



2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 800
Sacramento, CA 95833
hcai.ca.gov



**Hospital Building Safety Board
Ad Hoc How-To-Guide Development for Preapproved
Fabricated Components and Systems Subcommittee**

**May 6, 2026
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

Teleconference Meeting Access:

2020 West El Camino Ave, Conference Room 930, Sacramento, CA 95833
355 South Grand Avenue, Conference Room 2000, Los Angeles, CA 90071

Subcommittee Members Present

Cody Bartley, Chair
Belinda Young, Vice-Chair
Gary Dunger
Scott Karpinen
Carl Newth
Michael Davis

HCAI Staff Present

Arash Altoontash
Richard Tannahill
Alireza Asgari
Ali Sumer

HBSB Staff Present

Veronica Yuke, HBSB Executive Director
Marcus Palmer
Evet Torres

- 1 **1. Call to Order and Welcome**
- 2 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair (or designee)
- 3 Cody Bartley greeted attendees and called the HBSB Ad hoc How to Guide
- 4 Development for Pre-Approved Fabricated Components and Systems Subcommittee
- 5 meeting to order on May 6th, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.
- 6

1 **2. Roll Call and Meeting Advisories/Expectations**

2 **Facilitator:** Veronica Yuke, HCAI; HBSB Executive Director (or designee)

3 Veronica Yuke conducted roll call and established that a quorum was present. She
4 communicated the rules of engagement and the voting process to be conducted via roll
5 call.

6

7 **3. Review and approve the draft March 19, 2026, meeting report/minutes**

8 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair (or designee)

9 **Discussion and Input**

10 Cody Bartley reviewed the contents of the meeting report, noting it began with a review
11 and approval of the February 12, 2026, meeting minutes.

12 He summarized the vendor presentation by DuraFuse (PCS004), facilitated by Justin
13 Marshall, who discussed spending approximately 18 months on the technical terms to
14 get version one approved.

15 Cody Bartley summarized the vendor presentation by SurePods (PCS003), noting they
16 discussed the process and how they had been listed on additional projects, including
17 comments on the duration of time required to obtain the first PCS.

18 He also summarized the vendor presentation by Starc (OPM0642), which focused on
19 fire life safety components and aspects of obtaining pre-approval.

20 Cody Bartley then noted the meeting moved to a review and discussion of the proposed
21 white paper outline. He clarified that at that time, the document was thought to be a
22 white paper and was structured accordingly. He stated the Subcommittee went through
23 the entire outline, assigned parts for development to build on the outline, and
24 determined the next meeting date. Cody Bartley concluded that the bulk of the meeting
25 time was taken by the three vendor presentations, with significant conversation around
26 development of content and sections.

27 **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

- 28
 - None

29 **Voting**

- 30
 - Move to approve the March 19th, 2026, draft meeting report of the How-to Guide
31 Development for Pre-Approved Fabricated Components and Systems
32 Subcommittee.

- 33
 - **Motion:** Cody Bartley

- 1 • **Second:** Carl Newth
- 2 • **Outcome:** Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

3 **Informational and Action Items**

- 4 • The March 19th, 2026, staff meeting report of the How-to Guide Development for
5 Pre-Approved Fabricated Components and Systems Subcommittee was
6 approved.

7

8 **4. Review and discuss proposed Advisory Guide outlines**

9 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair (or designee)

10 **Discussion and Input**

11 Cody Bartley explained that based on the full board update, the document was moving
12 from a white paper outline to an advisory guide. He noted there were more templates for
13 advisory guides and that, based on other advisory guides, the document would not go
14 into project-specific examples but would take a more high-level approach to the
15 process. He suggested the subcommittee would need to reevaluate how examples are
16 incorporated, stating he still believed there were stories with the OPMs but the advisory
17 guide should not reference specific OPMs.

18 Cody Bartley emphasized this was a more formal process and noted the last meeting
19 had been broad in trying to cover everything about pre-approvals and prefabrication. He
20 stated he wanted to focus the advisory guide back to the title of the subcommittee,
21 which is *pre-approved fabricated components and systems*, clarifying it is not an
22 advisory guide for all of prefabrication but focused specifically on *pre-approvals*.

- 23 • Scott Karpinen agreed with the clarification and stated he had been under the
24 impression the outline focus was vague, thanking Cody Bartley for clarifying.

25 Cody Bartley acknowledged that as he developed the outline, it had become too broad
26 and needed to be brought back in for pre-approval aspects. He stated the advisory
27 guide would lead with definitions, then move to Section Two on the process, which was
28 the meat of the document. He noted he had harvested information from the webinar and
29 that an email had been sent from HCAI to fill in this part.

- 30 • Alireza Asgari explained that what was used in the previous meeting was not
31 going to be used. He stated that this is what was asked for previously, which was
32 a written document in text format for the white paper covering the process for a
33 PCS in the group and the process for a project in a region, which are two
34 different processes. Alireza Asgari noted the format had changed.

1 Cody Bartley responded that the content was still the meat of what was needed but the
2 format would change because it was now an advisory guide. He stated the project-
3 specific approach was not necessarily a pre-approval program and was not an OPM or
4 a PCS, and the focus should be on pushing the industry to obtain pre-approvals before
5 becoming just a project review.

6 • Alireza Asgari asked whether pre-approval referred only to PCS or also included
7 OPM.

8 • Ali Sumer (HCAI) responded that there was demand for pre-approving some
9 details for a facility, noting the regions had been entertaining the option of pre-
10 approving certain details facility-wide, and the facility later submits a project using
11 the pre-approved details. He explained that the project does not have
12 construction or a permit but serves as an inventory of details, also called pre-
13 approved. He stated it was up to the Subcommittee whether to include this
14 process as pre-approved or keep it under PCS.

15 Cody asked how many processes the Subcommittee wanted to cover in the white
16 paper: PCS, OPM, and project-specific pre-approvals.

17 • Ali Sumer corrected this to facility-specific.

18 • Cody Bartley agreed and stated the process section would have three
19 components addressing those three buckets independently, with each having its
20 own process to be addressed separately.

21 Cody Bartley reviewed the existing content on PCS, noting good development with the
22 PCS outline, including documents and attachments. He proposed combining the
23 process to obtain pre-approval with the process to use the pre-approval into three
24 sections addressing each topic. He asked Alireza Asgari whether what HCAI sent broke
25 down into PCS, OPM, and project-specific sections.

26 • Alireza Asgari explained the new sections included process to get pre-approval,
27 process to use the pre-approval through project-specific prefabrication, and a
28 new section on PCS renewal consideration with two subsections (new or revised
29 product or change in applicable code and standard).

30 Cody Bartley acknowledged these were good sections but felt they remained PCS-
31 heavy.

32 • Alireza Asgari confirmed that only Section Three addressed the application for
33 project-specific prefabrication.

34 Cody Bartley asked whether the same need existed in the industry for education on
35 OPMs.

1 • Ali responded that it would be good to touch on differences so that people do not
2 pursue PCS when they should be on OPM, suggesting a brief explanation that
3 points people in the right direction without going into the whole OPM program
4 and process, just a scope overview of OPM.

5 Cody Bartley agreed to briefly mention OPM but focus mostly on PCSs and facility-
6 specific approvals. He requested words on the OPM process from HCAI to thread into
7 the document.

8 Cody Bartley then addressed the inspection section, stating he believed inspection
9 stood alone and was not different for PCS versus project-specific. He asked the
10 Subcommittee to challenge this if wrong.

11 • Scott Karpinen responded with curiosity, noting the PCS is a different animal in
12 how inspectors are developed.

13 • Cody Bartley explained that even with a project-specific pre-approval, the same
14 level of understanding with inspections is needed.

15 • Michael Davis agreed with Cody Bartley, stating the discussion was not about
16 manufactured components where the IOR would not be involved (such as air
17 handlers), as IORs typically would not go to manufacturing operations. He stated
18 both should be the same.

19 Cody Bartley confirmed inspections would remain as one section in the advisory guide
20 and noted he had added a lot of words in that section. He mentioned the fire life safety
21 input from Nanci would be threaded into the advisory guide.

22 Cody Bartley discussed the vendor feedback section, stating he would summarize
23 feedback from the three vendors as experiences with the process. He noted he had
24 reviewed all other advisory guides and they did not highlight specific projects, so there
25 was no precedent. He proposed moving away from calling out three specific projects,
26 suggesting that highlighting specific projects could feel like favoritism in a formal
27 advisory guide.

28 Cody Bartley confirmed he would remove the specific project examples and instead use
29 broader examples of prefabrication. He mentioned the Q&A section at the end.

30 Cody Bartely addressed Belinda Young's previous question about the architect
31 component, stating he was not seeing as heavy of a lift since the focus was on pushing
32 vendors and manufacturers to pursue pre-approvals. He noted he would check with
33 Belinda to make sure other parts needed reinforcement.

1 Cody Bartley then discussed the Q&A from the 2024 webinar, stating he had populated
2 a spreadsheet with answers under his name and where he thought HCAI staff should
3 weigh in. He requested HCAI staff feedback before the document goes out.

4 • Veronica Yuke asked how soon responses were needed. Cody requested a
5 couple of weeks before the next meeting.

6 • Carl Newth asked about out-of-country fabricated items and whether limiting it to
7 North America would restrict obtaining desired products.

8 • Arash Altoontash (HCAI) responded that technically the location could not be
9 limited to a certain region as it did not follow the principles of a free market. He
10 explained that fabrication can happen anywhere but is subject to inspection as
11 required by the California Building Code, making attempts to limit geographical
12 location moot.

13 • Ali Sumer added that while location could not be limited, HCAI was aware of low-
14 quality out-of-country fabrication, with requirements being the same wherever the
15 work is done. He cautioned about quality and noted facilities should be aware of
16 resolutions if quality issues arise.

17 • Michael Davis shared an experience from his father, who was an IOR on a Hoge
18 project where base isolators were manufactured in England. His father traveled
19 to England and inspected them, and the processes were pretty much identical,
20 demonstrating that out-of-country fabrication can be done successfully.

21 Cody Bartley asked Michael Davis to help elaborate on out-of-country inspection
22 considerations in the inspection section of the white paper, and Michael Davis agreed.

23 Cody Bartley summarized his action items: thread HCAI's feedback into the process
24 section, work with Michael Davis on out-of-country inspections, and incorporate Nanci
25 Timmin's fire and life safety content.

26 • Alireza Asgari clarified the tasks were to write about OPM and provide questions
27 and answers.

28 • Cody Bartley confirmed and noted the document was becoming over ten pages,
29 so once the outline and structure were complete, the next meeting would be final
30 review and approval.

31 **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

32 • Scott Karpinen provided agreement on focusing the document on pre-approved
33 fabricated components and systems.

34 • Carl Newth asked about out-of-country fabricated items and limitations.

- 1 • Michael Davis shared his father's IOR experience with base isolators
2 manufactured in England.
- 3 • Alireza Asgari asked clarifying questions about pre-approval scope and tasks.
- 4 • Ali Sumer provided HCAI input on facility-specific pre-approvals and OPM.
- 5 • Arash Altoontash provided HCAI input on geographical limitations.

6 **Informational and Action Items**

- 7 • The document is transitioning from a white paper to an advisory guide.
- 8 • The advisory guide will focus on pre-approved fabricated components and
9 systems, not all of prefabrication.
- 10 • The process section will be split into three components covering PCS, OPM
11 (brief overview), and facility-specific pre-approvals.
- 12 • The inspection section will remain consolidated as one section. Specific project
13 examples will be removed in favor of broader examples.
- 14 • Cody Bartley will thread HCAI's feedback into the process section, incorporate
15 Nanci's fire life safety content, and develop the rest of the document.
- 16 • Michael Davis will help elaborate on out-of-country inspections.
- 17 • HCAI will provide words on the OPM process and review/respond to the Q&A
18 spreadsheet within a couple of weeks before the next meeting.
- 19 • The next meeting will serve as final review and approval of the advisory guide.

20 **5. Review Q&A from the June 25, 2024, “Preapproved Fabricated Components 21 and Systems” webinar**

22 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair (or designee)

23 **Discussion and Input**

24 Cody Bartley stated he had populated some answers and the next step was getting it
25 into HCAI staff hands and aligning on the answers.

26 Cody Bartley walked through each question. For the first question on scope gaps and
27 how to mitigate them, he stated this was a GC question requiring clear delineation of
28 scope, usually shown at the shop drawing level detail, understanding the product, and
29 handoffs required to complete install. He characterized this as a scope writing question.

30 On the question of scale or size that benefits from prefabrication, Cody Bartley
31 explained each pre-approved prefabricated product has a different threshold (SurePods
32 differs from DuraFuse steel frame system), so analysis must be project specific.

1 On the question about prefab process utilizing union labor, he stated this is not a factor
2 in pre-approvals by HCAI but rather a project-specific labor requirement that could vary
3 by project. Union labor is not something a pre-approval addresses.

4 On lessons learned associated with installation of prefabricated components and
5 tolerances, Cody Bartley noted that answering without a specific product being
6 discussed was difficult. He stated lessons learned would depend on the pre-fabricated
7 components being discussed and would be addressed in follow-up webinars, with a
8 request for people to reach out with specific questions.

9 On medical equipment (MEQ) changes during the design phase, Cody Bartley
10 acknowledged MEQ tends to be updated frequently and users want the latest and
11 greatest. He stated changes to MEQ equipment after permit approval need to be
12 updated through the ACD process to update anchorage requirements shown in the
13 approved drawings, noting this is a real-life scenario.

14 Cody Bartley noted the out-of-state question had already been discussed. On the
15 question about needing a larger cohort of IORs to handle this track, he stated HCAI is
16 actively recruiting IORs dedicated to meeting industry demands. He explained that he
17 marked it with "HCAI Staff ?" because he was hesitant to weigh in on sensitive areas
18 like bathrooms and air handlers, and acknowledged that HCAI had good words and a
19 prepared answer for that.

20 On whether items need to be inspected by project, Cody Bartley stated yes, but asked
21 HCAI to confirm. On the workload and prefabrication approach question, he responded
22 that HCAI and IOR should be involved in the prefabrication discussion before the
23 product arrives onsite to ensure buy-in on how it would be reviewed.

24 On shop drawing review between DPOR and offsite contractors, Cody Bartley stated
25 DPOR should review all shop drawings regarding prefabrication. He recommended
26 DPOR meet with any offsite contractors of prefabricated components to understand the
27 product. He placed responsibility on the design professional of record to understand the
28 product and what is shown in the drawings to complete the install. His advice was for
29 DPORs to visit the facility and see the product firsthand, though he requested HCAI
30 weigh in.

31 On continuous inspection of work, Cody Bartley acknowledged HCAI had already
32 discussed this and had a good answer. On the question of prefab module products
33 going through a PCS, he noted this was project-specific or facility-specific, confirming it
34 can be done but not as a pre-approval already accepted.

35 Cody Bartley noted he had populated some answers and asked HCAI to read and
36 wordsmith them as needed. He stated the subcommittee did not need to waste time

1 going through all of them and proposed exchanging emails between now and the next
2 meeting to button up this section.

- 3 • Veronica Yuke clarified that HCAI would send directly to Cody.
 - 4 ○ Cody confirmed they would send directly back and stated once the
 - 5 spreadsheet and answers were populated, the entire finalized version
 - 6 would be sent to the group before the next meeting for review. He stated
 - 7 the next meeting would review a finalized advisory guide and finalized
 - 8 Q&A getting ready to publish.
- 9 • Veronica Yuke requested HBSB staff be included in the back-and-forth
- 10 exchanges to maintain history of all documents.
 - 11 ○ Michael Davis agreed.

12 Cody asked Marcus Palmer if he had the printed copy.

- 13 • Alireza Asgari confirmed Evett Torres had sent the email with the attachment.

14 **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

- 15 • Veronica Yuke requested HBSB staff be included in email exchanges for
- 16 document history.
- 17 • Alireza Asgari confirmed receipt of the Q&A attachment from Evett Torres.

18 **Informational and Action Items**

- 19 • HCAI will review and provide feedback on the Q&A spreadsheet that Cody
- 20 Bartley has populated with answers.
- 21 • Emails will be exchanged directly between HCAI and Cody Bartle, with HBSB
- 22 staff included for document history.
- 23 • Once finalized, the entire spreadsheet and answers will be sent to the group
- 24 before the next meeting.
- 25 • The next meeting will review the finalized advisory guide and finalized Q&A in
- 26 preparation for publishing.

27

28 **6. Determine timeline for deliverables and schedule next meeting**

29 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair (or designee)

30 **Discussion and Input**

1 Cody Bartley stated he had most of the finalization in hand and had asked for items
2 from a few people, acknowledging everyone was busy. He proposed targeting a next
3 meeting at the end of June.

4 • Veronica Yuke and Evett Torres discussed availability, with Evett Torres noting
5 the week of June 22nd appeared open. Cody Bartely proposed Wednesday,
6 June 24th.

7 • Carl Newth stated he would be on vacation that week and unavailable.
8 Cody Bartley asked about the week prior. Carl Newth confirmed that week would
9 work, noting Friday was a holiday but other days were available.

10 • Veronica Yuke noted that there was an HBSB Committee meeting scheduled on
11 June 18th. She proposed the 17th and confirmed the 17th would provide enough
12 time to get the agenda out and asked whether it provided enough time for HCAI
13 to get responses back.

14 ○ Cody Bartely confirmed five to six weeks would be sufficient.

15 Cody Bartley set the next meeting for June 17th and proposed getting all questions and
16 answers, the OPMs, and Michael Davis's section within two to three weeks to allow two
17 weeks for incorporation.

18 ○ Michael Davis confirmed.

19 • Alireza Asgari asked for the Q&A document in Excel format instead of PDF, as it
20 was easier to write in.

21 ○ Cody confirmed he had sent the Excel previously. Evett Torres offered to
22 resend the document, noting one version had been reformatted.

23 • Evett Torres asked whether the Q&A would be posted with the agenda. Cody
24 confirmed yes. Evett Torres stated it would need to be received by June 3rd.

25 ○ Cody acknowledged this gave three weeks for populated responses and
26 asked Alireza Asgari if that felt acceptable.

27 ■ Alireza Asgari responded he would try.

28 Cody Bartley proposed that anything not completed could be brought to the next
29 meeting for group discussion and agreement.

30 ○ Veronica Yuke stated it could still be brought but could not be included in
31 pre-preliminary documents.

32 Cody Bartley confirmed June 3rd was the deadline to send the agenda. He asked
33 whether the outline needed to be posted at the same time.

- 1 ○ Veronica Yuke confirmed June 3rd was the posting date because of the
- 2 10-day public notice requirement.
- 3 ● Evett Torres clarified the agenda needed to be posted by the 5th, but the 3rd
- 4 provided enough time to remediate. She added she would need an agenda from
- 5 Cody Bartley approximately two weeks before that.
- 6 ● Veronica Yuke explained the Q&As could be placed on the agenda without being
- 7 included as an attachment and could be presented at the meeting.
- 8 ● Alireza Asgari asked for clarification on when responses should be sent.
- 9 Veronica Yuke responded there was wiggle room and Cody Bartley could work
- 10 with Alireza Asgari on the date, as long as it was included in the PowerPoint
- 11 before the meeting.
- 12 ○ Evett Torres clarified that if it was only to be shown at the meeting without
- 13 making it publicly available beforehand, she would need it the day before
- 14 the meeting.

15 Cody Bartely confirmed content could trickle in after June 3rd while the agenda could be
16 set without that content. He summarized the action items and the next meeting plan.

17 Cody Bartely confirmed the next meeting would review the draft finalized version of the
18 advisory guide and finalized Q&A, with hopes of being close to publishing after that
19 meeting. He acknowledged the document was large with a lot to pull together and
20 thanked everyone for their attention and participation.

21 **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

- 22 ● Michael Davis confirmed his deliverable timeline.
- 23 ● Alireza Asgari requested the Q&A in Excel format and asked for clarification on
- 24 response deadlines.
- 25 ● Evett Torres clarified posting and submission timelines.

26 **Informational and Action Items**

- 27 ● The next meeting will be held on June 17th.
- 28 ● Cody Bartley will send the agenda by June 3rd to meet the 10-day public notice
- 29 requirement.
- 30 ● The agenda will be posted, but the outline does not need to be posted at the
- 31 same time.
- 32 ● Q&A can be placed on the agenda without being included as an attachment.
- 33 ● HCAI, Michael Davis, and other contributors will provide their sections within two
- 34 to three weeks to allow two weeks for incorporation.

- 1 • Evett Torres will resend the Q&A document in Excel format. Content that is not
2 finalized by June 3rd can be discussed at the next meeting.
- 3 • The next meeting will review the finalized advisory guide and finalized Q&A in
4 preparation for publishing.

5

6 **7. Comments from the Public/Subcommittee Members on Issues not on this**
7 **agenda. The subcommittee will receive comments from the Public/Subcommittee**
8 **Members. Matters raised at this time may be taken under consideration for**
9 **placement on a subsequent agenda.**

10 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair (or designee)

11 Cody Bartley gave one more opportunity for public or subcommittee members to make
12 comments on items not on the agenda.

13

14 **8. Adjournment**

15 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair (or designee)

16 Cody Bartley thanked everyone and formally adjourned the HBSB Ad hoc How to Guide
17 Development for Pre-Approved Fabricated Components and Systems Subcommittee
18 meeting at 10:49 a.m.