee Member Layman stated they did not have checklists based on accessibility. They did not carry anything with them, but did inspection "off the top of their heads," which is not an uncommon practice. He noted some of the examples on the table were very thorough, especially the one that reproduces the codebook into a smaller form.

Chair Dolim stated it is not the time or the purpose of a checklist for an inspector in the field to open the codebook to figure things out.

Executive Director Castellanos stated the Legislature recognized that there were no tools for inspection and that failure occurred in compliance as a result of the final inspection. He stated he read all past agendas and minutes of CCDA meetings to follow the conversation. He concluded that there were many products that support plan review and providing surveys, but surveys are a different activity than doing a field inspection from a local building department perspective.

Executive Director Castellanos agreed with Mr. McGowan's comment that the checklist has to be useable by a field inspector. He requested that Committee Members consider defining "master checklist ... that may be used for building inspectors." He stated it is defined for plan reviews and for surveys, but he asked what it is for field inspectors. After defining the terms, the Committee can begin discussions about content with regard to those definitions. He asked if the DSA has anything for their field inspectors.

Committee Member Moe stated the DSA has an inspection card and a manual for their project inspectors. They have specific training sessions so inspectors know what to look for when they go out to a facility. Also, inspectors have to certify, so there is more training during the certification process. She cautioned that the tri-fold cards available from the Builders Bookstore have errors.

Chair Dolim agreed with Executive Director Castellanos that the Committee needs to stay focused on what is going to help the field inspector, not the plan review. He recommended as a goal to stay focused on the CCDA's Top-Ten violations for lawsuits. Parking violations are five of the Top-Ten violations. A tri-fold on parking would help alleviate half of the Top-Ten violations.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner Paravagna agreed with beginning in small steps and dealing with the hotter issues first, and then, after getting feedback, perfecting the process moving forward. He asked if there was a budget for the checklist. Executive Director Castellanos stated there is a budget for the meetings and for pulling together the content, but not for producing any material. He suggested preparing the content first before looking into how to distribute it.

Committee Member Cooknick suggested asking building officials about the areas that are the biggest mysteries or where they have the largest problems. He suggested, along with forming the checklist, to deal with the Top-Ten violations that the DSA finds are not in compliance, including the areas where the building officials are unclear.

An unidentified Committee Member stated the Top-Ten violations are more about existing facilities that are not new. It may be better to find out where the deficiencies are in new construction alterations than it is to deal with the Top-Ten list.

Executive Director Castellanos stated the need to be careful not to rely on the Top-Ten list too much, as it verifies the kinds of buildings, but not necessarily whether the lawsuit is a result of a failed initial inspection or if it is three years old. The law came as a result of complaints arising from noncompliance in new facilities.

The checklist can be a prompt to remind inspectors of what to check or it can be more comprehensive. It would be nice to have more information about the things that do not pass most often in new construction so they can be spot-checked. There is survey work being done on that, and staff can ask for that information.

The Commission is only dealing with one step in the construction process with the assumption that the plan reviewers, architects, and engineers are doing their jobs. The Legislature feels this one little group has been left out of the process. The Commission is charged with providing them with another tool to ensure all of the good work that has preceded them is being adhered to.

Committee Member Clair stated there is a danger of condensing the checklist too much. She suggested making it digitally based or creating it as an app with sufficient text that inspectors do not have to check the code unless they have a question. Then, inspectors can click on the code and read it. It is initially condensed, but immediately expandable. Some jurisdictions may not have the technological capability. She suggested, as part of the outreach, determining if technology is a possibility by asking what their technological resources are, the number of inspectors in their jurisdiction, and if they carry phones. If that can be understood, the Committee can create a better layered process than a condensed process that may end up not working as well. Chair Dolim agreed that layering would be a good strategy.

Commissioner Paravagna stated inspectors stay current if the checklist is electronic, because updates will automatically be made for everyone.

Committee Member Moe stated issues that she hears consistently at project inspector trainings are when to start the inspection process, how and where to measure, and

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

what the accessibility requirements are for signage. She stated part of the problem is the misunderstanding of what is required to be accessible.

Committee Member Marvelli stated the master checklist will have minor checklists under it. She stated she agreed with Committee Member Layman that the checklist could be broken up into the phases of inspection. She suggested the first breakdown might be the phases of construction where inspection occurs and, from there, what the inspectors need to look for in each phase.

Committee Member O'Neal stated the need to determine the sequence of construction to use for the checklist. She agreed with writing the checklist to the phases of construction and to have certain inspections checked at certain times.

**Public Comment:**

Michael Nearman, the Deputy Executive Director of the CBSC, stated this sounds like a good starting point. He suggested a survey of building officials and recommended a popular website, which they use to exchange information that might be a good tool. He suggested reaching out to CALBO and the American Institute of Architects (AIA) to come up with a survey list of the hot items and the importance of what types of devices they think they will use to give Committee Members an idea of what is possible. He stated he agreed with the move towards an electronic checklist, but cautioned that it has always been held back because the electronic possibilities are unknown. He suggested getting some feedback on that type of topic as a secondary direction.

**Committee Member Questions and Discussion:**

Committee Member Moe stated the DSA sent a survey to the project inspectors for their feedback. The DSA asked a series of questions and tailored their training based on the answers to those questions. She stated the DSA impresses the need for project inspectors to inspect to the approved plans and specifications that have gone through the review process by the DSA Plan Review staff.

Chair Dolim summarized the discussion to this point:

- A survey will assess the technology base
- The building inspector focus means focusing on newer construction
- The delivery method needs to be capable of updates

He asked for comments from Committee Members that have expertise in surveying or technology. Committee Member Clair stated a portable document format (PDF) can be created with hyperlinks. The master checklist can be created in Word and transferred into a PDF, where the highlighted code can be clicked on to navigate directly to that section of the code.

Executive Director Castellanos stated the DSA's inspection tool is comprehensive, but not specific. It is another good example of how to start a checklist. He suggested making the DSA's inspection tool look more generic so it will have a longer shelf life.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

Committee Member Marvelli asked if the DSA inspection list is for during construction, after constructed is completed, or if there is an overlap. Committee Member Moe stated the DSA instructs its inspectors that certification starts when construction begins, whether it is new construction or an alteration. The inspection process begins when construction begins. The new inspection tool with the layered inspection results will begin August 1<sup>st</sup>, so it has not been technically tested yet.

Executive Director Castellanos stated the DSA inspection tool is on their website and is a good place to start in terms of what a master checklist should include. From there, the Committee can start to discuss delivery of that information.

Commissioner Paravagna stated inspectors either have access to technology in the field or they do not. He stated the need, if the checklist is technology-based, to deliver a compatible product for inspectors who do not have technology in the field.

An unidentified Committee Member stated inspectors who do not have technology in the field can print out the up-to-date, relevant areas to take with them.

Executive Director Castellanos asked the three building departments represented in this Committee if a lack of clarity in the drawings occurs often and requires a more complete reference.

Committee Member Marvelli stated it does happen often. It is easy to make it right on the plan, but in the field it is totally different.

Executive Director Castellanos stated, when an inspector in the field encounters something like that, they may miss it because it is not on the plans, or they may not know it is an access item and pass it without being aware of it.

Committee Member Bumbalov stated inspectors in the field have check points. If they do not know something, they double check it.

Executive Director Castellanos stated, in terms of things that arise in the field that are not clear or contained in the drawings, the inspector can do one of two things: they miss it and there is an automatic failure, or they are skilled enough to know something is wrong and they seek the reference somehow, by calling the office or carrying a book.

Committee Member Marvelli agreed and stated, with the DSA projects, if there are existing field conditions that do not match what is on the plans, then the project inspector writes up a deviation notice, which comes through the architect or the engineer, through the contractor, and then through plan review. The deviation notice alerts them of a problem.

Chair Dolim stated eighty percent is existing inventory. He cautioned against ignoring it while focusing on a system for new construction. He also cautioned against making the system so complex that it only works for new construction and does not have at least some touch points on the existing basic inventory.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

Committee Member Clair stated it goes back to when the inspectors go out and do plan review per what is indicated on the drawings. The inspector needs to look to the set of plans, especially in existing construction, to look at the scoping portion of it. Without that balance of the scoping and the technical, potentially, they are going to point out things that they think are required to be accessible that are not.

She recommended the checklist be part of a layered system, where the project goes from the designer to the plan reviewer to the contractor to an inspector who inspects it. If the checklist mirrors that, then the final checklist is a condensed list for the inspector. If there is an issue, it goes back a layer, which is a plan review list that offers more information, and then back to the next layer, to the designer who created it.

She stated, although not all jurisdictions can afford it, technology only moves forward. If the Committee aims at providing something static, it will not serve the constituency or the mission of compliance. By putting something out there that is valuable, in some ways the cost of technology, even if it is shared, becomes less because the value of it is more important.

Executive Director Castellanos agreed. He stated he liked the DSA format because it is hyperlinked directly to the code. This does not prevent the use of it as a hard copy, because it is a straight checklist by section. He suggested creating a comprehensive on-line document that provides hyperlinks with the code for people who have questions.

Committee Member Clair agreed that this format will serve the constituency better, and will also protect the CCDA. A more condensed product can be misused where people point to the CCDA as the source of the misinformation. If it is layered, that content is there. The hyperlinks straight to the code are built in.

**Public Comment:**

Mr. Nearman agreed that the DSA checklist is a good comprehensive master. Three years ago, the past Checklist Committee thought the DSA plan review checklist was the answer and considered using that as the master checklist. He cautioned that legislators may remember that situation and, if they hear similar language coming out again, they may not approve.

**Commissioner Questions and Discussion, continued:**

Chair Dolim stated he would like to develop a goal statement as to the shape and format of the master checklist. He summarized the goals so far:

- An electronic format that is printable
- A technological solution of layering
- A way to be updated

He stated the Committee has determined the checklist is a product for newer construction, but Committee Members have yet to discuss how to address the existing inventory that is going through maintenance and if the checklist will be responsible for that, too.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

Committee Member O'Neal stated the checklist for existing buildings should address only what the inspection is for. She gave the example of an existing building where the plans and work are only on a small portion of the building. Inspectors have no authority to question the rest of the property or the building even though it might not be in compliance. They can only inspect what the permit was issued for, which means the checklist should only address items to be inspected.

**Public Comment:**

Mr. Nearman stated there are projects in existing facilities where the scope of work addresses a small portion of the building, and the overall evaluation of the project is impacted by the amount of accessibility that is requested for that project. There is a hardship issue that comes in, and some projects are limited. There is a twenty percent threshold, where the local official determines which of the items are most important to incorporate, but full coverage of everything in every case is not possible.

**Commissioner Questions and Discussion, continued:**

Committee Member O'Neal stated the hardship form or the summary of the upgrades should be provided on the plans that the inspector can inspect, but there may be projects that are not so clear. The plans will address whatever is supposed to be inspected. She suggested that the checklist make clear that it is limited by what the permit was issued for.

Committee Member Moe stated the DSA developed this procedure to clearly delineate on the plan when the inspector goes into the field, and what it is they need to inspect. The project inspector trainings teach that there is a difference between the terms "accessible route" and "path of travel." An accessible route only exists in new construction, and a path of travel only exists in existing construction. The trainings mention the accessible route, but focus on the path of travel.

Committee Member Marvelli suggested creating a set of assumptions as to how it will be used. It should not be an issue for the checklist to list which items will effectively determine access on a path of travel, alteration, or improvement. An effective use of the checklist sets the stage, and the stage is that there is a design process that incorporates this, there is a plan review process that ensures that the design information is clearly delineated, and there is an inspection process that, at these different layers of inspection, certain items are checked, and at a final inspection, it passes. She stated the need to understand that the onus of success of a project is not at the final inspection with someone adhering to a checklist. By then, it is too late. She stated there is a process and she suggested that the Committee set parameters on that process to successfully use the tool that it is providing.

Executive Director Castellanos stated his interest in the use of a checklist tied to inspector training, as Committee Member Moe mentioned. He questioned what CALBO is doing with regard to access. Committee Member Layman stated CALBO has

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

instructors that create their own programs based on the codebook. He stated it was possible to put a program together on the master checklist.

Chair Dolim stated he would like to develop a group definition, a mission. He stated the master checklist will be reflective of phases of when an inspection occurs, not just the finished product. He asked Committee Members for comments and suggestions.

Committee Member Bumbalov stated the HCD checklist is developed in a different way broken down by exterior and interior. He stated he did not understand how the phases can be put into a checklist.

An unidentified Committee Member noted that, two summers ago, during the Senate Bill (SB) 1186 conversations, one of the ideas was the notion of construction observation by someone with construction knowledge at key milestones to catch potential problems early in the construction process.

Executive Director Castellanos stated the phase element and the layering element are both necessary. The design goes through the plan review and includes the inspection in stages.

Chair Dolim used the example of having ten or twelve points on an item of inspection and coloring the first tier to be inspected blue, the second tier red, and the final tier green as a way to make one list focus an inspector for the appropriate time they are on the site.

Committee Member Clair stated, if it is effectively layered where a procedure is set up on how to support a successful inspection by using a layering process, eventually, many individuals will begin to use it, including designers, as long as it has depth and, ultimately, adds clarity by linking back to the code, as it is part of the layers.

Committee Member Layman confirmed what Committee Member Clair said about layering. He stated many inspectors do not check the elevation, or if there is a 6-inch block wall or an 8-inch block wall, or 2x4 studs or 2x6 studs when checking the foundation for the plumbing. He suggested that these be some of the bullet points on the master checklist, because they are important for accessibility and need to be caught early, not at the final inspection.

Committee Member Marvelli agreed and stated the checklist is looking at it from a completely different standpoint than from her background, which is the final inspection, but she noted that, in her experience, there is always a problem that must be fixed.

Chair Dolim summarized that some of the comments were to develop the comprehensive list, give it to the building inspection team to say what should be inspected on the first, second, and third visits, and maybe there will be some iterations that come as a result of the phases of this inspection.

Committee Member Clair stated, in going towards that goal, that CALBO, the AIA, and the DSA Academy can start developing training that integrates the checklist. She stated, since they all are participating in the master checklist's development and all are offering

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

training, it will send a common message and will start to change how the profession uses it.

Committee Member Cooknick noted that the master checklist will compel the designer to provide what people will be looking for from them.

Chair Dolim asked if it is important for the inspectors to have code citations in the checklist. Committee Member Clair stated the importance of providing a hyperlink to the code. She stated, when they start using it in that way, that becomes a universal language, they begin to remember where it is in the code, and their knowledge is increased. Chair Dolim stated it is a paraphrase of the code up to that point.

Committee Member Clair agreed and stated, if the code is hyperlinked, it will always be available and inspectors can get to the complete language and gain an understanding in that section. Then, when they read it the next time, in their minds they already know what it says.

Chair Dolim asked how, in Committee Members' vision of the checklist, to deal with 11A and 11B. He asked if there are so many differences between the two that a parallel document will need to be created.

An unidentified Committee Member asked what the difference in inspection is between the two. Committee Member Layman stated 11A and 11B are very different; however, they can be incorporated together, as Committee Member Clair said, by putting them in Word and PDF formats and creating hyperlinks to the code through all phases of inspection. If inspectors have a question, they can click on the hyperlink. Committee Member Layman stated providing the master checklist in this format is an inexpensive process that will be available to all divisions and everyone involved. For those who do not have the technology, they can print it out and take it in the field with them. Also, as Jim McGowan said, tri-folds can be put together for the different phases and different inspections. Inspectors know what they will be inspecting, so they can select the appropriate tri-fold on their way to the site, if they do not have a computer.

Committee Member Bumbalov stated Chapters 11A and 11B have different issues. There are few circumstances that require both chapters. He stated inserting both chapters into the same checklist may not work.

Committee Member Layman suggested that there be an 11A and an 11B that are separate, but could be put together for the final product into one book. The book would be hyperlinked so the differences would be addressed.

Committee Member Bumbalov stated his concern with linking 11A and 11B together, as they have not only different bullet points but also bullet points that overlap. He stated the same issues do not need to be pointed out.

Committee Member Marvelli stated 11A and 11B would be different checklists. It is all part of the same umbrella with the same result; it just takes a different path.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

Committee Member Marvelli agreed that having the code citation hyperlinked on the checklist is important, because it puts the onus on the inspector to research what they need to, and it would not have an incorrect code reference on the checklist if the code section is restated.

Committee Member Moe stated there can be projects where there is overlap of 11A and 11B, where both chapters would apply depending on the type of housing it is. The issue is the portions of 11A that apply and the portions of 11B that apply have to be clear on the plans. This goes back to clearer drawings, clearer scoping, and a clearer plan review that then goes to the building inspector, who now knows what to inspect to, and back to an inspector inspecting to the plans.

Committee Member Bumbalov stated these are circumstances that cannot be captured in a checklist. Committee Member Moe agreed. Chair Dolim agreed that it is not a plan checker's checklist, but will be a field inspector's checklist.

**Public Comment:**

Mr. McGowan stated he has heard all of this before, with the exception of the phase construction. The initial Committee stayed away from merging 11A and 11B, and ended up with two Subcommittees. That is why the HCD voluntarily put out a checklist.

Mr. McGowan stated the thrust of the legislation as it was understood at the time was to focus on businesses and the complaints they received for noncompliance. He recommended not combining 11A and 11B together, but he agreed with possibly making them separate checklists.

Chair Dolim asked if he was saying to put efforts in the business side first. Mr. McGowan stated it would be similar to Committee Member Lehman's pool example, where the scoping provision immediately splits into the housing side and the commercial side. The first choice is if it is a housing project or a non-housing project, utilizing HCD's work for the residential side.

He stated 11B has been recently changed from 11A, not only in its topics and how it is set up, but its number sequencing follows the ADA now. Not that it was that well-aligned before, but at least there was commonality in the nomenclature. So, now that that has changed, that creates a whole new level of reference and understanding of what this section means for housing as opposed to the commercial side. Secondary to residential, he suggested focusing on commercial.

**8. SET UP OF SUB-GROUPS AND FOCUS ON WORK EFFORTS**

- a. Meeting Schedules**
- b. Document Development**
- c. Time Line Development**
- d. Graphics**
- e. Product Data Entry**

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

Chair Dolim asked about the timeframe for the master checklist. Executive Director Castellanos stated there is no end date, but, because it is so late, there is some urgency communicated to both Commissions from the Legislature.

The checklist was a big item when it was first incorporated into legislation. There may be a perception that there is a failure in inspection that causes lawsuits and does not provide for full compliance as it should be. He stated every tool the Commission can add to enhance outcomes in terms of access is desirable. He stated CALBO is doing their part, and the DSA has a great program with inspection and Certified Access Specialists (CASP).

The goal is to use the rest of the year to get beyond the definitions, begin focusing on content, and then begin determining delivery methodologies. He added that Committee Members made a good start on it today.

Chair Dolim asked, since there is some organizational pressure to show the Legislature that the Checklist Committee is moving, if it would be more effective to demonstrate that less is moving but works well, or that more is moving but does not work as well.

Executive Director Castellanos agreed with Mr. McGowan that the usefulness of this tool is the most important. If this Committee can make a statement that CALBO, local building officials, the DSA inspection program, and the training components are all aligned to make this work and are moving in that direction, that is going to be a powerful statement.

Executive Director Castellanos asked Mr. McGowan if the earlier Committee made connections between the user, the producer, and the developer of the document and made joint statements about how it will be used as a training tool and in the field. He stated his recollection of reading the minutes is that they talked about the delivery technology, but did not spend much time talking about content or utility.

Mr. McGowan stated the content part of it was left to the Subcommittees, and it was their responsibility to come back with a product for the full Commission. There was a certain amount of dysfunctionality in this process. He noted this Committee is drilling down far more than the past Committee did. He suggested learning from the past Committee's mistakes. He recommended not losing sight of who the customer is and trying not to impose additional inspection sequences or processes upon them, but instead pointing out that they have certain things they should do. He stated he liked the phase idea that was discussed today.

Commissioner Paravagna suggested developing a pilot with inspectors in the field for their feedback.

Chair Dolim stated the need to get roles in expertise of the group to understand who can lead this a little further for the first, second, and third part of the conversation. It is important to get the mental organization of this put together to reach that end result.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

He asked Committee Member Moe who developed the DSA training inspector list. Committee Member Moe stated it was a joint effort with the DSA staff.

Chair Dolim asked if the DSA training inspector list is technologically difficult to work with. Committee Member Clair stated it is a PDF, a static document with no hyperlinks.

Chair Dolim stated the DSA training inspector list is the first step. The linkage part is the next step. He asked who knows about that. Committee Member Clair stated this would be the people on the technological side of the DSA.

Chair Dolim asked Committee Members O'Neal, Brinkman, and Layman if they would step into the phasing side of how to break the master checklist into inspection observation times.

Executive Director Castellanos stated local building job cards are phased. He asked if the DSA job cards are phased. Committee Member Clair stated they are. She will send a sample to staff.

Chair Dolim asked Committee Members if there were aspects and features of this that the Committee needs to focus on and discuss the talents needed at the table.

Committee Member Marvelli suggested surveying the building officials with questions such as where they see their technological capabilities and where they see themselves in five years.

Chair Dolim asked if CALBO would be best to prepare that survey for their organization. Committee Member Layman stated Committee Member O'Neal can ask Jeff James to run a flier out to the building officials with the request.

Chair Dolim asked if a thirty-day timeframe is realistic for that kind of information. Committee Member Layman answered in the affirmative. Executive Director Castellanos offered the help of the CCDA staff.

Chair Dolim asked Committee Member Moe to lead the list group to send out a list for Committee Members.

Executive Director Castellanos stated staff will post the DSA manual on the CCDA website and generate a draft of the definitions and goals discussed today to be sent to Committee Members for their review. He asked for feedback and other goals that may have been missed. He stated the goals were as follows:

- It should be reflective of the inspection phases, but also be cognizant of the end product
- It should be easily updated
- It should have good technology
- It must be accepted by local building officials and inspectors
- It should be connected to training by CALBO, the AIA, and the DSA
- It should incorporate code citations
- It should focus on 11B, or commercial or existing buildings

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON DISABILITY ACCESS  
CHECKLIST COMMITTEE  
JULY 28, 2014, MEETING MINUTES**

- To start with a comprehensive list
- To survey local building officials and architects

**Public Comment:**

Mr. Nearman stated it sounds like many different activities could be happening simultaneously. He stated he would like to hear about future meetings a week in advance and receive information to familiarize himself with.

**Committee Member Questions and Discussion:**

Chair Dolim stated there are thirty days to get a survey back from CALBO and one week for Committee Member Moe to circulate the list, which included the DSA manual used by project directors and for DSA training, and project inspection cards, which will generate massive input. Committee Member Layman stated in thirty days the inspection process should be complete and presented to the CALBO Committee so there will be something at the table for this Committee's review.

Chair Dolim stated there could be inspection list and scope progress while the survey is out. He asked who would be skilled in meeting with Committee Member Moe to give input on the inspection list before the next meeting, to bring a rough idea, in reflection with the survey, back to the group in thirty days.

Executive Director Castellanos stated Committee Members Moe and Clair, and Chair Dolim will work on the inspection list.

Chair Dolim stated the survey work is going to be done at CALBO. Committee Members Layman and O'Neal will work with CALBO on the survey tool.

Committee Member O'Neal asked for verification on the survey questions. Chair Dolim stated the technology level of the various jurisdictions, input of the content on the checklist and if it is going to include the scope and phases of inspections, the phases that would be most valuable as an inspector regarding accessibility, and what gives the most trouble to an inspector are the survey questions.

Executive Director Castellanos stated two Subcommittees have been put in place today. The next Committee meeting will be six weeks from today. Staff will send materials out one week ahead of time.

Chair Dolim thanked everyone for their ideas and input.

**9. OTHER INPUTS**

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

**10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

There was no discussion on this agenda item.

**11. ADJOURN**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.