



Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development



Hospital Building Safety Board

400 R Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, California 95811-6213
(916) 440-8446
Fax (916) 324-9118
<http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/Boards/HBSB/index.html>

**MEETING REPORT
HOSPITAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD (HBSB)
Tuesday, February 21, 2012
10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.**

Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board
Sacramento River Room (Suite 130), 400 R Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

Board Members Present

Joe La Brie, HBSB Chair
John Egan, HBSB Vice-Chair
Stephanie Clendenin, Ex-Officio
Paul Coleman, Ex-Officio
Enid K. Eck
Jay Elbettar
Michael Foulkes
Lou Gilpin
Bert Hurlbut
Eric Johnson
Bob Kain
Scott Karpinen
Trailer Martin
Michael O'Connor
Michael Osur
Carl Scheuerman
Brian Spindler
Jennifer Thornburg, Ex-Officio

OSHPD Staff

Glenn Gall
Mohammad R. Karim
Jacob Knapp
Roy Lobo
Chris Tokas
Elizabeth Wied

HBSB Staff

Linda Janssen, Executive Director
Evelt Torres

1 Call to Order

2 Mr. Joe La Brie, Board Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.



1 **Welcome and Introductions**

2 Mr. La Brie welcomed everyone, and participants took turns introducing themselves.

3

4 **Announcements**

5 Mr. La Brie recognized and thanked Mr. Jay Elbettar for his service on the Board. Mr.

6 Elbettar said it was an honor to participate and he commended the Board for its efforts

7 to improve the seismic safety of hospitals. He stated that he had recently been elected

8 to the ICC board of directors, a position that will keep him quite busy in the coming year.

9 Mr. La Brie presented Mr. Elbettar with a plaque and wished him success in his future

10 endeavors.

11

12 **Review and Approve October 26, 2011 HBSB Meeting Report**

13 Mr. La Brie reviewed highlights of the October 26 Board meeting and asked if there

14 were any changes or corrections.

15

16 Mr. Michael Osur advised that he attended the October 26 meeting, and he asked that

17 his name be included in the list of attendees on Page 1.

18

19 Referring to Page 17, Line 7, Mr. Gall noted that the reference to “Q-3408” should be

20 “CAN-3408.”

21

22 Mr. Michael O’Connor said his name should also be included in the list of attendees.

23

24 Ms. Linda Janssen reminded all participants to sign in when they arrive.

1 **MOTION:** (M/S/C) [La Brie/Martin]

2 The Board voted unanimously to approve the October 26, 2011 meeting report as
3 amended.

4

5 **Review Board Goals for 2012**

6 Mr. La Brie reviewed the Board's goals and priorities for 2012. He drew attention to the
7 2012 committee assignments.

8

9 **Review Meeting Schedule for 2012**

10 Mr. La Brie referred to the proposed 2012 meeting schedule in the meeting packet. He
11 noted that committee chairs have the prerogative to change meeting dates as they feel
12 necessary.

13

14 Mr. Burl Hurlbut advised that the Standard Details Committee had changed its April 10
15 meeting to April 5.

16

17 Mr. Hurlbut pointed out the draft meeting schedule shows the full Board meeting on both
18 November 8 and November 15. Ms. Janssen said she thought November 8 was
19 correct, and she stated she would confirm that date.

20

21 **OSHPD Update**

22 Ms. Stephanie Clendenin, OSHPD Acting Director, reported that Governor Brown was
23 able to reduce the structural budget deficit in 2011-12 from about \$20 billion to \$5 billion
24 by realigning public safety functions from state to local government, reducing cash

1 borrowing, and improving government efficiency by eliminating 15,000 positions and 20
2 state boards, commissions, departments, offices, and task forces. She said the
3 governor's proposed 2012-13 budget recognizes that economic recovery has been slow
4 and projects that employment will not reach pre-recession levels until 2016, and general
5 fund revenues will not recover until 2014-15. Ms. Clendenin noted there are several
6 ongoing risks to the state's budget, including efforts to reduce the federal deficit by
7 placing additional burdens on states, disproportionate growth of California's aging
8 population compared to its workforce, and declining income and assets of retirees.

9
10 Ms. Clendenin advised that the proposed 2012-13 budget projects a shortfall of \$9.2
11 billion, of which \$4.2 billion was carried over from the previous fiscal year. She said the
12 governor's budget proposes \$10.3 billion in expenditure cuts and new revenues,
13 including reductions in welfare and social services, as well as trigger reductions of \$5.4
14 to schools, courts, public safety, and fire protection if the ballot tax initiative next
15 November does not pass.

16
17 Ms. Clendenin noted that Governor Brown remains committed to reducing and
18 restructuring government by eliminating or consolidating 48 boards, commissions,
19 programs, and departments. She said state government reorganization entails creation
20 of a new Business and Consumer Services Agency, a new Government Operations
21 Agency, and a new Transportation Agency.

22
23 Ms. Clendenin advised that there were two specific budget proposals related to
24 OSHPD, primarily focusing on workforce issues. First, the governor proposes to

1 permanently fund the Song-Brown health data and planning program; in addition, the
2 governor plans to shift \$12.3 million from the Department of Mental Health to OSHPD
3 for mental health services and workforce education and training programs. Ms.
4 Clendenin noted that there are still uncertainties with respect to two other proposals,
5 one to have the Department of Finance conduct a department-by-department review to
6 identify additional positions for elimination, and another to review special fund program
7 budgets and shift resources to other programs.

8

9 Ms. Clendenin stated that the California Health and Human Services Agency and all of
10 its departments have been exempted from the general statewide hiring freeze, so
11 OSHPD can proceed to fill critical positions. She said OSHPD is still operating with
12 limiting resources and staffing, so the staff continues to look for ways to improve
13 efficiencies and reduce expenditures. Mr. Paul Coleman added that OSHPD was
14 actively recruiting and interviewing candidates.

15

16 Mr. La Brie thanked Ms. Clendenin for the update.

17

18 **Board Procedures Committee**

19 Mr. Michael Foulkes, Committee Chair, reported that the Board Procedures Committee
20 met twice since the last Board meeting.

21

22 Mr. Foulkes referred to the written report under Tab 17 of the meeting binder for a
23 summary of the December 12, 2011 meeting. He said the committee reviewed the
24 Board's 2012 goals and committee assignments, discussed the role of consulting

1 members, and reviewed proposed amendments to the Board's official policies and
2 procedures. Mr. Foulkes indicated that the committee recommends adopting a more
3 formal policy with respect to the appointment process and term limits for consulting
4 members. He added that there were no actions taken by the committee at the
5 December 12 meeting.

6
7 **MOTION:** (M/S/C) [Foulkes/Kain]

8 The Board voted unanimously to accept the report of the December 12 Board
9 Procedures Committee meeting as presented.

10

11 Mr. Foulkes stated that at its February 16, 2012 meeting, the committee reviewed and
12 approved a revised version of the policies and procedures document. He displayed a
13 copy of the updated document and explained each of the proposed changes. In
14 particular, he drew attention to the new language in Section VI.A.1)b.(1) on Page 4
15 regarding eligibility to serve as chair and vice-chair; rewording of Section VIII.A.1) on
16 Page 6 to express the intent to meet in different locations around the state; new
17 Paragraph 4) at the top of Page 7 to address videoconference meetings; new sentence
18 regarding conflict of interest in Paragraph 4) on Page 8; and additional committee chair
19 duties in Section C.1) on Page 9.

20

21 Mr. Foulkes reported that the committee also discussed imposition of fines for failure to
22 submit complete SB 499 reports and an expedited appeal process. He explained that
23 OSHPD staff has spent a considerable amount of time trying to get hospitals to submit
24 required information and following up. Although the statute gives OSHPD the ability to

1 assess fines, the committee decided to focus on clarifying and improving the reporting
2 process and building steps into the online reporting form so incomplete reports cannot
3 be submitted.

4

5 Mr. La Brie commented that he served on a board where conflicts of interest resulted in
6 only a few members being able to vote on certain issues, and he asked how those
7 situations could be avoided. Mr. Foulkes remarked that conflicts have not been a major
8 problem for the Board. He noted OSHPD can help by appointing members who are not
9 directly involved in matters likely to come before the Board. In addition, members can
10 benefit by training about what constitutes a legitimate conflict and how they should be
11 handled. He added that there have only been a few situations when an individual has
12 had to recuse himself or herself from participating in a decision.

13

14 Mr. Foulkes said OSHPD developed a draft policy intent notice, PIN 47, outlining the
15 procedure for an expedited appeal. He noted that the normal appeal process is
16 cumbersome and time-consuming, so the staff developed PIN 47 to address issues
17 involving fines or suspension of certification that may warrant a speedier resolution. Mr.
18 Coleman indicated that he would discuss PIN 47 as part of his presentation later. Mr.
19 Foulkes advised that the Board Procedures Committee endorsed PIN 47 as a voluntary
20 option. He added that the staff was in the process of revising the entire appeal process,
21 and recommendations will eventually come to the committee and the Board once that
22 has been completed.

23

1 Mr. Foulkes suggested deferring approval of the February 16 meeting report until written
2 minutes were available. He recommended that the Board adopt the revised Policies
3 and Procedures document as presented.

4

5 **MOTION:** (M/S/C) [Karpinen/O'Connor]

6 The Board voted unanimously to approve the proposed changes to the Policies and
7 Procedures document.

8

9 Mr. Foulkes reviewed the committee's goals for 2012. He noted that the key priorities
10 for the Board Procedures Committee will be leadership development, revisions to the
11 appeal process, and fostering greater interaction and communication among Board
12 members.

13

14 **Standard Details Committee**

15 Mr. Bert Hurlbut, Committee Chair, reviewed highlights of the committee's January 10
16 meeting. He reported that the committee discussed the process for updating the
17 previously approved standard partition details for the 2010 and 2013 code. He said the
18 committee plans to revisit the guidelines for post-installed anchors. The committee
19 emphasized the importance of training to promote use of the standard details and give
20 users a better understanding of how the standard details should be applied.

21

22 Mr. Hurlbut noted the committee is now working on standard ceiling details, with the
23 goal of having that package ready for OSHPD review in March. He indicated that the
24 committee will be looking at suspended acoustical ceiling details, construction

1 tolerances for splay wires and struts, slip joints at corridor intersections, safety factors
2 for suspension of fixtures, and criteria for attachment to partitions and soffits. He stated
3 that the standard ceiling details will use the same format as the partition details,
4 including flow charts and explanatory notes. Mr. Hurlbut said the committee reviewed
5 standard details for gypsum board ceilings, including restrictions on the use of shot pins,
6 details for trapeze conditions at ducts, and incorporating attic loads for ceilings. He
7 added that the draft standard details will be posted on the OSHPD Website for further
8 review and input before they are finalized.

9
10 Mr. Hurlbut thanked Ms. Dani Paxson and Mr. Kale Wisnia for their hard work and
11 assistance in developing the standard details.

12
13 In the future, Mr. Hurlbut advised, the committee will move to mechanical, electrical,
14 plumbing (MEP) and fire life safety details. He said the committee plans to incorporate
15 standard MEP details from the FREER manual. The committee will also consider
16 details pertaining to accessibility and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance,
17 and the committee will identify ways for people to submit ideas for future standard
18 details.

19
20 **MOTION:** (M/S/C) [Hurlbut/Spindler]

21 The Board voted unanimously to accept the Standard Details Committee's January 10,
22 2012 meeting report.

23

1 Mr. Hurlbut reviewed the committee's goals for 2012: completion of the standard ceiling
2 details; development of MEP and fire life safety standard details; identifying a process
3 for submitting new standard details; adapting standard details to the 2013 code; and
4 promoting use of the standard details.

5
6 Ms. Enid Eck noted that Page 10 of the meeting report reflects committee discussion of
7 humidifier installation for small rural hospitals and skilled nursing facilities, and she
8 asked if the committee was seeking input on this issue. Mr. Hurlbut responded that the
9 committee's focus was on installation rather than operation of the equipment. Mr. Gall
10 advised that as part of its proposed amendment package, OSHPD revised code
11 humidification requirements to comply with national standards, and those revisions will
12 be considered by the Building Standards Commission in July. Mr. Hurlbut added that
13 the Administrative Processes and Code Changes Committee deals with actual
14 humidification code requirements.

15
16 Mr. La Brie noted that individuals with issues they feel the Board should address can
17 draft and submit a written problem statement so the matter can be agendaized for
18 discussion at a future meeting.

19
20 Mr. Hurlbut said the Standard Details Committee will meet again on April 5. He
21 expressed appreciation to the committee members and consulting members for their
22 efforts.

23

24

1 **SB 499 Facilities Progress Reporting Committee**

2 Mr. Eric Johnson, Committee Chair, reviewed highlights of the committee's January 25,
3 2012 meeting. He said the staff made a presentation and explained proposed
4 modifications to the methodology for analyzing the results of the SB 499 reports
5 submitted by hospitals in November. He observed that the staff found that many
6 respondents were still confused about whether projects should be classified as retrofit,
7 replace, or remove, and the committee talked about ways of clarifying the meanings of
8 those terms. Mr. Johnson stated that the committee emphasized the need for education
9 to help hospitals understand what information is being required, and the committee
10 suggested offering a voluntary review or triage process to identify and resolve problems
11 before reports are submitted.

12
13 Mr. Johnson advised that the committee passed a motion to approve the proposed
14 algorithm as modified.

15
16 **MOTION:** (M/S/C) [Johnson/Egan]

17 The Board voted unanimously to approve the SB 499 Committee's January 10 meeting
18 report.

19
20 Mr. Johnson reported that the committee met again on February 15 to review the results
21 of the staff's analysis of the SB 499 reports based on the refined algorithm.

22
23 Mr. Johnson stated that the committee's priorities include assisting OSHPD with
24 clarifying definitions of the classifications used in the SB 499 reports; developing

1 training and education programs about how to fill out the reports; working with the SB
2 90 Committee to identify extension eligibility and paths to compliance; and expanding
3 OSHPD's list of frequently asked questions to include case studies and examples. He
4 said the committee would like to help reduce the amount of time the staff needs to
5 spend working with individual hospitals; develop a triage process to identify and resolve
6 reporting issues before the November 1 deadline; and support education and training
7 efforts.

8
9 Mr. Johnson advised that the next committee meeting is scheduled for August 21.

10

11 Mr. La Brie commended OSHPD staff for the enormous amount of time and work spent
12 on compiling and analyzing the results of the SB 499 reports. Based on a comparison
13 of 2010 and 2011 reports, he asked how the hospitals in the state were doing in terms
14 of compliance with seismic safety mandates. Mr. Johnson said the data shows that
15 many facilities are unlikely to meet the deadlines. Mr. Coleman added that he would
16 provide a summary of the results as part of his later presentation.

17

18 Mr. Foulkes observed that it behooves everyone in the hospital industry to make sure
19 SB 499 reports are complete and accurate. He noted that better quality data will save
20 considerable time for OSHPD staff and provide usable information to report to the
21 Legislature. Mr. Foulkes pointed out that the SB 499 Committee's work with the staff
22 and other committees is a model of collaboration and interaction, and he applauded the
23 committee's efforts.

24

1 Mr. O'Connor noted that if hospitals submit complete and timely data, it will benefit the
2 industry, OSHPD staff, and the state as a whole. He added that the education
3 programs and triage process will help resolve issues earlier in the process, avoiding the
4 need to impose fines and hear appeals.

6 **Education Opportunities Committee**

7 Mr. Brian Spindler, Committee Vice-Chair, reported that the committee met on January
8 26, 2012. He advised that the Best Practices Manual is currently being reviewed by
9 OSHPD staff, with the expectation that the final version will be ready for posting on
10 OSHPD's Website by April 1. He said the committee plans to update the manual every
11 three years in conjunction with the code revision cycle.

13 Mr. Spindler indicated that the committee discussed technological options and
14 suggested topics for educational seminars and Webinars. He stated that the committee
15 determined that complex topics should be addressed in live seminars and break-out
16 sessions, while more focused topics are better suited for short Webinars or animated
17 PowerPoint presentations. Mr. Spindler noted that committee members identified the
18 following possible topics: the Best Practices Manual; the SB 90 application process; SB
19 499 reports, standard details; the meaning of "materially alter;" special seismic
20 certification; OSHPD 3 clinic regulations and 2013 California Building Code changes.

22 Mr. Spindler reported that with respect to SB 90, the committee passed a motion
23 recommending that OSHPD prepare a video clip and/or PowerPoint presentation
24 explaining the application process to be posted to the OSHPD Website by mid-

1 February, and that OSHPD offer live instructional seminars in Sacramento and Los
2 Angeles prior to March 15 explaining extensions and providing case study examples.
3 He added that OSHPD responded quickly and scheduled seminars for February 27 in
4 Los Angeles and March 1 in Sacramento.

5
6 Mr. Spindler said the committee passed a motion recommending that OSHPD prepare
7 an instructional PowerPoint presentation or video clip on completing the SB 499 report
8 by September 1. He stated that the committee also recommended that OSHPD offer a
9 Webinar or live seminar covering the SB 499 process and compliance status, along with
10 different options for extensions.

11
12 Mr. Spindler noted that the committee also discussed the logistics and challenges of
13 offering educational seminars. He said the committee recommended holding live
14 seminars in locations that will accommodate up to 300 people. Committee members
15 asked the staff to investigate any applicable travel restrictions, identify suitable venues,
16 and consider registration fees and advertising.

17
18 Mr. Spindler said that at future meetings, the committee plans to discuss access to
19 OSHPD's e-Services Portal; seminars on standard details, "materially alter," special
20 seismic certification, OSHPD 3 clinics, and 2013 CBC code revisions; and the idea of
21 regularly scheduled OSHPD update podcasts.

22
23 Mr. Spindler advised that the next committee meeting was scheduled for April 18.

24

1 Mr. La Brie encouraged the committee to find ways to help reduce OSHPD's workload
2 by taking on responsibility for some of the development tasks. Mr. Spindler indicated
3 that committee members can play a useful role in outlining the content and technology
4 most appropriate for particular topics, and committee members will also serve as
5 presenters and speakers.

6
7 Mr. Scheuerman remarked that the committee invites interested parties to submit
8 examples and case studies to help illustrate common problems and issues.

9
10 **MOTION:** (M/S/C) [Spindler/O'Connor]

11 The Board voted unanimously to approve the Education Opportunities Committee's
12 January 26 meeting report.

13
14 Mr. Spindler reviewed the committee's goals and priorities for 2012: develop e-Services
15 Portal training; plan seminars on standard details, "materially alter," special seismic
16 certification; and investigate regularly scheduled OSHPD podcasts.

17
18 At 11:50 a.m., the committee recessed for lunch. Mr. La Brie reconvened the meeting
19 at 1:05 p.m.

20
21 **Structural and Non-Structural Regulations Committee**

22 Mr. John Egan, Committee member, reviewed highlights of the February 8 meeting of
23 the Structural and Non-Structural Regulations Committee. He said the main topic was

1 OSHPD's proposed amendments to the 2013 California Administrative Code and
2 California Building Code.

3

4 Mr. Egan reported that Mr. John Gillengerten informed the committee that the most
5 significant change related to use of new risk-targeted ground motion maps. He
6 observed that this change will not affect NPC-3 buildings because OSHPD intends to
7 use exemptions based on the 2010 code, but the change could affect retrofit plans in
8 areas where ground motions have increased or decreased. He said Mr. Gillengerten
9 advised that there will also be a substantial change in wind provisions, which will now
10 be based on the risk-focused ASCE-10 national standard.

11

12 Mr. Egan noted that Mr. Gillengerten reviewed NPC-5 requirements for new buildings
13 and existing buildings with significant additions. He explained that the new code
14 requires hospitals to maintain an adequate 72-hour water supply, but there is
15 considerable debate about how to determine what amount is appropriate. Mr. Egan
16 said Mr. Gillengerten reviewed a list of equipment and components that will require
17 special seismic certification, and he also told the committee that steel, concrete, and
18 masonry standards will be coordinated.

19

20 Mr. Egan indicated that Mr. Kevin Moore reviewed and explained the Appendix D
21 provisions for concrete anchors.

22

23 Mr. Egan reported that the committee also discussed some of the soils and foundation
24 provisions and some other aspects of the code changes. He indicated that one of the

1 other topics the committee considered was whether the inspector of record (IOR) or the
2 structural engineer of record (SEOR) should determine the number of special welding
3 inspectors on a site; after some discussion, the committee agreed that this decision
4 should be made by the IOR in consultation with the SEOR.

5
6 Mr. Trailer Martin, Committee Vice-Chair, commented that the new code provisions will
7 not take effect until January 1, 2014.

8
9 Mr. Egan stated that the committee passed a motion recommended that OSHPD submit
10 the proposed amendments to the California Building Standards Commission for
11 adoption.

12
13 A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 8 meeting.

14
15 Mr. Bob Omens asked if the new NPC-5 water supply requirements were open to
16 discussion. Mr. La Brie explained that the meeting report reflects what the committee
17 discussed. Mr. Martin recalled that there was considerable debate about this issue, but
18 the committee eventually decided to endorse the provisions as written. Mr. La Brie
19 added that the Administrative Processes and Code Changes Committee deals with the
20 contents of the code provisions.

21
22 Mr. Omens expressed concern about the impracticality of having to maintain a 72-hour
23 water supply of 50 gallons per patient per day. He noted that construction of a storage
24 tank, piping, emergency power, and maintenance issues are likely to be extremely

1 costly, and he questioned the need for such a stringent requirement. Mr. La Brie noted
2 that several participants at the meeting raised issues about how usage should be
3 estimated. Mr. Coleman acknowledged that basing storage requirements on licensed
4 beds may not be appropriate for every facility. He explained that the intent of the law is
5 to ensure continuous operation of a facility after a disaster, and the per-bed amount
6 takes into account water usage by patients as well as other hospital services. He said
7 OSHPD requested feedback from industry representatives about better methods for
8 calculating the amount needed, and he welcomed suggestions.

9
10 Mr. Mohammad Karim pointed out that the per-bed amount is not addressed in this
11 amendment package; rather, this structural section only specifies a 72-hour supply. He
12 clarified that the method for calculating what constitutes a 72-hour quantity is addressed
13 in the California Plumbing Code. Mr. Coleman said the plumbing provisions will be
14 addressed in a separate amendment package.

15
16 Ms. Elizabeth Wied advised that the minutes of the committee meeting should only
17 reflect what was discussed at the meeting. She clarified the committee recommended
18 OSHPD adoption, but the amendments to the structural provisions have not yet been
19 adopted.

20
21 Mr. Moore proposed some minor editorial changes to the meeting minutes: Referring to
22 Page 9, he recommended changing “refine” to “review” in Line 4. In Line 15, he
23 recommended inserting “anchorage” between “certain” and “conditions.” He clarified

1 that the intent is not for OSHPD to “provide references,” but to point the user to other
2 existing regulations. In Line 20, he suggested changing “buildings” to “anchorage.”

3

4 **MOTION:** (M/S/C) [Egan/Hurlbut]

5 The Board voted to approve the Structural and Non-Structural Regulations Committee’s
6 February 8 meeting report as amended.

7

8 Mr. Scheuerman indicated that he was abstaining from voting on approval of the
9 meeting report.

10

11 Mr. Egan reported that the committee identified three primary goals for 2012: 1)
12 developing guidelines for alternative means of compliance for deep foundation systems
13 and soil improvement systems; 2) assisting the Office in clarifying elements of the
14 seismic certification program and identifying additional equipment that should require
15 seismic certification; and 3) clarifying NPC-3 compliance with respect to bracing
16 requirements for utility distribution lines and egress requirements. Mr. Egan said the
17 committee will focus first on the seismic certification program, then special foundations
18 systems, and then NPC-3 compliance. He noted that deliverables will include a white
19 paper on special foundations, an expanded list of seismically certified equipment, and
20 frequently asked questions to clarify NPC-3 compliance requirements.

21

22 Mr. Scheuerman pointed out that the deadline for NPC-3 compliance is January 1,
23 2013, so it would be helpful to have guidance on those requirements as soon as

1 possible. Mr. La Brie suggested that the committee consider shifting its priorities to
2 accommodate the compliance deadline.

3

4 Mr. Egan indicated the committee would meet again on May 24 to review the final
5 amendment package before OSHPD submits it to the Building Standards Commission.

6

7 Ms. Eck asked what kind of non-structural issues the committee addresses. Mr. Martin
8 cited bracing and anchorage of HVAC, plumbing, electrical, and medical equipment as
9 examples.

10

11 **Administrative Processes and Code Changes Committee**

12 Mr. Scott Karpinen, Committee Vice-Chair, said the committee met on February 13 and
13 dealt with a number of topics, including the collaborative review process, SB 90
14 emergency regulations, updating OSHPD 3 clinic regulations, federal guidelines for
15 design and construction of healthcare facilities, and emergency water storage
16 requirements.

17

18 Mr. Karpinen advised that OSHPD is ready to develop a policy intent notice (PIN)
19 establishing parameters for the collaborative review process. He noted that Mr.
20 Coleman gave a presentation on the emergency regulations and deadlines for SB 90
21 extensions.

22

23 Mr. Karpinen indicated the committee spent most of the meeting reviewing proposed
24 revisions to the OSHPD 3 clinic regulations. He said the staff will continue working on

1 mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and fire life safety provisions, and those sections will
2 be ready for the committee to review at its next meeting.

3

4 Mr. Karpinen noted that the committee discussed the Federal Guidelines Institute
5 requirements, formerly the AIA guidelines, as a new standard for the construction and
6 design of healthcare facilities. He remarked that OSHPD is moving toward adoption of
7 more national standards instead of having to craft special California amendments for
8 each code cycle.

9

10 Mr. Karpinen advised that the committee also looked at the 72-hour water storage
11 requirement, a topic the Board discussed as part of the last agenda item. He said Mr.
12 Roger Richter, of the California Hospital Association, made a presentation to the
13 committee at its October meeting, and CHA will be gathering information on water
14 usage in California hospitals. He noted the committee will be considering alternative
15 ways of calculating adequate storage at the May meeting.

16

17 Mr. Karpinen summarized the committee's 2012 priorities and goals. He said the
18 committee plans to continue its review of OSHPD-proposed amendments to the codes,
19 consider other national standards pertaining to healthcare facilities, and continue
20 updating state regulations and policies. The committee's next tasks will be to review
21 and adopt the OSHPD amendments, a PIN for the collaborative review process, a code
22 application notice (CAN) for temporary permits, and recommend NPC-5 emergency
23 water storage provisions. Mr. Karpinen noted the committee's next meeting will be held
24 on May 15.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Mr. La Brie thanked Mr. Karpinen for his presentation.

Instrumentation Committee

Mr. Lou Gilpin, Committee Chair, reported that the Instrumentation Committee met on October 18, and the highlights of that meeting were reviewed at the last Board meeting. He said the committee talked about the status of instrumenting hospital buildings in California and selected new candidate buildings for instrumentation during the coming year.

Mr. Gilpin explained that under California’s Strong Motion Instrumentation Program, funds are allocated each year to install instruments in both new hospital buildings with specialized foundation conditions and in existing hospitals with certain unusual ground conditions, building types, or geological conditions of interest to the state. He stated there are currently about 50 instrumented hospitals in the state, and two or three new installations are added every year.

Mr. Gilpin reported that the committee reviewed and discussed a new standard memorandum of understanding that clarifies the contractual responsibilities and roles of instrumented hospital owners and state agencies.

Mr. Gilpin noted the committee also discussed the importance of rapid reconnoitering and recovery of damage data immediately after seismic events. The committee eventually concluded that this task was beyond the purview of the Instrumentation

1 Committee, so this issue was referred to the Structural and Non-Structural Regulations
2 Committee for further consideration.

3

4 Mr. Gilpin observed that the cost of maintaining instrumentation has been increasing
5 steadily as the number of instrumented buildings grows, so the sustainability of the
6 program is an issue the committee will need to address in the future. He said the
7 current prioritization list contains nine candidate buildings for instrumentation. He noted
8 the committee reviews the list each year and reorders some of the candidates as
9 needed. He reported that committee members recommended finding a candidate
10 building in Long Beach, an area that lacks instrumentation, as well as a site with soft
11 soils. The committee also talked about instrumenting non-structural elements of
12 hospital sites, and those opportunities will be explored in the future.

13

14 Mr. Gilpin advised that the committee's next meeting will be held on October 24.

15

16 Mr. Scheuerman observed that Lines 9 through 14 on Page 8 of the minutes imply the
17 committee took action by consensus to reorder the priorities. Mr. Gilpin stated that no
18 motion was passed, but the committee agreed to make that recommendation to the
19 Strong Motion Instrumentation Program.

20

21 **MOTION:** (M/S/C) [Gilpin/Scheuerman]

22 The Board voted unanimously to accept the Instrumentation Committee's October 18
23 meeting report, along with the priorities and goals detailed in the report.

24

1 **SB 90 Committee**

2 Mr. John Egan, Committee Chair, reported that the SB 90 Committee had not met since
3 the last Board meeting because the timing of SB 90 implementation is still uncertain.
4 He explained that SB 90 will only become operative when the federal government
5 approves funding to support certain California healthcare programs for children.

6
7 Mr. Egan stated that under SB 90, eligible hospitals can apply for extensions of up to
8 seven years to allow more time to meet their seismic mandates. He noted that the
9 application process begins with submittal of a letter of intent by March 31 describing the
10 reasons for the extension request. He referred to PIN 52, currently posted on OSHPD's
11 Website, for more details about the criteria and application guidelines. Mr. Coleman
12 added that task forces monitoring the situation believe the federal government will
13 approve the funding arrangement, but that action might not take place before the filing
14 deadline. Mr. Egan said the second deadline is September 30, by which time applicant
15 hospitals must submit HAZUS assessments of their candidate buildings.

16
17 Mr. Egan advised that OSHPD will be offering instructional seminars on the SB 90
18 process on February 27 in Los Angeles and March 1 in Sacramento. Mr. Coleman said
19 the Sacramento session will be recorded and posted on the OSHPD Website for the
20 benefit of people who are unable to attend.

21
22 Mr. Egan noted that the next committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 11.
23 By that time, he observed, OSHPD will have received letters of intent, so the committee
24 may be able to help plan next steps. He indicated that the committee has not yet

1 established specific goals and priorities. He added that another meeting will be held in
2 September shortly before the HAZUS submittal deadline.

3

4 Mr. Scheuerman asked if OSHPD had received any SB 90 extension applications yet.

5 Mr. Coleman responded that OSHPD received one preliminary submittal package that
6 the staff reviewed and discussed with the provider, but no official applications had been
7 submitted. He remarked that the upcoming seminars should help answer questions and
8 provide enough information to guide applicants in submitting their letters of intent.

9

10 Mr. Martin expressed concern about the uncertainty of the federal funding approval. Mr.

11 Richter said he was told that federal approval will probably come in June, with funding
12 allocated in the fall.

13

14 Mr. Coleman advised that because of the possible approval delay, the emergency
15 regulations were designed with a provision to allow administrative extensions to provide
16 time for OSHPD to review submittals and work with applicant hospitals. Mr.

17 Scheuerman asked if the administrative extension provision would go into effect before
18 the federal government commits funding. Mr. Coleman responded that OSHPD has no
19 authority to grant any extensions until the law is implemented, and the law cannot be
20 implemented until federal funding is approved. He said that if federal funding is
21 approved in June, OSHPD will immediately begin reviewing submittals and granting
22 administrative extensions before December 31.

23

1 One participant pointed out that SB 90 extensions will affect some hospitals' plans for
2 their SPC-1 buildings and what they need to report on their SB 499 reports. Mr.
3 Coleman acknowledged this problem. He said this was one of the reasons OSHPD
4 inserted the provision to allow administrative extensions of up to two years.

5
6 Mr. Rick Ginley asked if SB 90 applications will be kept confidential until the law actually
7 takes effect. Mr. Coleman indicated that OSHPD will not post applications on its
8 Website until the law takes effect. However, he cautioned, applications submitted to
9 FDD are part of the public record and must be divulged if anyone requests them. Mr.
10 Scheuerman noted that OSHPD has historically posted extension applications and their
11 outcomes on its Website.

12
13 Mr. La Brie thanked Mr. Egan for his report.

14
15 **Facilities Development Division (FDD) Update**

16 Mr. Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director, gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing
17 FDD activities. He displayed an organizational chart and discussed staffing changes.
18 He noted that FDD currently has 37 vacant positions.

19
20 Mr. Coleman showed a chart depicting the dollar value of projects under review, under
21 construction, and in the process of being closed. He pointed out that although dollar
22 values and revenues to OSHPD are down, the number of projects has been increasing.

23

1 Mr. Coleman displayed a graph showing plan review turnaround times in recent months.
2 He observed that processing time slowed down in December, due to holiday vacations
3 and staff training, but there was improvement again in January. He advised that the
4 staff will be returning to pre-furlough goals for turnaround time beginning on April 1.

5
6 Mr. Coleman reviewed FDD's key accomplishments, including expansion of the Rapid
7 Review program to Southern California, reinstating over-the-counter plan review in San
8 Diego, issuance of standard details for partitions, launching of the e-Services Portal,
9 developing residential building standards for skilled nursing facilities, beginning
10 revisions of the clinic regulations, adoption of emergency regulations for SB 90,
11 analyzing results of the SB 499 reports, reducing the backlog for geotechnical reviews
12 by 75 percent, new training and outreach programs, as well as a number of internal
13 organizational changes and efficiency improvements. He said FDD has reduced travel
14 costs, shipping costs, use of mobile devices, and state vehicle usage. He advised that
15 FDD will further reduce expenditures by encouraging more electronic submittals and
16 charging shipping fees.

17
18 Mr. Coleman noted that in the coming months, FDD will be raising the threshold of
19 projects eligible for rapid review from \$100,000 to \$175,000, providing over-the-counter
20 review services in Northern California, implementing a collaborative review process,
21 publishing more standard details, expanding access to the e-Services Portal, providing
22 additional training and services for inspectors, and issuing an updated Best Practices
23 Manual, clinic regulations, and FREER manual. He added that FDD will provide training
24 on SB 90, the meaning of "materially alter," use of standard details, and other important

1 topics.

2

3 Mr. Coleman reviewed the activities of the Building Standards Unit. He displayed a list
4 of recently released PINs and CANs as well as those currently under development. He
5 explained the basic provisions of PIN 53, clarifying the criteria for SB 499 and SB 1661
6 extensions due to unforeseen circumstances, and PIN 47, setting out the process for
7 voluntary expedited appeals. Mr. Coleman stated that FDD will continue to participate
8 in the effort to reorganize and revise Title 24 as part of the triennial code adoption cycle.
9 He commented that OSHPD is moving toward adoption of national standards rather
10 than creating California amendments with each code revision; in addition, codes are
11 becoming more performance-based instead of prescriptive.

12

13 Mr. Coleman encouraged interested parties to submit comments on OSHPD's proposed
14 code amendments before they are forwarded to the Building Standards Commission in
15 June. He added that the Building Standards Commission will also have a public review
16 period, so there will be additional opportunities to submit comments and suggestions as
17 part of that process.

18

19 Mr. Coleman discussed FDD's document management modernization project, an effort
20 to make document processing and storage more efficient by using electronic
21 identification systems.

22

23 Mr. Coleman showed charts illustrating the results of the staff's analysis of the SB 499
24 reports submitted by hospitals last fall. He compared 2010 results with 2011 results,

1 and presented compliance forecasts based on the refined algorithm developed by the
2 staff. He reviewed results by resolution classification, ownership type, number of beds,
3 location, and county. Mr. Coleman expressed concern about the high number of
4 potentially non-compliant SPC-1 hospital buildings by January 1, 2013.

5
6 Mr. La Brie expressed his appreciation to the FDD staff for their hard work.

7
8 **Regulation Update**

9 Mr. Glenn Gall, FDD Building Standards Unit Supervisor, provided a summary of FDD's
10 regulatory activities in recent months. He reported that all of the code proposals
11 OSHPD was working on for the past couple years have been codified and published,
12 and they will go into effect on July 1, 2012. In the meantime, he said, projects may use
13 the new code provisions if they request them as an alternative method of compliance.

14
15 Mr. Gall announced that OSHPD recently hired David Mason to fill the vacant
16 mechanical position. He said Mr. Mason has a logical engineering approach to
17 interpreting code provisions and looks to national standards for answers to problems,
18 which makes him a good fit for OSHPD.

19
20 Mr. Gall indicated that the staff has been meeting with clinic stakeholders to discuss
21 proposed revisions to OSHPD 3 regulations. He stated that the proposed regulations
22 will be posted on OSHPD's Website for public review, and he invited comments and
23 feedback on the regulatory package.

24

1 Mr. Gall said that in addition to structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing revisions
2 for the triennial code adoption cycle, the staff is working on some general clean-up and
3 maintenance of the hospital chapter of the California Building Code. He noted that the
4 finishing section has already been overhauled and updated. Mr. Gall advised that the
5 staff plans to accept some new products for specific applications in areas such as
6 dietary services; other revisions will include new provisions for airborne infection
7 isolation treatment rooms, ultrasound, and specimen collection spaces. He added that
8 the proposed package will be posted on the Website in March.

9
10 Mr. Gall thanked Mr. Gale Bate for his assistance in explaining and drafting the
11 regulations.

12
13 Ms. Eck commended OSHPD for recognizing the importance of handwashing as a way
14 of preventing hospital infections. Referring to Section 1226.4.13.8.2 of the proposed
15 clinic regulations, the sections on central sterile supply and sterilizing areas, she
16 suggested inserting generic language emphasizing the need for careful planning of
17 workflow between dirty and clean work areas. Mr. Gall pointed out that Title 24 focuses
18 on building requirements rather operational issues, but he acknowledged that proper
19 workflow is an element of good design. He invited Ms. Eck to email some proposed
20 draft language.

21
22 Ms. Eck drew attention to Table 1224.4.11 regarding acceptable ceiling and carpet
23 locations, and she asked why OSHPD would allow carpeting in nursing stations. Mr.
24 Gall responded that the code has always allowed carpeting in certain areas, particularly

1 in outpatient care settings, to reduce noise or facilitate cleaning. He added that any
2 carpeting in a healthcare facility must be easy to clean, and licensing has the discretion
3 to order carpeting removed if it is not properly cleaned or maintained. Ms. Eck said
4 carpeting makes sense in administrative areas, but not in nursing areas, and she
5 recommended that OSHPD rethink this provision.

6
7 Mr. Scheuerman commented that nursing stations in modern hospitals tend to be
8 decentralized and distributed in places near patient rooms. He noted there are some
9 situations where carpeting helps mitigate noise.

10

11 Mr. Gall proposed inserting an asterisk indicating that OSHPD may approve a facility
12 with carpeting, but licensing has the discretion to have it removed.

13

14 Mr. Gall encouraged Ms. Eck and other interested parties to attend the meetings where
15 the guidelines are discussed in detail.

16

17 **Meeting Wrap-Up**

18 Mr. La Brie recommended that Board members review the proposed 2012 goals and
19 submit any comments to the staff.

20

21 **Information Items**

22 Mr. La Brie drew attention to the informational materials in the meeting packet.

- 23 • HBSB Membership
- 24 • HBSB Roster

1 • HBSB Consulting Members Roster

2 • HBSB Committee List

3

4 **Comments from the Public/Board Members on Issues not on this Agenda**

5 There were no other matters brought to the attention of the Board.

6

7 **Adjournment**

8 Mr. La Brie thanked Board members, staff, and guests for their participation.

9

10 There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

DRAFT