



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**

**February 12, 2026
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

Meeting Locations:

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, Subcommittee Chair
Belinda Young, Subcommittee Vice-Chair
Michael L. Davis
Gary Dunger
Carl Newth

HCAI Staff Present

Richard Tannahill

HBSB Staff

Veronica Yuke, HBSB Executive Director
Marcus Palmer
Evet Torres

Consulting Members Present

Scott Karpinen

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

2 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair

3 Cody Bartley called the meeting to order on February 12, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. for the
4 HBSB Ad Hoc How-To-Guide Development for Preapproved Fabricated Components
5 and Systems Subcommittee. He welcomed attendees and thanked participants for
6 joining the meeting.

7

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

2 **Facilitator:** Veronica Yuke, HCAI; HBSB Executive Director

3 Veronica Yuke conducted roll call and confirmed a quorum. She reviewed meeting
4 expectations and rules of engagement.

5

6 **3. Review and Discuss Introductory Materials**

7 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley

8 **Discussion and Input**

9 Cody Bartley opened the first kickoff meeting for “part two” of the effort that followed a
10 webinar held on June 25, 2024. He stated the committee’s objective: produce a white
11 paper that builds on the webinar content and helps people understand how to pursue
12 prefabrication and the OSHPD Preapproved Prefabricated Components and Systems
13 (PCS) program. He noted that the PCS program had not received new approvals since
14 the webinar and asked how to encourage participation.

15 Cody Bartley proposed initial white paper topics and invited input. He stated the white
16 paper should include definitions, including clarifying “preapproved” versus
17 “premanufactured,” and it should include step-by-step instructions for how to get items
18 approved, consistent with the process covered in the webinar.

- 19 • Richard Tannahill clarified that although no additional PCS applications had been
20 submitted, several projects used prefabricated components without PCS
21 preapproval. He confirmed the subcommittee should cover both approaches and
22 suggested adding more real-world examples.
- 23 • Cody Bartley agreed and emphasized broadening beyond PCS alone to include
24 project-level permitting of prefabricated components.
- 25 • Belinda Young suggested using project examples and lessons learned, including
26 UCSF Medical Center’s self-performed bathroom pods and Sutter Santa Clara’s
27 attempt to use SurePods while modifying an approved PCS due to design and
28 dimension changes. She also referenced Kaiser Roseville as a case study for
29 prefabricated headwalls and similar assemblies approved through project steps
30 rather than PCS.
- 31 • Richard Tannahill stated the SurePods PCS update was already in process.

32 Cody Bartley proposed inviting vendor presentations, including SurePods, to capture
33 the vendor perspective, hurdles, roadblocks, and hesitations encountered during the
34 PCS process.

- 1 • Richard Tannahill stated he had recently met with SurePods and would be
2 involved.
- 3 • Belinda Young asked whether a “white paper” differed from an advisory guide.
- 4 • Cody Bartley described the white paper as a broader, step-by-step document
5 that captures what the webinar covered and can include examples; he
6 referenced prior white papers, including one on instrumentation, as a model.
- 7 • Richard Tannahill stated the “white paper” direction came from Chris Tokas and
8 noted he was not fully familiar with Chris Tokas’ intent but said the
9 instrumentation white paper was done well.
- 10 • Belinda Young said the intended product sounded more like a guide and
11 suggested a white paper might be easier to draft and distribute.
- 12 • Richard Tannahill described the white paper as the study and information, and a
13 guide as a more OSHPD/HCAI-specific “how-to,” and he referenced microgrid
14 work that could lead to both products.

15 Cody Bartley reiterated a developing outline: definitions, the approval process, and
16 expanded examples. He asked whether additional content was needed beyond
17 definitions, process, and examples.

- 18 • Scott Karpinen asked whether the subcommittee received feedback or questions
19 after the webinar.
- 20 • Cody Bartley stated the webinar generated many questions, but the responses
21 had not been posted, and he said the Q&A should become part of the white
22 paper.
- 23 • Scott Karpinen suggested including an FAQ section, consistent with other
24 guides.
- 25 • Cody Bartley agreed and said the subcommittee could compile questions and
26 include answers in the white paper.
- 27 • Belinda Young identified inspection as a recurring industry concern and asked to
28 include how inspection items get incorporated into the Testing, Inspection and
29 Observation (TIO) Program and what inspection processes apply to
30 prefabrication.
- 31 • Michael Davis stated that Joe LaBrie visited SurePods and worked with the TIO
32 to set up a model, and Michael Davis suggested using that work as a foundation.
- 33 • Richard Tannahill noted Belinda Young worked extensively with the TIO on
34 Kaiser Roseville and suggested comparing approaches.

35 Cody Bartley summarized the emerging structure: definitions, process, examples,
36 inspections for vendor and non-vendor prefabrication, and a Q&A/FAQ section.

- 1 • Richard Tannahill recommended reviewing sample past white papers to ensure
2 the subcommittee did not miss key elements.

3 Cody Bartley then discussed industry trends related to prefabrication and preapprovals.
4 He stated he saw hesitation to use preapproval programs because participants felt their
5 information became public, leading teams to pursue project-specific prefabrication
6 instead of preapproval.

- 7 • Richard Tannahill agreed and said people did not want information to be public
8 while they were going through the process.

9 • Richard Tannahill described a lack of collaboration across projects and said
10 teams were recreating processes, including TIO development, because
11 information was not being shared. He said this effort should document what
12 worked and what did not, including inspection logistics, location considerations,
13 and pros and cons of preapprovals.

14 • Cody Bartley agreed and referenced industry competition as a barrier to sharing
15 lessons learned.

16 • Belinda Young described Kaiser Roseville as a case where the owner mandated
17 silo reduction and collaboration across design firms and contractors to share
18 lessons learned and support continuous improvement. She said process
19 improvements should not be treated as proprietary and suggested reeducation
20 on collaboration for the benefit of the industry.

21 Cody Bartley asked for an owner perspective and invited Gary Dunger to comment.

22 • Gary Dunger stated owners generally focus on the best delivery method at the
23 lowest cost and do not get heavily involved in means and methods if the process
24 functions. He said he personally supported prefabrication, called it the future, and
25 cited prefabricated patient bathroom pods as an example of a compelling
26 approach.

27 • Richard Tannahill stated HCAI could serve as an intermediary for sharing
28 knowledge because people were more willing to share with the agency than with
29 competitors. He said owners wanted to do prefabrication but did not want to start
30 from scratch.

31 Cody Bartley transitioned to reviewing the June 25, 2024, webinar as context for the
32 white paper. He described the webinar sections: definitions (which required significant
33 effort and repeated discussion), different stakeholder perspectives (architect and
34 contractor views), PCS as one “slice,” distinctions and examples, and the “why” for
35 prefabrication. He stated the subcommittee should carry forward prior definitions with
36 less rework. Cody Bartley said the white paper should include definitions, the “why”

1 section, and more examples than before, but he emphasized that implementation and
2 roadblocks for prefabrication should be the main focus.

3 Cody Bartley stated the webinar included input from fire life safety and said the white
4 paper should also include the fire life safety voice and considerations. He emphasized
5 the approval process and inspection content as core components of the future white
6 paper, including application steps, submittals, and related resources. He referenced
7 additional topics from the webinar such as offsite and onsite inspections,
8 weatherization, shipping, change management, and TIO-related items, and he noted the
9 subcommittee previously had to keep examples generic rather than naming specific
10 facilities.

- 11 • Scott Karpinen stated that inspection requirements were a key area of confusion,
12 particularly for mechanical prefabrication. He asked for clarification on when an
13 IOR is required, what welding can occur without an IOR, and what testing can
14 occur offsite, including pressure testing. Scott Karpinen asked Belinda Young
15 whether Kaiser Roseville used continuous or intermittent IOR presence at the
16 offsite warehouse.
- 17 • Belinda Young stated the project used multiple IORs and scheduled offsite
18 warehouse visits, with greater IOR presence during welding activities.
- 19 • Scott Karpinen reiterated the need for inspection clarification and described
20 varying direction from OSHPD inspectors regarding when inspectors must be
21 onsite versus reviewing work after the fact for items like boiler skids and welds.
- 22 • Carl Newth stated inspections may need to occur twice; once during factory
23 fabrication and again when the component becomes part of an onsite assembly
24 and said the white paper may need to address that assembly-level reinspection
25 concept.
- 26 • Cody Bartley stated that if the subcommittee had inspection questions, the
27 broader industry likely did as well. He said the process and inspections sections
28 appeared to be the key intent of the white paper.
- 29 • Michael Davis stated the white paper should describe general methodology, but
30 each project's TIO would vary depending on construction methods. He explained
31 that Joe LaBrie's SurePods work described an approach where the IOR might
32 not need to be present continuously; instead, the IOR could verify completed
33 work in intervals before production continues. Michael Davis said the
34 subcommittee should express the concept in a general way useful to design
35 teams and project-specific situations.
- 36 • Cody Bartley stated the subcommittee needed to obtain the information Joe
37 LaBrie developed.

1 Cody Bartley completed the webinar refresher, asked for any questions about what the
2 webinar covered, and then stated the subcommittee had discussed goals, reviewed the
3 past webinar, and discussed industry trends.

4 **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

- 5 • None.

6 **Informational and Action Items**

- 7 • Cody Bartley identified the committee's output as a white paper and outlined
8 candidate sections: definitions, approval process steps, examples/case studies,
9 inspections (including TIO/IOR considerations), and Q&A/FAQ.
- 10 • Cody Bartley added fire life safety considerations as a needed white paper
11 component.
- 12 • Cody Bartley stated the subcommittee should obtain and review the question list
13 from the June 25, 2024, webinar and incorporate answers into the white paper.
- 14 • Cody Bartley stated the subcommittee should request and review Joe LaBrie's
15 SurePods inspection/TIO materials to use as a reference point for inspection
16 guidance.

17

18 **4. Agenda Item #4: Discuss Approach to Address Goals**

19 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley (or designee)

20 **Discussion and Input**

21 Cody Bartley initiated discussion on the approach needed to achieve the
22 subcommittee's goal of producing a white paper. He stated the first step would be
23 compiling the notes from the meeting into a rough outline that the subcommittee could
24 review and refine. He volunteered to prepare the initial outline before the next meeting
25 so the subcommittee would have a working structure to evaluate.

26 Cody Bartley stated the subcommittee should gather additional industry perspectives
27 through vendor, owner, and manufacturer presentations to better understand
28 experiences, roadblocks, and recommendations related to prefabrication and PCS
29 approvals. He stated he had a contact with SurePods and could invite them to present.

- 30 • Belinda Young recommended including vendors that had successfully obtained
31 PCS approvals, such as DuraFuse, to provide perspectives beyond SurePods.
32 Cody Bartley reviewed the PCS website and noted that Simpson Strong-Tie,
33 SurePods, and DuraFuse were listed, with SurePods and DuraFuse actively
34 engaged in PCS submissions.

- 1 • Cody Bartley stated these vendors would likely provide useful insight into the
2 approval process.
- 3 • Belinda Young stated she had previously discussed DuraFuse with a project
4 team and would locate her contact information.
- 5 • Gary Dunger suggested including companies that manufacture individual
6 prefabricated components, such as STARC prefabricated fire walls, to provide
7 additional perspective even if the components did not represent the full
8 prefabrication process.
- 9 • Cody Bartley acknowledged the suggestion and noted companies such as
10 STARC could provide useful insight into prefabricated wall systems.
- 11 • Gary Dunger stated he had a contact and could reach out to STARC.

12 Cody Bartley discussed a potential project timeline and indicated the subcommittee
13 might target completing the white paper by the end of the year, subject to confirmation
14 from HCAI leadership.

- 15 • Belinda Young asked for clarification regarding the rules governing how
16 subcommittee members could gather information and communicate with one
17 another outside of meetings.
- 18 • Veronica Yuke stated that no more than two subcommittee members could
19 collaborate at one time. She confirmed that subcommittee members could
20 contact outside parties, such as vendors or consultants to gather information, but
21 any information intended to be shared with the full subcommittee must be
22 submitted through HBSB staff for distribution.
- 23 • Scott Karpinen asked who would lead the authorship of the white paper.
- 24 • Cody Bartley stated the subcommittee would develop the initial content and
25 structure, while HCAI would review and approve the final document. He
26 explained that the subcommittee would organize the material and that
27 assignments would become clearer as the outline and content developed. He
28 also stated the subcommittee should first establish the outline and gather vendor
29 perspectives before assigning specific writing responsibilities.
- 30 • Belinda Young recommended locating the questions and answers generated
31 from the previous webinar so the subcommittee could evaluate recurring topics
32 and adjust the white paper outline accordingly.
- 33 • Cody agreed that the prior Q&A would help identify key issues raised by the
34 industry.

35 Cody Bartley summarized the assignments identified during the discussion and
36 confirmed responsibilities for vendor outreach and outline development.

- 1 • Veronica Yuke stated she would work with Chris to locate the Joe LaBrie sample
2 TIO materials and distribute them to the committee. She also confirmed she
3 would distribute the webinar Q&A and determine the expected completion
4 timeline for the white paper.

5 Cody Bartley asked whether any additional board member comments or questions
6 remained regarding next steps before closing the agenda item.

7 **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

- 8 • None.

9 **Informational and Action Items**

- 10 • Cody Bartley will compile meeting notes and prepare a draft outline for the white
11 paper prior to the next meeting.
- 12 • Cody Bartley will contact SurePods, Duir regarding a vendor presentation.
- 13 • Belinda Young will contact DuraFuse regarding a vendor presentation.
- 14 • Gary Dunger will contact STARC Company regarding a vendor presentation.
- 15 • Veronica Yuke will coordinate with Chris Tokas to obtain Joe LaBrie's sample
16 TIO and distribute it to the committee.
- 17 • Veronica Yuke will distribute the Q&A from the prior webinar to the committee.
- 18 • Veronica Yuke will confirm the anticipated completion timeline for the white paper
19 with HCAI leadership.

20

21 **5. Determine Schedule and Plan for Future Meetings**

22 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley (or designee)

23 **Discussion and Input**

24 Cody Bartley opened discussion on scheduling future subcommittee meetings and
25 stated that maintaining momentum toward completing the white paper by the end of the
26 year would likely require meetings at least once per month. He asked whether there
27 were objections to holding monthly meetings rather than meeting every other month.

- 28 • Veronica Yuke reviewed the upcoming calendar and noted that the first two
29 weeks of March were already scheduled with several subcommittee meetings.
30 She suggested scheduling the next meeting during the third week of March,
31 potentially on March 23.
- 32 • Belinda Young stated she would be traveling to Mexico during that week but
33 indicated she could still attend remotely. She said that the week of March 16
34 would work better.

- 1 • Veronica Yuke proposed March 19 as a potential meeting date. Both Carl Newth
2 and Cody Bartley confirmed availability.

3 Cody Bartley noted that a Full Board meeting was scheduled for April 9, 2026.

- 4 • Veronica Yuke stated the subcommittee could provide an update to the board
5 even if a separate subcommittee meeting did not occur before that board
6 meeting.

- 7 • Belinda Young asked whether the subcommittee could meet in conjunction with a
8 board meeting if members were already present.

- 9 • Veronica Yuke explained that the board meeting agenda was already fully
10 scheduled and would not allow time for an additional meeting.

11 Cody Bartley suggested that instead of scheduling multiple meetings in advance, the
12 subcommittee could schedule meetings month-to-month since the group was an ad hoc
13 subcommittee.

- 14 • Veronica Yuke agreed that scheduling one meeting at a time would work better
15 because staff calendars frequently change.

- 16 • The subcommittee agreed to schedule the next meeting for March 19, 2026,
17 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Veronica Yuke stated that additional potential dates
18 could be discussed during that meeting.

19 Cody Bartley stated the March 19 meeting agenda would likely include review of the
20 draft outline for the white paper, discussion of assignments, and continued development
21 of the document structure. He also stated the subcommittee would attempt to schedule
22 vendor presentations for the March 19 meeting if possible. Cody Bartley suggested
23 vendor presentations could be approximately 30 minutes and should focus on vendor
24 experiences with the PCS or prefabrication process and recommendations for
25 improvement.

26 **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

- 27 • None.

28 **Informational and Action Items**

- 29 • The subcommittee agreed to hold meetings approximately once per month to
30 maintain progress toward completing the white paper.
- 31 • The next subcommittee meeting is scheduled for March 19 at 10:00 a.m.
- 32 • Future meeting dates will be scheduled month-to-month due to changing staff
33 calendars.

- 1 • The March 19 meeting agenda will include review of the draft white paper outline
2 and discussion of assignments.
- 3 • The subcommittee will attempt to schedule vendor presentations for the March
4 19 meeting, with presentations expected to be approximately 30 minutes each.

5

6 **6. Comments from the Public/Subcommittee Members on Issues not on this**
7 **Agenda**

8 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley (or designee)

9 Cody Bartley invited comments from subcommittee members and members of the
10 public on issues not listed on the agenda. He stated that no comments were heard.

11

12 **7. Adjournment**

13 Cody Bartley announced the close of the meeting and thanked participants for their
14 attendance and contributions to developing the committee's work.