



SUBJECT

Collaborative Review and Construction process (CRC) & Phased Plan Review (PPR)

PIN: 50
Effective: 12/05/13



PURPOSE

The Office implemented its Phased Plan Review (PPR) Process in 2007. Several iterations of PPR have been used successfully on a number of projects reducing the time to first approval by up to six months, and minimizing the number of post approval documents submitted for PPR projects. In consideration of the Industry's growing demand for utilizing LEAN principles and Integrated Project Delivery methods, OSHPD is building on the success of the PPR process and implementing an optional plan review process known as Collaborative Review and Construction (CRC). This PIN incorporates lessons learned on PPR projects to date and, while defining the Collaborative Review and Construction process, re-defines the Phased Plan Review process.

BACKGROUND

From the California Health and Safety Code, Section 129765:

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the office, in its sole discretion, may enter into a written agreement with the hospital governing authority for the phased submittal and approval of plans. The office shall charge a fee for the review and approval of plans submitted pursuant to this subdivision. This fee shall be based on the estimated cost, but shall not exceed the actual cost, of the entire phased review and approval process for those plans. This fee shall be deducted from the application fee pursuant to Section 129785.

From the California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 1:

7-121 (c) **Phased plan review and collaborative review and construction.** A request for Phased Plan Review (PPR) or Collaborative Review and Construction (CRC) must be submitted to the Office in writing, prior to the Presubmittal meeting being scheduled. In addition to the items listed in 7-121 (a), for PPR or CRC reviewed projects, the architect or engineer in responsible charge shall submit the following information to the Office:

1. Complete project schedule.
2. Proposed review matrix outlining all phases, milestones, increments, and segments for the project.
3. Initial draft of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) proposed, defining roles and accountability of the participants.

7-133 (h) Phased submittal review and collaborative review.

1. The fee for phased submittal, review and approval pursuant to Section 7-130 shall be based on the written agreement, which shall include a schedule for payment. The phased review fee shall not exceed the fee required by Section 7-133 (a).
2. The fee for collaborative review shall be 1.95 percent of the estimated construction cost as calculated in accordance with Section 7-133 (a) 4 through 7.

POLICY

This OSHPD Policy implements the Collaborative Review and Construction process, and the re-defined Phased Plan Review process.

PROCEDURE

See Appendix A: Definitions

The table below describes the Collaborative Plan Review & Construction (CRC) process and the Phased Plan Review (PPR) process, including project parameters for which each process will be considered, description of sequential steps within each process through completion, Required Elements, and Goals and Best Practices for each process.

PHASED PLAN REVIEW (PPR) PROCESS	COLLABORATIVE PLAN REVIEW & CONSTRUCTION (CRC) PROCESS
Submit Request for Integrated Review (RIR) OSH-FD-122	Submit Request for Integrated Review (RIR) OSH-FD-122
<p>Project Parameters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Cost: > \$50 million* Collaboration Level 1 or 2 for \$50 mil to \$100 mil Collaboration Level 3 or equivalent for >\$100 mil * Lower Project Costs may be negotiated with the Office considering appropriateness and Office resources. • Increments: 2 - 3 max • Phases: 3 per Increment + final Implementation documents • Segments: 3 per Phase • Submittals: 1 per segment (indicate which disciplines require review) • Elements reviewed in each segment: negotiable • Fee: 1.64 % 	<p>Project Parameters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Cost: > \$100 million* Collaboration Level 3 or equivalent * Lower Project Costs may be negotiated with the Office considering appropriateness and Office resources. • Increments: 2 min - 6 recommended max • Phases: 3 per Increment + final Implementation documents • Segments: 3 per Phase • Submittals: 1 per segment (indicate which disciplines require review) • Elements reviewed in each segment: negotiable • Fee: 1.95%
Upon acceptance of RIR by the Office, assign OSHPD staff for the plan review of permit sets.	Upon acceptance of RIR by the Office, assign OSHPD staff for plan review including ACD's through construction.

POLICY INTENT NOTICE (PIN)

PPR - PROCESS	CRC - PROCESS
<p>Owner to schedule the Presubmittal Meeting with the Office. Review draft MOU & Matrix outlining tasks through approval of last CD or implementation submittal.</p>	<p>Owner to schedule the Presubmittal Meeting with the Office. Review draft MOU & Matrix outlining tasks through approval of last CD or implementation submittal and all collaboration workshops through construction for ACD resolution. ACDs reviewed within the CRC rolling review process will be limited to 8hrs per discipline per month, typically consisting of two 4 hour bi-monthly or four 2 hour weekly meetings as agreed.</p>
<p>Submit final MOU including matrix for office review and approval.</p>	<p>Submit Final MOU including matrix for office review and approval.</p>
<p>Upon approval of MOU submit first review with plan review application as scheduled within the approved matrix (including Matrix Summary - See Appendix).</p>	<p>Upon approval of MOU submit first review with plan review application as scheduled within the approved matrix (including Matrix Summary - See Appendix).</p>
<p>Plan reviews shall consist of:</p> <p>Plan Exchange Meetings: 1hr discipline to discipline pre-review meetings for design consultants to clarify segments to reviewers. 1hr discipline to discipline post-review meetings for reviewers to clarify comments to design consultants.</p> <p>Submittals and review per matrix schedule.</p> <p>Rolling reviews only for contract out structural.</p> <p>Log of conditional acceptance on matrix (when requested).</p> <p>Major Code Issues immediately resolved with rolling reviews, emails, meetings or teleconference.</p> <p>Back checks for the segment will be performed at next scheduled review per matrix.</p>	<p>Plan review shall consist of:</p> <p>Plan Exchange Meetings: 1hr discipline to discipline pre-review meeting for design consultants to clarify segments to reviewers.</p> <p>Submittals and review per matrix schedule.</p> <p>Rolling reviews, all comments and conditional acceptance for each discipline will be entered on OSHPD Collaborative Plan Check Review Log.</p> <p>Regularly scheduled Collaboration Workshops and special workshops deemed necessary or appropriate by the Sup, HFR or RCO, HFC.</p> <p>Major Code Issues immediately resolved with rolling reviews, emails, meetings or teleconference.</p> <p>Back checks for the segment will be performed at next scheduled review per matrix.</p>
<p>Phased review ends when all permit sets of construction documents have been approved. This includes permit sets and deferred approvals (when included in the Review Matrix).</p>	<p>Collaborative Review ends when all required construction documents have been approved. This includes permit sets, deferred approvals and ACD's.</p>
<p>Required Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RIR (OSH-FD-122) • MOU & Review Matrix • Pre-submittal Meeting • Owner-approved Space and Operational Program prior to first submittal • Plan Exchange Meetings • Collaboration Level One or Two for project up to \$100 million. Level 3 (or equivalent) for projects over \$100 million • For projects > \$100 million - BIM modeling software or at a minimum 3D modeling software • For projects > \$100 million - Project Design Team integrated with a CM/GC and major sub-contractors for the MEP trades 	<p>Required Elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RIR (OSH-FD-122) • MOU & Review Matrix • Pre-submittal Meeting • Owner-approved Space and Operational Program prior to first submittal • Collaboration Workshops • Plan exchange meetings • Rolling reviews & Record Review Set • Collaborative Plan check Review Log • Level- of-Detail Approach with Collaboration Level Three (or equivalent) • BIM modeling software or at a minimum 3D modeling software • All 2D drawings should be produced directly from the 3D model • Project Design Team integrated with a CM/GC and major sub-contractors for the MEP trades

PPR - PROCESS	CRC - PROCESS
<p>Goals and Best Practices</p> <p>A. Design Team Review Matrix</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Review Matrix for the development of the drawings must be based on a progressive level of detail and an outline schedule must indicate anticipated dates for meetings including OSHPD review staff. 2. It is highly recommended that the Project Design Team be integrated with a CM/GC and major sub-contractors for the MEP trades. <p>B. Plan Exchange Meetings (Limited to 1 hour per discipline)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the Review Matrix, Plan Exchange Meetings that involve OSHPD review staff should, at a minimum, include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Agenda with specific topics to be discussed • A summary of design and related code issues • Graphic presentations of specific areas of the design being discussed • New plans, calculations and specifications submitted for review 2. An Issues Log must be maintained to track design-compliance issues and should be reviewed at the beginning of each meeting. 3. Impacts of the discussion in the meeting on the remaining submittal dates in the Review Matrix shall be discussed. 4. At the conclusion of the project meeting, a summary of action-items should be reviewed, and the Design Team must provide OSHPD a written summary of issues, design direction agreed to in the meeting, and action-items for outstanding items or topics for the next meeting. 5. If necessary an updated Review Matrix shall be submitted. 	<p>Goals and Best Practices</p> <p>A. Design Team Review Matrix</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Review Matrix for the development of the drawings must be based on a progressive level of detail and an outline schedule must indicate anticipated workshop dates for meetings including OSHPD review staff. <p>B. Collaboration Workshops and Plan Exchange Meetings</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the Review Matrix, Collaboration Workshops or Plan exchange meetings that involve OSHPD review staff should, at a minimum, include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Agenda with specific topics to be discussed • A summary of design and related code issues • A complete OSHPD Collaborative Plan Check Review Log • Graphic presentations of specific areas of the design being discussed • New plans, calculations and specifications submitted for review (for Plan Exchange Meetings) 2. An Issues Log must be maintained to track design-compliance issues and should be reviewed at the beginning of each workshop agenda. 3. Impacts of the discussion in the workshop on the remaining submittal dates in the Review Matrix shall be discussed. 4. At the conclusion of the Workshop, a summary of action-items should be reviewed, and the Design Team must provide OSHPD a written summary of issues, design direction agreed to in the meeting, and action-items for outstanding items or topics for the next meeting. 5. If necessary an updated Review Matrix shall be submitted.

Original Signed

12/05/13

Paul Coleman

Date

APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS

Amended Construction Document (ACD): Work shall be installed in accordance with the approved construction documents, and any changes made during construction that are not in compliance with the approved construction documents shall be resubmitted for approval as an amended set of construction documents. *[OSHPD 1, 2 & 4] Change in the work shall be in accordance with Title 24, Part 1, Chapter 7, Section 7-153.*

Collaboration Level: “Integrated Project Delivery for Public and Private Owners” offers a tiered approach to achieving collaboration based on three levels. The three levels represent the typical spectrum through which owners move. The three collaboration levels are:

Collaboration Level One – Typical; collaboration not contractually required*

Collaboration Level Two – Enhanced; some contractual collaboration requirements*

Collaboration Level Three – Required; collaboration required by a multi-party contract*

*Collaboration Levels as defined in Integrated “Project Delivery For Public and Private Owners” published as a Joint Effort of the National Association of State Facilities Administrators (NASFA); Construction Owners Association of America (COAA); APPA: The Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers; Associated General Contractors of America (AGC); and American Institute of Architects (AIA)

Collaboration Workshop (CW): Regularly scheduled Team Meetings between the project’s design team and OSHPD staff where new comments/concerns are discussed and resolution of outstanding comments/concerns takes place.

Collaborative Plan Check Review Log: A log shared by the OSHPD and design team tracking comments and resolution and managed by arch and engineers of record (see attached example).

Collaborative Review and Construction (CRC): Is the process that engages the Office, at its sole discretion early in the project design phases as defined below, utilizing a **Rolling Review** process through issuance of permits and for ACD’s during construction, that consists of a series of regularly scheduled in-person review meetings where the plan reviewers and the designers meet to resolve outstanding comments. Submittal of details or drawings through e-mail, such as a PDF files or other acceptable electronic media, may be an alternative collaborative approach to resolving a plan check issue with a reviewer. Within each phase, milestone(s) will be established at which point specific, agreed upon segments of the design and/or building systems are completely designed and/or are defined in their entirety. Rolling reviews may be used with CRC. FDD will provide an agreed upon level of review allowing for written conditional acceptance of these segments as specified in the MOU.

Conditional Acceptance: This is FDD’s acceptance that a certain segment as currently shown complies with code, on the condition that no changes are made to the project affecting this acceptance.

Elements: Portions of the building or building systems used to further define a segment. Elements are conditionally accepted only as part of conditional acceptance of segments. Building permits are for projects or increments, hence elements do not have associated building permits.

Increment: Per Part 1, Title 24, Section 7-131. Approval of increments in phased and collaborative reviews will require review and conditional acceptance of all items affecting the

increment. If these required items are not to be constructed within an increment, they shall be clearly marked for reference only or be simultaneously submitted in another increment.

Integrated Review: Plan review performed by FDD staff prior to 100% Implementation documents utilizing either the Phased Plan Review (PPR) or Collaborative Review and Construction (CRC) processes.

Integrated Review Schedule: Typically a Gantt chart or bar graph showing the schedule for all phases of plan review and construction.

Level-of-Detail Approach: This approach to the development of Project Documents features project-specific milestones which are defined by a level of content detail provided by the design professionals in an electronic format – presumably a BIM or other 3D modeling software. The Level-of-Detail (LOD) descriptions could follow the 100-500 standard system (see table below).

Level of Detail	Model Content Description
100	Non-geometric data (Conceptual Design) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Space and operational programs • Adjacency diagrams • Stacking diagrams • Occupancy analysis • Typical room templates • Other data and diagrams providing design criteria • HVAC & Plumbing systems overview & sizing summary (e.g. Criteria for humidification, storm drainage, sanitary waste, grease waste, venting, and domestic hot & cold water) • Room to room ventilation • Single line diagrams showing feeders and branch circuit panels
200	Generic elements shown in 3D (Criteria/Detailed Design) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interior walls and doors • Exterior cladding, doors and windows • Ceiling and soffit planes • Fixed casework, fixtures and equipment required by room functions • Stairwells, elevators and primary duct shafts • Structural columns and grid beams • Air Handler Units, Cooling Towers, Chillers, and other major equipment. • Transformers and Emergency Generators
300	Specific elements confirmed in 3D geometry (Implementation Documents) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walls and doors with construction data for size, ratings and components • Ceiling systems with support grids and finish material data • Interior glazing and operable wall systems with detailed components • Casework, fixtures and equipment with support and anchorage • Stairways and elevators with detailed connections and components • Structural gravity and seismic components with detailed connections • All mechanical/plumbing equipment with connections detailed • All ductwork with diffusers and FSDs located in model • All electrical panel boards and equipment with connections detailed • All electrical and LV devices located in model • All fire sprinkler risers, hose connections and sprinkler heads located • Miscellaneous systems for security, IT, PTS and others shown
400	Shop Drawings and fabrication data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed fabrication models • Anchorage and seismic bracing components in model
500	As-Built models and data

Managed Review Process: Plan review process that utilizes an agreed upon schedule for submittal of plan review documents to The Office and turn-around times for review.

Major Code Issue (MCI): Non-compliant portion of the project that may require significant re-design. MCI's require resolution prior to subsequent submittals.

Milestone: A point in time defined by the percentage of completeness of a specified design phase for the entire project (or increment for incremented projects), when specific segments and elements are reviewed.

MOU: A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is a project agreement that defines the roles and accountability of the participants. The Review Matrix and the Integrated Review Schedule becomes the basis for the MOU. The MOU will also establish the fee payment schedule. The initial fee must include all costs that FDD anticipates will be incurred between the date of the MOU execution and the date that the first final review (100% Implementation Documents) of the first increment is submitted. It is expected that this fee will range from 10% to 35% of the total fee based on the estimated cost of construction. The MOU may be terminated because of major design or scoping changes to the project, non-compliance with the agreed upon schedule and inadequate responsiveness to comments. If terminated, the project must be resubmitted using the traditional plan review approach. The Deputy Director or a Deputy Division Chief may terminate the MOU on behalf of FDD.

Phase: Represents level of completion of construction documents for a project or an increment. Based on 2007, version 1, AIA Guide for Integrated Project Delivery, and numbered for use in the OSHPD data tracking system (Acella) and the **Review Matrix**.

<u>Integrated Phase</u>	<u>Traditional Phase</u>
1) Conceptualization/Criteria Design	Schematic Design
2) Detailed Design	Design Development
3) Pre-Implementation	<100% - Construction Documents
4) Implementation Documents	100% - Construction Documents

Other Integrated Phases: Agency Review/ Final Buyout, Construction and Closeout.

Note: Phases shall be for each increment.

Phased Plan Review (PPR): The process that engages the Office, at its sole discretion, early in the project design phases as defined below, utilizing a **Managed Review Process** through issuance of agency Permit(s). Within each phase, milestone(s) will be established at which point(s) specific, agreed upon segments of the design and/or building systems are completely designed and/or are defined in their entirety. FDD will provide an agreed upon level of review allowing for written conditional acceptance of these segments when requested. Rolling reviews, as defined below, may only be used within a PPR for resolution of **Major Code Issues** and shall be used for contracted-out structural review.

Plan exchange meetings: Meetings between the design team and plan reviewers at major hand-off of documents. To the Office: Design team will clarify segments to be reviewed. From the Office Review staff will clarify general scope of comments.

Presubmittal Meeting: This meeting is required per Part 1, T24, Section 7-121(c), for projects \$20 million and over. For Phased Plan Review and Collaborative Review this meeting will be held after approval by the Office of the request for integrated review. It will include a presentation of the project, proposed increments, rough draft of the MOU including Review Matrix outlining all milestones, increments, phases and segments for the project.

Review Matrix: A tool to plan the entire review and construction process and will include the following items: Tasks, milestones, design times, review times, comment response times, construction times as well as priority needed for acceptance of certain segments and/or elements are all considerations required for a well-thought out and achievable CRC or PPR Matrix. See attached example Matrix.

Record Review Set: As plan review progresses, a record set of plans incorporating all comment resolutions kept by the discipline in general responsible charge and submitted for Office sign off per the MOU.

Request for Integrated Review (RIR) OSH-FD-122: This form is available on our website and is required to request that the Office utilize Phased or Collaborative Review process for a specific project. It will give pertinent information for the Office to determine if either integrated review process is appropriate and if approved will list the OSHPD staff assigned to the project. The Office will try to keep assigned staff on the project to the extent possible.

Rolling Reviews: Consists of submittal of documents via **Plan Exchange Meetings**, plan review comments posted by OSHPD (or contract reviewer) to the **Collaborative Plan Check Review Log (CPCRL)** as generated, responses by design team submitted to OSHPD and logged in the CPCRL on a regularly scheduled basis, usually at two week or longer intervals, and **Collaboration Workshops (CW)** as needed on the basis of project complexity, schedule, specific phase of project development, construction activities and intensity, etc. as negotiated between the applicant and the OSHPD. The rolling reviews typically start at the beginning of the first submittal and continue through the construction process. The collaborative review process allows up to 8 hours per month, for rolling reviews of Amended Construction Documents (ACD). Further ACD's will be reviewed through normal processes.

Segment: Clearly defined part(s) of the building or building system that is substantially complete and submitted for review. If submitted under an increment the segment must only include work to be constructed within that increment. Segments may be further defined using elements. Segments receive conditional acceptance, not plan approval. Building permits are for projects or increments, hence segments do not have associated building permits.

Task: Item to be accomplished at the specified milestone.

SAMPLE REVIEW MATRIX (Page 1 of 3)
 (For Inc 1 = Fdn/Frame and Inc 2 = TI's)

Task		Inc.	Phase ³		Segments ²		Discipline Req'd	Elements to be reviewed/discussed	Estimated Submittal/ Meeting Date	Expected Review Completion Date	Acceptance of Discipline
No.	Type ¹		No.	Mile-stone	No.	Description					
1	PM	All	1	15%	NA	NA	Arch: <u>X</u> Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: <u>X</u> Elec: <u>X</u> FLSO: <u>X</u>	Project Overview & Discuss Matrix	12/10/2012		
2	CW	All	1	25%			Arch: <u>X</u> Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: <u>X</u> Elec: <u>X</u> FLSO: <u>X</u>	Finalize Matrix	1/1/2013		
3	S	1	1	50%	1A	Structural Design Criteria, Floor Load Diagrams	Arch: ___ Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___	Structural Design Criteria	2/3/2013	3/5/2013	Arch: ___ Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___
4	S	2	1	50%	1B	Unit Layout/Spaces/ corridors/exiting	Arch: <u>X</u> Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: <u>X</u>		3/3/2013	4/15/2013	Arch: ___ Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___
5	S	1	2	75%	2A	Primary Lateral, Gravity Members and Foundation Layout.	Arch: ___ Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___		3/15/2013	4/15/2013	Arch: ___ Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___
6	S	2	2	50%	2A	Furniture and Equipment Layout, Cladding and Window-Wall	Arch: <u>X</u> Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: <u>X</u>		5/5/2013	6/5/2013	Arch: ___ Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___

POLICY INTENT NOTICE (PIN)

Task		Inc.	Phase ³		Segments ²		Discipline Req'd	Elements to be reviewed/discussed	Estimated Submittal/ Meeting Date	Expected Review Completion Date	Acceptance of Discipline
No.	Type ¹		No.	Mile-stone	No.	Description					
7	PE	All					Arch: <u>X</u> Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: <u>X</u> Elec: <u>X</u> FLSO: <u>X</u>	Code Review	6/15/2013		
8	S	1	3	80%	3A	Connection Design, Drag and Chord Design, Cladding and Window Wall Connection.	Arch: ___ Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___		7/5/2013	8/15/2013	Arch: ___ Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___
9	PE	All					Arch: <u>X</u> Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: <u>X</u> Elec: <u>X</u> FLSO: <u>X</u>	Code Review	9/15/2013		
10	S	1	4		4	Final Implementation Documents	All		9/15/2013	10/15/2013	Arch: ___ Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___
11	S	2	3	80%	3A	Complete TI – Except Structural	Arch: <u>X</u> Struct: ___ Mech: <u>X</u> Elec: <u>X</u> FLSO: <u>X</u>		10/5/2013	11/15/2013	Arch: ___ Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___
12	S	2	3	75%	3B	TI Structural Review	Arch: ___ Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___	Interior Partitions, Ceilings, Utility Anchorage Exterior Cladding and Window Walls	10/5/2013	12/15/2013	Arch: ___ Struct: ___ Mech: ___ Elec: ___ FLSO: ___
13	PE	All					Arch: <u>X</u> Struct: <u>X</u> Mech: <u>X</u> Elec: <u>X</u> FLSO: <u>X</u>	Code Review	1/15/2014		

POLICY INTENT NOTICE (PIN)

Task		Inc.	Phase ³		Segments ²		Discipline Req'd	Elements to be reviewed/discussed	Estimated Submittal/ Meeting Date	Expected Review Completion Date	Acceptance of Discipline
No.	Type ¹		No.	Mile-stone	No.	Description					
14	S	2	4		4	Final Implementation Documents	All		1/15/2014	2/28/2014	Arch:____ Struct:____ Mech:____ Elec:____ FLSO:____

Notes:

1. Type PM = Pre-Design Meeting; CW = Collaborative Workshop (for CRC); S = Submittal to OSHPD; PE = Plan Exchange Meetings
2. Submittals should be in an order such that the segments submitted to OSHPD are **substantially complete** and provide enough information in conjunction with prior submittals to allow for a complete review. Segments must only include work to be constructed within that increment. Information provided that is not to be constructed within the submitted increment must be clearly marked for reference only or be simultaneously submitted in another increment.
3. For incremental projects phases shall be for each increment. Phase: 1) Conceptualization/Criteria Design, 2) Detailed Design 3) Pre-Implementation), 4) Implementation Documents, Agency Review/ Final Buyout, Construction and Closeout.

COLLABORATION LEVELS

Level of Collaboration	LOWER		HIGHER		
	Level One "Typical" Collaboration		Level Two "Enhanced" Collaboration		Level Three "Required" Collaboration
<i>Philosophy or delivery method?</i>	IPD as a Philosophy		IPD as a Philosophy		IPD as a Delivery Method
<i>Also known as...</i>	N/A		IPD-ish; IPD Lite; Non Multi-party IPD; Technology Enhanced Collaboration; Hybrid IPD; Integrated Practice		Multi-Party Contracting; "Pure" IPD; Relational Contracting; Alliancing; Lean Project Delivery System™
<i>Delivery Approaches</i>	CM at-Risk or Design-Build		CM at-Risk or Design-Build		Integrated Project Delivery
<i>Typical Selection Process</i>	Qualifications Based Selection of all team members or Best Value Proposal		Qualifications Based Selection of all team members		Qualifications Based Selection of all team members
<i>Nature of Agreement</i>	Transactional		Transactional		Relational
<i>Key Characteristics</i>	No contract language requiring collaboration Limited team risk sharing CM or DB share in savings		Contract language requiring collaboration Some team risk sharing Co-location of team		Owner-Designer-Contractor (and possibly other key team members- IPD Subs) all sign one contract that contracts collaboration Team risk-sharing-incl. A/E Team decision-making Optimizing the Whole Pain / Gain sharing Limits on litigation Co-location of the team
<i>Typical Basis of Reimbursement</i>	GMP		GMP		GMP or No GMP (some costs guaranteed)

Sample OSHPD Collaborative Plan Check Review Log

Hospital Structural Review by John Smith

Phase: Construction Documents, Milestone: 50%, Increment 1 , Task 2

Acknowledgement

List Server Address: *Hospital@googlegroups.com*

OSHPD Project IM-2012-00001 /I-2012-00002 (Increment 1) | Facility # 10000

Item No.	PR Eng.	Type	Spec or Dwg No. / Detail	Date of Posting	Comment	OSHPD Response	Design Team Response	Resolution / Remark	OSHPD Response
1	JS	C	Calcs. BF13	07/26/11	Beam at 2nd floor not braced at 8' as shown in calcs. Also, this beam will receive lateral loads from curtain wall.	Comment Accepted [8/2/11]	See revised calculation. (12/14/11) See added calculation on page BF13.2.	Revised BF13 calcs. does not include beam lateral loads due to curtain wall. (01/23/12) calc. W12.2 showed 66 lb. instead 44 lb. and calculation for Mn is not included in the response 02/07/12 Resolved	Include lateral loads due to curtain wall [12/15/11], Resolved [2/17/2012]
17	JS	D	S1.01	07/28/11	Verify storage area with architectural drawings and provide storage live loads on the vertical loads list. 2011 CBC, Table 1607A.1 item 20.	Comment Accepted [8/8/11]	See added load under 'Design Criteria'. RAM model has been updated to include higher live loads in storage areas.	Resolved 11/25/11	Accepted [12/15/11]

Type: C = Calculations; D = Drawing; S = Specification; T = TI

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

By And Between

OFFICE OF STATEWIDE HEALTH PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

And

(Hospital governing authority name here)

Recitals

- A. California Health & Safety Code Section 129765(b) allows the Office of Statewide Health Planning & Development (OSHPD) to enter into a written agreement with (Hospital governing authority name here) in order to engage in the (Phased Plan Review or Collaborative Review and Construction) submittal and approval process of hospital plans.
- B. (Hospital governing authority name here), and description (i.e. California non profit public benefit corporation) desires to participate in the (Phased Plan Review or Collaborative Review and Construction) submittal and approval process of hospital plans.
- C. By this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), OSHPD and (Hospital governing authority name here) hereby agree as follows:

Agreement

- 1) This MOU covers the submittal and approval of structural, mechanical, electrical, fire and life safety, and architectural plans for the (Project Name and Address).
- 2) The Project shall include one building only under this MOU. The building is described as the proposed: (Project Name) hospital building. (Note: Only one building per MOU for Incremental projects):
- 3) This MOU shall cover (structural, mechanical, electrical, fire and life safety, and architectural) design of the Project. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is the (Hospital governing authority name here) Review Matrix which specifies the milestones, tasks, increments, segments, and elements, with anticipated submittal and review completion dates for the entire Project.
- 4) At the end of each OSHPD plan submittal and review, segments and/or elements may be conditionally approved. The plans shall receive final approval only upon submittal and final review of all the remaining project plan segments and shall be in accordance with California Health & Safety Code Section 129765(a).

- 5) (Hospital governing authority name here) agrees to pay a phased plan review fee of 35% of the total fee based on (1.64 PPR or 1.95% CRC) of the cost of construction as estimated on the effective date of this MOU. This (Phased Plan Review or Collaborative Review and Construction) fee shall be deducted by OSHPD from the total Project application fee assessed pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 129785. This (Phased Plan Review or Collaborative Review and Construction) fee shall not exceed the total Project application fee. In accordance with 2013 CBC, Part 1, Section 7-133 (a) (Hospital governing authority name here) agrees to pay *70% of the total fee upon submission of the first 100% Implementation Documents including any incremental submittals, and balance of the fee (*30%), upon permitting of the initial increment. The final fee shall be based upon the determination of the final actual construction cost and shall be due prior to occupancy being granted. (*or as per payment schedule agreed upon within this MOU).
- 6) OSHPD and (Hospital governing authority name here) shall engage in an ongoing review of the Project as it proceeds to ensure that the Project is yielding the intended results.
- 7) Failure of (Hospital governing authority name here) to meet Project requirements including the deadlines set forth in Exhibit 1 may result in the termination of this MOU, and the Project being removed from the (Phased Plan Review or Collaborative Review and Construction) process and returned to the regular plan review process of OSHPD. Such failure shall be determined to occur at the sole discretion of OSHPD. In the event this MOU is terminated, (Hospital governing authority name here) shall pay to OSHPD all actual costs incurred by OSHPD in performing under this MOU.
- 8) No amendment to this agreement is valid unless in writing and signed by both parties. No oral agreement or understanding not incorporated in this agreement is binding on the parties.
- 9) When written notice is required, such notice shall be made as follows:

OSHPD
Attn: Paul Coleman
400 R Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95811

Hospital Governing Authority Name
(Hospital governing authority name here) Address
(Hospital governing authority name here) Phone

The contract managers for this MOU are as follows:

- a. OSHPD: _____, Senior Architect
Phone number:
Address:

b. (Hospital governing authority name here): _____,
Project Director
Phone number:
Address:

10) This MOU is effective on the date last signed by both parties. However, OSHPD is under no obligation to commence performance under this MOU until such time as the first segment is submitted to the Office and the fees required pursuant to paragraph 7 are paid.

Hospital Governing Authority Name
And Description

By: _____
Name of (Hospital governing authority name here)
Representative Project Director

Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development
By: Paul Coleman

By: _____
Paul Coleman Deputy Director
State of California
Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development

Reviewed and approved as to form

Name & Title
(Hospital governing authority name here) Legal Council

Elizabeth C. Wied, Chief Counsel
State of California
Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development

Flow Chart for Integrated Procedure

