

Residential Care Facility Advisory Committee Education Ad-Hoc Committee

Minutes, Thursday, November 13, 2008

Office of the State Fire Marshal, Sacramento, California

PRESENT:

Gregory Lake, Chair
Cindy Moore – SFM (teleconference)
Kevin Reinertson
Joe Garcia
Steve April
Rocque Yballa
Steve Hart
Steve Guarino – SFM
Jennie Johnson
Heather Harrison
Pat Stranahand

I. CALL TO ORDER

Gregory Lake, Chair, called the meeting to order at **1000** hours at the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) Headquarters, 1131 S Street, Sacramento, California.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

Each attendee gave their name and the organization they represent.

III. SCOPE:

To review the existing classes being taught to the fire service and providers on R-3.1 occupancies and to develop a format and content guide that would be used state-wide. It was determined, by consensus, that the scope of our task was not to create a formal training program that would be part of the State Fire Training Program, but that we establish the format and information for training fire officials that is consistent with all teachers.

IV. GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Group discussed SFM Draft Interpretation (withdrawn) regarding the applicability of CBC 425.8.5. on exterior ramps of R-3.1 Occupancies. The draft interpretation says it does not apply. Steve Guarino will amend the question and present a new draft to the RCF Committee for a clearer interpretation.

Joe Garcia suggested that the scope of the Ad-Hoc Committee be extended to cover all Residential Care Facilities which would include residential Child Care Facilities and Alcohol Rehab Facilities. All instructors are teaching all the occupancies in their classes so we should not exclude the R-4, I-1 and Child Care occupancies from our discussion. Greg Lake will confirm the scope of this committee with Chief Paez.

The process of creating the final curriculum will be to review the existing presentations and then determine the content based on mutual agreement.

Discussion on Reference Materials: Will include CBC, CFC, SFM Interpretations, Title 19. Title 22 will not be included for any purpose, because the fire service does not enforce it.

Discussion on List of Topics

History – Steve Hart asked if there should be a matrix that would include giving the H & S Code sections in sequence of their development as they have been applied to Residential Care facilities. Discussion followed, no decision was made.

Check with SFM on historical development of H&S Codes.

Greg Lake indicated that if a matrix was developed, it could be included in the handout material for the class.

It was decided that a brief description of prior codes would be put on a slide and only a few minutes would be dedicated to this discussion. CBC 111.5.1

Greg Lake began a discussion of his presentation sequence that was emailed prior to the meeting.

During the review of Greg's presentation, the following discussions occurred:

Discussion on class length; time frame. A reasonable time frame for a one-day class would be 6-8 hours, plus time of any videos that were added. Videos would be helpful to illustrate the codes. Rocque Yballa suggested a six-hour class from 9 to 4, with a catered 30 minute lunch.

Discussion on Pre-Inspection requests; the applicant must specify the type of occupancy that they want to be "pre-inspected" for. In the class, a copy of the Pre-Inspection Request (form 9092) is included as a handout.

Discussion on Slide appearance: Jennie Johnson requested that the slide numbers be shown on each slide.

Rocque Yballa discussed the guidelines for State Curriculum slide presentations and suggested that our presentations follow that guide of 6 lines per slide and a font size of ? to be discussed at next meeting.

Discussion continued on how to present the Health & Safety Code information in the class. The pertinent sections should be included in the handouts and referred to in the slides with as much emphasis as necessary to answer any questions. These sections would be referred to throughout the program when the relevant H&S Code sections were discussed.

Steve Hart drew a suggested presentation model on the whiteboard. It showed a diagram of a home floor plan and text boxes on the sides with the requirements and arrows pointing to the location of the application.

Rocque suggested that we use the State Fire Training Course Outline as a format for our discussion. Steve Hart volunteered to obtain a copy of the "outline".

For the purposes of our class, plans could be requested in order to establish the approved exit path(s), but would not be required unless new construction takes place. Change the name of the slide from Plan Review to the Basics of Reviewing Plans.

Discussion on Bedridden, Transfer Dependence and Hospice Waivers

Hospice Waivers need to be covered thoroughly so that the fire service does not mis-apply the Code. We need to define "dementia" and "transfer dependant" as they relate to HW's and bedridden...emphasis on "transfer dependant".

Heather Harrison discussed the fact that there are two classes of bedridden clients; transfer dependant is one and truly "bedridden" is the second. The statute says that you have to have the appropriate fire clearance, but it does not distinguish between the two types. She suggested that the statute needs to be changed to remove the "transfer dependant" category from the "bedridden" class of clients. Discussion followed. Rocque advised her that there is a formal process for the Dept of Social Services to make changes in regulations.

Because of the CCL bedridden definition we should stressfully note, in our class, that there are "transfer dependant" clients that are called "bedridden", but may otherwise be very ambulatory.

Rocque noted conditions that he considers necessary for application within his fire district, when responding to a request for "bedridden" clients in an existing R-2.1 facility. Provided the facility has all of the main safety elements of fire sprinklers, fire alarm, 1-hour construction etc., they still need:

- a. A smoke barrier wall to allow a "protect-in-place" protection plan
- b. A Disaster Plan
- c. An Emergency Response Plan describing their method of evacuation or relocation, etc
- d. Adequate Staffing

[Since there are many Fire Departments and Districts that are having difficulty with R-2.1 occupancies having "bedridden" persons, we will need more discussion between the fire service and the SFM's Office on what the fire service can require in order to approve the fire safety clearance.]

The question was asked: Who would present a legislative change in the "bedridden" to exclude "transfer dependant". Heather Harrison said that her organization would work on obtaining a sponsor for a "Bill". Roc suggested that the Advisory committee could make a recommendation to the SFM and cc NorCal and SoCal Boards and thus encourage fire service support of a proposed bill. Heather said that fire service support would be crucial. Rocque expressed that it would be important that a "local" fire service person make a presentation to the Fire Prevention Officers. Greg suggested that Rocque do an educational presentation to NORCAL and Rocque felt that Jim Pettigrew should do a presentation to SOCAL as Co-Chair of the Building Standards Committee.

Discussion: Handouts should include pertinent interpretations and Information Bulletins as well as the Health & Safety Code Sections referenced.

It was agreed that the SFM Interpretations referencing "prior Code" sections should be included for reference to existing facilities.

Moving on with Greg's presentation – General Exiting Requirements for R-3.1 Occupancies Rocque noted that in addition to the general requirements, the residential requirements for ramping and landings are still applicable for new facilities.

Discussion: Evacuation Drills. Steve Hart suggested that the presentation include a reference to CFC 405 as a guide for those jurisdictions that have adopted this Chapter locally for R-4 and I-1 Occupancies only. Since the SFM did not adopt Chapter 4, it would not otherwise be presented.

Greg finished the review of his presentation.

Joe Garcia reviewed his presentation (To be sent out ASAP). Joe discusses each topic presented in each slide. The applicable H & S Code sections are discussed as a group. He described the fact that some Regulations are found in the Statutes which does not allow the specific requirement to be mitigated by alternate means. 13135 has the regulations right in the statute.

Joe covered Foster homes, non-ambulatory definition, bedridden definitions and variables, delineation of authority to local fire jurisdictions, hand sanitizers as new in H & S Code, delayed egress. He then discussed I-1, R-4 & R-3.1 requirements for exiting. In the application of 2007 Codes to existing facilities, Joe referred to the SFM Interpretation that says that existing facilities can remain as licensed under the previous code until there is a change in the level of care of any of the clients to either non-ambulatory or bedridden status or if non-ambulatory or bedridden clients were added, at which time they would need to be brought up to current.

Joe also talks about the existence of the RCF Committee and what it does. As he talks about the specific occupancy regulations, he talks about where the code has changed from the 2001 code to the 2007 code requirements.

Joe has two handouts that he distributes. One is the Joe Garcia one-page matrix of the requirements for the I-1, R-4 and R-3.1. The other is a checklist for each occupancy for an Inspector in the field to use. It is permissible to change his logo for whoever wants to put their district logo on it.

Discussion on Integral Facilities – example: cottages around a central dining hall. Each cottage could qualify as R-3.1 and the entire facility could be licensed as an R-4 or I-1 occ.

Meeting adjourned at 2:55 PM

Next meeting will be Tuesday, January 27, 2008 at 10:00 AM, SFM's Office