HCAI Department of Health Care Access and Information
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

March 19, 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

Committee Members Present
Cody Bartley, Subcommittee Chair
Belinda Young, Subcommittee Vice-Chair
Michael Davis
Gary Dunger
Carl Newth

Consulting Member Present
Scott Karpinen

HCAI Staff Present
Richard Tannahill
Ali Sumer

HBSB Staff Present
Veronica Yuke, Executive Director
Evett Torres
Marcus Palmer

1. Call to Order and Welcome

Facilitator: Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair

Cody Bartley called the HBSB Ad hoc, How to Guide Development for Prefabricated Components and System Subcommittee meeting to order on March 19, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

2. Roll Call and Meeting Advisories/Expectations

Facilitator: Veronica Yuke, HCAI; HBSB Executive Director

Veronica Yuke conducted roll call and confirmed a quorum. She presented meeting expectations and stated that voting would be conducted through roll call.

3. Review and approve draft February 12, 2026, meeting report/minutes

Facilitator: Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair

Discussion and Input

Cody Bartley summarized the February 12, 2026, meeting. He stated that the subcommittee discussed the previous webinar and the definitions that were included in it. He further stated that the group held a brainstorming session to identify the topics that needed to be included in the outline. He explained that this discussion helped form a rough draft and establish the main speaking points, as well as identify areas that required further development. He described the discussion as a thorough review of what topics the subcommittee needed to address.

Cody Bartley reported that the informal action items included development of the outline based on the prior discussion and distribution of the questions and answers from the previous webinar. He also stated that the committee discussed the current meeting date and outlined the vendor presentations they wanted to hear. He noted that those presentations had since been scheduled and would take place immediately after this section.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- None.

Voting

Motion to approve the draft January 22, 2026, meeting report/minutes.

- **Motion:** Scott Karpinen
- **Second:** Gary Dunger
- **Outcome:** Motion passed unanimously.

Informational and Action Items

- The February 12, 2026 meeting report/minutes was approved.

4. Vendor Presentation: DuraFuse Frames PCS-0004

Facilitator: Justin Marshall

Justin Marshall began by presenting a timeline of the DuraFuse PCS process. He stated that DuraFuse initially submitted its design guide PCS application in February 2022. He explained that the company then spent approximately 18 months working back and forth with its HCAI reviewer on technical review items. He stated that version 1.0 received approval in July 2023.

He further explained that since the initial approval, DuraFuse had submitted two additional rounds of updated information, which HCAI reviewed and approved. He stated that as of November 2025, the system was on version 3.0. He noted that some revisions involved drawing updates, while others involved technical design changes. He also stated that the company was preparing additional updates related to the transition to the 2025 California Building Code and other technical revisions, which were expected to be submitted in April and May 2025. In addition, he reported that DuraFuse had recently completed testing for pre-Northridge connection retrofits and planned to submit a second design guide specifically related to seismic retrofit applications.

Justin Marshall explained that one of the primary motivations for pursuing the PCS was the lengthy timeline associated with building code adoption. He stated that the structural steel standards must first move through AISC, then ASCE 7, then the IBC, and finally the CBC, which creates a significant delay before new systems can be used in hospital projects. He stated that the PCS allowed DuraFuse to begin using its system in hospital facilities more quickly. He also stated that the PCS provided a streamlined prequalification process for Level 1 facilities and reduced perceived risk for design teams, construction teams, and owners.

He stated that the PCS also reduced uncertainty during plan review because it consolidated the relevant technical information into a single document. He explained that this created more predictable and consistent outcomes during permitting and review and increased opportunities for use in hospital projects.

Regarding the review process, Justin Marshall described it as a comprehensive and technically rigorous review. He stated that DuraFuse had already completed review by the AISC connection prequalification review panel before submitting for PCS approval. He explained that the initial review from February 2022 through July 2023 involved several rounds of technical review, responses to comments, and updates. He stated that each turnaround cycle typically took approximately six to eight weeks and usually included a follow-up meeting. He noted that subsequent revisions moved somewhat faster because they involved smaller portions of the document.

He also stated that modifying language that was included in the original approval had proven difficult and required substantial effort.

Justin Marshall stated that once the PCS was published, DuraFuse received more opportunities to work on hospital projects. He explained that engineers, contractors, and fabricators were more willing to consider the system because the PCS increased confidence in its use. He also acknowledged that the company continued to make editorial and technical updates based on lessons learned from project use.

Regarding the TIO, he stated that it was initially developed by DuraFuse personnel based on company testing and the AISC 358 connection prequalification panel review.

He explained that the company then worked with its HCAI reviewer to finalize the TIO included in the design guide. He described the TIO as relatively straightforward and stated that it primarily focused on field inspection of bolting and the steel fabrication and shop drawing review process.

As advice for others pursuing a PCS, Justin Marshall stated that the PCS was the best available option for expediting preapproval for HCAI projects. He recommended early engagement with HCAI to understand process requirements, timelines, and expectations. He emphasized the importance of complete documentation, including test reports and design documentation, to reduce review iterations. He also advised others to carefully review all prescribed HCAI language before approval, noting that later revisions can be difficult. He additionally stated that applicants should understand that HCAI review includes a significant cost associated with staff review time.

- Following the presentation, Cody Bartley thanked Justin Marshall and asked whether the referenced costs related primarily to time and manpower or to additional testing.
    - Justin Marshall clarified that the cost he referenced related specifically to HCAI staff review time and invoiced review hours. He stated that testing costs were separate and would have been incurred regardless of HCAI submission.
- Scott Karpinen commented that he had initially been skeptical of the PCS process but now viewed it as highly beneficial. He described a previous hospital project in which the team had considered the DuraFuse system but ultimately chose another option because they lacked confidence in OSHPD review timelines and field implications before the PCS was available. He stated that, had the PCS existed at that time, the team likely would have selected DuraFuse.
- Cody Bartley added that he was currently involved in an acute care facility project in which DuraFuse was listed as a structural option specifically because it already had PCS approval. He stated that he was beginning to see the PCS process directly influence project specifications and available structural options.
    - Justin Marshall stated that this experience was consistent with what DuraFuse was seeing in the market.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- Scott Karpinen provided comments regarding the practical benefits of the PCS process based on prior project experience.
- Cody Bartley provided additional board comments regarding current project use and market recognition of the DuraFuse PCS.

Informational and Action Items

- The subcommittee received the vendor presentation from Justin Marshall regarding DuraFuse Frames PCS-0004.
- The presentation provided information regarding the PCS approval timeline, review process, TIO development, project implementation, associated costs, and recommendations for future PCS applicants.

5. Vendor Presentation: SurePods PCS-0003

Facilitator: Jake Meyer, West Coast Project Manager, SurePods (or designee)

Jake Meyer thanked the subcommittee for the opportunity to provide feedback on the PCS process and addressed the prepared discussion questions.

Regarding what motivated SurePods to pursue the PCS and the advantages of doing so, Jake Meyer explained that the effort began in 2021 with a structural pre-approval for the bathroom pods. He stated that he took over the process beginning with version two, which expanded the structural pre-approval to include mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire life safety, and related pre-approved system details. He explained that version three added a TIO program specific to SurePods' prefabricated bathroom pods and established a guideline for offsite prefabrication.

He stated that California represented a largely untapped market for prefabricated bathroom pods and that the PCS served as a proof of concept to demonstrate to HCAI, clients, and design teams that the product could be approved and used in California hospital construction. He explained that the primary anticipated advantage was allowing customers to select a pre-approved pod design and remove design and review time from project schedules.

Regarding the company's experience going through the process, Jake Meyer explained that SurePods involved multiple disciplines, including structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire life safety, and architectural scopes. He stated that the company began with a pod design previously used on a non-California project and selected the most standard rectangular layout as a baseline.

He explained that SurePods onboarded engineering subcontractors to redesign the pod as necessary to comply with PCS requirements and California Building Code requirements. After updating the drawings, SurePods submitted them to HCAI, where each discipline reviewed and returned comments separately. He described the process as highly collaborative, particularly because HCAI staff and reviewers met with SurePods through Teams meetings to clarify questions and comments. He stated that

after comment resolution, the second submission and final approval process for version two took approximately one and one-half to two weeks.

He stated that version three followed a similar process but focused more heavily on inspection services and TIO requirements.

Regarding use of the PCS, Jake Meyer stated that SurePods had not yet been able to utilize the PCS to its fullest extent. He explained that while the PCS had served as a strong proof of concept and opened discussions with clients and design teams, the company's goal remained to provide a fully pre-approved pod that could be directly incorporated into a project without redesign.

He stated that engineering assumptions and design constraints limited this objective. Specifically, he noted that the approved pod design was based on a four-sided rectangular box with maximum dimensions of eight feet by ten feet. He explained that projects with slab designs outside the approved assumptions, different fixture layouts, or significant architectural modifications could require supplemental engineering or re-review. He further explained that determining the threshold for when layout changes require re-review remained an active point of collaboration with HCAI staff.

Jake Meyer stated that hospital clients often want individualized bathroom layouts, finishes, and fixture placements, which makes full standardization challenging. He stated that SurePods continued to work toward a balance between custom design and a catalog-style pre-approved product.

Regarding development of the TIO, Jake Meyer stated that HCAI was highly collaborative throughout the process. He explained that SurePods worked primarily with former head of inspection services Joe Labrie, who visited the company's Phoenix facility to review its production process, quality control program, and customization procedures.

He explained that the first step involved defining inspection milestones before production, during production, and after installation at the job site. He stated that because the pods involve multiple disciplines, the TIO had to address structural framing inspections, material identification, MEP rough-in inspections, and fire life safety components.

He stated that the parties also worked to determine a reasonable inspection cadence for offsite construction and ultimately established a framework of inspections at approximately 10 to 25 percent production completion increments, with prototype inspections occurring before production began.

He explained that SurePods believed continuous full-time inspections were unnecessary due to the company's documentation and quality control systems and that HCAI agreed with this approach.

Regarding advice for others considering a PCS, Jake Meyer stated that applicants should first determine whether their product requires HCAI review during permitting and whether it introduces something new or unique to the industry or to HCAI review processes. He stated that if so, a PCS would likely be beneficial.

He further advised that applicants evaluate whether their product can be standardized. He stated that if a product must be fully custom designed for every project due to numerous variables, a PCS may not be practical.

- Richard Tannahill commented that HCAI had been working with SurePods to build greater flexibility into the PCS and stated that they were close to allowing more variables within a maximum size.
    - Jake Meyer agreed and stated that the goal remained to allow a pre-approved pod to function more like a catalog product.
    - He also explained that SurePods had been educating owners, contractors, and architects on the assumptions built into the PCS, including pod shape, dimensions, slab design, fixture layout, door types, and ADA constraints.
- Cody Bartley asked Jake Meyer about the timeline for approval of version one.
    - Jake Meyer stated that he could not provide that information because he assumed responsibility after version one had already been approved.
- Ali Sumer explained that version one involved extensive multidisciplinary discussions because the PCS program was new at the time. He stated that the timeline was longer primarily because HCAI needed to bring the correct disciplines into the process and establish distinctions between OPM and PCS programs.
- Scott Karpinen commented that he hoped HCAI would continue building flexibility into the PCS process because hospitals often require different bathroom configurations and fixtures.
- Richard Tannahill responded that HCAI was very close to that objective.
- Scott Karpinen also asked about the inspection process and whether certain inspections could be completed in the field.
    - Jake Meyer explained that the pods are shipped without exterior sheathing, which allows all wall cavities, in-wall MEP systems, and framing to remain visible for inspection after delivery and before final installation. He stated that SurePods intentionally tried to move as much

inspection activity offsite as possible so that the pods could arrive as largely inspected units.

- Richard Tannahill added that the intent was to complete all possible inspections in the factory and limit onsite review to unloading inspections, transport damage checks, and final connection verification.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- Cody Bartley asked a follow-up question regarding the approval timeline for version one.
- Richard Tannahill provided subcommittee comments regarding ongoing efforts to expand flexibility within the PCS.
- Ali Sumer provided HCAI staff comments regarding the multidisciplinary nature and timeline of version one approval.
- Scott Karpinen provided comments regarding flexibility and inspection processes and asked follow-up questions related to field inspections.

Informational and Action Items

- The subcommittee received the vendor presentation from Jake Meyer regarding SurePods PCS-0003.
- The presentation addressed the PCS motivation, approval process, use limitations, TIO development, inspection cadence, and recommendations for future applicants.
- HCAI staff and SurePods indicated that they are continuing to work toward greater flexibility within the PCS framework.

6. Vendor Presentation: STARC Systems OPM-0642

Facilitator: Mark Marquez, Regional Sales Manager, STARC Regional Sales Manager (or designee)

Mark Marquez introduced Bruce Bickford, former Vice President of Product Development for STARC Systems, and stated that Bruce Bickford had spearheaded the OPM approval process.

Bruce Bickford explained that STARC Systems provides temporary wall systems used for containment and barriers within construction settings. He stated that from the company's early development, there had been strong interest in creating a one-hour fire-rated product and that serious development began in 2019.

He explained that a key regulatory hurdle for entering the California market was obtaining an OPM approval through OSHPD, now HCAI. He stated that the primary

motivations were obtaining both seismic approval and fire-related acceptance for the wall system in California hospital projects.

He stated that STARC Systems worked closely with OSHPD, later HCAI, including Nanci Timmins and staff in the fire office. He further stated that the company retained Degenkolb, a California civil engineering firm, as a key partner to assist with structural evaluations, design presentations, and preparation of the application materials.

Bruce Bickford stated that the OPM process began in 2021. He explained that the initial review cycle included an 80-day nominal startup review period, followed by two published 30-day review cycles. He stated that HCAI generally remained on schedule, possibly taking closer to 90 days for the first review, and that the feedback provided was constructive and useful.

He explained that after receiving comments, STARC Systems and Degenkolb revised the drawing packages and application materials and completed the final review cycle in late 2021.He further stated that the company later made design changes to improve the product and returned in 2023 to revise the OPM by adding new components and modifying parameters of the wall system to better meet customer needs and improve flexibility. He stated that this revision process took approximately 150 days and was completed toward the end of 2023.

Regarding fire approval, Bruce Bickford explained that because the product was a one-hour rated fire system, the company sought written approval from HCAI. He stated that Nanci Timmins made clear that HCAI did not issue written approvals for fire ratings. He explained that the company instead obtained approval through the California State Fire Marshal’s office.

He stated that although HCAI did not issue written fire approval, staff were willing to discuss the system with regulatory personnel and verbally support the product during project reviews.

Regarding use of the OPM, Bruce Bickford explained that STARC Systems sells directly to contractors and also rents systems through rental partners. He stated that once the materials leave the company, STARC Systems primarily provides technical and engineering support as needed, but is generally not directly involved in project-specific approval cycles.

He explained that project approvals typically move through engineers and HCAI reviewers, who reference the OPM during review. He stated that questions occasionally return to STARC Systems regarding specific field conditions, applicability, best use, and alternate means of compliance, particularly in complex hospital environments involving fire barriers above ceilings.

He further stated that inspections and field interpretation questions are typically handled directly by contractors, subcontractors, or Degenkolb.

Regarding advice for others pursuing an OPM, Bruce Bickford emphasized the importance of engaging an experienced engineering partner early in the process. He stated that Degenkolb's experience with HCAI and familiarity with California requirements was critical to the project's success.

He stated that although the timeline was stressful for a fast-moving development company, the overall process worked well and resulted in successful approval.

Cody Bartley thanked Bruce Bickford for presenting and stated that hearing about the OPM process provided a different perspective from the PCS presentations discussed earlier in the meeting. He stated that the presentation was helpful in understanding the benefits of the OPM process.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- Cody Bartley provided subcommittee comments thanking Bruce Bickford for presenting and noted the value of hearing the OPM perspective in contrast to the PCS presentations.

Informational and Action Items

- The subcommittee received the vendor presentation from STARC Systems regarding OPM-0642.
- The presentation addressed the motivation for pursuing the OPM, the approval timeline, fire approval coordination, implementation experience, and recommendations for future applicants.

7. Review and Discuss Proposed White Paper Outline

Facilitator: Cody Bartley (or designee)

Discussion and Input

Cody Bartley stated that after hearing from three vendors and receiving three different perspectives on the program, the outline previously prepared would need to be revisited to incorporate the new feedback. He explained that this was the board's first formal review of the outline and that the goal was to assign responsibilities and determine deliverables for each section.

He began by reviewing the definitions section, stating that the definitions were carried forward directly from the prior webinar and had already undergone significant discussion and refinement during multiple previous meetings. He stated that he intended to carry forward the same definitions unless the board identified a reason to revise them.

He then reviewed the process section, explaining that it should address the process for obtaining pre-approval, using a pre-approval, and handling project-specific prefabrication that does not apply broadly across the California market. He noted that HCAI staff input would be critical for this section. He also stated that this section should include practical advice for navigating the process, including recommendations such as engaging California-based engineers or professionals with prior experience shepherding applicants through HCAI review.

Cody Bartley next addressed the inspections section, including how TIOs are developed and implemented, and emphasized the importance of highlighting collaboration between HCAI and manufacturers.

He then discussed the fire life safety section, stating that the STARC Systems presentation provided valuable insight into fire life safety considerations and that the white paper needed to clearly explain what applicants should expect and how to navigate this portion of the process.

He reviewed the example projects section, identifying UCSF Parnassus, Kaiser Roseville, and Sutter Santa Clara as potential case study examples.

He also reviewed the vendor feedback section, which would capture key takeaways and recommendations from the vendors who presented during the meeting.

Finally, he stated that the Q&A section would incorporate the questions and answers from the June 24, 2024, webinar and potentially expand into a broader frequently asked questions section.

- Scott Karpinen asked whether the Q&A section would include a general FAQ section beyond the webinar questions. Cody Bartley agreed that it could and stated that a dedicated FAQ section or threaded FAQs throughout the document would be beneficial.
- Cody Bartley further stated that the white paper should emphasize advice, appeal, and benefits to make the prefabrication process less intimidating and encourage industry adoption.
- Gary Dunger suggested adding a separate section addressing the Alternate Method of Compliance (AMOC) process, particularly as it relates to fire life safety issues and changes to pre-approvals. He stated that this would be especially valuable because many fire life safety approvals involve AMOCs.

Cody Bartley agreed and proposed adding a dedicated section between the fire life safety section and example projects section to address AMOCs and changes to pre-approvals after issuance.

The subcommittee then moved into assignment of responsibilities for development of each section:

- Cody Bartley agreed to begin drafting the process section using prior webinar materials and coordinate with HCAI staff.
- Ali Sumer agreed that Cody Bartley could begin drafting and HCAI staff would continue development from there.
- Veronica Yuke requested that the draft be circulated to HCAI staff once completed.
- The inspections section was assigned to Michael Davis, with Scott Karpinen offering assistance.
- Veronica Yuke agreed to coordinate Nanci Timmins' input for the fire life safety section.
- The new AMOC/change to pre-approval section was tentatively assigned to Belinda Young due to her design professional perspective.
- Cody Bartley agreed to follow up with SurePods regarding UCSF Parnassus.
- Cody Bartley stated that he would reach out to Belinda Young regarding Kaiser Roseville and Sutter Santa Clara.
- Cody Bartley agreed to take the lead on vendor feedback.
- The Q&A and FAQ section would continue to be developed at the next meeting.
- The subcommittee also reviewed the June 2024 webinar Q&A spreadsheet, noting that many questions still required formal answers before publication. Cody Bartley stated that he would add responsibility assignments, develop preliminary responses, and circulate the updated spreadsheet for further review before the next meeting.

Cody Bartley concluded that the outline was now established and that the next step would be development of each section prior to the next meeting.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- Scott Karpinen provided comments and recommendations regarding inclusion of a general FAQ section and offered assistance with the inspections and offsite fabrication sections.
- Gary Dunger provided comments recommending inclusion of an AMOC section.
- Ali Sumer and Veronica Yuke provided staff input regarding development responsibilities and document circulation.

Informational and Action Items

- The subcommittee reviewed and discussed the proposed white paper outline.
- Cody Bartley to draft the process section and vendor feedback section
- Michael Davis, with Scott Karpinen's assistance, to develop the inspections section
- Veronica Yuke to coordinate fire life safety input from Nanci Timmins
- Belinda Young to be contacted regarding the AMOC/change section and example projects
- Cody Bartley to follow up with SurePods and develop responsibility assignments for webinar Q&A responses
- Updated drafts and assigned responses to be circulated prior to the next meeting

8. Determine timeline for Deliverables and Next Meeting Date

Facilitator: Cody Bartley (or designee)

Discussion and Input

Cody Bartley stated that, after reviewing calendars and upcoming board commitments, he was considering scheduling the next subcommittee meeting during either the last week of April or the first week of May. He noted that the full board meeting was scheduled for April 9 and that additional meetings beginning the second week of May could create scheduling conflicts. He emphasized the importance of maintaining momentum on the white paper development effort.

- Carl Newth indicated that the proposed timing was acceptable.

Cody Bartley asked whether the group wanted to select a date immediately or distribute a scheduling poll.

- Veronica Yuke noted that Belinda Young and Michael Davis were not present and recommended using a scheduling poll.
- The subcommittee agreed to issue a poll for dates during the first week of May, specifically around May 5 through May 7.
- The discussion then shifted to deliverables. Cody Bartley stated that the immediate focus should be on written content for the white paper rather than graphics or formatting. He emphasized that the deliverables should consist of substantive written content and process descriptions.
- Veronica Yuke and Evett Torres discussed agenda posting deadlines and initially reviewed possible submission dates. After recalculating the timeline, Evett Torres

clarified that if materials were to be formally included with the agenda, they would need to be submitted by April 22.

Cody Bartley proposed targeting April 22, 2026, as the deadline for submission of draft content materials.

He further explained that HCAI and board staff would be reviewing the submitted material for the first time during the next meeting in the first week of May.

Cody Bartley also discussed the overall publication timeline for the white paper. He stated that the goal was to publish the white paper before the end of the calendar year. He estimated that the subcommittee would likely need at least three additional meetings before the white paper would be ready for final publication. He described the anticipated sequence as:

1. Review of draft content at the next meeting
2. Subsequent meeting for review of finalized content
3. Final review meeting prior to publication

- Scott Karpinen agreed that the projected timeline and workload appeared reasonable.
- Ali Sumer noted that he would be unavailable for two weeks and requested additional flexibility.

Cody Bartley stated that Ali Sumer's portion could be submitted approximately one week later if necessary, while still maintaining the overall schedule.

- Veronica Yuke stated that board staff would send reminders as the deadline approached.

Cody Bartley acknowledged that the reminders would be helpful and reiterated the importance of keeping the project moving forward.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- Carl Newth, Scott Karpinen, Ali Sumer, Veronica Yuke, and Evett Torres provided subcommittee and staff comments regarding scheduling, deadlines, and deliverable timing.

Informational and Action Items

- Board staff to distribute a scheduling poll for the first week of May 2026
- Draft white paper content materials due by April 22, 2026
- Next meeting tentatively planned for the first week of May 2026
- Board staff to issue deadline reminders

- Subcommittee to continue development toward end-of-year publication target

9. Comments from the Public/Subcommittee Members on Issues not on this Agenda.

Facilitator: Cody Bartley (or designee)

Cody Bartley stated that the subcommittee had completed discussion of the timeline, deliverables, and next meeting scheduling. He then opened the floor for questions or public input from members of the board, HCAI staff, and members of the public regarding issues not listed on the agenda.

- None.

10. Adjournment

Cody Bartley thanked all participants for their attendance and contributions and stated that he looked forward to seeing everyone again during the first week of May. He noted that the meeting had generated significant input and encouraged members to consider how to apply the discussion to their assigned sections. The meeting was adjourned 11:37 a.m.