
AB 835 SINGLE EXIT STAIR WORK GROUP MEETING

Meeting Minutes – Tuesday, November 4, 2025



Crystal Sujeski, CAL FIRE – Office of the State Fire Marshal, Chair (Present)
Robert Marshall, Senior Regulatory Engineer - UL Solutions, Deputy Fire Chief - San Mateo (Retired) - Co-Chair (Present)

Work Group Members

Stoyan Bumbalov, Executive Director, Building Standards Commission
Timothy O'Malley (Alternate), Building Standards Commission (Present)
Kyle Krause, Deputy Director, Housing Community Development (Present)
Mitchel Baker (Alternate), Assistant Deputy Director, Housing Community Development
Stephan Smith, Executive Director, Center for Building in North America (Present)
Jeff Maddox (Alternate), The Fire Consultants
James Dobson, Fire Marshal, California Fire Chiefs (FM Section) (Present)
James Gillespie Fire Marshal (Alternate), California Fire Chiefs (FM Section)
Joe Cavin, Fire Marshal, California Fire Prevention Officers (Present)
Ian Hardage, Fire Marshal (Alternate), California Fire Prevention Officers
Brian Rice, President, California Professional Firefighters
Melissa McDonald, Executive Assistant (Alternate), California Professional Firefighters
Ed Mendoza, MAP Research Associate, California YIMBY (Present)
Brian Hanlon, CEO (Alternate), California YIMBY
Max Dubler, California YIMBY (Present)
Robert Raymer, Consultant, California Building Industry Association (Present)
Christopher Ochoa, Senior Council (Alternate), California Building Industry Association
Ali Fattah, Asst Deputy Director, San Diego, Representing California Building Officials (Present)
Matt Wheeler (Alternate), California Building Officials
Faruk Sezer (Alternate), California Building Officials
Tracy Rhine, Senior Policy Advocate, Rural Counties Representatives of California
Patrick Blacklock (Alternate), Rural Counties Representatives of California
Staci Heaton (Alternate), Rural Counties Representatives of California
Jack Smalley, Legislative Advocate, California State Association of Counties
Mark Neuburger, Legislative (Alternate), California State Association of Counties
Travis Tyler, Director, California State University (CSU) (Present)
Mike Major, (Alternate), California State University (CSU)
Stephen Guarino, Director, University of California (UC) (Present)
Tracy Staiger, (Alternate), University of California (UC)

CAL FIRE Staff

Daniel Berlant – State Fire Marshal
Vickie Sakamoto – Assistant State Fire Marshal
Tim Spears – Assistant Deputy Director (OSFM – CDA)
Jena Garcia, CAL FIRE – Office of the State Fire Marshal

1. CALL TO ORDER 8:05 AM

Crystal Sujeski

- A. Welcome/Introductions
- B. Roll Call/Quorum Established
- I. Robert Marshall - Opened the meeting by announcing a change in procedure.
 - a. The meeting format changed due to concerns from the Legislative and Governor's Offices about voting on a legislative report.
 - b. No formal vote will be taken; instead, members will provide comments on the document.
 - c. The document won't be shared on screen and will be discussed in general terms.
 - d. Questions should be directed to Crystal, as the changes were communicated to the chairs only recently.
 - e. This is expected to be the final meeting and expressed appreciation for everyone's input and collaboration.

C. Agendas/Minutes Review (Motion Required)

- I. Agenda 11/04/2025

Motion: James Dobson/Ali Fattah **Action:** Approved

- II. Minutes 10/17/2025

Motion: Joe Cavin/Robert Raymer **Action:** Approved

2. OLD BUSINESS

Robert Marshall

A. Timeline – Updates

- I. Crystal Sujeski explained that public comments can be submitted via a dedicated email address available on the State Fire Marshal's website until December 1. After internal and executive review, updates will be posted on the committee's webpage, and stakeholders are encouraged to subscribe for Title 24 rulemaking updates to stay informed.
 - a. [Workgroups | OSFM](#)
 - b. [Subscribe to Newsletter | OSFM](#)

3. NEW BUSINESS

Robert Marshall

A. **Review Drafted Report** – Open discussion for input on subgroup topics.

- Robert Marshall outlined a plan to review a document section by section, focusing primarily on the incomplete egress analysis and fire department capabilities, while briefly covering previously discussed sections and returning to the executive summary at the end.

1) Baseline Comments:

- i. Page 7 - Ali Fattah clarified that the Uniform Building Code influenced building practices not just on the West Coast, as stated in the document, but throughout the western United States, extending as far as Minnesota. Robert Marshall confirmed. Ben Fell updated the draft/corrected.
- ii. Page 9 - Ali Fattah suggested adding a clarification near the end of the section—likely on page 9—explaining that the project is exempt from AB 130 due to specific code sections. Robert Marshall agreed and proposed creating a new subsection titled “Effects of AB 130” to include a brief

explanation about the exemption, particularly regarding single-stair provisions. For AB 130 justification, see Health and Safety Code 18929.1(c), see exception 3, then go to Health and Safety Code 13108.5.2. Ben Fell confirmed the placement, and Marshall noted he and Crystal would help finalize the wording once the section is drafted. Kyle Krause suggested placing this clarification in the recommendations section instead, to better inform the legislature that continued work in this area is already authorized, which Fattah supported. Crystal Sujeski added that including the information in both locations would be beneficial, and the group agreed to finalize placement and wording collaboratively.

- iii. HCD General Comment on Draft Document - Recognizing that the workgroup "recommendations" draft document will be reviewed and considered by the SFM and others to create and submit a final report, HCD recommends changing title of the draft document to "Single-Exit Stair Workgroup Recommendations to the State Fire Marshal" to be consistent with the workgroup charter.

2) Code Comparison Comments:

- i. Appendix A Stephen Jacob Smith Stephen & Ali Fattah recommended strike the last three columns—not just the titles. This includes striking three jurisdictions other than New York, Seattle, and Washington State. Ben Fell offered to take care of.
- ii. Appendix B, Stephen mentioned he had a few final edits and planned to include a note attributing much of the content to a Canadian code consultant's work on single-stair provisions, excluding a section on Spain that he created himself and intended to remove due to lack of citation. Robert asked if the Canadian document was publicly available, and Stephen confirmed it was, offering to include a full citation and link so readers could access the source. The group agreed this would enhance transparency and credibility. Finally, Stephen confirmed there were no further changes needed for the appendices at that time.
- iii. Appendix C, Stephan confirmed he would maintain consistency in how NRS references are handled, leaving them in place and noting that some content may need to be converted. Regarding ICC IFC E24-24, Robert Marshall suggested including the full code text as an additional page in Appendix C, rather than creating a separate appendix, so readers can see the exact language; Stephen agreed and committed to appending the code text accordingly.
- iv. Page 10 – Ali Fattah identified a legend for NR, but doesn't have issue which duplicating information.
- v. Ali Fattah raised a concern that the document might be misinterpreted to suggest that six-story wood-frame buildings (Type 5A construction) are broadly permitted, when in fact this is only allowed in specific jurisdictions like Seattle or Washington State. Stephen Jacob Smith noted that a disclaimer is already included stating the table should not supersede Table 504.4, but acknowledged that the unique Seattle allowance might not be clear without a footnote. While Stephen was open to adding a clarifying footnote, Robert Marshall felt it might not be necessary, as the intended legislative audience may not delve into construction type

distinctions, and the existing note should suffice. Ultimately, the group leaned toward keeping the current language but acknowledged the nuance for jurisdictions with unique allowances.

- vi. Page 17-Ali Fattah suggested revising the heading and language on page 17 from “Summary of Department Concerns” to “Summary of Fire Service Concerns” for clarity and consistency, proposing that the phrase “department raised” be changed to “fire service raised.” Robert Marshall acknowledged the suggestion but asked to revisit it when they reached that section in the review. Fattah agreed to wait and thanked him.
- vii. Stephen Jacob Smith raised uncertainty about whether Honolulu still permits six-story buildings with a single stair, noting past requirements like 48-inch stair widths. Robert Marshall offered to verify with the State Fire Marshal, but Greg Rogers said he would speak directly with the Honolulu Fire Chief that evening and follow up with Robert. Marshall agreed, appreciating the help.

3) Fire Protection Comments:

- i. Page 11 – Jeff Maddox suggested adding two sub headers on page 11—one for “Sprinklers” and another for “Construction Type”—to improve clarity under the Fire Protection section.
- ii. Page 12 – Jeff Maddox proposed revising a sentence on page 12 to clarify that only one of the three passive alternatives is needed in place of an active smoke control system, recommending the phrase “at least one of three passive alternative options.” Robert Marshall confirmed the changes, and Ben was tasked with implementing them.

4) Egress Analysis Comments:

- i. Joe Cavin opened the egress discussion by commending Ben Fell for integrating content from both the early egress committee work and James Dobson’s fire scenarios. He confirmed that the floor area per level (approximately 4,500 sq ft) was based on real Seattle building plans and explained that occupant loads were calculated per code. Joe noted that while floor area details could be added, they may not significantly impact the document, especially since images and videos were removed. He also mentioned the absence of scissor stair details and suggested possibly restoring original exit times, but left both points open for group input.
- ii. Jeff Maddox suggested clarifying the egress analysis by specifying that the modeled evacuation time refers to all occupants reaching the exterior at grade. He also proposed adding a note that the scenario assumes occupants and firefighters begin at the same time—a conservative, worst-case assumption. The group, including Robert Marshall, Ali Fattah, Joe Cavin, and Stephen Jacob Smith, agreed with Jeff’s proposed wording, which he shared in the chat for inclusion. “This analysis makes the conservative assumption that occupant evacuation and fire fighter response begin simultaneously. It is likely that at least some occupants will have begun evacuation before the FD arrives.”
- iii. Page 14-Jeff Maddox recommended clarifying the egress analysis section by specifying that the modeled evacuation time refers to all occupants reaching the exterior at grade, to give the data more meaningful context.

He also proposed adding a note that the scenario assumes a conservative, worst-case condition where evacuation and firefighter ingress begin simultaneously. Ali Fattah supported the clarification, noting that response times can vary and the assumption may not reflect typical conditions. The group, including Robert Marshall, Joe Cavin, and Stephen Jacob Smith, agreed with Jeff's proposed language, which he shared in the meeting chat for inclusion. "Counterflow can also occur in two-stair buildings, but it is possible for the FD to manage the evacuation to separate the two groups."

- iv. Page 15-Jeff Maddox raised a concern about a sentence in the "Occupied Roof and Egress Capacity" section that incorrectly implied stairwells were often exceeded in capacity; the group agreed to delete that clause for accuracy. Robert Marshall also suggested removing the word "new" from a sentence about egress challenges, noting the issues are not new but previously considered. Ali Fattah pointed out that the report includes a section on occupiable roofs, but the group never discussed how to handle them—such as whether to treat them as private or shared spaces for egress and occupancy load purposes. The group agreed this was a gap, and Ali volunteered to draft a paragraph addressing the issue and send it to Ben, copying Robert and Crystal.
- v. Page 15-Jeff Maddox proposed adding a sentence to the paragraph on page 15 regarding the use of elevators for evacuation, stating that the cost of converting them to evacuation elevators would far outweigh the benefits of a single-stair design. Stephen Jacob Smith initially questioned the strength of the statement but quickly withdrew his concern after Jeff noted that such upgrades typically cost millions of dollars. The group responded with light humor, and no objections were raised to including the sentence.
- vi. Jeff Maddox questioned the relevance of a paragraph discussing egress risks for elderly residents, arguing that such risks exist in both single- and two-stair buildings and are not addressed by code. Stephen Jacob Smith agreed, noting that large two-stair buildings could present even greater challenges, while Crystal Sujeski added that licensing requirements for elderly care facilities would likely prohibit single-stair designs. Robert Marshall suggested keeping the section but simplifying it to state that single-stair buildings may exacerbate existing egress challenges. Ed Mendoza disagreed, calling the statement speculative, and Ian Hardage noted that small family daycares are legislatively protected in California and cannot be considered.
- vii. Stephen Jacob Smith requested that the evacuation modeling video be made publicly accessible via a link in the report, noting that both sides of the discussion found it informative. Robert Marshall and Crystal Sujeski agreed, with Crystal confirming she would check if it was already on the CAL FIRE website and ensure it's posted under additional resources. Ben Fell was asked to add a sentence and link to the document referencing the video. James Dobson also approved sharing his video and will coordinate with Crystal to provide a downloadable version for inclusion.
- viii. Stephen Jacob Smith proposed adding a statement to the egress section acknowledging that a larger two-stair building was originally considered for modeling but was not completed due to resource constraints. He also

suggested noting that there was internal disagreement about whether such a comparison would have been appropriate. Robert Marshall clarified that his objection was not to modeling a two-stair building itself, but to comparing it at fully occupant load against a smaller single-stair building, which he felt would not yield meaningful results. Stephen emphasized that floor plate size is a key limiting factor in single-stair designs and should be reflected in the analysis, while Robert agreed that future studies should include more comprehensive modeling of both configurations under similar conditions. The group agreed to include language in the report that reflects the differing perspectives. Ben Fell was tasked with incorporating the agreed-upon text into the egress section.

1. Greg Rogers suggested simplifying the language in the report by using occupant load factors instead of referencing specific square footage or “10 times” floor area comparisons, noting that such technical details may confuse legislative readers. Greg Rogers-Egress – compromise, based on codes occupant load factor
 - a. For both the single- and two-stair plans, a roughly 4,500-sq. ft. floor plate was modeled (in line with the largest floor plates that we were able to find from Seattle), assuming roughly 23 occupants per floor. There was disagreement within the group of whether, going forward, it would be appropriate to model a two-stair building with a much larger occupant load. For multifamily residential occupancy (IBC Group R, typically R-2), the IBC 2024 occupant load factor is 200 gross sq ft per occupant for sleeping areas in residential buildings.
2. Robert Marshall agreed this could be a good compromise, and Joe Cavin supported removing the “10 times” reference while still acknowledging the group’s earlier discussions and disagreements about modeling a larger two-stair building. Stephen Jacob Smith proposed updated text that includes a reference to a 500-person occupant load—the maximum allowed under current code for two-stair buildings—while also noting that such a size may not be practically achievable due to other code constraints. Ian Hardage endorsed using occupant load factors as a more balanced and performance-based approach, emphasizing that the goal is to assess equitable safety between single- and two-stair systems, not to push designs to code maximums. The group agreed to revise the language to reflect these points and include the noted disagreement in the report. Stephen offered to send his floor plan examples directly to Robert for review.

5) Operational Needs / FD Capabilities Comments:

- i. James Dobson opens the conversation by stating that he still needs to write the paragraph on tools, equipment, and operations and that he hopes to be done at the end of the day (November 4th, 2025). He then moves on to discuss the video shown last meeting. This video shows a simulation of potential conflicts between firefighter operations and civilians during the evacuation of a six-story building. Link to video:

<https://youtu.be/wPaM1mBWvGQ>. He then states that this video might be more apt to be put in the egress analysis section over its current location on page 19. He also says that he doesn't believe that there needs to be caveat that this video was done without smoke or without an actual event, meaning it lacks the chaos present during a real evacuation as that is visible in the video. He states that it is hard to scale that level of chaos into a simulation, which is real concern for firefighting modeling.

- ii. Page 19 – Robert Marshall expresses concern regarding moving the video to the egress section as it may look like the video was done in conjunction with the modeling in the egress section, which it wasn't. James Dobson confirms that the video and modeling are completely independent. Robert Marshall states that he would prefer if the video stays in the operational needs section and that the committee can write language specifying that the video and modeling were done independently.
- iii. Page 19 – James Dobson agrees with Robert Marshall's assessment, stating that the video was intended to show challenges raised by single exit stairs as far as conducting operations go and the impact that has along with showing egress, so it could work for both sections. He then specifies that the video was modeled as clear as possible and that it was unknown what the results of the simulation would be.
- iv. James Dobson finishes stating that the only thing he needs to complete is the operational paragraph mentioned above which he will send to the committee once it's done. Robert Marshall confirms and reminds the committee that they will also need to add the language for the video and add the link.
- v. Page 16 – Jeff Maddox disagrees with the word unresolvable present in a section stating that the “conflict between ingress and egress is unresolvable in a single-stair configuration unless there the size is expanded.” He believes that this issue could be resolved by assuming there are very few occupants when the firefighters are in the stairs, so he would like to find a different word.
- vi. Page 16 – James Dobson doesn't have an issue with softening the language, as long as there is an indication that a conflict is present. He states that the solution provided by Jeff Maddox would require either a delayed ingress by firefighters or having occupants shelter in place to stagger, which is not practical for a few reasons. One, firefighter ingress deals with smoke and gases, requiring medical care to be received by occupants as quickly as possible. Second, sheltering in place goes against the fire drills that occupants have learned. But he is okay with saying that the conflict is present with less harsh language.
- vii. Page 16 – Jeff Maddox proposes language that the conflict is “difficult to resolve”, leaving the rest of the sentence the same. Robert Marshall and James Dobson agree with that change, Ben Fell is assigned to make the change.
- viii. Page 16 – James Dobson also mentions how impressed he was with the scissor stair results, something that Joe Cavin had mentioned previously, and that they may want to add that stair configuration could be a solution to this conflict, not just widening stairs, something that hasn't been highlighted in the document. Jeff Maddox agrees with this. Robert

Marshall suggests adding a line that the issue could be resolved through the configuration of the stairs and asks Ben Fell to note that change. James Dobson asks if this change satisfies Joe Cavins concern about not having enough information regarding stair configurations, Joe confirms that it does.

- ix. Page 17 – Jeff Maddox then moves to talking about aerial access. He references the section under the heading that states that single stair design assumes immediate redundant aerial access, something that can't be reliably provided against across all jurisdictions. He doesn't agree with this as the problems with not having aerial access are limited when internal fire safety features are present, so aerial access is not necessarily needed, just good to have. He also mentions that the single stair provisions rely on the internal fire safety features like small occupant loads, small buildings, and sprinklers, so aerial access is not necessarily needed.
- x. Page 17 – James Dobson specifies that the reason this language was added was because some jurisdictions, including Europe, don't allow buildings to be taller than where the aerials can reach. He adds that there is a built-in redundancy of a second stair, if one is compromised there is another means of egress. This redundancy is not present when there is only one stair, so the aerial apparatus becomes the secondary means of egress. The goal was to specify that is not what aerial apparatuses are designed for; they are not supposed to be a means of egress. They're meant to be a rescue.
- xi. Page 17 – Robert Marshall agrees with Jeff Maddox that the sentence might be misleading to people who don't understand fire response, but that there is something in between the committee can write. He brings up the general concern that departments with different sizes and responses, such as a volunteer fire department versus an urban fire department, need to be thought of before allowing single stairs everywhere. Robert wants to mention something about that in this section, combining all these ideas into one paragraph. Jeff Maddox and Robert Marshall agreed.
- xii. Page 17 – Stephen Jacob Smith brings the committee back to the point about Europe and aerial access, saying it's true that they assume aerial access, however this is under the conditions of stairways open to the units with no corridor separation, no sprinklers, no smoke control, and no standpipes. If you cannot get aerial access, then you use stairway pressurization and corridor separation. However, aerial rescue has never been assumed in California fire rescue policies, so these extra protections are necessary even with disagreement on if aerial access is necessary. Robert Marshall agrees and asks for Jeff Maddox, James Dobson, Crystal Sujeski, and Ben Fell to work on language incorporating everything that was discussed, saying the committee agrees that aerial access shouldn't be relied on.
- xiii. Page 17 – James Dobson agrees, saying they want to highlight this so there is no mistaking what fire rescue can do with aerial rescue versus what they cannot. He also mentions Washington state, and their city fire departments was against the entire states having single exit stairs because their configuration of hydrants and aerial apparatuses prevented

smaller jurisdictions from providing the same response model. New York and Seattle rely on having a robust aerial apparatus response to make single exit stairs work.

- xiv. Page 17 – Stephen Jacob Smith suggests that the operational needs part says that this is the perspective of the fire department. Jeff Maddox makes a change saying that single exit stair designs should not rely on or assume aerial access because aerial access cannot be reliably provided across all jurisdictions. Robert Marshall and Stephen Jacob Smith agree. Jeff Maddox says he's fine with the rest of the chapter, James Dobson and Robert Marshall agree.
- xv. Page 17 – Stephen Jacob Smith brings up a concern stating that this is not a developer driven change, it's driven by California EMB and developers have been hands off. He wants to change to cost or affordability driven change. Robert Marshall suggests stating that proponents noted that the proposal is motivated by cost savings. Stephen Jacob Smith agrees. James Dobson agrees partially but mentions that developers have pushed for this in roundtables so saying they are hands off is inaccurate. Robert Marshall agrees, which is why he wants to say proponents as that includes everyone.
- xvi. Page 17 – Robert Marshall states that they should address the difference in fire rescue capabilities across the state in the summary of department concerns.
- xvii. Crystal Sujeski asks if it would be helpful to explain that if the allowance for taller buildings to have single exit stairs was approved, the fire department would have to update their standard operation procedure and maybe have additional training. James Dobson states that these changes would impact procedure more than that, as it is a fundamental change to how fire responses must be conducted in these buildings. He states that most jurisdictions have a high-rise policy, which is not defined by the height specified in the code but rather when equipment must be carried aloft, something that happens starting at three stories, so these changes are included in these high-rise policies that will have to change. Robert Marshall says to add the training piece and high rise policy to the summary of department concerns. James Dobson agrees.

The committee breaks: 10 minutes

6) Cost Impact Comments:
 i. **None**

7) Recommendations Comments

- i. Stephen Jacob Smith states that some planners request and/or require a certain amount of recreational space that can only be achieved on the roof, so he mentions that planning rules may need to change, but this mention doesn't have to be reflected in the document.
- ii. Crystal Sujeski asks whether it is appropriate to recommend that changes be done sooner rather than later, such as making changes in an intervening versus triennial versus continuing the work group for another three months. Stephen Jacob Smith asks if there is no triennial cycle until

2030, Robert Marshall says that there is, there's just no local amendments, so there's a reduced intervening cycle. Crystal Sujeski mentions that AB130 says this issue gets a pass and Robert Marshall says that theoretically means this could be adopted into the 2025 code if E24 passes. Robert Marshall agrees that this timeline should be put in.

- iii. Jeff Maddox mentions comments regarding four stories versus six stories and that he agrees with the four story recommendations but disagrees with many of the recommendations for six stories. Jeff Maddox says that smoke proof enclosures require pressurized stairs or exterior vestibules which would be expensive and/or difficult, so he prefers the Life Safety group's suggestion to have self-closing doors with magnetic hold opens. Robert Marshall says that a comment ends by saying this work group is heading in a good direction, but five and six story buildings need more research and need to be debated further down the road as more data is collected. He suggests deleting all the stuff that mentions six stories and saying that this topic needs more studies and discussions before anything conclusive can be written. Stephen Jacob Smith also had concerns about the six story comments but Robert Marshall's suggestion works for him. Joe Cavin agrees with this decision.
- iv. Robert Marshall suggests adding a line of "six stories or greater in height" in reference to the recommendation of an OSFM work group and then remove all specific recommendations related to six story buildings and above.
- v. Stephen Jacob Smith recommends asking for an allocation of funds, like Minnesota, for more modeling. Robert Marshall and Jeff Maddox agree. Crystal Sujeski says you could also request money for training the fire department and/or curriculum development. Robert Marshall agrees, suggesting this go into the first set of recommendations, that there be money allocated to develop training and/or provide trainings. Jeff Maddox agrees. Ben Fell confirms these changes have been made.
- vi. Jeff Maddox is curious about the last paragraph, as it only mentions the feedback from the fire departments. Robert Marshall agrees and asks Jeff Maddox to write a change. Stephen Jacob Smith says that we could say there was a divergence of opinions, with fire departments landing hard on one side and engineers, builders, others landing on another side. Kyle Krause Agrees and adds that maybe there should be a summary of the reasons why fire departments oppose this. Robert Marshall agrees to add a short paragraph for context for both side's points.
- vii. Max Dubler wanted to change the wording for recommendation 3 to say "Stories served by the single exit in buildings exceeding 3 stories in height shall not include more than 4 dwelling units per story and the floor area per story shall not exceed 4,000 net habitable square feet." Robert Marshall agrees, saying it could be crafted around what E24 says.
- viii. Jeff Maddox added in a final sentence and Stephen Jacob Smith did as well. The committee is prompted to decide which one the like best. Robert Marshall prefers Stephan's. Stephan Jacob Smith recommends not going into too much detail. Jeff Maddox is fine with either option. Robert Marshall asks if there is any objection to Stephan's second one. There is no objection. Ben Fell reflected the change on the document.

- ix. Joe Cavin asks if the committee should change buildings to R2 occupancies, because recommendation 1 says that single exits should be permitted in buildings. Robert Marshall agrees. Ben Fell changes the document.
- x. No further comments on the recommendations.

8) Appendices

- i. Timothy O'Malley has a concern about AB130 Appendix D being too vague in that it's not just emergencies that allow for those exceptions. This will be worked out with Crystal Sujeski.
- ii. Crystal Sujeski offers HCD an opportunity to add anything to the appendix, Kyle Krause says this is a significant public policy issue he will get back to her. Robert Marshall asks for Kyle Krause to write a short paragraph for the executive summary regarding the fact that this is a public policy.
- iii. No further comments on the document

4. ROUNDTABLE - None

Robert Marshall

7. MEETING ADJOURNED (Motion Required) 10:32 AM

Robert Marshall

Motion: Bob Raymer/James Dobson	Action: Approved
--	-------------------------

If you would like to watch the recording of this meeting, please visit the link below:

<https://youtu.be/hWscDkvyUDU>