

**FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS
FOR
PROPOSED BUILDING STANDARDS
OF THE
OFFICE OF STATEWIDE HEALTH PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

REGARDING THE CALIFORNIA ELECTRICAL CODE
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 24, PART 3**

The Administrative Procedure Act requires that every agency shall maintain a file of each rulemaking that shall be deemed to be the record for that rulemaking proceeding. The rulemaking file shall include a final statement of reasons. The Final Statement of Reasons shall be available to the public upon request when rulemaking action is being undertaken. The following are the reasons for proposing this particular rulemaking action:

UPDATES TO THE INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS:

The Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) finds that no revisions have been made which would warrant a change to the initial statement of reasons for the following proposed actions:

Article 517.30(B)(7) – The essential electrical system of an ambulatory surgical clinic is required by Articles 517.45 (B) and (C) to comply with Section 517.30. As the requirements of Section 517.30 are made by reference only for ambulatory surgical clinics, many designers of stand-alone surgical clinics fail to implement this requirement. The proposed change provides that the essential electrical system requirements also apply to ambulatory surgical clinics.

Article 517.123 - The existing provisions of this article are being repealed and replaced with language that provides consistency with nationally recognized standards for nurse call system requirements for hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, licensed clinics and correctional treatment centers. The proposed amendments are based on the national standards of UL 1069: *Standards for Hospital Signaling and Nurse Call* and The Facility Guidelines Institute's *Guidelines for Design and Construction of Health Care Facilities*.

MANDATE ON LOCAL AGENCIES OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The OSHPD has determined that the proposed regulatory action would not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts.

OBJECTIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS MADE REGARDING THE PROPOSED REGULATION(S)

• **45-Day Comment Period – April 22, 2011 to June 6, 2011**

The OSHPD received the following comment for this proposed action as noticed during the 45-Day Comment Period from April 22, 2011, through June 6, 2011:

Comment #1:

Commenter: Vince Baclawski, Senior Director, Codes and Standards, National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA)

Mr. Baclawski submitted suggested language for Article 517.123 regarding the proposed “call systems” requirements for health facilities. The proposed modifications were suggested mainly to provide clarification

and consistency within the requirements and to mitigate the potential for misinterpretation. The changes also coordinate with current practice and protocol for the use of call systems.

OSHPD Response: OSHPD agreed with Mr. Baclawski's suggested changes to Article 517.123 and noticed the proposed amended language during the 15-Day Comment Period from June 16, 2011, to June 30, 2011. No comments were received during the 15-day period.

Code Advisory Committee - Further Study Recommendation

In review of OSHPD's proposed code changes to the California Mechanical Code, the Plumbing, Electrical Mechanical and Energy Code Advisory Committee recommended further study regarding the necessity of a nurse call system reset button at the patient station. OSHPD further researched the subject and verified that the reset button location at the patient station is a required primary function under UL 1069. The code change proposal was noticed during the 45-Day Comment Period (April 22, 2011 to June 16, 2011) without changes to the initially submitted language.

- **15-Day Comment Period – June 16, 2011 to June 30, 2011**

The OSHPD did not receive any objections or recommendations for this proposed action as noticed during the 15-Day Comment Period from June 16, 2011 to June 30, 2011.

DETERMINATION OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND EFFECT ON PRIVATE PERSONS

OSHPD has determined that no alternative considered would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulation.

REJECTED PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE THAT WOULD LESSEN THE ADVERSE ECONOMIC IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES:

No alternatives were proposed. OSHPD has determined that the proposed regulations will not have an adverse economic impact on small businesses.