



Hospital Building Safety Board

400 R Street, Suite 200
 Sacramento, California 95811-6213
 (916) 440-8453
 Fax (916) 324-9118
<http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/Boards/HBSB/index.html>

HOSPITAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD Standard Details Committee

**Thursday, May 15, 2014
 10:00 a.m. - 1:30 p.m.**

Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development
 400 R Street, Suite 452
 Sacramento, CA 95811
 (916) 440-8453
 and
 Metropolitan Water District Headquarters
 700 N. Alameda Street, Suite 2-546
 Los Angeles, CA 90012
 (213) 897-0166

Committee Members Present

Bert Hurlbut, Chair
 Michael O'Connor, Vice-Chair
 Rami Elhassan
 Eric Johnson
 Scott Karpinen
 Bruce Macpherson
 Arlee Monson

John Egan (HBSB)

OSHPD Staff

Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director
 Brett Beekman
 Gary Dunger
 Mohammad Karim
 Chris Tokas

HBSB Staff

Linda Janssen, Executive Director
 Cathy Kane
 Evett Torres
 Kathi Zamora, FDD

- 1 **1. Welcome and Introductions**
- 2 Committee Chair Bert Hurlbut brought the meeting to order. He invited the participants
- 3 to introduce themselves.



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. Hurlbut stated that the objective of the meeting was to get the Fire Life Safety Details cleaned up. Kale Wisnia will input the changes and send them on to Mr. Dunger for final review. They will then be posted on the website.

(3.) Review the draft Fire Life Safety Details

Mr. Monson led the review.

- The Narrative is patterned after the Partitions and Ceiling Narratives. Mr. Dunger noted that #2 appears twice. He also suggested a bullet point #D for #2: “These OPDs may not be used as a basis for an Engineering Judgment.”
- The Flowchart is patterned after other OPDs. It is broken down by the type of detail – floor, wall, etc.
- The General Notes focus on general code issues for Fire Life Safety and fire protection. Mr. Dunger pointed out the problem with actual code references: they will have to be edited with every code cycle. Mr. Coleman responded that these details are only good for a code cycle; when a new code comes out the details have to be reviewed anyway.
- Mr. Karim stated that the code cycle number will be shown in two places: the watermark and the footer.

Discussion and Public Input

Mr. Dunger expressed concern with the 1½" maximum gap for the connection of wallboard to the fireproofing.

1
2 The group discussed pinch points – the single point of connection of two membranes of
3 the fire resistive wall. Mr. Coleman suggested having them 1½" or the thickness of the
4 fireproofing, whichever is greater.

5
6 An Interested Party asked about the first three details: in the second option where the
7 column is rotated 90°, he confirmed that it is assumed that the column can be rotated in
8 either direction.

9
10 The group agreed that on all applicable details, each column side needs to be
11 firesprayed.

12
13 Mr. Dunger commented that "mineral wool-type fitting" should be foil faced for a smoke
14 seal, or it should be sprayed (mineral wool doesn't have much smoke resistance). It
15 can be on either face.

16
17 After discussing the 1/2" measurement on FR1.33, the group decided to specify "1/2"
18 maximum.

19
20 Mr. Dunger noted that FR1.34 would also be a good application to use foil faced on one
21 side or spray material.

22

1 Mr. Dunger and Mr. Monson discussed the problem of rated walls terminating with
2 glass. In a fire scenario, the glass will be blown out. The best that can be done is to
3 keep the smoke from going from one side of the wall to the other.

4
5 For the details showing glazing, Mr. Donelan suggested removing the moderate cuts off
6 the gyp board; Mr. Monson said they would show a molding strip. The group discussed
7 not showing miters at the joint corners.

8
9 The group discussed problems with the details on mullions and the possibility of using
10 UL-rated mullions, but not a built condition.

11
12 For FR1.37 and FR1.38, the group agreed on the need to define structural versus non-
13 structural mullions.

14
15 For FR1.39, Mr. Dunger pointed out that there is already a wall-to-wall joint system that
16 is very similar, but it is for a structural wall. He appreciated the distinction, but FR1.39
17 should match the structural wall dimensions.

18
19 Mr. Coleman commented on the 5/8" rather than 1/2" minimum fire sealant measure on
20 FR1.40.

21
22 The group discussed the issue of thickness for 2-hour walls. Mr. Dunger said he would
23 do some research.

24

1 Many of the details needed to have black lines added.

2

3 Mr. Dunger suggested adding a “shiny 90” to one of the details – a lightweight 90°
4 metallic angle.

5

6 Mr. Monson suggested changing one of the Notes to specify staggering the joints.

7

8 For FR3.06, the group discussed having four screws in drywall to drywall rather than
9 two screws; this is best practice.

10

11 For FR3.07, Mr. Dunger pointed out that the top of wall detail is not the issue – it is the
12 supports that penetrate the spray. Mr. Coleman suggested renaming the detail.

13

14 Mr. Karpinen asked about having a 6” rated wall with a perpendicular pipe going
15 through. Can you have a hanger inside the rated wall? The group agreed that you can
16 put anything inside a rated wall as long as it doesn’t penetrate.

17

18 For FR3.08, the group agreed that you would not see Z-clips on a vertical tube – it
19 should be horizontal.

20

21 Mr. Dunger noted that he had received comments on Note #2 of FR4.01 regarding the
22 cast iron flange – it doesn’t work with a concrete anchor.

23

1 For FR4.02, the group objected to the placement of a slip joint. Mr. Dunger also felt that
2 the intent of the detail should not be how to build a head of wall system, but how to build
3 a suspended shaft. The group suggested referencing the head of wall system
4 architectural detail for those who need that.

5
6 Mr. Dunger added that some of the information shown is not needed because it is a
7 standard J track.

8
9 Mr. Hurlbut stated that for next steps, Mr. Dunger would submit his handwritten
10 comments; then Mr. Wisnia would input them and send them back. The details do not
11 need to go back to the committee after that.

12

13 **MOTION:** (M/S/C/) [Karpinen/]

14 The Board voted unanimously to recommend the details, with the comments
15 noted, for OSHPD review and approval.

16

17 **4. Discuss MEP Standard Details**

18 Mr. Hurlbut noted that most Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing details end up being
19 structural in nature. Many are listed as assemblies or are pre-approved with ISAT,
20 TOLCO, Mason, etc. Mr. Monson asked if they truly are pre-approved; Mr. Karim
21 responded that TOLCO, Mason, and ERICO are.

22

23 Mr. Hurlbut felt that for the HBSB to come up with MEP details would be very difficult
24 because they would be competing with industry. Mr. Johnson noted that working with

1 the ISATs on the team is not a major fiasco, as long as someone on the team is going
2 to carry that work.

3

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

5 There were no further comments.

6

7 **6. Adjournment**

8 Mr. Hurlbut adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.