

**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**

**Tuesday, June 7, 2016**  
**10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.**

**Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development**  
**400 R Street, Suite 452**  
**Sacramento, CA 95811**

and

**Metropolitan Water District Headquarters**  
**700 N. Alameda Street, Suite 2-546**  
**Los Angeles, CA 90012**

**Board Members**

Mike Hooper, Chair  
John Donelan  
Eric Johnson  
Bruce Macpherson  
Bert Hurlbut, Consulting Member  
Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member  
Scott Karpinen, Board Chair

**OSHDP Staff**

Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director  
Hussain Bhatia  
Diana Scaturro  
Richard Tannahill  
Chris Tokas  
Beth Wied

**HBSB Staff**

Kathi Zamora  
Krista Harrington  
Evet Torres

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

- 1 Mr. Mike Hooper, Committee Chair, called the meeting to order and announced that
- 2 a quorum was present. The group determined that the Committee Vice-Chair
- 3 position did not have to be filled at this point – the important thing was that a quorum
- 4

1 was present. Mr. Scott Karpinen, Board Chair, said that when a few more Board  
2 members officially join the committee, that extra role will be filled.

3 Committee members, OSHPD staff, and other attendees introduced themselves.

## 4 **2. Review and approve the April 14, 2016 meeting report/minutes**

5 Mr. Hooper reported that during the April meeting, the committee had discussed having  
6 seminars on lessons learned during construction and on 2016 code changes. For the  
7 former, they had discussed developing a top ten list of construction issues from all  
8 disciplines, and possible breakout sessions.

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

10 The committee voted unanimously to adopt the April 14, 2016 meeting minutes.

## 11 **3. Discussion on the 2016 OSHPD/HBSB Educational Opportunity Seminar** 12 **Survey**

13 **In May, the committee invited interested parties to participate in a survey**  
14 **regarding issues that frequently impact hospital construction projects**

- 15 • **Review survey format and results**
- 16 • **Discussion and public input**

17 Mr. Hooper requested the committee to consider the seminar objectives and possible  
18 subtopics for the seminar sessions as they reviewed the survey responses.

19 The group observed that the number of respondents (57) was low considering how  
20 many surveys had been sent out.

21 The group discussed difficulties stemming from Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)  
22 upgrade requirements.

23 Mr. Hooper had reviewed the survey results and shared his comments.

- 24 • A number of the questions could be answered by reading the administrative  
25 code. Also, the document *Tips from the Experts* would answer many of the  
26 concerns.
- 27 • There were many human behavior-type complaints about interpretation.
- 28 • There were questions about OSHPD process and procedures.

- 1 • e-Services Portal (eSP) had come up.
- 2 • There seemed to be a general lack of knowledge of code.
- 3 • There were complaints about document management: how documents were put
- 4 together and the lack of completeness.

5 Considering these responses, Mr. Hooper noted that the upcoming seminar could focus  
6 on the same topics as the previous seminars.

7 Mr. Coleman commented that from the Hospital Owners, he saw complaints: about field  
8 staff changes to approve plans, changes in scope, and inconsistency. Those could be  
9 lumped into one category. For training, Mr. Coleman noted that the Comment Process  
10 Review (CPR) has been inserted into the Building Code now, and people should take  
11 advantage of it. OSHPD seeks to automate the process where submitted concerns are  
12 elevated to progressively higher levels.

13 Mr. Hooper commented that for those afraid of retribution, this process would provide a  
14 helpful timeline through which someone should expect to get the answers they look for.  
15 Overall, out in the field, the most critical thing is trying to get rulings decided one way or  
16 the other so the project can move forward.

17 Mr. Coleman stated that OSHPD has an internal process that they could inform the  
18 industry about, called Resolution of Approved Document Issues. He noted that when  
19 plans are approved, they will stand as approved unless a Life Safety issue is  
20 discovered. This is in writing as a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP).

21 Mr. Coleman suggested handling this issue – the dispute when field staff differs from  
22 the approved plans – as an FAQ on the website. It is actually an internal OSHPD issue.

23 Mr. Coleman suggested that a seminar could address issues of field changes, changes  
24 in scope (which has a remodel Code Application Notice [CAN]), and Resolution of  
25 Approved Document Issues.

26 Regarding review time, Mr. Coleman said that OSHPD will be addressing it in the longer  
27 run with Electronic Plan Review. The e-Checklist also addresses review time; it shows  
28 what each discipline is looking for in terms of code compliance. Eventually it will allow  
29 hyperlinks in the electronic drawings where designers can indicate compliance with  
30 code requirements. Mr. Bruce Macpherson, Committee Member, added that

1 e-Checklist will help with inconsistency in reviews and interpretation of code.

2 Mr. Richard Tannahill commented that due dates for review times used to be published  
3 for the public, but the eSP on the public side presently does not show the due dates.  
4 Much of OSHPD's reviews are completed early; if people knew that, maybe complaints  
5 would decrease.

6 Mr. Coleman added that part of the issue is that the industry does not realize that  
7 turnaround time also includes some triage and checking for completeness that staff is  
8 supposed to complete within five days. Even with Electronic Plan Review, the program  
9 technicians must check that all of the files downloaded properly.

10 Mr. Hooper observed that there had been a survey response about understanding  
11 Materially Alter. Mr. Coleman commented that every seminar addresses that issue.  
12 Possibly OSHPD could do some training internally.

13 Mr. Hooper pointed out that questions were submitted about de-licensing and changing  
14 of occupancies. Mr. Coleman responded that an OSHPD task force is working on  
15 repurposing of hospital buildings; by September possibly a presentation could be done.  
16 The same goes for CPR, the Resolution of Approved Document Issues, and new  
17 programs that will help with review time.

18 Mr. Hooper had observed confusion in the owners' responses regarding the FREER  
19 manual. Mr. Coleman pointed out confusion about the field confirmation process as  
20 well.

21 Ms. Diana Scaturro commented that in the Rapid Review Unit, they are seeing projects  
22 being removed from Acute Care Services and then being adapted for other purposes –  
23 but there is really no understanding on the owner's side of how to approach that issue.  
24 They do not understand bigger issues and bigger questions. Mr. Coleman agreed that it  
25 is a very commonly occurring issue. Providing direction on this issue alone would make  
26 the upcoming seminar worthwhile.

27 Mr. Macpherson said that it would be good to clarify the code requirements for changing  
28 occupancies of buildings. Mr. Coleman noted that different situations will result in  
29 different options.

1 Ms. Scaturro noted that Mr. Coleman has given a direction to this committee regarding  
2 the hardline requirements for B and I Occupancies – to find what meets the intent but  
3 not necessarily the letter of the code. This information would be helpful to share at the  
4 seminar.

5 Mr. Macpherson asked if it would be beneficial to do away with over-the-counter reviews  
6 in favor of over-the-computer. Mr. Coleman replied that in a number of situations that  
7 could be beneficial and could occur (for example, for job sites in San Diego). There  
8 may be some reviews that would be better as over-the-counter either at the job site or at  
9 a location within the region – but they would be better served if the field staff does them.

10 Mr. Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member, commented that one of the most efficient ways  
11 of getting changes done in the field is with the field inspectors on the job site. Another  
12 theme we are seeing from the survey is the availability and number of field inspectors  
13 available for a project. Mr. Macpherson felt that the big issue is availability of staff; they  
14 are very open to field reviews but are overworked.

15 Mr. Coleman stated that OSHPD is taking numerous cost-reducing steps in order to  
16 enable hiring of more field staff. Right now OSHPD just does not have the revenue to  
17 be able to hire.

18 Ms. Scaturro explained how the Rapid Review Unit is hoping to achieve more  
19 efficiencies: with over-the-counter review, the unit is starting to make frequent use of  
20 Skype – it is easier for the disciplines.

21 Mr. Coleman noted that slipsheets must go in the back of the electronic package. This  
22 seminar could train owners in what to look for in their designers' performance – what  
23 indicates good or bad performance. With electronic plan review, owners will get a list of  
24 remarks and the designers' responses to the remarks. The industry may receive a rude  
25 awakening about slipping in sheets.

26 Mr. Coleman also noted that use of Skype can save another backcheck cycle.

27 **4. Discussion on the proposed topics for the Committee's 2016 Educational**  
28 **Opportunity Seminars: "Lessons Learned During Construction" and "Update on**  
29 **2016 Code Changes"**

30 **• Review objectives**

- 1 • **Determine subtopics and define sessions**
- 2 • **Develop list of speakers and format**
- 3 • **Develop preliminary seminar dates and locations**
- 4 • **Discussion and public input**

5 Mr. Hooper listed the topics he had noted at this point.

- 6 1. The CPR Process
- 7 2. Reducing Review Time
- 8 3. Directions for Repurposing Buildings and Occupancies
- 9 4. What Owners Need to Know About the Quality of Documents (can be covered
- 10 under #2)
- 11 5. The Remodel CAN (?)
- 12 6. FREER (?)

13 Regarding #5 and 6, Mr. Coleman commented that owners need to understand that  
14 although a project does not require a review or a permit, it does require some level of  
15 OSHPD involvement. He noted that some compliance issues can be handled over the  
16 phone. Number 6 could be titled “How to Use the FREER Manual.”

17 Mr. Macpherson shared the worry of the owners: that if they call OSHPD, a simple  
18 decoration-type project will become an onerous, time-consuming OSHPD project.  
19 Addressing that fear could go a long way in getting people to communicate with  
20 OSHPD. Due to the nature of remodel projects, many unforeseen conditions come up.  
21 Owners might envision OSHPD holding up a project for something small like replacing  
22 flooring.

23 The group discussed having a FREER Helpdesk. Mr. Coleman also suggested calling  
24 the Regional Compliance Officer (RCO).

25 Mr. Bert Hurlbut, Consulting Member, asked if the FREER manual is updated every  
26 code cycle. Mr. Coleman replied that it was updated a few years ago by a team led by  
27 Mr. Gordon Oakley of OSHPD. It is actually more process-driven.

28 Mr. Karpinen, observing the broad spectrum of responses to the survey questions,  
29 asked if the committee should change the title of the seminar. He also asked Mr.  
30 Coleman about bringing in field staff to relate common issues they encounter.

1 Mr. Coleman commented that the Best Practices seminar had addressed these  
2 recurring issues. Transparency is the key; that is why the electronic plan review  
3 process is going to provide much more transparency than we have ever had.

4 Mr. Coleman felt that the name of the seminar was the draw. We should start with  
5 lessons learned before construction starts (plans, slipsheeting, etc.), then move into  
6 lessons learned during construction – how to get issues resolved in a timely way. He  
7 commented that we want to make the CPR process more visible and formal; issues  
8 should be brought up within a certain timeframe of their occurrence, in order for them to  
9 be processed.

10 He felt that owners should know the importance of giving the design team time to do  
11 discovery. This will prevent scope changes during construction – the drawings need to  
12 match the conditions.

13 Mr. Chris Tokas, OSHPD, said he would vet the questions with the field staff.

14 Mr. Hurlbut commented that currently we do everything under Building Information  
15 Modeling (BIM). It is a problem to pay for people to do the BIM work, with all the  
16 information that's shown all of a sudden. Mr. Coleman added that OSHPD sees the  
17 information on the initial plans that they review and approve, then the BIM models come  
18 in and change it all.

19 Mr. Eric Johnson, Committee Member, commented on the issue Mr. Tannahill had  
20 raised about the compliance duration of code cycles. He suggested a basic table. Mr.  
21 Coleman said that the same questions exist for accessibility. Mr. Tannahill noted that  
22 currently we allow for specific exceptions to code, for example before 2001, but with  
23 accessibility they are not permitted.

24 Mr. Tannahill noted that when someone does a separate project on items exempt from  
25 accessibility, the changes may still trigger accessibility. Mr. Macpherson noted that the  
26 concept of what you are doing and why you are doing it is important. So many issues  
27 arise when someone changes or adds to an approved project. The group agreed.

28 The group discussed the seminar schedule. They came up with:

29         Session 1: Pre-construction issues that should be done right

30         Session 2: Beginning construction

1           Session 3: Issues during construction

2           Session 4: Closure of construction

3 Mr. Kreuser suggested a session on documentation. He also mentioned that much of  
4 the material above was covered during last year’s seminars. Mr. Coleman responded  
5 that this year the emphasis would be slightly different: how do these items affect  
6 construction?

7 Mr. Hooper mentioned having a panel discussion. Mr. Coleman did not want a panel to  
8 become a gripe session about people’s specific experiences – it can be hard to keep  
9 the panels general. It is best to have people submit questions beforehand that the  
10 panelists address.

11 Mr. Hooper moved the group toward assigning speakers. Mr. Coleman suggested Mr.  
12 Oakley and Mr. Gary Dunger of OSHPD. The group suggested Mr. John Donelan,  
13 Committee Member, who agreed, as did Mr. Macpherson.

14 Mr. Karpinen observed that two of the survey respondents wanted more field staff  
15 involvement in the presentations. There were many comments about the need to learn  
16 from unsuccessful projects. Mr. Coleman noted that Mr. Oakley and Mr. Dunger had  
17 both been RCOs so they would bring that perspective.

18 Mr. Kreuser agreed to speak in the “During construction” session.

19 Mr. Coleman listed the tentative speaker assignments:

20           Session 1: Mr. Tannahill and Mr. Macpherson

21           Session 2: Mr. Hooper and Mr. Oakley

22           Session 3: Mr. Kreuser and Mr. Dunger

23           Session 4: Mr. Hurlbut and Mr. Tokas

24 Either Mr. Karpinen or Mr. Joe La Brie will be the emcee.

25 The group established that the sessions will be 75 minutes each. Mr. Karpinen noted  
26 survey comments that there is never enough time for Q & A; the group agreed to have  
27 15 minutes at the end of each session for that.

28 Mr. Coleman will give the opening welcome.

1 The group decided to have lunch last for an hour to make time for the panel discussion.  
2 They needed to see what kinds of questions come in to do more planning on that.

3 After hearing rough presentations at the next meeting, the group can rework the  
4 schedule accordingly.

5 Mr. Hooper directed the group to the topic of presentation content. Mr. Coleman  
6 suggested for the presenters to meet with their co-presenters to discuss content they  
7 already had, and to go through the survey responses to consider those from their  
8 specific areas. Mr. Hooper suggested that at the next committee meeting, presenters  
9 could discuss the content they had put together.

10 The seminar is to take place sometime in October or November.

11 Ms. Kathi Zamora, OSHPD, and staff will begin arranging locations. The group  
12 discussed potential cities and decided to start with Los Angeles and Sacramento.

13 Mr. Hooper asked about the possibility of holding the Code Changes seminar. Mr.  
14 Coleman responded that OSHPD would first need to meet with the technical leads for  
15 each discipline to see what information has been put together and what is still needed.

## 16 **5. Comments from the Public/Board Members on issues not on this agenda**

17 An Interested Party commended OSHPD's moves to use Skype and other online  
18 capabilities for the sake of efficiency. She felt that OSHPD is more accessible online –  
19 they should get the word out about these improvements.

20 An Interested Party representing the Hospital Association felt that the seminars and  
21 their content have been excellent. Hospital owners and members of the Hospital  
22 Association greatly need this information. She encouraged having more  
23 webinar/archiving recording, and offering these as a series of modules on the website.  
24 The other Interested Party was also in favor of having the seminars available online.

25 Mr. Coleman pointed out that OSHPD has a Training and Education page available on  
26 the website. OSHPD does not post seminars immediately after they are held, in order  
27 to be fair to those who paid to attend.

## 28 **6. Adjournment**

29 Mr. Hooper adjourned the meeting at approximately 12:00 p.m.