

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

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

**Tuesday, August 25, 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
Eric Johnson
Bert Hurlbut, Consulting Member
Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member
Scott Karpinen, HBSB Chair

OSHDP Staff

Hussain Bhatia
Gary Dunger
Diana Scaturro
Richard Tannahill

HBSB Staff

Kathi Zamora, Acting Executive Director
Evet Torres
Krista Harrington

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 and approve July 7, 2015 draft meeting report / minutes**

5 **MOTION:** (M/S/C/) [Hooper/Johnson]

6 The committee voted unanimously to adopt the July 7, 2015 meeting minutes.

1 **3. Planning & Development of 2015 Seminar, *Building Relationships for a***
2 ***Successful Project*. Each Seminar subcommittee will provide an update on**
3 **its respective Session assignments.**

4 Mr. Donelan reported that Mr. La Brie and Mr. Gritters had some concerns about the
5 actual session order.

6 **A. Session 1: “Poll Group Outcomes” subcommittee**

- 7 ○ Report on Final Poll Group, including the total number of participants and
8 demographics
- 9 ○ Report on final Survey results, number of responses and outcomes

10 Mr. Hurlbut reported that the poll had closed on Friday, August 21 at 5:00 PM.
11 There had been 91 respondents from industry and 60 from OSHPD. Ms.
12 Torres displayed the results in the form of bar graphs and percentages. Mr.
13 Hurlbut reviewed each item, contrasting the industry responses with those of
14 OSHPD.

- 15 ○ Review and approval of subcommittee’s recommendations
- 16 ○ Discussion and Public Input

17 Ms. Scaturro noted the difference in perspective between the people in Plan
18 Review within OSHPD, and those on the outside exposed to the day-in, day-
19 out dynamics. She asked about the seminar – what would the committee
20 want to do with these poll results as a tool.

21 Mr. Hurlbut replied that he would like to take perhaps half a dozen people
22 from different ends of the spectrum to discuss the results. Everyone at the
23 seminar should get a copy of the survey.

24 Mr. Bhatia commented that 90% of the survey respondents work on large
25 projects with OSHPD, while OSHPD’s workload is exactly the reverse: 90%
26 is small projects.

27 Mr. Johnson commented that surveys can be interpreted in many different
28 ways. Accordingly, the committee might do an Executive Summary stating its

1 interpretation of the findings from the industry respondents, while OSHPD
2 might do an interpretation of the Plan Checkers' and Inspectors' results.

3 Mr. Donelan was impressed by the balance in respondent numbers between
4 OSHPD and industry.

5 Ms. Scaturro referred to the difference in perspective regarding materially
6 alter; where can understanding be improved.

7 Mr. Hurlbut pointed out the importance of trust with the field staff as it pertains
8 to materially alter. Mr. Tannahill added that good relationships in the field can
9 result in work not being scrutinized as hard.

10 The group discussed the materially alter issue. Ms. Scaturro stressed that
11 when it comes to technical decisions, OSHPD has been striving to make the
12 requirements as black and white as possible for all the various staff. Mr.
13 Donelan agreed that such decisions should not rely on personalities.

14 Ms. Scaturro noted that when field staff is out walking the project, OSHPD
15 considers that the Design Professional, the Inspector of Record, and possibly
16 the contractor are the only ones that need to be present. In contrast, the
17 facility owners may want additional people there to listen and take notes.

18 Mr. Tannahill commented that owners will bring various people when meeting
19 with OSHPD – they want all the bases covered.

20 Mr. Dunger commented that sometimes the field staff needs to be with the
21 IOR alone for purposes of evaluating performance – there are times when
22 other people do not belong on the walk.

23 Mr. Bhatia commented that from the reviewer's perspective, having too many
24 people trying to jump in can be very distracting. Insistence on an answer at
25 that moment can also be intimidating for the reviewer.

26 Mr. Hurlbut asked about the date of the dry run; Ms. Zamora replied that it is
27 September 29.

1 Mr. Hurlbut noted that once he reads through all the survey comments, he will
2 have a better idea of what works well and what doesn't.

3 **B. Session 2: "What the Code Requires" subcommittee**

- 4 ○ Report on the subcommittee's progress in developing program content
5 related to its seminar topic

6 Mr. Tannahill reported that Mr. Dunger had helped the subcommittee with
7 formatting and reviewing the 200 slides. Mr. Tannahill had broken down the
8 presentation into subgroups. The slides do quote a lot of code.

9 Mr. Hooper added that the subcommittee needed to choose the code they are
10 going to address in detail.

- 11 ○ Review and approval of subcommittee's recommendations
- 12 ○ Discussion and Public Input

13 Mr. Karpinen commented that when he and Gordon Oakley had presented at
14 the Materially Alter seminar, they had addressed the key points and then had
15 additional examples included in an attached appendix.

16 The committee discussed the problem that there was an abundance of
17 information to present. Mr. Dunger suggested setting the expectations at the
18 seminar's outset: the presenters would touch on the bullet points that were
19 important.

20 Mr. Dunger noted that the slides identified the code as coming from either the
21 Building Code or the Administrative Code.

22 **C. Session 3: Case Studies Subcommittee**

- 23 ○ Identify which projects will be used as case studies at each of the seminar
24 venues
- 25 ○ Identify candidate presenter(s) for the Case Studies session at each of the
26 seminar venues
- 27 ○ Report on progress with the presenters to coordinate the completion of the
28 presentation

1 Mr. La Brie will present on the San Diego project. Mr. Donelan displayed a
2 list of all of the projects slated for presentation. He stated that the committee
3 needed to identify the items in the poll whose outcomes were significant, and
4 get them to Mr. Gritters, Mr. La Brie, and Ms. Scaturro, who would contact the
5 case study presenters regarding these issues to address.

- 6 ○ Review and approval of subcommittee recommendations
- 7 ○ Discussion and Public Input

8 The committee established that each of the six case studies (three for North
9 and three for South) would have 20 minutes for the presentation, which did
10 not leave much time for questions. Each case study did not have to cover all
11 10 or 12 questions.

12 An Interested Party suggested using the incremental review/approval
13 process, with its discrete phases and collaborated approval plan, as a theme.

14 Mr. Kreuser – a panel participant – said that the panel was focusing on
15 unique project-specific teams that have had successful OSHPD projects. The
16 panel would bring to the forefront the reasons for their success – now that the
17 survey has been completed, the panel can identify the questions that
18 corresponded to the success. The panel has picked UCSF Palomar in San
19 Diego as an example of a successful project.

20 Mr. Johnson agreed with the rest of the committee that the case studies did
21 not have much time at all to spend on questions. The audience will have the
22 opportunity to ask questions during the Panel Discussion.

23 **D. Session 4: Panel Discussion Subcommittee**

24 Panel Discussion members are Mr. Johnson, Mr. Dunger, Mr. Tokas, and Mr.
25 Oakley.

- 26 ○ Identify potential topics derived from the Seminar Survey results

27 Mr. Johnson said that the panel may discuss negative poll results, negative
28 comments, and struggles. The first session will tie in with the last session.

- 1 ○ Report on plan for coordination of panel member discussion content with the
2 Seminar Survey results

3 Mr. Kreuser stated that the “test-proven teams” had been picked because
4 they had successful projects. The committee needed to coordinate the
5 successful themes identified in the survey into Panel Discussion bullet points.
6 What worked and why did it work?

- 7 ○ Review and approval of subcommittee recommendations
8 ○ Discussion and Public Input

9 The committee established that the three separate teams would have their
10 own Q & A times. The committee decided upon 25 minutes for each team.

11 Ms. Scaturro said that she would share Mr. Hurlbut’s list with Mr. La Brie and
12 Mr. Gritters (the emcees along with Mr. Hurlbut), so that they could share it
13 with the presenters.

14 Mr. Hurlbut felt that the seminar content should all point back to successful
15 relationships which should yield a successful project.

16 Mr. Kreuser said that the Panel Discussion members would meet at least
17 once more to identify the questions for the Panel Discussion. They would
18 also distribute the Executive Summary from OSHPD to the project teams so
19 they could start coordinating and strategizing.

20 Ms. Scaturro suggested dropping the number of Case Studies from three to
21 two – the presenters could have a better opportunity to tell their full story.
22 The committee liked this idea. Mr. Hurlbut noted that the flyers would not
23 have to be changed. Mr. Donelan stated that the committee’s decision was to
24 go with two case studies.

25 **4. The Committee will discuss and approve agendas for the following:**

- 26 ○ Seminar practice run: September 29, 2015

1 The committee found that the survey results in bar graph form were more
2 helpful and easy to read than the percentage figures. Mr. Hurlbut agreed to
3 remove the percentage figures.

4 An Interested Party asked about the desired outcome or goal of reviewing the
5 survey results in this setting. Mr. Hurlbut explained that some of the results
6 showed an interesting difference between industry's view and OSHPD's view;
7 the seminar would address whether there is a way to get them closer together
8 – more in alignment – for a successful project.

9 An Interested Party suggested using the Executive Summary to solicit
10 solutions to these issues. Ms. Scaturro suggested that the case studies could
11 also be used as a place to tackle such issues.

12 Mr. Donelan noted that his section must present what works, and perhaps
13 what doesn't work, in a framework of what the code requires. The case study
14 presenters will not be present at the dry run – the committee will have to rely
15 on them to give information on what the case studies entail beforehand. Mr.
16 Hurlbut commented that seeing those slides beforehand could at least ensure
17 for the committee that the case studies look similar.

18 Mr. Kreuser said that as with the case studies, the panel discussion speakers
19 will submit their slides beforehand so the committee can have an idea of what
20 they are presenting. Mr. Johnson added that the subcommittee could take
21 some of the provocative questions and use them as talking points for the
22 group.

- 23 ○ Seminars:
 - 24 ■ October 21, 2015 in Anaheim
 - 25 ■ October 27, 2015 in Concord
- 26 ○ Discussion and Public Input

27 Ms. Zamora noted that while the schedule gives an ending time of 4:00, the
28 flyers state 4:30. Staff will change the flyer and re-post it tomorrow.

1 Mr. Karpinen inquired about why there would be three emcees rather than
2 one or two. Mr. Donelan and Mr. Hurlbut agreed that two would be fine; the
3 committee agreed that it was not necessary to have Mr. Gritters as the third.

4 **5. Comments from Committee Members and the Public on Issues Not on This**
5 **Agenda**

6 There were no additional comments.

7 **6. Adjournment**

8 **MOTION:** (M/S/C/) [Johnson/]

9 The committee voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:00 p.m.