

**OSHPD** Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development



**Hospital Building Safety Board**

2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 800  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
(916) 440-8453  
(916) 324-9188 Fax  
[www.oshpd.ca.gov/Boards/HBSB/index.html](http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/Boards/HBSB/index.html)

**HOSPITAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD  
Structural and Nonstructural Regulations Committee**

**Thursday, October 31, 2019  
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development  
2020 West El Camino Avenue, Ste. 930  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
and  
Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development  
355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1901  
Los Angeles, CA 90071**

**Committee Members Present:**

Rami Elhassan, Chair  
Maryann Phipps, Vice-Chair  
Marshal Lew  
Jennifer Thornburg  
Michael O'Connor

**Consulting Members:**

Michelle Malone

**OSHPD Staff:**

Paul Coleman, OSHPD Deputy Director  
Joe LaBrie  
Roy Lobo  
Diana Navarro  
David Neou  
Carl Scheuerman  
Ali Sumer  
Richard Tannahill  
James Yi, OSHPD Legal Counsel

**HBSB Staff:**

Ken Yu, Executive Director

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

2 Rami Elhassan, Chair, called the meeting to order. The Committee members and OSHPD  
3 (Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development) staff introduced themselves from the  
4 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

1 **Discussion and public input**

2 **MOTION:** [Lew/Phipps]

3 The Committee voted unanimously to accept the September 24, 2019 draft meeting  
4 report/minutes.

5 **Informational and Action Item**

- 6 • None.

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

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

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

13 **Discussion and public input**

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

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

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

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

29 Mr. Coleman advised using the language “equipment that was seismically certified” for Number  
30 2 B and remove 100lbs.

31 Ms. Phipps wanted to know how equipment is deemed essential and Mr. Sumer explained that  
32 the hospital owner and their team decide that. She wanted to see the word essential removed  
33 from Number 2 B. Mr. LaBrie believed removing the word essential would make things even  
34 more confusing.

1 Mr. Elhassan reiterated he was in support of using the language of 100lb equipment and strike  
2 out the language “with center of mass located 5-feet or more”. Mr. Coleman concluded that the  
3 definition of essential needed to be included and Ms. Malone added that the definition should  
4 include the words “essential after a major event”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

33 Mr. Coleman summarized that OSHPD was in the interim code cycle and any changes would  
34 not go into effect until July 01, 2022. He expressed that if the PIN was updated and completed  
35 before then, that would be best. The Committee would have time to review the PIN with the  
36 proposed changes but not the code changes.

1 Ms. Phipps put forward the following motion: That the Committee direct OSHPD to complete the  
2 development of the code changes incorporating comments from the Committee in time to  
3 submit it for the deadline.

4 **MOTION:** [Phipps/O'Connor]

5 The Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion as stated.

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

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

15 **Informational Item and Action Item**

- 16 • Remove the language “as needed” from Movable Equipment, Number 2 – Page 2.
- 17 • Strikeout the language “with center of mass located 5-feet or more” from Countertop  
18 Equipment, Number 2 B – Page 2.
- 19 • Include the definition of the word essential for Countertop Equipment – Page 2.
- 20 • The definition for essential should include the words “after a major event”.
- 21 • Revisit Temporary Equipment at a future meeting
- 22 • Removed Exemption 2 but keep Item B regarding components that weighed 20lbs or less.
- 23 • Strike the language for Fixed Equipment, Number 1 stating “medical, laboratory or other  
24 equipment” and have it read “required for essential equipment” – Page 1 of the PIN
- 25 • Provide clarity in terms of load rating for Moveable Equipment, Item D, Section 3 – Page 2  
26 of the PIN.
- 27 • Strike the word administrators in Moveable Equipment, Item 4 B – Page 2 of the PIN
- 28 • Moveable Equipment, Item 2 B should read optional and if the design team chose to  
29 included restraints on the drawings then it would be subject to OSHPD review – Page 3 of  
30 the PIN
- 31 • Strike the word administrators in Additional Considerations – Page 3 of the PIN
- 32 • Bring back the PIN for the Committee to review before the full Board meeting in December  
33 2019.

34 **4. Discuss proposed changes to the 2019 Intervening Code Adoption Cycle, California**  
35 **Building Code, Title 24, Part 2:**

- 36 • Special Seismic Certification of fluoroscopy equipment
- 37 • Proprietary requalified field-bolted special moment frame connections

38 **Presenter:** Roy Lobo, OSHPD

39 **Discussion and public input**

1 Ms. Phipps asked who decided how many fluoroscopy machines are needed and Mr. Coleman  
2 announced that the hospital makes that decision.

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

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

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

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

14 **MOTION:** [Phipps/Malone]

15 The Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion as it was stated.

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

19 **MOTION:** [Phipps/O'Connor]

20 The Committee voted unanimously to approve the motion as it was stated.

#### 21 **Informational Item and Action Item**

- 22 • Explore applying Number 12 to all movement connection systems – Page 2
- 23 • OSHPD continue developing the provisions for SidePlate and work with SidePlate to resolve  
24 any outstanding issues

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

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

#### 28 **6. Adjournment**

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

