

**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](http://www.oshpd.ca.gov/Boards/HBSB/index.html)

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

**Thursday, April 14, 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  
Joe La Brie, Consulting Member  
Scott Karpinen, HBSB Chair

**OSHPD Staff**

Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director  
Hussain Bhatia  
Gary Dunger  
Roy Lobo  
Diana Scaturro  
Richard Tannahill

**HBSB Staff**

Kathi Zamora, Acting Executive Director  
Krista Harrington  
Evet Torres

1 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

- 2 Chair Mike Hooper called the meeting to order. Board members, OSHPD staff, and  
3 Interested Parties introduced themselves. Mr. Hooper announced that a quorum  
4 was achieved.

1 **2. Review and approve September 29, 2015 draft meeting report / minutes**

2 Mr. Hooper stated that the minutes had been approved at the full Board meeting last  
3 November 18.

4 **3. Review the data and suggestions compiled from the 2015 “Building**  
5 **Relationships for a Successful Project” Seminar Forms**

6 Ms. Zamora directed the committee members to the handout.

7 Mr. Coleman observed that 19% of attendees had registered as Hospital Owners, but  
8 31% identified as Hospital Owners.

9 Mr. Hooper observed comments that people wanted more of an interactive seminar; that  
10 they liked the panel discussion; and that they wanted more OSHPD representation.

11 Mr. Karpinen observed comments requesting smaller projects and case studies.

12 Mr. Coleman observed comments requesting conflict resolution as a topic. Mr. Donelan  
13 said that the focus had been on relationships and what was going well.

14 **4. Discussion on the proposed topics for the Committee’s 2016 seminar:**  
15 **“Lessons Learned During Construction” and “Update on 2016 Code Changes”**

- 16 • Determine the main learning objectives/goals of the seminar

17 Mr. Karpinen stated that during construction, hard issues can be encountered based  
18 on design or how the project is being built. The same issues can carry over from  
19 project to project. The committee needs to devise a list of issues.

20 Mr. Coleman noted that field staff can bring forward issues they have encountered.  
21 He also noted the importance of showing where things have gone right.

22 Interested Party Jim Davis, an Inspector of Record (IOR), noted that many of Dignity  
23 Health’s projects are focused on IT tenant improvement projects in existing  
24 buildings. He described the difficulties encountered during OSHPD reviews. A  
25 continuing problem is that the services provided to the owner are missing many  
26 conceptual details that are part of the project; they are left for the contractor to try to  
27 stumble through, while the owner tries to keep the project on schedule and the  
28 architect continually tries to infill details.

1 Mr. Davis suggested having a process for reviewers to speak openly with owners  
2 about conditions of drawing preparations before they actually get permitted. This  
3 would stop much of the “shadowboxing” between the owner, the design professional,  
4 and OSHPD. At the same time, the architect needs to be able to convey the  
5 information about the design that the owner has given, directly to OSHPD and to the  
6 builders. Mr. Davis stressed the unique and important relationship between OSHPD  
7 and the owners.

8 Mr. Hooper asked about the seminar goals and objectives that Mr. Davis would like  
9 to see. He answered that he would like to see discussion of an open relationship  
10 between reviewers and architects – showing that OSHPD is not averse to having  
11 conversations with the owner that the architect may need more resources to be able  
12 to adequately respond to backcheck comments and other items. This may not only  
13 help facilitate the job, but also help the owner stay on track in getting what the  
14 architect has promised him.

15 Mr. La Brie suggested a main objective of targeting mistakes that happen on a  
16 regular basis.

17 Mr. Johnson suggested a Top Ten list of issues for electrical, mechanical, and  
18 architectural – all the trades.

19 Ms. Scaturro suggested sending out a survey to the industry where respondents  
20 could rank topics on importance.

21 Interested Party Scott Bell noted that in his Preferred Provider Network they do  
22 quarterly education sessions with architects, making use of surveymonkey.

23 Mr. Karpinen commented on the need for OSHPD’s input, including Area  
24 Compliance Officers (ACOs), during discussions.

25 Mr. Coleman commented on the roles and responsibilities aspect. We have systems  
26 in place, for example, after the third backcheck staff is supposed to meet with the  
27 client (the owner). We are faced with the issue that hospitals have a very slim  
28 operating margin.

1 Mr. Coleman continued that during the last recession, the industry had done  
2 something different than in the past: many firms let their senior staff go and kept  
3 their junior staff. The result is that the quality of the plans coming in has suffered.

4 Ms. Scaturro pointed out the number of processes that people don't know about.  
5 Regarding the problem of the owners not being aware – with the movement toward  
6 Electronic Plan Review, owners are now being copied when OSHPD sends  
7 comments out.

8 Mr. Coleman described a process in development for certain types of hospital  
9 projects such as replacement of radiology equipment: e-Checklist, which will enable  
10 the design professional to know what the architectural plan checker is looking for in  
11 the code section.

12 Mr. Tannahill had observed the document compliance issue that the design is not  
13 necessarily wrong, but many parts are unclear.

14 Mr. Macpherson had noticed that his staff focuses on the work the contractor needs  
15 to know to the exclusion of document compliance.

16 An Interested Party commented that what he is looking for in the next seminar would  
17 be what has worked well, in order to resolve problems that come up such as  
18 equipment changes. Regarding existing conditions, what has been successful for  
19 things such as attaching to nonconforming firewalls?

- 20 • Outline sub-topics and define sessions

21 Mr. Hooper asked if the committee wanted to separate the Changes to 2016 Code  
22 section, or intermingle it with Lessons Learned.

23 Mr. Coleman felt that because of the number of code changes, it should be its own  
24 seminar. Mr. Lobo agreed. Mr. Coleman wanted to see the people on a project  
25 working toward the end outcome – using the checklist – from the very start of  
26 construction

27 Mr. Kreuser commented that having two separate seminars may put them in  
28 competition regarding attendance.

1 Mr. Coleman felt that two locations apiece should be offered for the two seminars.

2 Mr. La Brie commented that there would be a difference in audience between the  
3 two seminars; owners may not want to have a “deep dive” on the code changes.

4 Mr. Coleman suggested that for the Code Changes seminar, a breakout of the  
5 disciplines could be handled in a half day. Perhaps the Lessons Learned seminar  
6 could also be a half day, on the same day.

7 Mr. La Brie noted that IORs would have difficulty if the breakout sessions were held  
8 concurrently.

9 Mr. Hurlbut noted that many attendees from the last seminar had commented that  
10 they wanted a more interactive seminar. Four interactive sessions – Architectural,  
11 Structural, MEP, and Admin – could easily take 1½ hours apiece if the audience  
12 were asking questions.

13 Mr. Coleman commented that sometimes interactive sessions can turn into gripe  
14 sessions. Consistency between the north and south sessions could also be an  
15 issue. Attendees could be asked ahead of time to give the issues they want  
16 discussed, and the committee could select the universal ones.

17 Mr. La Brie suggested writing fictitious building problem scenarios as a way of  
18 introducing the code changes.

19 Mr. Davis said that three books supplied by the OSHPD Preapproval of  
20 Manufacturer’s Certification (OPM) group discuss typical details of items that are  
21 readily approved. The books are an excellent tool for IORs.

22 Mr. Coleman agreed on the value of using Pre-Approved Details and OPMs rather  
23 than reinventing. Another option, as yet unused, is for hospitals to develop standard  
24 details at the project outset and have them preapproved by OSHPD, then giving  
25 them to the designer.

26 Mr. Coleman noted that there is no cumulative list of comments made on drawings  
27 that would show commonly occurring problems. (However, Electronic Plan Review  
28 will be able to capture them.)

1 The committee discussed sending a survey to IORs, designers, inspectors, builders,  
2 and owners, asking the top 10 issues and problems they commonly see.

3 Mr. Hooper summarized the objectives the committee had devised: focus on all  
4 sizes of projects – large and small – within existing facilities; address the mistakes  
5 that keep occurring; and compile a top 10 list of major concerns from everyone. This  
6 would provide the foundation for the seminar.

7 The committee noted that they already have a listserv from the previous survey.

8 Mr. Coleman said that when the surveymonkey results come back, staff can sort  
9 them into some kind of spreadsheet to distribute to the committee members. The  
10 members will then develop the topics and organize speakers.

11 Mr. Macpherson noted that to keep a successful construction project going, two  
12 things need to be maintained: flow of information and flow of money.

13 Mr. Hooper mentioned a frequent question from inspectors about how far outside a  
14 project to go for things that are noncompliant – this is still confusing for many IORs  
15 in the field.

16 Mr. Coleman noted that many options are available such as the remodel CAN and  
17 the predesign meeting. There are processes in place that people are not aware of.

- 18 • Develop list of speakers and format

19 Mr. Coleman said that staff would draft a survey and distribute it to the committee  
20 members for their review. Staff would take their comments and finalize the survey,  
21 then send it to the listserv. Those recipients would have a timeframe for responding  
22 if they wish for their issues to be considered.

23 Mr. Hooper suggested deferring the list of speakers until the next meeting.

- 24 • Develop preliminary seminar dates and locations

25 Mr. Coleman felt that the question of the Code seminar (full day or half day) could be  
26 considered at the next meeting when the survey results have come in.

1 The committee discussed the timing for the Code seminar. Ms. Scaturro noted that  
2 designers are preparing their material now. Mr. Hooper suggested September for  
3 the Code seminar and October/November for the Lessons Learned seminar.

4 Mr. Johnson suggested having a lunch speaker, possibly presenting on security of  
5 electronic health care records.

6 Mr. Coleman mentioned that for the Lessons Learned seminar, he wanted to avoid  
7 having separate Regional Compliance Officers (RCOs) in the north and south giving  
8 different answers.

9 He added that the committee members represented all of the different stakeholders,  
10 so that they could each examine the survey results in the different categories.

11 Mr. Dunger mentioned that with the Rapid Review Unit, OSHPD is tracking how  
12 electronic documents are being submitted that cause problems from both a  
13 programmatic standpoint and a configuration standpoint. A Lessons Learned topic  
14 could be how to avoid pitfalls when preparing electronic documents.

15 Mr. Coleman felt that the topic could actually be its own seminar – possibly before its  
16 statewide implementation June 27. He suggested a series of webinars – the short  
17 time period does not lend itself to setting up seminars.

18 Mr. Karpinen asked if all the seminars thus far have been fully booked. Mr. Coleman  
19 and Ms. Torres answered that they have.

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

21 There were no further comments.

## 22 **6. Adjournment**

23 After a motion and a second, the committee adjourned the meeting at approximately  
24 11:55 a.m.