

OSHPD of Statewide Health Planning and Development



Hospital Building Safety Board
400 R Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, California 95811-6213
(916) 440-8453
Fax (916) 324-9118
www.oshpd.ca.gov/Boards/HBSB/index.html

**HOSPITAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD
Standard Details Committee**

**Thursday, June 2, 2016
10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.**

**Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development
400 R Street, Suite 452
Sacramento, CA 95811**

and

**Metropolitan Water District Headquarters
700 N. Alameda Street, Suite 2-546
Los Angeles, CA 90012**

Board Members

Henry Huang, Chair
Michael O'Connor, Vice-Chair
John Donelan
Mike Hooper
Mark Hershberg, Consulting Member
Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member

HBSB Staff

Kathi Zamora
Krista Harrington
Evet Torres

OSHPD Staff

Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director
Brett Beekman
Gary Dunger
Mohammad Karim, Ph.D.
Richard Tannahill
Nanci Timmins
Chris Tokas
Beth Wied

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 2 Mr. Henry Huang, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order. The committee
- 3 members, OSHPD staff, and audience members introduced themselves from Los
- 4 Angeles and Sacramento.

1 **2. Review the May 15, 2014 meeting report/minutes**

2 Mr. Huang stated that the meeting minutes had already been approved by the Board.

3 **3. Review of the current electronic process for application of OSHPD**

4 **Preapproved Details (OPDs)**

- 5 • **File size limitation when implemented on sheets**

- 6 • **Discussion and public input**

7 Mr. Michael O'Connor, Vice-Chair, mentioned there's an issue of electronic plans being
8 rejected because the file was too large. Mr. Paul Coleman, OSHPD, stated that the
9 details must first be put into the drawing in the CAD program, then flattened before
10 converting to PDF. The process must be followed step-by-step.

11 Mr. O'Connor mentioned that to flatten the files, they have to be put into CAD format – if
12 another file type were available, it would be much easier to implement. Mr. Chris
13 Tokas, OSHPD, said that staff could explore using PNG files.

14 Mr. Tokas explained that OSHPD was keeping the June 27 Electronic Plan Review
15 deadline in mind. There are now two ways to reduce the file size: by flattening it while
16 in the CAD format – the preferable way – and by converting the CAD file to PDF, then
17 flattening it.

18 Mr. Tokas asked about the best form; Mr. O'Connor answered that the easiest form
19 would be DWF or G. Dr. Mohammad Karim, OSHPD, noted that this would defeat the
20 purpose. OSHPD will look into the issue. Mr. O'Connor also agreed to look into a
21 preferable format.

22 **4. Review and discuss proposed amendments to current OSHPD Preapproved**
23 **Details**

24 Mr. O'Connor suggested turning this into a process question: If there are a few
25 amendments to the already-approved details, how would they be submitted for
26 consideration for a variation or an additional OSHPD Preapproved Detail (OPD)? Mr.
27 Coleman suggested submitting them to Dr. Karim, as his unit handles preapprovals.
28 That unit would bring them to the next committee meeting for discussion.

1 Mr. Huang raised the issue of the committee's mission. When a detail reaches this
2 committee, it has been vetted by OSHPD staff who have found that they do not agree.
3 Does this committee act as an appeal hearing body for technical issues? Mr. Huang
4 stated that he does not feel comfortable approving things that are not tested. Mr.
5 Coleman answered that some of the details for today's meeting have not been reviewed
6 by OSHPD. OSHPD is showing them in order to determine if they are in fact Standard
7 Details. If they are, OSHPD will begin the process of in-house reviews.

8 Mr. Huang sought to determine whether this committee is the final decision-making
9 body on technical issues. Mr. Coleman replied that it is not, but the members provide a
10 valuable weigh-in on technical issues. Mr. Huang suggested that a standard procedure
11 for this committee should be established; Mr. Coleman felt that was a great idea.

12 • **Allow some variations of columns such as box columns, tubes, pipes, etc.**

13 Mr. Tokas read the comments submitted by Mr. Burt Hurlbut regarding the Fire Life
14 Safety column variation issues. Ms. Nancy Timmins, OSHPD, felt that the tube and
15 height details would need a different detail drawn up. Mr. Donelan felt that detail
16 pictures are definitely necessary to aid in visualizing, as opposed to just notes.

17 Mr. Donelan suggested taking the round shape out of the equation for the structural
18 steel column. A box column is shown in the Standard Details further into the document.

19 Mr. Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member, asked about the closure angle in the detail. Mr.
20 Coleman said that the detail is more of a shaft wall where you have to do the inside fire
21 material before putting in the outer layers of gyp board. Mr. Donelan suggested using
22 an inset. Mr. Coleman agreed that we should do something to assist the inspector in
23 doing his job, rather than use something that is open to interpretation.

24 Mr. Tokas asked the group about leaving the 2013 details the way they are or amending
25 them to incorporate this proposal; do we re-issue them as 2016? Mr. O'Connor
26 volunteered to work on the box column and tube amendment.

27 Mr. Huang asked about floor and ceiling intersection. Mr. Coleman responded that
28 there are a number of details addressing that.

29 Dr. Karim stated that there are three OPDs for structure; there are virtually no structural
30 changes between 2013 and 2016 as far as OPDs are concerned. OSHPD's plan is not

1 to change them at all – to allow the 2013 OPD to be used for all codes. However, there
2 are enough changes in the Fire Life Safety to upgrade it to 2016.

3 • **Clarity on partitions hitting exterior glass**

4 Mr. Huang asked about other recommended amendments. Mr. Tokas showed the
5 example detail “Clarity on Partitions Hitting Exterior Glass.” OSHPD had received three
6 proposals that morning that show the partition terminating against the mullion in each.

7 Mr. Gary Dunger, OSHPD, gave a historical perspective. When OSHPD originally
8 discussed the rated wall terminations as non-rated curtain walls, they shared with the
9 committee that there are so many variations that it does not make sense to use one or
10 two as Standard Details – there would be very limited usage. OSHPD recommended
11 that they be detailed on the plans. However, the committee wanted to have one or two
12 Standard Details to point at, so that is what OSHPD did.

13 Mr. Donelan pointed out that the significance of the ones they did approve was the
14 drywall on the extensions, which are nothing but aluminum – a combustible material.
15 The glass curtain wall is not equivalent to the one-hour or two-hour partition. What we
16 put between the partition and the glass curtain wall ought to be as good as the glass.
17 Aluminum does not suffice. We have done our job if whatever is between the wall and
18 the glass survives until the glass blows out.

19 Mr. Tokas stated that the question posed to OSHPD by every architect is that the detail
20 is not architecturally pleasing; can we do something different? Mr. Kreuser commented
21 that he did not know of any curtain wall manufacturer that would let someone else
22 fasten to their system because it is self-supporting. They will not accept drywall being
23 fastened to their mullion – typically that is a deferred approval system. Mr. Tokas
24 agreed that Mr. Kreuser was bringing up a lot of structural and Fire Life Safety issues –
25 they are not good samples – but OSHPD was using them as ideas to work with.

26 Mr. Donelan expressed the hope that real designs would enter the mix with some sort of
27 test. Mr. Huang commented on the larger issue that code development used to entail
28 putting a new set of code out, using it for about a year, then thinking about mending it
29 for the next cycle.

1 Mr. Donelan suggested sending this one back to the designers and not trying to make a
2 Standard Detail – the condition is unique.

3 Mr. Hooper said that the whole idea is to ensure that the wall is protected all the way to
4 the glass. The aluminum mullion is not a proper protection. He ventured to say that the
5 contractor as well as the IOR will want to see a specific detail showing exact installation.
6 But there are so many variations that one Standard Detail is not going to cover it.

7 Mr. Donelan commented that OSHPD’s responsibility is to communicate to staff what is
8 going to be good enough. Mr. Coleman felt that this was a case in which a Standard
9 Detail helps to give guidance to the industry as to what kinds of things are acceptable.

10 Mr. Huang commented that developing an alternative is beyond the scope of this
11 committee. Mr. Hooper felt that the whole idea was to ensure an approvable rating all
12 the way to the glass; this detail does not do that. The group agreed that they did not
13 want to see an Engineering Judgment for every one of these.

14 Mr. Hooper suggested providing a note with these details, expressing that these are not
15 meant to be the only options. They need to be detailed on the plans and reviewed on a
16 case-by-case basis.

17 Mr. Tokas referred to the detail that is presented as if it is a steel T, not aluminum, and it
18 terminates against the glass. Mr. Donelan pointed out that it was an example of “good
19 enough.” Mr. Dunger noted that the complaint has always been its visibility from the
20 outside looking in.

21 The group discussed the dilemma of what to include and what not to include. Mr.
22 Coleman said that this kind of detail should not be put in per se. Mr. Dunger noted that
23 the ones that are approved are very much like this.

24 • **2016 CBC impact to existing details**

25 Mr. Coleman asked how much of the 2016 code is going to revise the Fire Life Safety
26 details; were the changes significant? Mr. Dunger replied that it will be just the code
27 references that are changed. Mr. Donelan said that they would check to see that the
28 code references are correct, and at the same time check the impacted code section for
29 any changes.

30 • **Other recommended/proposed amendments**

1 Mr. Tokas explained the proposed new detail (“Electrical penetration – T-rating”) with a
2 building cross-section showing an equipment path at the top of the floor. It shows
3 electrical conduit going from the equipment through the floor and back into the service
4 system.

5 Mr. Donelan stated that if the concrete housekeeping pad were removed, the grout
6 depth would not be the full depth of the concrete. This again seemed to meet the
7 criteria of “good enough.”

8 Mr. Coleman asked about having a separate detail for this specific condition. You
9 already have the penetration, and if you have the depth from the slab on top, then there
10 should be a logical conclusion.

11 Mr. Richard Tannahill, OSHPD, felt that people would want to see a detail
12 demonstrating that this is acceptable; it diverts from an approved detail. You are
13 providing less protection because of the additional layer of concrete. Mr. Donelan
14 countered that this is a tested system – a variation of an exception which allows the
15 grout in lieu of getting a tested system. Mr. Coleman said that this might be a technical
16 training issue for OSHPD staff. Mr. Huang said that accordingly, there is no need for an
17 additional detail.

18 Mr. Hooper commented that from an inspector’s point of view, when looking at a set of
19 drawings he would assume that there would be approvable detail that speaks to this fire
20 penetration. Ms. Timmins felt that this is the way it should be. They agreed that a
21 specific detail isn’t needed.

- 22 • *(out of order)* **Fire Life Safety details: Allow for 2-hour wall using 3/4" Gypsum**
23 **Board**

24 Mr. O’Connor explained that this was a notation from Mr. Hurlbut suggesting that the
25 consideration of 3/4" gyp board is sufficient in the industry and could be an alternate to
26 some details (in lieu of two layers of 5/8"). Mr. O’Connor’s suggestion would be that if
27 there is a specific consideration with a specific system that Mr. Hurlbut would like the
28 committee to look at, that it be submitted through the regular process.

29 Mr. Huang commented that this proposed substitute was a fairly general issue. The gyp
30 board industry does a great amount of testing to create something new without other

1 test results does not seem to make sense. Mr. Coleman suggested to disregard the
2 proposal.

3 Mr. Dunger mentioned that a well-regarded drywall and plaster industry representative
4 had indicated that the proposal would not work. An Interested Party said that he would
5 reach out to his contacts at the Gypsum Association to see if they could back the claim.

6 **5. Consider suggestions for new OSHPD Preapproval Details**

7 Mr. Coleman stated that one of the areas OSHPD was considering for developing
8 Standard Details was single-story Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNFs). There are some
9 new types of construction using metal framing and wood framing. Standard Details for
10 2-hour walls when the framing is parallel or perpendicular, and all the various conditions
11 that come up, are a possibility. There will be Fire Life Safety details and some
12 Structural details.

13 He continued that OSHPD already has the expedited building permit for replacement of
14 water heaters, installation of TV and monitor brackets, and replacement of handrails.
15 OSHPD is working on a detail for replacement of HVAC equipment on the roof – there
16 are all kinds of roofs to deal with.

17 **• Discussion and public input**

18 Ms. Timmins mentioned details for incidental use rooms in 5-As. Mr. Donelan
19 commented that there is some junk code that hasn't been fixed describing the
20 separation in 5-As. Mr. Coleman asked if this topic would require details or Code
21 Application Notices (CANs). Mr. Dunger commented that it would definitely be a
22 variation from the prescriptive requirement of the code. A horizontal fire barrier is
23 needed, although code does not allow that. Mr. Donelan offered to do some drawings if
24 Ms. Timmins could supply sketches.

25 An Interested Party mentioned the older multi-story buildings with a SNF on a certain
26 level, that had met code at one time. When the buildings are upgraded, the owner
27 hears that he no longer needs closers on the doors because of the new code. That
28 degrades the paths of Fire Safety. Mr. Coleman responded that typically, new
29 construction must comply with current code. However, multi-stories with SNFs are a

1 case-by-case because some are the entire building and some are one floor. Changes
2 to any floors in a building that also impact the OSHPD floors bring OSHPD into the loop.

3 Mr. Coleman mentioned that at one time, there had been talk of Accessibility Standard
4 Details. However, most design professionals now have standard Accessibility sheets
5 that show the typical details, most of which come out of the code itself.

6 Mr. O'Connor mentioned that there constantly seem to be discussions on mounting
7 heights for devices based on types. If there were some consensus, it would be very
8 beneficial. He said he would feed that one into the process.

9 Mr. Coleman mentioned that code requires all electrical junction boxes to be
10 independently supported. OSHPD has run into a number of cases where they are
11 supported by several orange conduits on each side attached to the structure within a
12 foot of the box. You still must have independent support for that box – but that seems a
13 bit excessive. Details for typical examples could be appropriate so that we don't keep
14 coming up with variations and applications out in the field; or they might be best as
15 FAQs, PINs or CANs.

16 **6. Comments from the Public/Board Members on issues not on this agenda**

17 Mr. Huang suggested submitting a progress report for the November Full Board
18 meeting, so they can project for next year. Mr. Coleman said that for the details
19 discussed today, the committee should meet between the July and November Full
20 Board meetings. At that time, they can also talk about agendas and priorities for next
21 year.

22 **7. Adjournment**

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

24 The Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

25 The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.