

OKLAHOMA UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION

REGULAR MINUTES

UNIFORM BUILDING CODE COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM

2401 NW 23RD STREET, SUITE 82

OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73107

FEBRUARY 15, 2022 – 1:30 P.M.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wayne Allen, Stephanie Cliff, Daniel Favata, Warren Goldmann, Paul Gunderson, Danny Hancock, Mitchell Hort, Lonnie Shackelford, and Donny Williamson

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT

Dee Hays, Kyle Lombardo, Scott Tucker, and Cary Williamson

OTHERS PRESENT:

Billy Pope (OUBCC Staff), Lindsay Heinrichs (OUBCC Staff) Kathy Hehnly (OUBCC Staff), Bryan Neal (Oklahoma Attorney General's Office), Amber Armstrong (A & E Code Professionals), Mike Means (Oklahoma Home Builders Association), Steve Funck (OMES ABS), and Chris Ramseyer (University of Oklahoma)

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Danny Hancock, Chairman of the Commission called the regular meeting of the Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission to order at 1:30 p.m. in the Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission Board Room at Shepherd Center, 2401 NW 23rd St., Suite 82, Oklahoma City, OK 73107.

STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE:

The following statement was read into the record:

"This regular meeting of the Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission scheduled to begin at 1:30 p.m. on this 15th day of February 2022, has been convened in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, Title 25 O.S. Sections 301 through 314.

Further, this meeting was preceded by an advance public notice that was sent to the Secretary of State electronically specifying the date, time, and place of the meeting here convened.

Notice of this meeting was given at least twenty-four (24) hours prior hereto. To date, 4,627 (four thousand six hundred twenty-seven) people have filed a written request for notice of meetings of this public body."

REPORTS:

CEO's Report:

Mr. Pope addressed the Commission. He noted before the Commissioners was a list of some classes staff were working on scheduling with ICC for the rest of the year, but they were still waiting on the final signed contract and purchase order to be issued. He added they still needed the Construction Industries Board (CIB) approval of the CEUs. He noted the classes were scattered in the OKC and Tulsa areas.

He stated one other thing he wanted to bring to their attention was the receipt of permit funds for January was high due to the City of Oklahoma City paying three months of permits at once. He added there were no penalties for paying late and staff did reach out to jurisdictions via email and phone calls to encourage them to submit their reports and funds. Mr. Favata asked about the training classes and if they were strictly for inspectors. Mr. Pope replied they were. The Commission, Mr. Pope and Mr. Neal discussed the history of the agency legislation related to training classes, who staff had initially allowed to fill classes after giving first option to inspectors, the previous Governor's office interpretation of the who was allowed to attend the training classes; and the cost for the classes. Mr. Pope noted the only way to change who was allowed to attend, would be through a change to the agency's statutes through the Legislature.

Financial Report:

Mr. Steve Funck with the Office of Management and Enterprise Services, Agency Business Services division, greeted the Commission. He reviewed each of the monthly reports, starting with the Operating Budget Comparison by Department and Account report. He reviewed the Allotment Budget and Available Cash report and stated the cash balance at the end of January 2021, was \$1,308,251. He reviewed the Summary of Receipts and Disbursements report and noted the same number was on this one and the two reports tied together. He added the difference between the receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year to date was \$55,911. He noted on the summary for the clearing account, the balance was \$90,572 and it would be transferred by the end of the month into the operating account. He reviewed the 6-Digit Object of Expenditure Report, noting the total expenditures for the month of January was \$45,790. He reviewed the 6-Digit Expenditure Detail Report which listed the payments made during the month of January and included everything but payroll expenditures. He noted the non-payroll total expenditures paid for the month were \$23,896. He reviewed the Outstanding Encumbrances Report, which were the contracts in place for the remainder of the fiscal year. He noted the total amount of encumbrances remaining were \$120,392.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Hancock noted there was some interest in moving up the Public Comment and asked if there were any motions for that.

MR. DANIEL FAVATA MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. LONNIE SHACKLEFORD TO MOVE PUBLIC COMMENT FROM THE END OF THE MEETING TO BEFORE THE ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

VOTING AYE: Wayne Allen
Stephanie Cliff
Daniel Favata
Paul Gunderson
Warren Goldmann
Danny Hancock
Mitchell Hort
Lonnie Shackelford
Donny Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Dee Hays
 Kyle Lombardo
 Scott Tucker
 Cary Williamson

Mr. Mike Means, Executive Vice President of the Oklahoma Home Builder's Association addressed the Commission. He stated he was there to address agenda item "4C," more specifically numbers "2, 3, and 4" under item 4C. He stated he would like the Commission to vote "no" for each of those actions. He explained he thought when looking for a Chief Executive Officer for the Commission, they needed an administrator, not an expert. He noted there were many administrators out there working for different state agencies and none of them were experts. He cited the examples such as the director for Engineers and Land Surveyors who was not an engineer or land surveyor and the director for the Board of Architects who was not an architect. He stated he was the administrator for the Oklahoma Home Builders Association, and he was not a home builder. He added when looking at the requirements the Commission was trying to put in place, and comparing them to other states, they were tightening down the requirements and narrowing the applications of who would be best as an administrator for the Commission. He stated they were looking for an administrator not a code official. He stated the OUBCC was not the ICC, and they were not developing codes. He added the Commission analyzed codes to determine the best fit for Oklahoma. He stated the administrator did not do that, that was what the Commission did through technical committees to allow the expertise to come in and determine what codes would be applicable for Oklahoma. He addressed number 3 that specified, 10 years of experience as a licensed unlimited contractor in each of the trades. He noted that excluded general contractors and the Commission was saying they need not apply. He stated most general contractors he knew didn't hold the actual licenses for each area that came under their purview to build the buildings they built. He stated he found those particular items being considered for an administrator were ridiculous. He added the Commission was not going to get the person that needed to be the administrator they want them to be, they would be getting a code person who would probably then drive the codes and not allow the Commission to do the job they were called to do and that the Governor had appointed them to do as the Commissioners. He expressed disappointment in that he couldn't take any comments or answer any questions.

Mr. Chris Ramseyer, a retired professor with the University of Oklahoma addressed the Commission. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to talk and stated he had worked with the OUBCC as part of several technical committees. He noted he was a structural engineer by trade and was the sole engineer involved in the iconic Sky Dance Bridge downtown. He added he probably knew as much about structural engineering as anyone in the State. He stated as mentioned in Mr. Means comments, he was a board member with the Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors. He stated the Board's director was not an engineer or a surveyor. He noted she made more salary than probably 80 percent of the engineers and land surveyors in the state and was worth every single penny. He noted she administered his board; she did not vote on topics that related to engineering and surveying as they had topic experts for that. He noted his Board recently came up with a new designation called "Professional Structural Engineer" and he was the topic expert for it. He explained when somebody sent questions into the Board and asked if they needed to be a licensed structural engineer to build a building, the question was referred it him, and it took up to maybe an hour at most a week, to provide answers to those questions. He stated he did not charge his Board; he did that because he felt it was a way to improve our state. He noted the idea of the overly restrictive description for what the Commission wanted as far as a CEO, flew in the face of our Governor's position, flew in the face of

most of the politics as he knew it in the state, which was towards less restriction. He added there was an article in he believed yesterday's Daily Oklahoman about five agencies that were under review because they had written such restrictive guidelines for their officers, that it essentially became a closed coble of self-interest. He noted that self-interest was not good for us. He stated in his opinion, the Commission had to have it as open as possible and look for the best administrator. He added the way Commission had it written now; he could not apply for the job, and he would put his credentials up against anybody's. He stated Ms. Hehnly could not apply for the job, and yet he thought she had been doing a wonderful job as an assistant to the OUBCC. He stated he would add his voice to Mr. Means' and actually hope and intreat the Commission to vote no on those issues. He then thanked the Commission.

Mr. Hancock clarified with the Commission and public that the approval of the January meeting minutes was not a final approval of the job description and that the job description was up for discussion, and they could still make changes to it. He added the point about General Contractors was a very valid point. There was some discussion on when the minutes of the February 7, 2022, special meeting minutes would be approved.

ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Discussion and possible approval of the January 18, 2022, regular meeting minutes

MR. DONNY WILLIAMSON MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. MITCHELL HORT TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 18, 2022, REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

VOTING AYE: Wayne Allen
 Stephanie Cliff
 Daniel Favata
 Paul Gunderson
 Warren Goldmann
 Danny Hancock
 Mitchell Hort
 Lonnie Shackelford
 Donny Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Dee Hays
 Kyle Lombardo
 Scott Tucker
 Cary Williamson

Discussion and possible action on the possible sale and/or permanent transfer of the two-conference room tables that OUBCC bought on April 2, 2012, to the Construction Industries Board (CIB)

Mr. Hancock explained the tables under discussion, were the ones everyone had seen and used before. He added they matched the others in the CIB conference room before the OUBCC moved. He noted in his opinion, they were not needed by the OUBCC. He stated the CIB could no longer re-order them. He stated the Commission needed to discuss what to do with them and that the CIB was asking for the tables but that required a Commission action.

Mr. Pope stated he wanted to make sure the Commission knew what happened. He noted the OUBCC bought both tables and paid \$1040 for the two of them. He noted they had been used all the years the Commission had been with the CIB. He stated there had been some complaints the Commission had used some of the other equipment in the conference room, but the rent paid every month to the CIB paid for the use of the break room, conference rooms, the hall ways and front lobby areas as well as the OUBCC office space. He added the Commission had paid for whatever was used during that time and didn't feel like the Commission owed anything to the CIB. He added at the time they set this up and were working on ordering the tables, they were working with Mr. Nathan Powell, the director at that time and Ms. Sarah Musset who has since passed away. He noted they worked with and helped the CIB. He added Ms. Hehnly had helped them with a lot of stuff when they were down some employees, so they always allowed them to work with and help them out. He stated his thought was anytime we are state agency, we should help any other state agency to do better for the citizens of Oklahoma. He noted he broke out the information in a detailed letter to everyone to explain what happened and what was done and what happened in the process when trying to establish this. He noted they had worked with Ms. Ramona Parker with the OMES Real Estate Division, and she was working with CIB to find out what they wanted to do. He stated he told her to have CIB tell the Commission what they would give for the tables, and he would see if the Commission would do that. He added that didn't happen. He stated instead, the Commission had received a letter from the head of the CIB stating they wanted the Commission to give the tables back to them and to pay to bring it back to them. He added he thought it was a decision the Commission needed to make; it was not something he thought he could decide for the whole agency.

Mr. Hancock noted there had been discussion of another table that was going to be given to the OUBCC. Mr. Pope confirmed that was from the State Fire Marshal's office. He added that was their understanding, but they didn't have it yet. Mr. Hancock asked if the Commission was going to have to pay for it. Mr. Pope stated they would not have to pay for it. Mr. Hancock noted in his opinion the relationship across all departments was very important and he didn't believe the Commission needed the tables and felt the Commission should decide on how to give them back, either sold at a certain price or agreed to a transfer of property.

MR. DANIEL FAVATA MADE A MOTION TO TRANSFER THE TABLES TO THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRIES BOARD (CIB), HOWEVER COSTS FOR MOVING THE TABLES WOULD BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CIB

Mr. Goldmann suggested an explanation from Mr. Pope should be given to the CIB, that we had paid for the use of the meeting space in the agency monthly rent and that the OUBCC was pleased to work with the CIB. He added it should be gracious, but that the Commission was not willing to pay to move them back. He added it should be a letter or something rather than a notice of action. Mr. Hancock asked what the cost to move them would entail. Mr. Pope noted he wasn't sure.

MR. DANIEL FAVATA AMENDED HIS MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. PAUL GUNDERSON, TO INCLUDE A GRACIOUS LETTER TO THE CIB

VOTING AYE: Wayne Allen
Stephanie Cliff
Daniel Favata
Paul Gunderson
Warren Goldmann
Danny Hancock
Mitchell Hort
Lonnie Shackelford
Donny Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Dee Hays
Kyle Lombardo
Scott Tucker
Cary Williamson

Discussion and possible action to approve a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) job description in preparation for a search for a new CEO

Mr. Favata noted the first item required any Commissioner interested in applying for the position to recuse themselves. Mr. Hancock noted the right thing to do would be to open up the table to discuss the item. He added it was fine if Mr. Favata wanted to step away, but he thought there was something in Title 74 where it talked about the fact that the Commission could employ a former member after a year's time. Mr. Neal noted he was not sure about what Mr. Hancock was referring to. He added he had looked into the matter and there were limitations on state legislators not being able to serve as agency directors or in other capacities within agencies for a certain amount of time. He added he wasn't able to find authority that prohibited it in this situation. He stated, in addition to that Mr. Pope shared with him an email he had received from Mr. Jake Smith with OMES Human Capital Management that stated Mr. Smith knew of no limitation either. He explained the purpose of the first item, was to prevent someone from having a conflict of interest that may be interested in applying for the job. He added as he understood it there had been at least one expression of interest. He added it wasn't directed at any one individual other than all of them having something in common, including himself, that he took an oath of office from the Constitution of Oklahoma. He reviewed the language of the Oath of Office. He noted the purpose of the review was to let them all be on notice that he could see participation in talking about the qualifications for a position and the pay for the position could well violate that oath of office, if they were applying for the position. He reviewed the next section of the constitution that specified the ramifications of violating the Oath of Office. He noted if they were interested that they should not be involved in the discussions.

- 1. Discussion as to anyone who is currently serving as an OUBCC Commissioner and is interested in applying for the CEO position, to announce such interest publicly and by such announcement that OUBCC commissioner shall recuse and not participate in any manner, vote, discussion or comment about what is in agenda items 2 through 9 below, in setting up of the job description and the salary range that will be set for the CEO advertisement, in agenda items 2 through 9, below*

Mr. Daniel Favata recused himself from the meeting and left at 2:11 p.m. Before he left there was some discussion to determine if Mr. Favata needed to wait and return after the discussion was over

and if the recusal applied only to Commissioners or if anyone in attendance at the meeting who was interested would need to leave as well. The consensus at the end of the discussion was the recusal only applied to Commission members and that Mr. Favata did not need to wait to rejoin the meeting.

- 2. Discussion and possible action on the CEO Job Description to include the requirements for at least (10) years of years of Oklahoma licensed unlimited inspection experience in each Oklahoma licensed trade or field, including unlimited Building, unlimited Electrical, unlimited Mechanical, unlimited Plumbing, and unlimited Gas Piping*

Mr. Hancock noted while he wasn't interested in applying for the job, he only had two of the licensed trades and while he felt he could do the job, he wouldn't be able to apply as he didn't have all three trades. He added the public comments brought up a really good point, the Commission had forgotten about the building contractors that were not licensed in the State. He added they could address and discuss each item under 4C then do a final vote of the final draft. He wasn't sure they wanted to vote on each particular item in the list, but they could if the Commission wanted to. Commission consensus was to vote at the end of all the discussion points.

Mr. Hort asked if it would be appropriate to send the job description to the personnel committee that reviewed the employment of the CEO. He noted the requirements they came up with all those years ago may no longer be appropriate and he felt the personnel committee would be a good place to discuss that. There was discussion regarding the version before the Commission that had already gone through review by OMES Human Capital management; that sending the job description to the personnel committee would delay getting the job search started, but getting the description right was more important than when the job search started as the new director could be with the agency for a long time. There was further discussion on how restrictive the job description was and how there was a very limited number of people who could meet all the requirements; the history of the original job description and who was involved with the development of it; the length of time it took to develop that description; and what the group anticipated the original job would entail, such as the CEO providing training around the state on the codes, and that things had not turned out exactly the way they thought it would; and that what they wanted then, might not be what was needed now. Concern was express that there wouldn't be many people within both the state and nationally that would qualify for the job as it was described; that Oklahoma was unique with individuals able to hold licenses in multiple trades; that some of the commissioners felt the job was more managerial in nature; and the agency rules to adopt codes and how they were developed and what role the CEO had in that process.

The Commission and Mr. Pope discussed the need for the CEO to have a good understanding of the codes as both staff and the CEO answered questions on a daily basis. They discussed that the questions came from jurisdictions, the public, insurance companies, architects, engineers, contractors and other trades people; if it was the Commission's job to answer those questions; that staff had been doing so for 12 years; and who would answer those questions if the OUBCC didn't; legal aspects to some of those questions; and the assumption of liability related to answering them.

There was further discussion on allowing the public in attendance to address the Commission on these topics and that public comment had already been addressed and the Commission had moved on.

Mr. Hort was asked where he came up with the limited number of people he stated earlier would qualify for the position in Oklahoma. Mr. Hort noted it was because he had been in the business for more than 30 years and knew just about everyone in the cities and what their backgrounds were. He added while he felt the job description was too narrow, not all the requirements should go away. There was further discussion on the requirements for code certifications. The discussion then went back to the types of questions received by the OUBCC; a call one of the commissioners had received and how he responded, contacting the ICC for interpretations and that they were a really helpful source.

There was further discussion on a point of order for when it was acceptable for the public to be involved in the discussion; that public comment was not legally required, that the Commission had a history of allowing public comment and it was legally permissible; and that the Commission had already allowed the public to comment and that they had moved on to other portions of the agenda. Mr. Neal stated he didn't know what the public members would want to say and that the Commission should not engage in a back and forth discussion as there may be other members of the public out there that would have liked to have known that those things may have been discussed and may be upset that since they may not have been on the agenda, they didn't come. He added it was out of respect to the other members of the public. He noted he was providing the best legal advice he could and had been working with the Open Meeting Act for more than 30 years. He noted there was an Attorney General Opinion issued about 15 years ago that public comments were not required for every meeting. There was discussion on if a Commissioner could ask questions of someone in the audience; that it would need to be on an agenda to allow others to know that would be discussed and with whom; that technical committee meetings were not subject to the Open Meeting Act so they allowed for more public input; how lengthy meetings could be when someone said something and someone in the audience felt the need to respond; and the need for the Commission to do the work they were tasked with and to discuss the issues among themselves.

Mr. Hancock noted Mr. Hort's suggestion of sending the job description to a committee was a good one and asked if there was a motion. There was further discussion on sending the job description to the standing personnel committee and which commissioners were on it; that everyone on the Commission should have input on the description and how would sending it to a committee help; that the Commissioners could reach out to the groups they represented get feedback and send it to the personnel committee to address; inviting agency stakeholders to the podium when all of the commissioners were present to allow them to provide input that way; and if the public only got to provide input on the technical committees. Mr. Neal noted technical committees were not subject to the Open Meeting Act and didn't have the same limitations as the Commission. The Commission and Mr. Neal discussed when the Commission could have discussion with members of the public during meetings and that they were not allowed to do so during the Public Comments portion of the meetings; that they needed to be mindful of those people in the public that may say "well I didn't know the Commission was going to talk about that" or "you didn't tell me" and how that was a limitation from the Open Meeting Act; and that they could invite stakeholders so long as the agenda specified who was being called and the specific areas that the invited stakeholders would be limited in addressing. Concern was expressed that if only specific stakeholders were invited that it could cause problems and that it would need to be open to all. Mr. Hancock noted it would probably be better to go ahead and send the description to the committee. He added the committee members could reach out to any stakeholders and then bring forth a final draft recommendation to the rest of the Commission. There was discussion on who was on the personnel committee and if new members

could be appointed to the Committee. Mr. Neal noted they could not at this meeting as that was not on the agenda. The Commission and Mr. Neal discussed at a previous meeting Commissioners were saying they wanted to be on committees, and that the discussion at those meetings were discussing specific committees at the time the commissioners volunteered as part of those agenda items. There was further discussion on what the Commission could do with the job description in relation to the different requirements; and if they needed a motion to discuss subitems 2, 3, and 4.

MS. STEPHANIE CLIFF MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. WARREN GOLDMANN TO OPEN DISCUSSION FOR ITEMS 2, 3, AND 4

After review, Commission consensus was that no motion was needed for the Commission to discuss the items on the agenda. The Commission discussed General Contractors and that they were not licensed in the state; if the job description was too narrow; that the next CEO needed to have knowledge regarding the codes; modifying the description to say 10 plus years in the construction industry; requirements for getting unlimited licenses in the trades in Oklahoma; and the need for the new CEO to be able to answer questions from Commissioners. There was further discussion on the code defining a code enforcement official as law enforcement; that some General Contractors were not licensed and didn't understand the codes well; that someone with MEP licenses may not understand the Building Code well and both areas should be taken into consideration.

The commission recessed at 2:48 p.m. due to the sounding of the building fire alarm. The Commission reconvened at 3:04 p.m. A second roll call was made to confirm attendance and the presence of a quorum.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Wayne Allen, Stephanie Cliff, Warren Goldmann, Paul Gunderson, Danny Hancock, Mitchell Hort, Lonnie Shackelford, and Donny Williamson

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT

Daniel Favata, Dee Hays, Kyle Lombardo, Scott Tucker, and Cary Williamson

3. *Discussion and possible action on the CEO Job Description to include the requirements for at least (10) years of experience as an Oklahoma licensed unlimited Contractor in each of the following Oklahoma licensed trades, including Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing and Gas Piping*
4. *Discussion and possible action on the CEO Job Description to include the required holding of an ICC Certification as a (MCP) Master Code Professional, (MCO) Master Code Official and a (CBO) Certified Building Official for at least (10) years will be considered very strongly towards the credentials required for the CEO's position with the additional requirements to the required credentials in the CEO Job Description in agenda items 2 and 3 above*

After the Commission reconvened there was further discussion on numbers 3 and 4 and if the job description should rely on licensing requirements or experience in the construction industry or both; what the current wording stated; that they wanted to make sure the licensed individual wasn't an apprentice; how to address qualified applicants that may not be licensed in the MEP trades; if the job description was for contractor licenses or just inspector licenses; overlapping knowledge between the MEP trades; the need for the new CEO to understand the intent of the codes; changing the requirement for licensing to include the word "preferred" and how that could impact the job search;

and who could apply. There was further discussion on the CEO answering code questions; that while Mr. Pope did not speak much in technical committee meetings, this was due to the changes being proposed and discussed meeting the intent of the code and providing safety. Mr. Pope stated if he felt there was something that was a life safety issue, he would address that. He added Staff answers code questions as well as himself and that there were times when the questions had to be sent to him as it was beyond the knowledge of staff. There was further discussion on the Commission staff answering code questions and that both the CIB and the State Fire Marshal's office referred code questions to the OUBCC.

The Commission discussed that there were some points of knowledge needed by the CEO that they wouldn't have if they were not licensed in one of the trades with an unlimited license; including others like general contractors; and that while there was good conversation happening, that sending the job description to the standing Personnel Committee would allow for a further in-depth review.

MR. WARREN GOLDMANN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. PAUL GUNDERSON TO SEND THE JOB DESCRIPTION TO THE OUBCC STANDING PERSONNEL COMMITTEE FOR REVISION

The commission discussed sending any comments to the personnel committee members to review; that Mr. Hort as the Vice-Chair of the Commission should act as the Chairman of the Personnel Committee, and that comments should be sent to him; and that the members on the committee were: Mitchell Hort, Stephanie Cliff, Kyle Lombardo, and Paul Gunderson.

VOTING AYE: Wayne Allen
Stephanie Cliff
Paul Gunderson
Warren Goldmann
Danny Hancock
Mitchell Hort
Lonnie Shackelford

VOTING NAY: Donny Williamson

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Daniel Favata
Dee Hays
Kyle Lombardo
Scott Tucker
Cary Williamson

5. *Discussion and possible action on the CEO Job Description to include any other matters or requirements not addressed in items 2, 3, and 4 above*
6. *Discussion and possible action on the CEO Job salary range and setting the CEO salary range, for the new CEO position's advertisement and publication*
7. *Discussion and possible action to request and direct OMES Human Capital Management to review the revised OUBCC CEO Job Description as determined by the OUBCC and analyze*

salary range for possible adjustment in light of the new revisions and requirements so that upon advertisement and publication of the new CEO's position with its revised CEO Job Description, that an adjusted salary range, if any, of the CEO's position shall be advertised and published with the adjusted salary range, if any, and that OMES Human Capital Management report its determination of an adjusted salary range to the OUBCC upon the completion of such salary analysis

8. *Discussion and possible action to request and direct OMES Human Capital Management advertise and publish the opening of the OUBCC CEO Position with its revised CEO Job Description as determined by the OUBCC, to advertise and publish the opening of the CEO's position for a period of time of not less than sixty (60 days), to advertise and publish the opening of such OUBCC CEO's position in professional and trade publications, newsletters, newspapers, job boards, postings, and places appropriate for the professional executive position of the OUBCC CEO and in such professional and trade publications, newsletters, newspapers, job boards, and postings requested by the OUBCC*
9. *Discussion and possible action to authorize OMES Human Capital Management to gather and collect all CEO position applications/resumes in confidence on behalf of the OUBCC submitted for consideration at the office of OMES Human Capital Management and at the end of the not less than sixty (60) day period of CEO job opening advertising and publication, to analyze and screen the CEO position applications/resumes for compliance with the minimum listed requirements in the OUBCC CEO Job Description, and thereafter that OMES Human Capital Management report its analysis and screening results to the OUBCC Standing Personnel Committee Chairman or his/her designee in confidence for subsequent review and analysis by the OUBCC Standing Personnel Committee for further consideration and interviews, and that the OUBCC Standing Personnel Committee conduct interviews of appropriate candidates for the CEO position, and that the OUBCC Standing Personnel Committee make recommendations to the OUBCC as to such candidates*

NEW BUSINESS:

There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT: (3:21 P.M.)

MR. WARREN GOLDMANN MADE A MOTION WITH A SECOND BY MR. WAYNE ALLEN TO ADJOURN

VOTING AYE: Wayne Allen
Stephanie Cliff
Paul Gunderson
Warren Goldmann
Danny Hancock
Mitchell Hort
Lonnie Shackelford
Donny Williamson

VOTING NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Daniel Favata
Dee Hays
Kyle Lombardo
Scott Tucker
Cary Williamson

Minutes approved in the regular meeting on the 22 day of March 2022

DANNY HANCOCK
Danny Hancock, Chairman
Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission

PREPARED BY: KATHY HEHNLY
Kathy Hehnly, Executive Assistant
Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission

Official Copy: Original with signatures in office file.