



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



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

**Wednesday, March 12, 2025  
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

### **Locations:**

2020 West El Camino Ave, Conference Room 930, Sacramento, CA 95833  
355 South Grand Avenue, Conference Room 1901, Los Angeles, CA 90071

### **Committee Members Present**

Jim Malley, Chair  
Michael Davis  
Teresa Endres  
Martin Hudson  
Courtney Johnson  
Jennifer Thornburg

### **Consulting Member Present**

Mark Hershberg

### **HCAI Staff Present**

Chris Tokas, OSHPD Deputy Director  
Arash Altoontash  
Richard Tannahill  
Roy Lobo  
Mia Marvelli  
Ali Sumer  
Andia Farzaneh

### **HBSB Staff Present**

Veronica Yuke, Executive Director  
Marcus Palmer  
Evet Torres

## **1. Call to Order and Welcome**

**Facilitator:** Jim Malley, SE, Senior Principal, Degenkolb Engineers; Committee Chair  
(or designee)

Jim Malley called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on March 12, 2025. He welcomed all attendees, confirmed audio/visual connections with Los Angeles, and initiated the meeting of the Hospital Building Safety Board Structural and Nonstructural Regulations Committee.

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

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

Veronica Yuke conducted the roll call, confirming that a quorum was present. She reviewed expectations for virtual participation, including muting when not speaking, chat/reactions protocol, and identifying oneself before speaking.

## **3. Triennial Code Cycle update and timelines on proposed amendments to the 2025 California Building Standards Code Title 24, Part 1, Part 2, and Part 10**

**Facilitator:** Mia Marvelli, Architect, Supervisor; HCAI (or designee)

### **Discussion and Input:**

Mia Marvelli presented an update on the status and upcoming actions for the 2025 California Building Standards Code (Title 24, Parts 1, 2, and 10). She explained that:

- In December 2024 and February 2025, the California Building Standards Commission (CBSC) adopted all agency rulemaking proposals.
- These proposals now form the 2025 version of the codes, incorporating new model codes reviewed by multiple committees, including Structural and Nonstructural Regulations.
- The official publication will be available July 2025 with an effective date of January 1, 2026.

Mia Marvelli emphasized that they have moved on to working on the Intervening Code Cycle Supplement (“blue pages”), which will become effective July 1, 2027. She provided a timeline detailing internal deadlines, review cycles, and expected board actions:

- Internal code discussions: January–June 2025
- Deputy Director review: July 2025
- Codes and Processes Committee preliminary overview: May 2025
- Formal review meetings:
  - Codes and Processes Committee: September 10, 2025
  - SNSR Committee: October 2025
  - Full Board approval: December 2025
- Final submittal to CBSC: December 1, 2025

She noted that most amendments will affect the Administrative Code, Building Code Volume 2, and the Existing Building Code.

1 In addition to structural updates, Mia Marvelli outlined HCAI's involvement in ongoing  
2 code assessments, including:

- 3 • Reviewing Tentative Interim Amendments (TIAs) from NFPA and other model  
4 code agencies.
- 5 • Updating reference standards as national code committees introduce changes.
- 6 • Incorporating feedback from stakeholder queries and clarifying ambiguous code  
7 provisions.
- 8 • Supporting legislative implementation such as SB 1382, which affects OSHPD 3  
9 clinic code changes for alternative birthing clinics.

#### 10 **Informational and Action Items:**

- 11 • Publication of 2025 code is scheduled for July 2025.
- 12 • Effective date of new code: January 1, 2026.
- 13 • Next priorities: Prepare 2025 Supplement and finalize changes for submission by  
14 December 2025.
- 15 • HCAI to hold two public meetings regarding SB 1382 and stakeholder feedback  
16 sessions with CPCA and other clinic organizations.

#### 17 **Committee and Public Comments:**

- 18 • Teresa Endres (Board Member) asked for clarification on:
  - 19 ○ The meaning of "TIA" — Mia Marvelli explained it stands for Tentative  
20 Interim Amendment, typically issued by national code bodies like NFPA.  
21 California reviews and selectively adopts these through its formal process.
  - 22 ○ How external input from architects and stakeholders can be submitted;  
23 Mia directed feedback to the Regs Unit email.
  - 24 ○ She referenced a plumbing fixture code concern as an example and  
25 raised issues around defining mobile equipment in design documents.
- 26 • Chris Tokas and Mia Marvelli contributed clarifications:
  - 27 ○ Chris Tokas explained past efforts to define and differentiate mobile vs.  
28 fixed counters and their structural attachment implications.
  - 29 ○ Mia Marvelli elaborated on how these code clarification requests  
30 contribute to the annual list of recommended code changes.

1 **4. Streamlining the use of existing OSHPD Preapproval Programs to align with**  
2 **the new nonstructural component force equation in ASCE 7-22**

3 **Facilitator:** Timothy Piland, SE, Senior Structural Engineer; HCAI (or designee)

4 **Discussion and Input:**

5 Timothy Piland presented an update on changes related to preapproval programs in  
6 response to the updated ASCE 7-22 structural provisions, now incorporated into the  
7 2025 California Building Code (CBC). He emphasized that significant updates to  
8 equation 13.3-1 and tables 13.5-1 and 13.6-1 affect force calculations for architectural  
9 and mechanical components.

10 To address these changes, HCAI developed a simplified compliance approach and  
11 created a free educational webinar, scheduled for Wednesday, April 9, 2025. The  
12 webinar will:

- 13 • Explain the modifications to  $F_p$ , the design force variable.
- 14 • Review the new variables introduced in Chapter 13.
- 15 • Clarify implications for both the OSP (Special Seismic Certification Preapproval)  
16 and OPM (Preapproval of Manufacturer's Certification) programs.
- 17 • Provide examples for applying the new design approach in real projects.
- 18 • Outline new requirements for submittals under the updated standards.

19 Timothy Piland noted that:

- 20 • The webinar flyer was distributed to over 1,100 recipients, including engineers,  
21 manufacturers, and design professionals involved in preapproval programs.
- 22 • Over 400 people had already registered.
- 23 • The goal is to support proactive adoption of the new standards and reduce  
24 confusion over force amplification methods under ASCE 7-22.

25 **Informational and Action Items:**

- 26 • Webinar Date: April 9, 2025
- 27 • Topic: Transitioning OSHPD OSP and OPM programs to ASCE 7-22
- 28 • Distribution: Notification sent to manufacturers, licensed engineers, and  
29 stakeholders
- 30 • Objective: Facilitate consistent implementation and reduce design errors under  
31 the new force equations

## **Committee and Public Comments:**

- Teresa Endres asked whether the webinar would be available on the HCAI website.
  - Timothy Piland confirmed that it would be posted under the Webinars page on the HCAI site.
- Jim Malley expressed appreciation for the timing and clarity of the webinar, noting the complexity and impact of the ASCE 7-22 updates on design calculations. He commended the HCAI team for staying ahead of industry needs and helping standardize the implementation process.

## **5. Policy Intent Notice (PIN) 77 for Steel Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC)**

**Facilitator:** Roy Lobo, Principal Structural Engineer, HCAI (on behalf of Mohammad Karim, PhD, SE, Supervisor, HCAI)

### **Discussion and Input:**

Roy Lobo delivered an update on Policy Intent Notice (PIN) 77, confirming that the document is now officially published and available on the HCAI website. PIN 77 establishes updated guidelines for Steel Quality Assurance and Quality Control, specifically targeting construction submittals and inspections involving steel components in healthcare facilities.

Roy Lobo clarified that:

- PIN 77 was already presented in detail during the previous Structural and Nonstructural Regulations Committee meeting, where it was reviewed with comprehensive commentary.
- The current session served to formally announce its publication and inform the committee that it is ready for application in both current and upcoming submittals.

### **Informational and Action Items:**

- PIN 77 provides clear, codified standards for QA/QC related to steel fabrication and erection.
- PIN 77 – Steel QA/QC is available for public download on HCAI Website
- New projects designed under the 2025 code cycle may incorporate PIN 77 directly.
- For existing projects, applicants must revise their already-approved specifications and submittals if they choose to apply PIN 77 retroactively. Roy Lobo indicated

1 that these revisions may involve updates to the project's TIO forms and  
2 referenced standards.

### 3 **Committee and Public Comments:**

- 4 • Jim Malley asked for clarification on how PIN 77 applies to active versus future  
5 submittals.
  - 6 ○ Roy Lobo responded that for 2025 code projects, the use of PIN 77 is  
7 straightforward and encouraged.
  - 8 ○ For previously approved projects, applying PIN 77 would require  
9 modification of submitted documents, guided by a footnote in the PIN that  
10 explains the transition procedure.
- 11 • Jim Malley acknowledged the guidance as a valuable step forward in steel  
12 QA/QC protocols and thanked Roy Lobo for the update.

### 14 **6. New automated Seismic Compliance Project portal to facilitate submittals of** 15 **updated compliance plans**

16 **Facilitator:** Ali Sumer, PhD, SE, Supervisor, HCAI (or designee)

#### 17 **Discussion and Input:**

18 Ali Sumer introduced the new automated seismic compliance project portal, developed  
19 to modernize and streamline the submission process for seismic compliance plans. He  
20 explained that while the fundamental requirements for seismic compliance plans have  
21 remained unchanged since 1994, the method of submission has evolved; from paper, to  
22 PDF, to now a dynamic, interactive online portal launched on March 3, 2025.

23 Ali Sumer emphasized that the new system:

- 24 • Supports facilities in fulfilling updated regulatory obligations by January 1, 2026.
- 25 • Enables each hospital to submit a building-by-building compliance plan,  
26 specifying whether they will retrofit, demolish, replace, or otherwise address  
27 seismic risks.
- 28 • Allows facilities to report on SPC and NPC statuses for each building.

29 The new portal includes:

- 30 • Prepopulated building data for each facility (i.e., building names, SPC/NPC  
31 ratings).
- 32 • Drop-down menus for compliance strategy selection.

- Detailed milestone tracking and self-reported status updates (i.e., “Not Started,” “In Progress,” “Completed”).
- HCAI review/comment fields for each building line item.
- A built-in “Critical Milestones” mechanism to determine if facilities remain on track toward seismic compliance by 2030 or extended deadlines.

The interface was designed using a user-centered design approach to ensure accessibility and ease of use, even for smaller or rural hospitals. A user guide and PIN 80 accompany the release, detailing procedures for both compliance plan submissions and applications for delay under AB 869.

Ali Sumer confirmed that all submitted compliance plans and HCAI determinations will be publicly visible on the HCAI website to promote transparency and accountability.

#### **Informational and Action Items:**

- Portal Launch: March 3, 2025
- Compliance Plan Deadline: January 1, 2026
- Facilities must specify:
  - Compliance methods - demo, retrofit, replacement
  - Related milestones and timeline
- PIN 80 published March 4, 2025, outlines compliance requirements and delay procedures
- HCAI to provide ongoing feedback and field verification of milestone statuses
- Critical milestones will be used to determine overall project progress and risk of noncompliance

#### **Committee and Public Comments:**

- Martin Hudson asked whether users had begun engaging with the portal and whether feedback had been received.
  - Ali Sumer responded that an application was submitted the same day the webinar aired and that additional questions have been received mainly from smaller hospitals needing clarification on SPC/NPC concepts.
  - He confirmed that user response has been positive, and early questions indicate facilities understand the concept well.
- Jim Malley asked about roles and responsibilities in completing the portal application.

- Ali Sumer clarified that administrators, contractors, or design professionals can complete the submittals as long as they have the facility's unique PIN and password.
- Chris Tokas elaborated on the design philosophy, emphasizing a “human-centered” approach aimed at:
  - Reducing back-and-forth delays
  - Eliminating bureaucratic complexity
  - Promoting accurate, timely submissions
- Jim Malley and Chris Tokas further discussed the statutory requirement that compliance plans remain current and updated throughout the life of the project—a requirement that has historically been neglected.

## **7. Advisory Guide: A13 – NPC Upgrade Construction Process for Existing Ceilings and Above Ceiling Utilities**

**Facilitator:** Ali Sumer (or designee)

### **Discussion and Input:**

Ali Sumer provided a detailed overview of Advisory Guide A13, which introduces an alternative method for completing NPC upgrade projects involving existing utility systems located above ceilings in hospital facilities.

Ali Sumer explained that this guide is specific to NPC utility upgrades and is not intended for projects involving equipment upgrades, tenant improvements, or new construction. The A13 guide is intended for facilities where existing conditions are largely unknown—a common situation in older or complex hospital buildings.

Ali Sumer emphasized that the A13 approach:

- Is most effective when documentation is limited, or ceiling access is constrained.
- Allows phased, strategic construction activities by splitting the scope into manageable zones (i.e., ICU, radiology).
- Facilitates a survey-as-you-go process, where details are refined in the field based on what is discovered during ceiling access.
- Encourages using typical details selected from OSHPD Preapproval Manuals appropriate to each building's construction type (wood or concrete), while prohibiting blanket inclusion of entire OPMs.

The process includes:



1. Initial preparation of typical details and building-specific information.
2. Permit issuance under a T&M basis.
3. First on-site assessment, where the design professional, contractor, and HCAI field staff jointly evaluate existing conditions.
4. Field installation of bracing and upgrades as needed.
5. Completion of each milestone area with ongoing layout drawing updates and thorough photo documentation.
6. Final submittal of “as-built” drawings to close out the project.

He emphasized that design professionals, not contractors, must lead field decisions, and that photo documentation is critical throughout the project lifecycle.

Ali Sumer further explained the decision-making process:

- If most conditions are known, the standard NPC submittal process is more efficient.
- If conditions are unknown or complex, the A13 guide is ideal, even though it requires more engagement from field staff and designers.

He also noted that if a new condition is discovered mid-project, a new OPM detail may be submitted as a Non-Material Amendment. If further customization is needed, an ACD is required.

The guide promotes transparency and accountability by requiring each milestone’s closure to be verified by HCAI field staff.

#### **Informational and Action Items:**

- Advisory Guide A13 is available online and will be featured in a dedicated webinar on Tuesday, March 18, 2025.
- The process is intended to:
  - Simplify NPC upgrades for unknown conditions.
  - Reduce planning-phase uncertainty.
  - Increase adaptability for hospitals during phased construction.
- Design professionals must:
  - Maintain updated layout drawings throughout the project.
  - Submit as-built documentation for final approval.

- HCAI will perform spot checks to verify work before milestone sign-off.

## **Committee and Public Comments:**

- Teresa Endres expressed appreciation for the inclusion of two flowcharts that explain when and how to use the A13 guide.
  - She emphasized how critical it is to take lots of photos, noting that even experienced teams often forget to document essential components once ceilings are closed.
  - Teresa Endres thanked Ali Sumer for helping non-engineers clearly understand the process.
- Martin Hudson asked whether LiDAR technology was being used to map above-ceiling spaces.
  - Ali Sumer confirmed that LiDAR is increasingly used, especially in complex environments, although limitations exist in congested areas.
  - Jim Malley added that his firm uses LiDAR frequently and recently adopted wearable shoulder-mounted scanners to increase mobility and capture quality. He noted LiDAR's particular usefulness in mechanical rooms and subgrade spaces but acknowledged its limitations above ceilings.
- Chris Tokas reiterated the importance of simplifying processes on the front end to minimize back-and-forth corrections during construction. He emphasized that the process was designed with both technical reliability and user accessibility in mind.

## **8. Seismic compliance update on recently signed legislation: AB 869 (Chapter 801), and PIN development**

**Facilitator:** Ali Sumer (or designee)

### **Discussion and Input:**

Ali Sumer presented a comprehensive overview of the seismic compliance updates related to AB 869 and the development of PIN 80. He stated that AB 869, signed into law in late 2024, allows certain qualifying hospitals to request a three-year extension beyond the original January 1, 2030, seismic compliance deadline. This extension is specifically for hospitals demonstrating financial distress or other qualifying conditions.

Ali Sumer noted that the compliance plan portal, launched on March 3, 2025, was designed to support this legislative change and aligns with the new regulatory requirements. Alongside the portal, PIN 80 was released on March 4, 2025, providing

procedural guidance for both standard seismic compliance plan submissions and delay applications under AB 869.

Ali Sumer clarified the eligibility criteria under AB 869, which applies to:

- Distressed hospital loan program recipients.
- Small and rural hospitals.
- Critical access hospitals.
- District hospitals with specific exceptions.

To be eligible, hospitals must:

- Submit an NPC-5 report by January 1, 2025 (an extension of the original January 1, 2024, deadline).
- Submit an updated compliance plan by January 1, 2026, using the automated portal.

Ali Sumer explained that hospitals requesting a delay must outline:

- A building-by-building compliance strategy.
- A clearly defined list of milestones and completion dates.
- A justification for the requested delay, including supporting financial documentation and explanations of conditions beyond the hospital's control.

Ali Sumer emphasized that while a three-year extension is permitted under the law, an additional two-year extension may also be granted in the future if the hospital demonstrates a new hardship that is clearly outside its control. However, applications for this further extension will not be considered until after January 1, 2030.

He also clarified that while hospitals may request extensions, interim deadlines for planning and design submissions, 2026 and 2028, remain unchanged. These interim benchmarks ensure that hospitals continue progressing toward final compliance, regardless of eligibility for delay.

Ali Sumer shared that HCAI has identified 130 potential facilities that may qualify under AB 869, though not all may meet the final eligibility requirements. To aid transparency, HCAI published a list and encouraged facilities to review it and reach out with clarifications or disputes.

Additionally, HCAI incorporated flowcharts into the application guide to help facilities:

- Determine eligibility.

- Understand required documentation.
- Navigate the application process and updates.
- Plan for revisions in case of evolving circumstances.

The delay application itself is designed to be simple:

- One text box to enter the proposed new compliance date.
- Upload fields for financial and operational documentation supporting the delay request.

Ali Sumer reiterated that HCAI will respond to each application within 120 days of submission, as required by the statute. He encouraged early submissions, noting that while responses may be rapid during normal operations, mass last-minute submissions may take the full review period.

Finally, Ali Sumer reiterated that compliance plan milestones will be tracked through the same online portal for all facilities, but additional monitoring and accountability will apply to those receiving a delay. These include:

- \$5,000 per day fines for deviations from the approved milestones.
- Delays in issuing permits if noncompliance is identified.

#### **Informational and Action Items:**

- AB 869 allows a three-year seismic compliance extension to January 1, 2033.
- Facilities must:
  - Submit NPC-5 reports by January 1, 2025.
  - Submit updated compliance plans by January 1, 2026.
  - Use the new automated portal to apply for delay extensions.
- PIN 80, released on March 4, 2025, provides step-by-step guidance.
- HCAI may approve additional two-year extensions after January 1, 2030, based on future circumstances.
- Enforcement mechanisms include daily fines and permit holds for noncompliance.
- Applications require documentation of financial hardship or external constraints.

#### **Committee and Public Comments:**

- Teresa Endres asked whether PIN 80 applies only to facilities requesting delay under AB 869.

- Ali Sumer clarified that PIN 80 covers both standard compliance plans and delay applications. While the delay process applies only to a subset of facilities, all facilities are required to submit updated compliance plans.

## **9. Proposed Requirement for Amplification of Diaphragm Transfer Shears by $W_0$ and $R_{upper}/R_{lower}$ in building when a Type 4 out-of-plane irregularity is triggered by a stiffness irregularity, using the Two-stage analysis procedure in ASCE 7**

**Facilitator:** Roy Lobo, PhD, SE, Principal Structural Engineer, HCAI (or designee)

### **Discussion and Input:**

Roy Lobo presented a highly technical proposal addressing how diaphragm transfer shears should be amplified in buildings that exhibit a Type 4 out-of-plane irregularity, particularly when such irregularities are triggered by stiffness discontinuities and evaluated using the two-stage analysis procedure from ASCE 7.

Roy Lobo explained that in many podium-type structures, where a flexible upper structure sits atop a stiff lower podium, the diaphragm often acts as a load transfer mechanism between the dissimilar systems. Current modeling and design practices may not sufficiently account for the amplification of diaphragm shears due to this stiffness discontinuity.

He proposed requiring that:

- Diaphragm transfer shears be amplified by the overstrength factor ( $W_0$ ), and by the ratio of  $R_{upper}$  to  $R_{lower}$ , where  $R$  represents the response modification coefficient for the respective structural system.
- This approach ensures that diaphragm forces reflect the actual redistribution of loads between the two stages of structural systems in dual-response buildings.

Roy Lobo provided justification for the proposed changes based on:

- Nonlinear finite element analysis conducted on a 7-story building that exhibited this irregularity.
- The analysis demonstrated significant underestimation of diaphragm forces when these amplifications were not applied.
- By using the proposed amplification, engineers would better capture force redistribution effects and ensure safer, code-compliant designs.

He shared a summary of the technical study results, including visual outputs of the model showing:

- Force concentrations in the diaphragm under lateral load.
- Significant increase in diaphragm demands when considering stiffness, irregularities and dynamic amplification factors.
- Roy Lobo clarified that this proposed change would not apply to all buildings, but only to:
  - Structures using the two-stage analysis method.
  - Buildings triggering a Type 4 vertical irregularity based on stiffness contrast.
  - Diaphragms functioning as transfer elements between different structural systems.

He also highlighted that this issue is especially relevant in healthcare facility design, where mixed system configurations and performance-based designs are frequently used.

Roy Lobo concluded by recommending that the committee consider incorporating this requirement into California amendments to the 2025 California Building Code, specifically under the structural design provisions governing seismic load paths.

#### **Informational and Action Items:**

- Proposed requirement: Amplify diaphragm transfer shears by  $W_0 \times (R_{\text{upper}}/R_{\text{lower}})$ .
- Applies only to:
  - Structures using two-stage analysis.
  - Buildings exhibiting Type 4 out-of-plane vertical irregularities.
- Based on nonlinear analysis of a 7-story model demonstrating force underestimation in diaphragms.
- Proposal aims to improve seismic resilience and compliance with ASCE 7 modeling intent.
- HCAI will circulate the technical paper and model findings for review.

#### **Committee and Public Comments:**

- Several committee members acknowledged the complexity and specialized nature of the proposal.
- No specific objections or revisions were raised during the discussion.

- Jim Malley thanked Roy Lobo for the depth of analysis and clarity of the technical presentation, noting that this type of proposal reflects the committee’s critical responsibility in advancing seismic safety.

## **10. Proposed reduction of the Lower bound $F_p$ force requirement for design of nonstructural components in base isolated hospital buildings**

**Facilitator:** Roy Lobo, PhD, SE, Principal Structural Engineer, HCAI (or designee)

### **Discussion and Input:**

Roy Lobo presented a proposal to revise the minimum seismic design force ( $F_p$ ) requirement for nonstructural components located in base-isolated hospital buildings. He explained that current code requirements may overestimate the seismic demand on nonstructural elements in such systems, especially when compared to what dynamic analysis and actual performance suggest.

Roy Lobo began by providing context:

- The 2022 ASCE 7 Standard, adopted into the 2025 California Building Code, includes a lower-bound seismic force of  $0.3 SDS W_p$ , where:
- $SDS$  = design spectral acceleration.
- $W_p$  = component weight.
- This lower bound is not scaled for base-isolated systems, meaning that force reductions from isolation are not recognized in the minimum values.

Roy Lobo explained that this can lead to over-conservative designs, unnecessary bracing, and increased cost for nonstructural systems—despite the known performance benefits of base isolation in reducing seismic floor accelerations.

To support the proposed reduction, Roy Lobo referenced:

- A nonlinear time-history analysis performed on an actual base-isolated hospital building.
- The analysis showed that peak floor accelerations and component responses in isolated structures were consistently lower than in fixed-base counterparts.
- The study included multiple ground motion records and variations in component anchorage locations (i.e., roof, mid-height, near base).

Roy Lobo recommended that for base-isolated hospital buildings, the minimum force requirement for nonstructural component anchorage be reduced from  $0.3 SDS$

W<sub>p</sub> to 0.2 SDS W<sub>p</sub>, recognizing the benefit of reduced seismic input from the isolation system.

He noted that this change would:

- Maintain safety by aligning more closely with expected seismic performance.
- Offer cost savings in system bracing and anchorage requirements.
- Provide consistency with performance-based design principles.

Roy Lobo emphasized that this proposal would apply only to:

- Buildings using base isolation per CBC Chapter 16.
- Anchored nonstructural components that meet detailing and attachment criteria.
- Not applicable to equipment on isolation platforms, which are governed by different provisions.

He recommended that this proposed amendment be added to the California amendments for the 2025 code cycle and circulated for public and industry review.

#### **Informational and Action Items:**

- Proposed reduction of minimum anchorage force from 0.3 SDS W<sub>p</sub> to 0.2 SDS W<sub>p</sub> for nonstructural components in base-isolated buildings.
- Based on nonlinear time-history analysis demonstrating reduced floor accelerations in isolated systems.
- Aims to reduce unnecessary design conservatism and construction cost.
- Proposal applies only to:
  - Base-isolated hospital buildings
  - Anchored nonstructural components
- Excludes equipment mounted on isolated platforms.

#### **Committee and Public Comments:**

- Jim Malley thanked Roy Lobo for the technical justification and acknowledged the potential benefit to hospital projects that use seismic isolation.
- He recommended that the full technical study be shared with stakeholders for transparency and evaluation.



1 **11. Proposed removal or revision of California Building Code exceptions to AISC**  
2 **(American Institute of Steel Construction) design specifications**

3 **Facilitator:** Jim Malley, SE, Senior Principal Degenkolb Engineers, (or designee)

4 **Discussion and Input:**

5 Jim Malley presented a proposal to remove or revise certain California amendments to  
6 the AISC design specifications that are currently embedded in the CBC. He explained  
7 that many of these state-specific exceptions were added years ago and are now either  
8 obsolete, redundant, or in conflict with updated AISC national standards and  
9 methodologies.

10 Jim Malley identified specific examples of existing CBC exceptions that warrant review,  
11 including:

- 12 • Legacy references that override provisions in the current AISC 360 and AISC  
13 341 standards without offering clear justification.
- 14 • Exceptions that require additional detailing or analysis not consistent with current  
15 performance-based or code-based design approaches.
- 16 • California-specific language that creates confusion among engineers submitting  
17 plans across different jurisdictions.

18 He emphasized that removing or updating these exceptions would promote:

- 19 • Consistency between the California Building Code and nationally accepted AISC  
20 design methods.
- 21 • Improved clarity for structural engineers and plan reviewers.
- 22 • Fewer errors or delays during plan check, especially for engineers unfamiliar with  
23 California's unique amendments.

24 Jim Malley also pointed out that:

- 25 • The 2025 CBC already incorporates the latest AISC standards (including AISC  
26 360-22 and AISC 341-22), which reflect decades of research, practical lessons,  
27 and nationwide consensus. He noted that many of the older CBC exceptions  
28 were removed in the last CBC update leaving just a few issues to be considered.
- 29 • By continuing to retain outdated or unnecessary exceptions, California may  
30 inadvertently undermine the benefits of adopting modernized codes.

31 He proposed a systematic review of all current CBC exceptions to AISC specifications,  
32 with the goal of:

- 33 1. Eliminating exceptions that are no longer justified.

2. Clarifying the application of exceptions that may still serve a specific purpose and consider suggesting that AISC adopt the CBC language.

3. Aligning California code language more closely with AISC format and terminology.

Jim Malley noted that HCAI staff would prepare a side-by-side matrix comparing current California exceptions with the relevant AISC provisions to facilitate this effort. The committee would then review each item in a future meeting or working group session.

#### **Informational and Action Items:**

- Proposed removal or revision of outdated or conflicting California-specific exceptions to AISC 360 and AISC 341.
- Goal is to:
  - Eliminate confusion and outdated references.
  - Promote code alignment and reduce unnecessary design hurdles.
- HCAI to prepare a comparative analysis matrix of CBC exceptions vs. AISC standard provisions.
- The topic will return for further committee discussion and possible action in a future meeting.

#### **Committee and Public Comments:**

- Roy Lobo expressed support for the review process and agreed that alignment with AISC national standards would benefit the broader engineering community.
- Jim Malley reaffirmed the importance of transparency and consensus in the review, especially given the historical context behind some of the exceptions.
- No other committee members voiced objections or concerns.

### **12. Comments from the Public/Committee Members on Issues not on this Agenda**

**Facilitator:** Jim Malley (or designee)

#### **Discussion and Input:**

Jim Malley opened the floor for comments from both the committee members and the public regarding topics not listed on the current meeting agenda. He reminded attendees that while no formal discussion or action could be taken on off-agenda items during the meeting, these items could be considered for placement on a future agenda, in accordance with Government Code §§ 11125 and 11125.7(a).

## **Committee and Public Comments:**

- Jim Malley thanked committee members for their engagement and noted the value of maintaining an open channel for future input.
- Jim Malley acknowledged the public's continued interest and participation in the regulatory process and encouraged stakeholders to submit topics for future consideration through the appropriate HCAI contact channels.

## **13. Adjournment**

Jim Malley noted that several items discussed—particularly proposed structural code amendments—would return for further review or action in future meetings. He encouraged committee members to stay engaged and to begin reviewing materials that would be circulated in the coming months, including the matrix of AISC exceptions and supporting studies on seismic force modifications.

He also acknowledged the efforts of HCAI staff, particularly those responsible for launching the new seismic compliance portal and supporting documentation such as PIN 80 and Advisory Guide A-13.

Jim Malley officially adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:00 p.m.

This page left intentionally blank.