1. Welcome and Introductions

Rami Elhassan, Chair, called the meeting to order. The Committee members and OSHPD (Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development) staff introduced themselves from the Sacramento and Los Angeles locations. A quorum was present.

2. Review and approve the September 24, 2019 draft meeting report/minutes

Presenter: Rami Elhassan, Chair
Discussion and public input

MOTION: [Lew/Phipps]
The Committee voted unanimously to accept the September 24, 2019 draft meeting report/minutes.

Informational and Action Item

- None.

3. Discussion and development of a Policy Intent Notice (PIN) for anchorage/bracing requirements for movable and mobile equipment based on proposed definitions and amendments in the express terms for the 2019 California Building Code, Title 24, Part 2:

- Seismic anchorage/restraint requirements for fixed, movable, and mobile equipment.

Presenter: Rami Elhassan, Committee Chair; Maryann Phipps, Committee Vice-Chair; Ali Sumer, OSHPD

Discussion and public input

Ms. Phipps wanted to know if Interim Equipment could be a subset of Temporary Equipment. Mr. Sumer explained that Temporary Equipment has a maximum of 180-days and so Interim Equipment does fit into that requirement. He advised not to include language about the 180-day maximum under Temporary or Interim Equipment.

Mr. Elhassan asked if the equipment is heavy, tall, and connected via a plug, is that considered Movable. Mr. Sumer stated it would not be considered Fixed Equipment.

Ms. Phipps suggested removing the language “as needed” at the end of Number Two for Moveable Equipment.

An interested party challenged what the rationale was when it came to the 5-foot requirement for Countertop Equipment. Mr. Sumer stated that counters were already at 3 ½-feet and any equipment on top would be at or above 5-feet. Mr. Elhassan proposed to remove the 5-foot requirement and have it read “anything more than 100lbs if it is essential to operations shall be”. Ms. Phipps suggested to remove the word essential and say, “anything over 400lbs with a C.G (Center of Gravity) higher than 4-feet” because that would be consistent with the bases of all other equipment in the building.

Mr. Coleman advised using the language “equipment that was seismically certified” for Number 2 B and remove 100lbs.

Ms. Phipps wanted to know how equipment is deemed essential and Mr. Sumer explained that the hospital owner and their team decide that. She wanted to see the word essential removed from Number 2 B. Mr. LaBrie believed removing the word essential would make things even more confusing.
Mr. Elhassan reiterated he was in support of using the language of 100lb equipment and strike out the language “with center of mass located 5-feet or more”. Mr. Coleman concluded that the definition of essential needed to be included and Ms. Malone added that the definition should include the words “essential after a major event”.

Mr. Sumer reported that it would be up to the owner to determine what category each equipment falls under and then follow the requirements of how it should be anchored (or not anchored). Mr. Coleman added that OSHPD cannot regulate every piece of equipment in a hospital.

In terms of Temporary Equipment, Item B, Ms. Phipps wanted to know if the ground could support the piping, conductors, and ductwork. Ms. Coleman answered that the ground could be used as a support.

Mr. Coleman announced that in terms of Temporary and Interim Equipment, the staff is going to define whether it is supported by the hospital structure or not. If it is on the hospital structure then it may need to be reviewed differently than something located on the ground. Ms. Phipps agreed that was a good idea.

Ms. Phipps asked if the authority having jurisdiction determines what is hazardous. Mr. Coleman answered that hazardous items are listed in the code.

An interested party wanted to know the definition of discrete. Mr. Lobo answered that the definition was copied from ASCE (American Society of Civic Engineering) 7.16. Ms. Phipps suggested removing Exemption Number 2 and Mr. Sumer responded that it could be removed, but staff wished to keep Item B regarding 20lbs or less.

Mr. Elhassan and an interested party suggested including the word “or” for Moveable Equipment, Item 3, at the end of the first sentence. Ms. Phipps wanted more clarification included for Moveable Equipment, Item 3 D, in terms of load rating.

Mr. Coleman proposed putting in a best practices section and suggested that Item 2 B under Moveable Equipment should read “anchorage is not required”. Ms. Sumer advised that it read not required and point to a guideline or document outside of hard drawings. Mr. LaBrie wanted to see it read optional and then if the design team chose to include it on the drawings then it would be subject to OSHPD review.

Ms. Phipps determined that countertop equipment anchorage worked only if OSHPD was aware that it could be determined as moveable equipment. By categorizing it as movable, adhesive restraints could be used to restrain it.

Mr. Coleman summarized that OSHPD was in the interim code cycle and any changes would not go into effect until July 01, 2022. He expressed that if the PIN was updated and completed before then, that would be best. The Committee would have time to review the PIN with the proposed changes but not the code changes.
Ms. Phipps put forward the following motion: That the Committee direct OSHPD to complete the
development of the code changes incorporating comments from the Committee in time to
submit it for the deadline.

**MOTION:** [Phipps/O’Connor]
The Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion as stated.

Mr. Elhassan recommended that OSHPD continue with the PIN and that it come back to the
Committee at a future meeting for review. Ms. Phipps emphasized that the PIN should be
completed and published by the end of 2019 due to new concepts for Moveable and Mobile
Equipment being introduced in January of 2020. Also, she suggested not to include any details
in the PIN. Mr. Coleman suggested bringing the PIN back to the Committee before the full
Board meeting in December of 2019.

Mr. Scheuerman wanted to know if there were any concerns about the PIN being published
prior to the mid-cycle code changes taking effect. Mr. Coleman explained that the PIN was a
policy, not a code requirement.

**Informational Item and Action Item**
- Remove the language “as needed” from Movable Equipment, Number 2 – Page 2.
- Strikeout the language “with center of mass located 5-feet or more” from Countertop
  Equipment, Number 2 B – Page 2.
- Include the definition of the word essential for Countertop Equipment – Page 2.
- The definition for essential should include the words “after a major event”.
- Revisit Temporary Equipment at a future meeting
- Removed Exemption 2 but keep Item B regarding components that weighed 20lbs or less.
- Strike the language for Fixed Equipment, Number 1 stating “medical, laboratory or other
equipment” and have it read “required for essential equipment” – Page 1 of the PIN
- Provide clarity in terms of load rating for Moveable Equipment, Item D, Section 3 – Page 2
  of the PIN.
- Strike the word administrators in Moveable Equipment, Item 4 B – Page 2 of the PIN
- Moveable Equipment, Item 2 B should read optional and if the design team chose to
  included restraints on the drawings then it would be subject to OSHPD review – Page 3 of
  the PIN
- Strike the word administrators in Additional Considerations – Page 3 of the PIN
- Bring back the PIN for the Committee to review before the full Board meeting in December
  2019.

4. **Discuss proposed changes to the 2019 Intervening Code Adoption Cycle, California
Building Code, Title 24, Part 2:**
- Special Seismic Certification of fluoroscopy equipment
- Proprietary requalified field-bolted special moment frame connections

**Presenter:** Roy Lobo, OSHPD

**Discussion and public input**
Ms. Phipps asked who decided how many fluoroscopy machines are needed and Mr. Coleman announced that the hospital makes that decision.

An interested party explained that the assumption that a Magnetic Particle Test results in better-quality welds was false. He announced that his company did not do Magnetic Particle Tests and that it would not be included in the company’s criteria.

Ms. Phipps asked what the quality control and quality insurance measures related to the weld were. An interested party declared that there was a requirement that the welding procedure itself be qualified and that there be continuous inspection of the weld.

An interested party recommended that Number 12 be applicable to all movement connection systems and not just SidePlate.

Ms. Phipps put forward the following motion: That the Committee accept OSHPD’s code change proposal related to the special seismic certification of imaging equipment and complete the process for submitting that to the Building Standards Commission.

**MOTION:** [Phipps/Malone]
The Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion as it was stated.

Ms. Phipps put forward the following motion: That the Committee recommend that OSHPD complete the code change proposal related to the bolt SidePlate and work with SidePlate to resolve the remaining outstanding issues before the deadline for submission.

**MOTION:** [Phipps/O’Connor]
The Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion as it was stated.

**Informational Item and Action Item**
- Explore applying Number 12 to all movement connection systems – Page 2
- OSHPD continue developing the provisions for SidePlate and work with SidePlate to resolve any outstanding issues

**5. Comments from the Public/Board Members on Issues Not on This Agenda**

An interested party requested adding a discussion regarding code section 1617A.1.26 to the next meeting’s agenda

**6. Adjournment**

Rami Elhassan, Chair, adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:24 p.m.