

**REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING  
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND THE  
DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATIVE SERVICES ON**

**Regulatory Provisions  
Affecting Accessible Routes  
into Certain Buildings and the  
Promotion of Universal Design  
Elements in Dwelling Units  
(HJR 648, 2011)**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



**HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 6**

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
RICHMOND  
2012**





Robert F. McDonnell  
Governor

James S. Cheng  
Secretary of  
Commerce and Trade

# COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

William C. Shelton  
Director

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

January 9, 2012

### MEMORANDUM

- TO:** The Honorable Bob McDonnell, Governor  
Members of the General Assembly of Virginia
- FROM:** Bill Shelton, Director  
Department of Housing and Community Development
- SUBJECT:** Initial report, pursuant to HJR 648, addressing accessible routes for persons with disabilities and the promotion of universal design features in dwelling units.

House Joint Resolution 648 (2011) requested the Department of Housing and Community Development and the Department of Rehabilitative Services to study the feasibility and appropriateness of amending the Uniform Statewide Building Code with respect to accessible routes for persons with disabilities entering public and private buildings and facilities. The resolution also charged the agencies with considering actions that could promote the increased use of universal design features in dwelling units.

The study was to be conducted over two years, with the initial and final reports due, respectively, by the first day of the 2012 and 2013 sessions of the General Assembly. The current document reports on activities associated with the study during 2011. An advisory group that drew upon a wide range of individuals with expertise in building design and accessibility issues provided invaluable assistance and insights to the agencies in initiating the study. Thanks to the work of the advisory group during the initial study year, the state agencies anticipate making several recommendations in the final report that address relevant regulatory considerations.



## Preface

---

House Joint Resolution 648 (2011)<sup>1</sup> requested the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) in cooperation with the Department of Rehabilitative Services (DRS) to undertake a two-year study addressing the accessibility of portions of the built environment to persons with disabilities. The resolution identified the following specific areas of concern:

- Proposed amendments to the Uniform State Building Code (USBC) addressing access routes into public buildings and privately-owned buildings used by the public;
- Enhanced incentives for the greater use of universal design elements in dwelling units;
- Costs of retroactive and prospective construction mandates to private businesses and local governments, technical and feasibility issues relating to compliance requirements, and the feasibility of requiring universal design features in dwelling units;
- Prioritization of existing accessibility set-aside provisions for building renovation; and
- Consider findings and recommendations for USBC accessibility amendments.

The resolution required the agencies involved in the process to complete their meetings before November 30 of each year, submitting an executive summary and report to the Governor and General Assembly before the first day of the next Regular Session of the General Assembly.

The Departments invited representatives of an array of stakeholder organizations to serve on a work group. Participants encompassed potentially affected business groups, the building and construction community, design professionals, local governments and representatives of the disability community. The agencies with primary responsibility for the study provided staff support and technical assistance.<sup>2</sup>

The work group met on August 12, 2011, and October 14, 2011, at the Virginia Housing Center. The initial meeting included a review of the purposes of and schedule for the study, presentations of relevant background information by agency staff and participants (including provisions of key regulations), information about the growing number of Virginians with disabilities and opportunities for addressing accessible routes and entrances. Participants also discussed various approaches to promoting greater use of universal design. Finally, members of the group considered the probable timeline for the development of the 2012 USBC and its interaction with any recommendations included in the final HJR 648 report.

The second and final 2011 meeting addressed in more detail seven potential areas for changes in the 2012 building code, the availability of information about accessibility features in rental and home sales listings, the need for greater public awareness of accessibility issues, and increasing use of the existing livable homes tax credit. DHCD also informed work group members of opportunities that local code enforcement personnel will have in 2012 to receive training intended to increase their knowledge and awareness of mandated accessibility requirements and standards as well as the importance of assuring that both new construction and existing buildings are in compliance. The work group scheduled two more meetings in 2012 to continue its work and produce its final recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix A

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix B for invited participants and agency staff.



## Table of Contents

---

Transmittal Letter	i
Preface	iii
Executive Summary	vii
2011 Preliminary Report	
Background	1
Work Session Summaries	1
August 12, 2011	1
October 14, 2011	5
Areas for Potential Code Changes in the 2012 USBC	6
Appendix A: Study Resolution	9
Appendix B: Study Participants and Support Staff	10

---



## Executive Summary

---

During 2011, the Department of Housing and Community Development and the Department of Rehabilitative Services established an advisory work group to assist in responding to the direction provided by HJR 648. The HJR 648 Work Group met twice during 2011. To complete its work, it has scheduled two additional meetings for March and April 2012.

During 2011, the Work Group focused its initial efforts on sharing information and perspectives while reviewing the current state of activities, programs and regulations that address accessibility. The Work Group identified issues that should receive immediate attention and that appeared amenable to the development of a set of consensus recommendations. To accomplish this task, the Work Group established sub-groups to develop specific code changes and policy recommendations over the next three months that would then be embodied into the final HJR 648 report to the General Assembly.

The areas under review will include the:

- Development of proposed changes to the Uniform State Building Code (USBC);
- Review of the costs associated with retroactive and prospective construction mandates;
- Exploration of the use of various incentives and market-driven initiatives encouraging the greater use of visitability and universal design elements in new one- and two-family construction, and;
- Consideration of whether the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) barrier removal requirements should be incorporated into the USBC. This consideration would address how such requirements could be implemented in existing buildings after weighing the legal, technical and cost concerns that would have to be addressed in order to achieve a consensus on appropriate actions.

With respect to incentives to encourage the greater use of universal design and visitability features, the Work Group agreed that that this constituted a significant challenge for both the near and long-term. The importance of expanding stakeholder awareness of existing incentives through more frequent and formal outreach efforts was identified as an important concern. Work Group members noted that several extant ideas and programs can be or are already being used today to increase the accessibility of one- and two-family for persons with mobility limitations. Forging disparate individual efforts into a more coherent and comprehensive set of activities and programs will be subject to further review and development of recommendations by the HJR 648 Workgroup and its sub-groups.



## **Background**

In response to the provisions of HJR 648 (2011), the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) and the Department of Rehabilitative Services (DRS) invited representatives from potentially affected interest groups to serve on a work group that would consider responses to the issues included in the resolution. Participants invited to the initial work sessions included business and trade groups, the building and construction community, design professionals, local governments and representatives of the disability community.

## **Work Session Summaries**

*August 12, 2011*

The initial work session focused on familiarizing participants with the purposes of the study and providing information that would be essential to the members.

Increasing Education and Awareness: Following the introduction of the participants, Mr. Ron Clements of VBCOA introduced a general discussion ensued about the importance of incorporating an educational component in efforts aimed at attaining and fostering the removal of barriers in existing buildings. Members noted that this was of particular significance in addressing accessible routes from private and public parking facilities to the entrances of existing buildings.

Mr. Ken Fredgren of the Reston Access Committee cited that organization's experience within the Reston area in this regard. Mr. Emory Rodgers, Deputy Director DHCD, noted that efforts to increase professional awareness of accessibility had accelerated in recent years. For example, the Virginia Society-American Institute of Architects had conducted several accessibility seminars for architects during the past two years. The Jack Proctor Virginia Building Code Academy (JPVBCA) has conducted accessibility code training for code enforcement personnel. In addition, as noted by Ms. Gayle Brunk of the Valley Association for Independent Living, building officials at the state, regional and local levels have also conducted accessibility training. From a different perspective, the Homebuilders Association of Virginia has introduced regional building associations to its Easy Living/Visitability program, which promotes design features intended to make homes more user friendly for persons with mobility limitations. The group consensus was that more frequent, formal and substantial efforts are needed to reach more stakeholders.

Relevant Standards and Regulations: To provide the members of the work group with a consistent body of information, DHCD staff briefed those present on the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC) and American National Standards Institute (ANSI), A117.1 accessibility standards. Staff discussed how these related to the purpose and objectives included in HJR 648.

In the case of new building construction or a change of occupancy or significant alteration to an existing building, the USBC provides the mandatory requirements for accessible routes from parking facilities, accessible entrances and work area accessibility.<sup>1</sup> This includes items such as bathrooms, accessible switches as well as environmental controls and lever door hardware. Dwelling units in hotels and apartments must be accessible. However, neither state law nor the USBC regulations include any retroactive accessibility requirements for existing buildings and parking facilities other than signage for accessible parking spaces.

Familiarity with the existing regulatory provisions was necessary because HJR 648 specifically charged DHCD and DRS with studying the appropriateness of the building code's accessible route requirements for existing buildings as well as ways to promote, by incentives, universal design features in dwelling units. Related issues included the cost of retroactive or new construction mandates and technical feasibility. Finally, HJR 648 directed the participants to examine the prioritization of a 20 % set-aside for accessibility features that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires in the case of certain building renovation projects.

Background for HJR 648: Mr. Fredgren provided additional information about the origin of the study resolution and his experiences working on accessibility concerns with local businesses in Reston, Virginia. Based on that experience, he and others in the Reston Accessibility Committee (RAC) had reasoned that if signage was subject to retrofit requirements, perhaps the ADA requirement for barrier removal could address the restriping of handicapped parking spaces. This also led to the question of whether restriping of certain existing parking lots without handicapped designated spaces could be accomplished through the 2012 USBC regulatory process or if it would require legislative direction. Other questions concerned the number of spaces that might be required in the retrofit of an existing parking lot without designated handicapped parking spaces as well as the consequences if creating handicapped parking spaces took the property out of conformity local zoning requirements. Because parking lot restriping does not currently require a building permit, even if a retrofit was required, how could it be enforced? Mr. Fredgren noted that one indicator of the significance of this issue was the fact that the Virginia DMV has issued over 305,000 handicapped parking permits and their number continues to grow each year.

Mr. Fredgren pointed to another concern. Virginia law currently does not allow local governments to amend the USBC or adopt provisions that exceed its requirements. He suggested considering whether it might be appropriate to permit localities to amend the USBC for accessibility requirements in existing buildings. The subsequent discussion noted the rationale for the decision in 1973 to supersede all local building codes and develop a single, uniform set of

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the USBC, Change of Occupancy currently means a change in the use or occupancy of a building that would place it in a different division of the same group of occupancies (e.g., A-1 Assembly to A-3 Assembly) or in a different group of occupancies (e.g., M Mercantile to R Residential) or a change in the purpose or level of activity in the building that changes the application of the building code to it. An alteration is any construction or renovation to an existing building that is not a repair or addition,

standards with statewide applicability. This allowed the same construction methods and materials to be used across the Commonwealth by eliminating duplicative and contractor provisions from local codes. Local building officials and representatives subject to USBC regulations expressed concern legislation that would permit varying requirements from locality to locality. Staff noted that local governments have sometimes used proffered conditions in connection with zoning cases to gain voluntary building code requirements for new construction that also might be applicable to some existing buildings where special use permits might be required for rehabilitation projects. Mr. Fredgren concluded this discussion by noting that the demographics of an aging population and its purchasing power increasingly make it good business to increase the accessibility for existing buildings.

ADA Priorities: The accessible requirements for a change of occupancy are more extensive than for alterations. Alterations involving a work area require that 20% of certain costs be used on accessible requirements. The ADA has an extensive list of priorities, but the list is a *guideline* that also allows for consideration of cost factors and the technical feasibility of each project. The study group will explore whether the 20% set-aside can be listed and prioritized in the USBC/IBC for alterations, as is the case for a change of occupancy. Taking this approach--providing a mandated list of priorities in the case of alterations--creates certain challenges. The 20% depends on the cost of qualifying alterations underway in the work area; the monies available may only be able to undertake work to lower switches or receptacles and install lever hardware, but not provide accessible entrances or bathrooms. Other alternative regulatory approaches could include adding the prioritization list into alterations or doing away with the 20% and requiring some limited number of required accessible features. There was general agreement that cost had to be a consideration for any recommendations.

Mr. Harold Stills, a VBCOA representative, asked if HJR 648 was intended to require all occupancies for existing building to have an accessible route and entrance. In the subsequent discussion, the conclusion was that HJR 648 was not prescriptive, but that one of its principal purposes was for the study group to establish scoping provisions and gain consensus for any regulatory or legislative changes for any recommendations affecting any occupancies.

Residential Accessibility and Universal Design Issues: Mr. Rodgers reminded participants that the Virginia Housing Policy Task Force is concurrently looking at impediments to affordable housing and encouraging incentives for builders to offer options for 1 & 2 family dwellings that increase their accessibility. There is also interest in having the USBC establish definitions and standards in the 2012 USBC for universal design and visitability.

HJR 648 charges the study group to look at how 1 & 2 family dwelling units may be encouraged to incorporate accessible features and incentives. In recent years, the national model codes have mainstreamed accessibility requirements into the basic egress and other trade requirements. For example, doors must have 32 inches clear width with lever hardware. Various levels of accessible 1 & 2 family dwelling units that can be studied. The first is generally referred

to as visitability/Easy Living approach that the HBAV encourages its membership making available as design construction options to home purchasers. This includes a step free entrance, 32” clear width doors on all first floor doors, 36” corridors, a first floor bedroom, a full bath with grab bars and a kitchen allowing wheelchair entry. The second is a more rigorous set of accessible requirements generally referred to as universal design that includes accessible cabinets, controls, door hardware, switches and sinks, and counters meeting A117.1 dimension and reach requirements. All entrances must be accessible and bathrooms must have the 5 feet turn-around dimension. Although there are now requirements for accessible dwelling units in new and altered hotels and apartments, there is not a matching consensus or mandate for 1 & 2 family dwelling units. Many of the participants expressed their preference for incentives over mandates as the best option, pointing to the availability of incentives such as the recently amended tax credit legislation that gives builders access to up to \$5000 per qualifying unit.

2012 USBC Schedule: Mr. Rodgers reviewed the probable schedule for adoption of the 2012 USBC. The process would begin with stakeholders reviewing the model codes and current 2009 USBC for significant changes and drafting code changes. The Board of Housing and Community Development (BHCD) would approve the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) and hold its first public hearing in 2012. In 2013, numerous work groups would convene to review code changes; the BHCD would meet to consider code changes; and, the BHCD would approve proposed regulations. The BHCD would approve final regulations and hold a second public hearing in late 2013. The final 2012 USBC would take effect by July of 2014. This schedule depends on receiving administrative approvals by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce and Trade and the Governor’s Office. The process normally takes at least two years from the publication of the NOIRA to the effective date and final approvals.

The initial meeting concluded with recommendations for the following additional information and items to be considered at the work group’s next meeting in October:

- As part of the discussion of education on accessibility needs and requirements, DHCD’s Training and Certification Office would identify opportunities in the 2012 JPVBCA training schedule to conduct accessibility training on an annual basis.
- Members would receive a copy of the current handicapped parking signage requirements.
- Mr. Fredgren would provide additional information on the disability population handicapped parking permits.
- Options for parking lot striping and local government accessibility requirements for existing building were to be discussed further at the subsequent meeting.
- Change of occupancy and alteration requirements were to be discussed further.
- Staff will provide additional information on definitions of universal design and visitability.

*October 14, 2011*

The October work session followed up on items identified during the initial meeting in August.

Accessibility Training Opportunities: As promised at the previous meeting, Mr. Rodgers opened the session with a review of the 2012 schedule of accessibility training sessions for residential and commercial buildings. Members of the work group were invited to participate in one of the sessions. DHCD provided contact information for any member wishing to reserve a place at a convenient time and location.

Additional Data Sources: Mr. Fredgren provided additional information on the number of Virginians with disabilities and the categorization of those disabilities. He called attention to the 2004 estimate of 1.49 million Virginians with varying degrees of disabling conditions out of a then population of nearly 7.5 million. He also noted other sources of information on the topic that were available for review. Additional materials included recent newspaper articles addressing the continuing shortage of housing with visitability or universal design accessibility features. The articles noted the growing but still slow market response to this housing need. The ensuing discussion recognized that despite the desire of builders to see demand, persons with disabilities continue to face difficulties in finding housing with needed accessibility features. Matching potential demand with supply has continued to be challenging. Work group members suggested the possibility of improving the process by working with the Realtors and the property listing companies.

Existing Building Code Provisions for Accessibility Enhancing Features: Mr. Vernon Hodge of DHCD's Division Building and Fire Regulation provided an overview of the current Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC)/International Existing Building Code (IEBC)/International Building Code (IBC) and ANSI (A117.1) accessibility definitions and code requirements for existing buildings, including historic buildings. The USBC currently requires that an existing building undergoing alterations to the primary workspace or to the building must include accessibility features equal to up to 20 percent of the applicable work costs.

The standard includes the prioritization of accessibility features that should be considered first: these include accessible parking, an accessible route and entrance and then bathrooms and work area improvements. When there is a partial or complete change of occupancy, specific accessibility features must be included. These include an accessible route from the parking area and one accessible route to primary work areas, an accessible entrance and loading zone, accessible parking (where provided) and signage. The ensuing discussion highlighted several areas that need further clarification, such as a full or partial change of occupancy. Such items could be included in code changes developed during the 2012 USBC revision.

The work group discussed a number of regulatory code changes, identifying eight to be considered by sub-groups for review at the next meeting currently scheduled for March 29, 2012.

Support staff would work with the lead for each sub-group, familiarizing them with the code change form, the format and style for code changes and sample code changes. Work during the interim between meetings would emphasize the importance to a successful code change process of preparing a supporting statement that outlines the need, the cost and the ability to gain a consensus supporting the change.

Other Areas for Possible Work Group Recommendations: Some possible recommendations that could be incorporated into the final HJR648 report in 2012 include cooperation between advocacy groups and the Virginia Association of Realtors in developing a set of accessibility criteria for the MLS on each dwelling unit. Further enhancements to the livable homes tax credit could also be considered; however, members noted that the current amount allocated for the credit is not being fully used. Thus, a more important step with respect to the tax credit may involve actions that increase public awareness of the benefit.

Future Meetings: The next two meeting dates will occur during March and April 2012. The March meeting will provide for the review and finalizing of 2012 regulatory code changes so that they can be considered during the subsequent code change cycle. Members will also review other possible recommendations that promote and encourage greater accessibility in new homes. These could include mandating additional accessibility features, developing more effective visitability incentives and promoting the wider use of universal design features in homes. The work group will also explore steps to encourage owners of existing buildings that operate as places of public accommodation to make improvements addressing accessible parking and routes to accessible entrances and other technically achievable interior accessible features.

## **Areas for Potential Code Changes in the 2012 USBC**

The following specific items related to building code requirements with potential impacts of building accessibility were recommended for further review, with the expectation that some or all could be presented in the form of code change requests during 2012. Several of the areas recommended for further review address potentially complex policy decisions, including legislative rather than regulatory responses. Additional information about some of these items follows the item.

- Consider, for the purpose of increased visitability, the width of interior doors within single-family dwellings as well as or other proposals for visitability or implement features of universal design.
  - Visitability and universal design are related but distinct concepts. Visitability generally focuses on the shorter term of guest visitation. Universal design addresses a broader array of items influencing the overall longer-term livability of a residence for an occupant with varying disabling conditions. Visitability might incorporate provisions of the A117.1 Type C standard providing 32” clear width doors to habitable spaces, zero-step entrance, accessible bath and 36” corridors on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor.

- Consideration of visitability standards would necessarily also address which, if any, residential occupancies might be subject to the standard's threshold requirements.
- Code changes addressing universal design would likely be more difficult to scope. The extensive range of options could include the use of A117.1 Type B standards for bathrooms, grab bars, controls and switches, structural supports for a stair lift or a closet size designed to accept insertion of an elevator, showers for wheelchairs entry and appliances within the required reach ranges
  - Consider implementing standards addressing the thickness of carpet underlayment in commercial buildings. (Carpet standards address carpet pile but do not consider underlayment thickness.)
  - Consider whether the restriping of parking lots should be considered as an alteration under the USBC, thereby triggering a requirement that specific certain accessibility requirements be met.
    - There are differences between the ADA provisions for parking lot restriping and those of the USBC. The ADA considers restriping as an alteration while the USBC/IBC does not. This distinction could be the focus of a code change. If restriping were considered an alteration, then existing parking facilities would need to add accessible parking spaces, including van spaces, according to the current provisions of the model International Building Code's Table 1106.1.
  - Examine current code provisions addressing when permits are necessary for issues involving accessibility.
  - Provide greater clarity in delineating what constitutes a change of occupancy (partial or full) and how accessibility provisions should be applied.
  - Re examine and make recommendations addressing the number of accessible parking spaces that should be required for various building occupancies.
    - Another code change that could be considered would involve the review of the number of accessible parking spaces that should be mandated for certain specific occupancies under current conditions. Examples included certain medical facilities, including physicians' offices where outpatient procedures are performed, as well as certain classes of restaurants.
  - Examine the prioritization of components within the accessibility upgrades associated with building alternations to determine amounts to be spent on upgrading the path of travel to the primary function area.
  - Examine the barrier removal requirements of the ADA (and related federal regulations) to determine the feasibility of recommending as a legislative proposal incorporating specific retrofitting provisions as part of the USBC.
    - Current Virginia policies would suggest that requiring retroactive barrier removal and increases in the parking space requirements for existing facilities would require legislative direction.



2011 SESSION

ENROLLED

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 648

*Requesting the Department of Housing and Community Development, in cooperation with the Department of Rehabilitative Services, to study the feasibility and appropriateness of amendments to the Uniform Statewide Building Code to provide accessible routes for persons with disabilities into public and private buildings and facilities and promote universal features in dwelling units. Report.*

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 4, 2011  
Agreed to by the Senate, February 22, 2011

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the Commonwealth to ensure the accessibility of persons with disabilities to all public buildings and private buildings open to the public and to provide universal design features in dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, it is in the interest of the citizens of the Commonwealth for persons with disabilities to enjoy maximum self-sufficiency in the built environment; and

WHEREAS, providing the shortest accessible route that connects to accessible parking and passenger loading zones and accessible building and facility entrances, as well as the use of universal design features in dwelling units, are among the first steps to creating maximum self-sufficiency for persons with disabilities; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Department of Housing and Community Development, in cooperation with the Department of Rehabilitative Services, be requested to study the feasibility and appropriateness of amendments to the Uniform Statewide Building Code to provide accessible routes for persons with disabilities into public and private buildings and facilities and promote universal features in dwelling units.

In conducting its study, the Department of Housing and Community Development, in cooperation with the Department of Rehabilitative Services, shall:

1. On or before July 1, 2012, complete a study on proposed amendments to the Uniform Statewide Building Code to provide access routes for persons with disabilities into public and private buildings or facilities and enhance the availability of incentives for the greater use of universal design features in dwelling units;

2. Examine the costs of retroactive or new construction mandates to private businesses and local governments and technical and feasibility issues addressing compliance requirements that may affect the structural integrity of buildings, the feasibility of requiring universal design features in dwelling units, and other similar issues;

3. Examine additional options, including prioritizing components of accessible routes and establishing a different distribution schedule for the use of the 20 percent of renovation dollars required in the Uniform Statewide Building Code (USBC) for improving accessibility in existing buildings where accessible routes and entrances are deemed technically infeasible; and

4. Submit the joint findings and recommendations of the Departments on the feasibility and appropriateness of amendments to the Uniform Statewide Building Code.

The Departments shall include as participants in the study representatives of stakeholders including business groups, the building community, design professionals, local governments, the disability community, and others as it deems appropriate.

Technical assistance shall be provided to the Department of Housing and Community Development and the Department of Rehabilitative Services by the Virginia Disability Commission, the Virginia Board for Persons with Disabilities, the Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, and the Department for the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing. All agencies of the Commonwealth shall provide assistance to the Departments for this study, upon request.

The Department of Housing and Community Development and the Department of Rehabilitative Services shall complete their meetings for the first year by November 30, 2011, and for the second year by November 30, 2012, and the Director of the Department of Housing and Community Development and the Commissioner of the Department of Rehabilitative Services shall submit jointly to the Governor and the General Assembly an executive summary and report of their findings and recommendations for publication as a House or Senate document for each year. The executive summaries and reports shall be submitted as provided in the procedures of the Division of Legislative Automated Systems for the processing of legislative documents and reports no later than the first day of the next Regular Session of the General Assembly and shall be posted on the General Assembly's website.

ENROLLED

HM648ER

## Appendix B: Study Participants and Support Staff

---

### Invited Study Participants

<b>Representative</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Laurie Aldrich	Virginia Retail Merchants Association
Joel Andrus	Virginia Retail Merchants Association
Teri Barker Morgan	Virginia Board for People with Disabilities
Matthew Barkley	Fairfax Department of Family Services
Gayl Brunk	Valley Associates for Independent Living (VAIL)
David Burds	Endeppence Center of Northern Virginia (ECNV)
Audrey Clark	Fairfax County Director of Building Plan Review
Vantoria Clay	Endeppence Center, Inc. (ECI)
Ron Clements	Chesterfield County Engineering Supervisor ( representing Virginia Building Code Officials Association-VBCOA)
Marcia Dubois	Department of Rehabilitative Services
Tom Elliott	City of Charlottesville Building Official
Ken Fredgren	Reston Accessibility Committee
Brian Gordon	Apartment and Office Building Association
Katie Hellebush	Virginia Hospitality & Travel Association
Kelly Hickok	Resources for Independent Living (RIL)
Steve Johnson	Endeppence Center, Inc. (ECI)
Ronald Lanier	Virginia Department for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Karen Michalski-Karney	Blue Ridge Independent Living Center
Edward Mullen	Home Builders Association of Virginia (HBAV) - Reed Smith
Nicole Riley	State Director, National Federation of Independent Businesses (NFIB)
Steve Smallwood	City of Fredericksburg Director of Building and Development Services
Jim Snowa	Virginia Society of the American Institute of Architects (VS-AIA)
Jane Ward Solomon	Department of the Blind and Visually Impaired
Harold Stills	Hanover County Building Inspections Plans Examiner (VBCOA)
Marion Stillson	Reston Accessibility Committee
Mike Toalson	Chief Executive Officer, Home Builders Association of Virginia (HBAV)
W. Francis Vineyard	City of Charlottesville Building Inspector

### DHCD Support Staff

Emory Rodgers	Deputy Director, Division of Building and Fire Regulation
Vernon Hodge	Technical Services Manager, Division of Building and Fire Regulation
Janice Firestone	Program Support Specialist, Division of Building and Fire Regulation
Bill Ernst	Policy Office Manager, Division of Administration







