

OSHPD 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, September 29, 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

Bert Hurlbut, Consulting Member
Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member
Joe La Brie, Consulting Member
Scott Karpinen, HBSB Chair

OSHPD Staff

Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director
Hussain Bhatia
Gary Dunger
Mohammad Karim, Ph.D.
Roy Lobo
Gordon Oakley
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. He noted that it was more of a run-
3 through for the upcoming seminar than a meeting. Board members, OSHPD staff,
4 and Interested Parties introduced themselves.

1 **2. Review and approve August 25, 2015 draft meeting report / minutes**

2 Mr. Kreuser said that on page 5, line 18, UCSF Mission Bay should be added.

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

4 The committee voted unanimously to adopt the August 25, 2015 meeting minutes
5 as amended above.

6 **3. Practice-run for the proposed 2015 Seminar, *Building Relationships for a***
7 ***Successful Project*. Each Seminar subcommittee will submit and go through**
8 **their proposed PowerPoint Presentations in preparation for the Seminars.**

9 Mr. Donelan asked moderators Mr. Hurlbut and Mr. Gritters how they wanted to divide
10 the time. They decided that Mr. Hurlbut will take the morning session and Mr. Gritters
11 will take the afternoon. Mr. Hurlbut said that after he opens the seminar, he will
12 announce the presenters. Just before each presenter speaks he will give their bio.

13 Mr. La Brie presented his seminar opening to the committee. It stresses the following:

- 14 • Collaboration.
- 15 • Success as seen by owners, designers, structural engineers, contractors,
16 subcontractors, and OSHPD.
- 17 • Chances for a project's success.

18 Ms. Zamora reported that at this point, 130 people are registered for the Anaheim
19 seminar and 108 are registered for Concord. Mr. Coleman said that 140 is the limit.

20 Mr. Hurlbut asked where the Executive Summaries should be worked in to the seminar;
21 Mr. Coleman answered that it would be the Poll Group Outcomes to show the
22 interpretation of the survey results.

23 Mr. Hurlbut thanked Mr. Bhatia for developing graphs to illustrate the survey results.

24 The committee ascertained that presentations will last for an hour, while Q & A will last
25 for 15 minutes. Lunch will be 90 minutes.

26 Mr. Coleman was doubtful about whether OSHPD Director Bob David will speak during
27 the initial welcome. Mr. Coleman said that he himself would speak briefly.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

A. Session 1: *Poll Group Outcomes*

- i. Review of proposed PowerPoint slides and presentations
- ii. Discussion and Public Input
- iii. Committee recommends approval of proposed seminar content

Mr. Hurlbut will show slides and give interpretations, pointing out the disconnects. Mr. Coleman noted that there should be some disconnects, because all of our roles are different.

Mr. La Brie offered to work in the background on logistics and so forth throughout the seminar.

Mr. Hurlbut said that he will take two to three minutes on each of the 20 comments.

Ms. Zamora said that with WiFi in the room, attendees will be provided a link to be able to download the survey results. (There will be no handouts – OSHPD is trying to get away from paper where possible.)

Mr. Hurlbut presented the slides.

Mr. Donelan suggested that Mr. Coleman weigh in on some of the slides when the OSHPD perspective would be helpful. Mr. Coleman agreed – the audience should know about some of OSHPD’s challenges.

Mr. Hurlbut said he would email the slides to the committee.

B. Session 2: *What the Code Requires*

- i. Review of proposed PowerPoint slides and presentations
- ii. Discussion and Public Input
- iii. Committee recommends approval of proposed seminar content

Mr. Donelan stated that the presentation had been formatted at first as an instructional presentation. Mr. Hooper and Mr. Tannahill had redone it to give it more of a seminar orientation.

Mr. Tannahill began the presentation and noted that they had condensed the presentation from 300 slides to 162. The presentation will explain what the roles

1 and responsibilities are by law and regulation – this should help to build relationships
2 and set expectations during a project.

3 Mr. Tannahill outlined the topics:

- 4 • Scope of the Presentation
- 5 • What the Code Requires/Interpretations
- 6 • Start/Stop Work Orders
- 7 • When Permits Are Required
- 8 • Working Without a Permit
- 9 • Liability of the Building Official
- 10 • AMCs (Alternate Methods of Compliance)
- 11 • Engineering Judgments
- 12 • How to Appeal Decisions
- 13 • CPRs (Comment and Process Reviews) – the current process

14 (The committee felt that changes to the next code cycle could be addressed during
15 the upcoming year and a half.)

- 16 • Permits for the different types of projects
- 17 • FREER Manual
- 18 • How to Use Shop Drawings Properly in a Set
- 19 • Deferred Submittals/Approvals and ACDs (Amended Construction Document)
- 20 • TIOs (Testing-Inspection-Observation)
- 21 • Requirements in the Health and Safety Code for Designers
- 22 • Personal Knowledge (for the architect, engineer, IOR, contractor)
- 23 • Special Inspections/Inspectors of Record (IORs)
- 24 • Application of Permits, Phased Approvals, Incremental Reviews
- 25 • Documenting Construction
- 26 • Time Limits for Review and Approval
- 27 • Fees (according to type of project)
- 28 • Inspections
 - 29 ○ Exposed work

- 1 ○ Responsibilities
- 2 ○ Code
- 3 ○ Special Inspections
- 4 ○ Final Inspections
- 5 ○ Agencies
- 6 ○ Inspection Requests
- 7 ○ IORs
- 8 • Errors on Drawings
- 9 • Notifying OSHPD at Stages of Construction
- 10 • Field Reporting
- 11 • Nonconforming Materials
- 12 • Observations by OSHPD
- 13 • Certificate of Occupancy
- 14 • Issuance of CFO
- 15 • Project Close-Out
- 16 • Reopening Projects for Administrative Paperwork

17 Mr. La Brie suggested that Mr. Tannahill and Mr. Hooper tailor their comments on
18 each slide to relationships, roles, and responsibilities.

19 Mr. Hurlbut suggested that the speakers also talk about things that can cause a Stop
20 Work Order – what can create an unsuccessful project.

21 Mr. Gritters suggested including slides focused on roles and responsibilities of the
22 design professional of record, IOR, contractor, owner, etc. A large component of
23 being a good partner and collaborator is understanding what your partners expect of
24 you and what the code requires of you.

25 The committee discussed the issue of OSHPD’s perception that designers are trying
26 to pass off their TIO responsibilities. The committee recognized that there is much
27 interaction going on and much collaboration necessary that is beyond the TIO form.

28 **C. Session 3: Case Studies**

- 29 i. Review of proposed PowerPoint slides and presentations

- 1 ii. Discussion and Public Input
- 2 iii. Committee recommends approval of proposed seminar content

3 Mr. Gritters reported that he had received the slide decks for four of the six case
4 studies. He commented that one of the panels is on UCSF Mission Bay, as is one of
5 the case studies – but Mr. Gritters doesn't have the slide deck for it. He felt that having
6 both a panel and a case study on the same subject was a bit of overkill. He suggested
7 using Stuart Ekblad for the Panel Discussion and using just two case studies for the
8 Northern California seminar.

9 Mr. Gritters also does not have the slide deck for the Kaiser Central San Diego project.
10 He and Mr. La Brie will call the contacts to try to obtain it.

11 Mr. Gritters recommended using St. Jude Fullerton and Sutter Santa Rosa for Northern
12 California, and UC Irvine and Children's Hospital of Orange County (CHOC) for
13 Southern California, while leaving an opening for Kaiser Central San Diego.

14 Mr. Kreuser agreed that with just 20 minutes of presentation time, the project content
15 would suffer; having just two presentations rather than three was preferable.

16 Mr. Gritters said that he would be tracking the time to prompt the presenters. Ms.
17 Zamora noted that in the past, Linda Janssen would watch the time and send text
18 messages to Mr. La Brie.

19 Ms. Zamora also stated that in the past, all the presentation files would be merged in
20 proper order into one document in the morning; the presenters would then go straight
21 through. Staff will need everyone's material in the next two weeks to be able to do that
22 again.

23 Mr. Gritters said that he would see if Kaiser wanted to bow out of the Case Studies
24 portion.

25 He proceeded to show the slides for St. Jude and Sutter Santa Rosa. He felt that even
26 30 minutes might be difficult to fit in all of the material for Sutter Santa Rosa.

27 He has requested all of the teams to prepare a 30" x 42" poster board to place in the
28 gathering area and the lunch area for the attendees to look at.

1 Mr. Gritters continued with the slides for CHOC and UC Irvine. He stressed that the real
2 goal is to focus on relationships, particularly between the project delivery team and
3 OSHPD.

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

- 5 i. Review of proposed PowerPoint slides and presentations
- 6 ii. Discussion and Public Input
- 7 iii. Committee recommends approval of proposed seminar content

8 Mr. Kreuser stated that the Panel Discussion consists of one project team – the
9 Universal Health Service (UHS) Temecula project has an owner representative,
10 principal architect, compliance officer, IOR, and general contractor representative. They
11 will speak about what made their project a success, what attributes they used, and
12 lessons learned. UHS strongly promotes Integrated Project Delivery (IPD).

13 However, despite all of the individual companies, a continuing theme to be seen will be
14 that success boils down to the individual people. The IPD gets interrelationships going
15 that entail accountability, respect, commitment, the ability to change behaviors, and so
16 on.

17 Mr. Kreuser showed the UCSF slides. There are six people participating on the panel.
18 Getting the Compliance Officers on both of the panels will be important in portraying the
19 interface between the IORs, OSHPD, and the respective home office.

20 Both panels will be somewhat self-directed; the moderator will be Mr. Kreuser.

21 Mr. Gritters emphasized that the content of the discussion for both panels will point to
22 building and strengthening relationships with OSHPD. Mr. Hurlbut stressed that this
23 should include relationships with all team members.

24 Mr. Kreuser commented that UCSF was a “best value” type of project where the
25 individuals saw the necessity of coming together and formulating a project team that
26 thrived on working well together. He will include a section on “Lessons Learned” – both
27 the positive side and the negative side – at the end of the session to provide attendees
28 with a takeaway.

1 Mr. Hurlbut suggested emphasizing the co-location of UCSF's two huge offices, which
2 makes it so much easier to walk around and talk.

3 Mr. Donelan suggested putting together a script of questions to send to the speakers in
4 advance, so they would know what to talk about. This would encourage the focus on
5 the group's interaction.

6 Mr. Gritters stated that all of the panelists' participation has been confirmed with the
7 exception of one.

8 Mr. Donelan cautioned that some speakers may use this opportunity to promote their
9 own interests. The moderator would need to ensure that everyone stays on topic.

10 The group recommended going out into the audience with the microphone to solicit off-
11 the-cuff questions for the speakers. Mr. Kreuser agreed that a discussion can be more
12 effective than a presentation.

13 Mr. Karpinen noted that the seminars have always been crunched for time, so the more
14 interactive time for questions, the better.

15 **4. Committee will review and finalize details pertaining to the Seminar venues**
16 **and logistics.**

17 Ms. Zamora said she would ensure that remote microphones are available for the
18 audience.

19 She stated that over 200 people have already signed up.

20 She reminded the group that final presentations must be sent to staff no later than noon
21 on October 13 in order to do the merging and formatting.

22 **5. Comments from the Public/Board Members on Issues Not on This Agenda**

23 An Interested Party who spends time in education and training gave a vote of
24 confidence. He commented that what the committee has put together so far looks
25 outstanding.

26 Ms. Torres requested a list of the panelists who will be having lunch. She also
27 requested confirmation from the committee members on who will be attending the
28 seminar.

1 **6. Adjournment**

2 Mr. Donelan adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:30 p.m.