

**OSHDP** Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development



**Hospital Building Safety Board**

400 R Street, Suite 200  
Sacramento, California 95811-6213  
(916) 440-8453  
Fax (916) 324-9118  
[www.oshpd.ca.gov/Boards/HBSB/index.html](http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/Boards/HBSB/index.html)

**HOSPITAL BUILDING SAFETY BOARD  
Education and Outreach Committee**

**Wednesday, June 3, 2015  
10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.**

**Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development**

400 R Street, Suite 452  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
(916) 440-8453

and

**Metropolitan Water District Headquarters**

700 N. Alameda Street, Suite 2-546  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
(213) 897-0166

**Board Members**

John Donelan, Chair  
Mike Hooper, Vice-Chair  
Mike Gritters  
Patrick Sullivan  
Bert Hurlbut, Consulting Member  
Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member  
Joe La Brie, Consulting Member  
Scott Karpinen, HBSB Chair

**OSHDP Staff**

Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director  
Gary Dunger  
Diana Scaturro  
Richard Tannahill  
Chris Tokas

**HBSB Staff**

Linda Janssen, Executive Director  
Evet Torres

1 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

2 Chair John Donelan called the meeting to order. Board members, OSHPD staff, and  
3 Interested Parties introduced themselves.

4 **2. Review April 22, 2015 final meeting report / minutes**

1 Mr. Donelan noted that at the top of page 7 the misspelled name “Hoover” should be  
2 “Hooper.”

3 **MOTION:** (M/S/C/) [Gritters/Hooper]

4 The committee voted unanimously to adopt the April 22, 2015 meeting minutes  
5 as corrected.

6 • Discussion and Public Input

7 Ms. Janssen confirmed that Mr. Hooper is a voting member of the committee.

8 **3. Planning & Development of 2015 Seminar “Building Relationships for a**  
9 **Successful Project”**

10 A. Develop Strategic Survey

- 11 ○ Committee members discuss and finalize survey questions that address the  
12 dynamics of a typical hospital construction project

13 Mr. Donelan stated that Mr. La Brie had done a great deal of background  
14 work in developing the Strategic Survey. Contributions had come from Mr. La  
15 Brie, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Gritters, and Mr. Hurlbut.

- 16 ○ Committee members discuss and determine the best method(s) for  
17 administering the Strategic Survey to the Poll group

18 Mr. Donelan asked the committee about the three possible Excel survey  
19 responses *Agree, Undecided, and Disagree*.

20 Ms. Janssen stated that it would be easy to set something up using  
21 SurveyMonkey. Mr. Gritters noted that this software automatically tabulates  
22 the results; Ms. Scaturro noted that it is easy to generate reports at the end.  
23 Mr. Donelan concluded that the group consensus was to use SurveyMonkey.

- 24 ○ Committee members discuss and determine how to solicit case studies of  
25 healthy projects from Strategic Survey participants (poll group)

1 Mr. Donelan stated that he had received a possible case study from Carl  
2 Scheuerman regarding a Sutter hospital replacement project. For additional  
3 case studies the poll group could be consulted.

4 Mr. Hooper commented that much can be learned from projects that “went  
5 south.” Mr. Gritters noted that it was important for those in the case study  
6 group to discern the best way to pick appropriate cases from positive and  
7 negative perspectives.

8 The committee observed that depending on the individual or the firm, there  
9 could be a polarized perception about the success of a project. Mr. Coleman  
10 suggested that criteria of a successful project need to be defined.

11 Mr. La Brie stressed that simplicity was a top priority: someone submitting a  
12 possible project would submit a one-page abstract. The committee would  
13 then discuss the submittals to see which ones best qualify.

14 Ms. Scaturro established with Mr. Coleman that projects would fall into  
15 delivery method categories of Design-Build, Design-Bid-Build, and Integrated.  
16 People would submit projects according to the delivery method they used. An  
17 Interested Party suggested looking also at the size of projects, which affects  
18 the success factors.

19 Mr. La Brie cautioned not to lose sight of the message, that is, relationships.  
20 Thirty minutes should be sufficient for a case study. He commented on the  
21 dearth of engineers in the poll group – what was that saying? It was possible  
22 that the poll group participants whose numbers were higher were more  
23 relational in the way they work. Mr. La Brie asked the committee whether  
24 they should target solicitations to the engineers, whose group numbers were  
25 low.

26 Mr. Coleman commented that most projects succeed according to the  
27 relationship of the Architects, Owners, General Contractors, and Inspectors of  
28 Record (IORs), rather than the engineers. Mr. Gritters noted that field staff  
29 were missing from the poll group.

1 Mr. Karpinen stated that he and Eric Johnson had sent out the survey to  
2 electrical and mechanical engineering firms in the area, without much  
3 response.

4 Mr. Kreuser commented that it would be nice to get the mechanical, electrical,  
5 and plumbing engineers involved. They have an influence on projects. He  
6 agreed that it was important to get some Field Inspectors to participate. Mr.  
7 Coleman consented.

8 Mr. Sullivan suggested tapping into OSHPD records of people who have  
9 worked on projects in the last couple of years. Mr. Coleman replied that  
10 OSHPD has a Quality of Service Survey on its website, but the response  
11 OSHPD receives is minimal. The idea for the current survey is to find people  
12 who are motivated to be proactive in improving the communication and  
13 relationships system.

14 Mr. Hooper stated that he had reached out to IORs mostly from Kaiser;  
15 maybe we should reach out to IORs working at other places. Ms. Janssen  
16 responded that staff has sent the email to the several hundred people on the  
17 HBSB Interested Party list.

18 Mr. Coleman stated that of field staff, representation is needed from the  
19 Compliance Officer, the District Structural Engineer (DSE), the Fire Marshall,  
20 and the Field Supervisor. Also, representation is needed from both Northern  
21 and Southern California because of their different ways of doing business.

22 Mr. Gritters agreed that demographics of the respondents (north or south,  
23 profession) are important to know when evaluating opinions by group – as  
24 opposed to evaluating opinions of all the respondents in general.

25 Mr. Coleman felt that if Southern California representation is lacking, we  
26 should do additional outreach to that demographic.

27 Mr. La Brie suggested sending another email blast requesting additional  
28 demographic information (big/small project, discipline, northern/southern,  
29 etc.).

1 B. Committee members discuss content of seminar topic related to materially alter  
2 and begin developing guidelines and examples of the types of work that should and  
3 should not be considered as materially altering a project

4 Mr. Donelan asked the committee whether they wanted to include the topic of  
5 materially alter in the seminar. Mr. La Brie responded that the topic could be  
6 addressed in the statements having to do with construction. The committee  
7 agreed that materially alter can hinder or enhance a project; how to integrate it  
8 into the overall program was the question.

9 Mr. Coleman stressed that we should include materially alter as it relates to  
10 relationships and roles, not to the specific details of what it is and is not. Roles in  
11 decision-making, documentation, and the process should be addressed, as well  
12 as how the relationships between the different entities affect materially alter.

13 Mr. La Brie suggested having each of the four sessions take a small portion of  
14 time describing what code says about determining materially alter. Mr. Coleman  
15 agreed.

16 (E. Assign seminar preparation responsibilities to committee members and  
17 FDD/HBSB staff)

18 Mr. Donelan enlisted volunteers for each session with two members of each  
19 subcommittee working on the sessions. Results were as follows.

20 Mike Gritters: Case Studies, Session 2

21 Mike Hooper: Session 1

22 Bert Hurlbut: Session 3

23 Eric Johnson: Session 4

24 Patrick Sullivan: Session 3

25 Pete Kreuser: Session 4

26 John Donelan: Session 1

27 Joe La Brie: Case Studies, Session 2

28 Ms. Janssen reviewed the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act regulations for  
29 meetings of committee members with OSHPD staff.

1 Mr. La Brie said that he would provide an overall umbrella of coordination behind  
2 the scenes, supporting the different subcommittees as needed. This would result  
3 in seminar cohesion.

4 Mr. Donelan mentioned the need for support from FDD staff during the seminar.  
5 The group decided that Ms. Scaturro (Case Studies), Hussain Bhatia (Session  
6 3), and Richard Tannahill (Session 1) would be assigned. For the panel  
7 discussion, Mr. Coleman assigned Gordon Oakley and Chris Tokas, or their  
8 delegate. Mr. Karpinen suggested Mr. Dunger for the panel discussion as well.  
9 Mr. Sullivan suggested Eric Reslock from Public Affairs for the poll group.

10 Mr. Coleman felt that OSHPD staff who could determine successful projects for  
11 the case studies would be Mr. Tokas and Mr. Oakley.

12 Mr. La Brie suggested using Outgoing Board Member Bert Hurlbut, Incoming  
13 Board Member Mike Gritters, and Chair John Donelan as facilitators. They  
14 consented.

15 C. Committee members discuss and determine content of seminar topic related to  
16 roles, responsibilities and relationships for successful projects

17 Mr. Donelan emphasized that the core of all the sessions needs to be  
18 relationships.

19 D. Committee members discuss and determine topics for the "Panel Discussion"  
20 portion of the seminar

21 Mr. Donelan stated that the committee had now established the topics.

22 The committee returned to the list of survey questions.

23 Mr. La Brie suggested for the committee to sift through the questions quickly,  
24 eliminating any questions that were not useful. Questions whose results show a  
25 disparity in understanding could be targeted and addressed during the seminar.

26 The committee proceeded through the questions and determined which would be  
27 grouped, which would be eliminated, and which questions would be left to the Poll  
28 subcommittee to make a final determination.

1 Mr. La Brie clarified that the purpose of the survey is to find misunderstandings  
2 among the stakeholders that do this work. The first three sessions are sources of  
3 information that should all be in alignment. The fourth session should be the place  
4 to talk about the right answer: what the code says, what we are actually doing, and  
5 what we think we should be doing. The panel may be not only question/answer, but  
6 also a discussion of disconnects identified in the poll.

7 The group decided to move the poll results session to the first timeslot; second will  
8 be the code session; third will be the case studies; fourth will be the panel  
9 discussion.

10 The group noted that there was much repetition in the questions that could be  
11 eliminated by the committee. They all preferred to decrease the number of  
12 questions.

13 Mr. Coleman requested a question regarding people reluctant to complete a survey  
14 or use the Comment and Process Review (CPR) because of fear of retaliation.

15 Ms. Scaturro suggested a question about the implications of not closing a project  
16 correctly. Mr. Coleman felt that for this seminar, the issue is who has responsibility  
17 for ensuring that projects are closed in compliance.

#### 18 **4. Comments from Committee Members and the Public on Issues Not on This** 19 **Agenda**

20 Mr. La Brie felt that the committee should press ahead to hold the seminar this year.  
21 Mr. Donelan pointed out that the subcommittees had substantial work to accomplish  
22 before the committee meets again.

23 Mr. La Brie stated that the subcommittees should come to the next meeting ready to  
24 make recommendations. Details will be finalized then.

25 The committee settled on July 7 or 10 for the next meeting; Ms. Janssen will check  
26 on meeting room availability.

27 Mr. Gritters asked what has been done to regarding educating owners and  
28 stakeholders about SPC-4D – how it might affect their master planning. Mr.

1 Coleman responded that education has been somewhat limited because SPC-4D  
2 has not yet been adopted by the Building Standards Commission. Some information  
3 has been given out to the industry via meetings and a webinar to make them aware  
4 of this option. OSHPD plans to give a presentation shortly after the first of the year.

5 **5. Adjourn**

6 **MOTION:** (M/S/C/) [Gritters/Kreuser]

7 The committee voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:26 p.m.