

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS  
FOR PROPOSED BUILDING STANDARDS  
OF THE DIVISION OF THE STATE ARCHITECT (DSA-SS, DSA-SS/CC)  
REGARDING THE 2025 CALIFORNIA EXISTING BUILDING CODE  
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 24, PART 10  
(DSA-SS 06/24)**

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

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

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

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

**MANDATE ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS**

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

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

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

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

The text with proposed changes was made available to the public for a 45-day comment period from September 6, 2024, until October 21, 2024. One (1) comment was received

during the 45-day public comment period. This comment was not specific to DSA's proposed amendments. There was no subsequent public comment period.

## **COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE 45-DAY COMMENT PERIOD**

### **ITEM 5**

#### **Chapter 5 PRESCRIPTIVE COMPLIANCE METHOD**

##### **Commenter(s) and Recommendation:**

Shahen Akelyan, MS, SE, Assistant Chief, Permit and Engineering Bureau, Chief of Counter Operations, Department of Building and Safety, City of Los Angeles.

The commenter suggests amendments to International Existing Building Code (IEBC) Chapter 5, Section 506.5.3 Seismic loads (seismic force-resisting system). Specifically, the commenter suggested removal of model code language in exception 1 regarding occupancy groups S and U, and adding a new exception 5 regarding occupancy groups and risk category.

##### **Agency Response:**

DSA acknowledges the commenter's suggestions; however, DSA has not proposed any amendments to Section 506.5.3. Further, DSA does not adopt Section 506.5.3 for occupancies, buildings and applications regulated by DSA and listed in Section 1.9. For occupancies, buildings and applications regulated by DSA, the performance level requirements of Section 506.5 are replaced with the performance level requirements of Section 317.5. Therefore, DSA is proposing no further changes to the Express Terms for the 2025 CEBC in response to the comment.

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

Government Code Section 11346.9(a)(4) requires a determination with supporting information that no alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed, or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulation, or would be more cost-effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy or other provisions of law.

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:**

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

The Division of the State Architect did not receive or reject any proposed alternatives that would lessen adverse economic impact on small business.