



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**

**June 17, 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
Micheal Davis
Gary Dunger
Scott Karpinen
Carl Newth
Belinda Young

HCAI Staff Present

Arash Altoontash
Alireza Asgari

HBSB Staff Present

Veronica Yuke, Executive Director
Rajveer Dhaliwal
Marcus Palmer
Evelt Torres

- 1 **1. Call to Order and Welcome**
- 2 **Facilitator:** Cody Bartley, DPR Construction; Subcommittee Chair (or designee)
- 3 Cody Bartley called the HBSB Ad-hoc Subcommittee on How-to-Guide Development for
- 4 Pre-Approved Fabricated Components and Systems meeting to order on June 17,
- 5 2026, at 10:00 AM.
- 6
- 7 **2. Roll Call and Meeting Advisories/Expectations**
- 8 **Facilitator:** Veronica Yuke, HCAI; HBSB Executive Director (or designee)

Veronica Yuke conducted roll call and established a quorum. She advised that any voting during the meeting would be conducted through roll call by the Executive Director.

3. Review and approve the draft May 6, 2026, meeting report/minutes

Facilitator: Cody Bartley (or designee)

Discussion and Input

Cody Bartley led the review of the draft May 6, 2026, meeting report. He recapped the prior meeting's content, noting that the subcommittee was moving from an informal white paper to an advisory guide and that the advisory guide would focus on pre-approved fabricated components and systems rather than all prefabrication. He explained that PCS and the OPM would be addressed.

Cody Bartley noted the discussion of fire life safety content and his action item to thread that into the outline. He stated that the prior meeting had asked to elaborate on the out-of-country inspection sections, that HCAI was providing words on the OPM process and helping respond to the Q&A spreadsheet, and that the subcommittee had hoped the prior meeting would serve as the final review and approval of the advisory guide because they were getting close. He recalled that the subcommittee reviewed the Q&A from the June 25, 2024, Preapproved Fabricated Components and Systems webinar, that he had populated some answers, and that there was an action item to circulate the spreadsheet with HCAI staff and complete the remaining answers. He noted the spreadsheet had been sent out before the present meeting and would be covered again today.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- None

Voting

Motion to approve the May 6, 2026, Ad Hoc How-To-Guide Development for Preapproved Fabricated Components and Systems Subcommittee meeting report.

- **Motion:** Cody Bartley
- **Second:** Carl Newth
- **Outcome:** Motion passes unanimously, with no abstentions.

4. Review and discuss proposed Advisory Guide outline

Facilitator: Cody Bartley (or designee)

1 Discussion and Input

2 Cody Bartley walked the subcommittee through the populated outline on screen,
3 reminding members that the content still needed to be moved into the advisory guide
4 format. He noted the definitions had not changed since the last meeting and matched
5 those covered in the webinar. He stated the PCS section was now covered using words
6 supplied by Alireza Asgari via email. He proposed removing website snapshots from the
7 final guide and keeping it to words with a link to the documents, citing document length.
8 He explained that the process-to-use-pre-approvals-in-the-drawings section also came
9 from Alireza Asgari and that he had included a workflow showing how to apply a PCS to
10 a project. He described breaking the OPM facility-specific prefabrication process into a
11 flow chart to show the benefits of project-specific versus pre-approvals, noting the
12 overall goal of driving more pre-approvals. He credited Alireza Asgari for the PCS
13 renewal considerations language and stated the inspection process section (onsite,
14 offsite, and manufacturers) had not changed much and would be moved into a final
15 Word document.

- 16 • On the out-of-country inspection section, Michael Davis explained that inspection
17 for prefabricated components is the same as inspection on a job, with the TIO
18 provided by the design professionals serving as the driving force for how often
19 and at what intervals the IOR performs inspections, whether in or out of country,
20 and that all inspection practices match those in the "Tips From the Experts"
21 reference. He recommended referencing that guide rather than duplicating the
22 effort.
- 23 • Cody Bartley asked Michael Davis to address how an IOR or special inspector
24 gets approved out of the country, whether IORs are flown over or a local
25 inspector can be certified.
- 26 • Michael Davis responded that the IOR would be flown over if specific observation
27 is needed, or special inspection could be farmed out through the testing lab's
28 arrangements with inspectors worldwide, as long as they are approved on the
29 TIO. Gary Dunger offered to help with the section, citing his current Cedar Sinai
30 project manufacturing seismic friction dampers for an SPC 4D retrofit in New
31 Zealand, where local inspectors are being identified through a process that
32 begins with the design professional and architect or engineers and obtains
33 OSHPD buy-in.
- 34 • Cody Bartley asked Gary Dunger and Michael Davis to jointly write up the
35 section.
- 36 • Alireza Asgari explained that OSHPD Policy Intent Notice 58 pre-approves test
37 and special inspection, that qualification standards such as ASCM/ASTM apply
38 worldwide, and that inspectors qualify by submitting their qualifications into an

1 automatic system that tracks who is approved for what type of inspection, inside
2 or outside the U.S.

- 3 • Cody Bartley confirmed the section would reference PIN 58 and identified it as a
4 gap still needing development.

5 On the fire and life safety section, Cody Bartley stated the content came from Nanci
6 Timmins, that it was several pages, in-depth, and largely composed of considerations,
7 and asked HCAI for help condensing it because he was not comfortable cutting fire life
8 safety content himself. He noted he wanted to keep Nanci Timmins's checkboxes and
9 outline.

- 10 • Scott Karpinen asked about the review process.
- 11 • Cody Bartley explained the outline and the draft advisory guide Word document
12 would be emailed out for a feedback period, followed by another meeting, with
13 Veronica Yuke adding that HCAI would also conduct a final in-house review.
- 14 • Gary Dunger offered to review and tighten the fire and life safety section given
15 his background.
- 16 • Scott Karpinen suggested using a Bluebeam Studio session for a single live
17 markup document. After discussion of the two-person collaboration limit (serial),
18 with Belinda Young and Veronica Yuke noting only two board members at a time
19 but that HCAI staff do not count against that limit.
- 20 • Cody Bartley proposed inviting Gary Dunger and Scott Karpinen as primary
21 reviewers with HCAI staff, then opening a separate Bluebeam session for
22 Belinda Young and himself before the next meeting.
- 23 • Gary Dunger suggested incorporating the eTIO program, but Cody Bartley
24 recalled that Ali Sumer had previously advised against covering it, while noting
25 an advisory guide can be updated after release.

26 On vendor feedback, Cody Bartley proposed referencing the prior meeting report rather
27 than re-summarizing each vendor's multi-page feedback.

- 28 • Scott Karpinen and Belinda Young supported keeping the document from
29 growing too long, and suggested including the feedback via a link.
- 30 • Belinda Young raised whether including vendor-specific names posed any issue.
- 31 • Cody Bartley explained they would be shown only as examples without
32 elaborating, since the vendors presented publicly and the meeting minutes are
33 public, and that HCAI staff review would flush out any concerns.

34 Cody Bartley described the Q&A section as containing all 24 questions from the 2024
35 webinar with answers coordinated between him and HCAI, to be sent out for review
36 rather than read aloud.

Cody Bartley then shared a draft Word document converting the outline into advisory guide format, including a short introduction, a comparison table contrasting PCS and project-specific fabrication (scope, flexibility, approval, risk, and use), the key definitions section, the PCS and OPM sections, the pre-approval drawings workflow diagram, the facility-specific fabrication process, PCS renewal considerations, the inspection process and TIO development in bullet form, the out-of-country and vendor manufacturer inspection sections, the fire life safety section kept in bullet format for further review, the vendor feedback link, and the Q&A section. He stated the document was about 21 pages.

- Belinda Young recommended redacting some of the fire life safety content as overweighted relative to architectural and structural topics and ensuring applicability to the prefab component piece specifically.
- Belinda Young also asked about graphics
- Cody Bartley reported that Copilot had given similar feedback recommending visual process maps, a PCS workflow, the comparison table, and an inspection TIO workflow.

Discussion followed on whether HCAI had an existing inspection workflow diagram, with Michael Davis offering to build a simple one and Arash Altoontash stating he was not aware of a published flow chart but would research it. Alireza Asgari elaborated on the PCS-versus-project-specific distinction, explaining that a PCS must be generic enough to apply across many projects (giving the example of a SurePod rectangular bathroom pod) while project-specific prefabrication accommodates unique shapes or modifications required by a particular project.

- Belinda Young shared offsite prefab inspection process workflow charts her team developed for a project with material ID, which Cody Bartley said matched what they were looking for.

Cody Bartley ended stating he would place the content into the template, send it out with the meeting report (with a two-week wait agreed with Veronica Yuke and Belinda Young to allow the out-of-state inspection section to be developed before the Bluebeam session), and set up the Bluebeam review process.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- No additional

Informational and Action Items

- Gary Dunger and Michael Davis to jointly write up the out-of-country inspection section and copy Cody Bartley, referencing PIN 58.

- Cody Bartley to merge the out-of-country inspection content into the guide and reference PIN 58 in that section.
- Gary Dunger to review and condense the fire and life safety section.
- Cody Bartley to place the content into the advisory guide template and apply HCAI/OSHPD formatting and logos before distribution, and to change the font from 11 to 12 point.
- Cody Bartley to send the outline and draft advisory guide Word document out with the meeting report, with distribution to wait approximately two weeks to allow development of the out-of-state inspection section.
- HCAI staff to provide the formatting template to Cody Bartley.
- A Bluebeam Studio review session to be set up with Gary Dunger and Scott Karpinen as primary reviewers alongside HCAI staff, followed by a separate session for Belinda Young and Cody Bartley, then a final meeting to review incorporated comments.
- Arash Altoontash to research whether HCAI has a published inspection workflow/process diagram and report back.
- Belinda Young to share her team's offsite prefab inspection process workflow charts as a reference.
- Vendor feedback to be included by linking to the prior meeting minutes rather than re-summarizing.

5. Determine timeline for deliverables and next meeting date

Facilitator: Cody Bartley

Discussion and Input

Cody Bartley led the subcommittee in building out a deliverables timeline, working around the July holiday. He set Monday, July 6th as the date for all content to be sent to him, with members sending material to HCAI staff and copying him. He allotted two weeks for Gary Dunger and Michael Davis to provide their material, two weeks for him to assemble it, and two weeks for cleanup, placing completion at July 20th. He scheduled the start of the first Bluebeam session for July 24th, allowing a week to get it posted and live, followed by a three-week comment period for HCAI staff, Gary Dunger, and Scott Karpinen, ending August 14th.

- In response to Scott Karpinen confirming the revision flow, Cody Bartley built in a week for revisions (August 14th to 21st), then a second Bluebeam session for Belinda Young and himself running to September 4th, followed by a week to clean up.

Cody Bartley and Veronica Yuke then worked through meeting dates. Noting the September 7th holiday and the requirement that the document be posted two weeks before a meeting, they ruled out earlier September dates.

Cody Bartley recapped the full sequence, two weeks to finalize content, two weeks for him to incorporate it, a week to post the Bluebeam session live, three weeks for HCAI staff, Gary Dunger, and Scott Karpinen to review, a week to incorporate comments, a second two-week Bluebeam session for Belinda Young and himself, a week of cleanup, and three weeks for everyone to digest the final version before the September 30th meeting, after which the document would proceed through the legal process before posting. He remarked that the effort had covered a lot of ground over several months and expressed his goal of getting the document across the finish line.

Subcommittee and Public Comments

- No additional

Informational and Action Items

- All content due to Cody Bartley (sent to HCAI staff, copying him) by Monday, July 6th.
- Gary Dunger and Michael Davis to provide their material within the content-finalization window; Cody Bartley to assemble and clean up content by July 20th.
- First Bluebeam session to start July 24th, with a three-week comment period (HCAI staff, Gary Dunger, Scott Karpinen) ending August 14th; Cody Bartley to incorporate revisions by August 21st.
- Second Bluebeam session for Belinda Young and Cody Bartley running through September 4th, followed by a week of cleanup.
- Final version to be distributed approximately three weeks ahead of the meeting and posted two weeks in advance.
- Next meeting set for Wednesday, September 30th (with Ken Yu available to step in for Veronica Yuke if needed).
- Document to proceed through the legal/approval process before public posting.

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

Facilitator: Cody Bartley (or designee)

1 **Discussion and Input**

2 Cody Bartley opened for comments from the public and subcommittee members on
3 issues not on the agenda.

4 **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

- 5 • None.

6 **Informational and Action Items**

- 7 • None.

8

9 **7. Adjournment**

10 Cody Bartley thanked attendees for joining and expressed his anticipation of finalizing
11 the content and publishing the advisory guide, noting it was an exciting moment and
12 expressing hope that it would help the industry. He formally adjourned the meeting at
13 11:00 a.m.