

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**

“Building Management Systems” Workshop/Meeting

**Wednesday, June 3, 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
Patrick Sullivan
Bert Hurlbut, Consulting Member
Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member
Joe La Brie, Consulting Member
Scott Karpinen, HBSB Chair

OSHPD Staff

Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director
Gary Dunger
Diana Scaturro
Richard Tannahill
Chris Tokas

HBSB Staff

Linda Janssen, Executive Director
Evet Torres

1. Welcome and Introductions

- 2 Chair John Donelan called the meeting to order. Board members, OSHPD staff, and
- 3 Interested Parties introduced themselves.

1 **2. Review April 22, 2015 final meeting report / minutes**

2 Mr. Donelan noted that at the top of page 7 the misspelled name “Hoover” should be
3 “Hooper.”

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

5 The committee voted unanimously to adopt the April 22, 2015 meeting minutes
6 as corrected.

7 • Discussion and Public Input

8 Ms. Janssen confirmed that Mr. Hooper is a voting member of the committee.

9 **3. Planning & Development of 2015 Seminar “Building Relationships for a**
10 **Successful Project”**

11 A. Develop Strategic Survey

- 12 ○ Committee members discuss and finalize survey questions that address the
13 dynamics of a typical hospital construction project

14 Mr. Donelan stated that Mr. La Brie had done a great deal of background
15 work in developing the Strategic Survey. Contributions had come from Mr. La
16 Brie, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Gritters, and Mr. Hurlbut.

- 17 ○ Committee members discuss and determine the best method(s) for
18 administering the Strategic Survey to the Poll group

19 Mr. Donelan asked the committee about the three possible Excel survey
20 responses *Agree*, *Undecided*, and *Disagree*.

21 Ms. Janssen stated that it would be easy to set something up using
22 surveymonkey. Mr. Gritters noted that this software automatically accrues the
23 results; Ms. Scaturro noted that it is easy to generate reports at the end. Mr.
24 Donelan concluded that the group consensus was to use surveymonkey.

25 Ms. Scaturro mentioned the comment box; the committee felt strongly that it
26 was important to include.

- 1 o Committee members discuss and determine how to solicit case studies of
2 healthy projects from Strategic Survey participants (poll group)

3 Mr. Donelan stated that he had received a possible case study from Carl
4 Scheuerman regarding a Sutter hospital replacement project. For additional
5 case studies the poll group could be consulted.

6 Mr. Hooper commented that much can be learned from projects that “went
7 south.” Mr. Gritters noted that it was important for those in the case study
8 group to discern the best way to pick appropriate cases from positive and
9 negative perspectives.

10 The committee observed that depending on the individual or the firm, there
11 could be a polarized perception about the success of a project. Mr. Coleman
12 suggested that criteria of a successful project need to be defined.

13 Mr. La Brie stressed that simplicity was a top priority: someone submitting a
14 possible project would submit a one-page abstract. The committee would
15 then discuss the submittals to see which ones best qualify.

16 Ms. Scaturro established with Mr. Coleman that projects would fall into
17 delivery method categories of Design-Build, Design-Bid-Build, and Integrated.
18 People would submit projects according to the delivery method they used. An
19 Interested Party suggested looking also at the size of projects, which affects
20 the success factors.

21 Mr. La Brie cautioned not to lose sight of the message, that is, relationships.
22 Thirty minutes should be sufficient for a case study. He commented on the
23 dearth of engineers in the poll group – what was that saying? It was possible
24 that the poll group participants whose numbers were higher were more
25 relational in the way they work. Mr. La Brie asked the committee whether
26 they should target solicitations to the engineers, whose group numbers were
27 low.

28 Mr. Coleman commented that most projects succeed according to the
29 relationship of the Architects, Owners, General Contractors, and Inspectors of

1 Record (IORs), rather than the engineers. Mr. Gritters noted that field staff
2 were missing from the poll group.

3 Mr. Karpinen stated that he and Eric Johnson had sent out the survey to
4 electrical and mechanical engineering firms in the area, without much
5 response.

6 Mr. Kreuser commented that it would be nice to get the mechanical, electrical,
7 and plumbing engineers involved. They have an influence on projects. He
8 agreed that it was important to get some Field Inspectors to participate. Mr.
9 Coleman consented.

10 Mr. Sullivan suggested tapping into OSHPD records of people who have
11 worked on projects in the last couple of years. Mr. Coleman replied that
12 OSHPD has a Quality of Service Survey on its website, but the response
13 OSHPD receives is minimal. The idea for the current survey is to find people
14 who are motivated to be proactive in improving the communication and
15 relationships system.

16 Mr. Hoover stated that he had reached out to IORs mostly from Kaiser;
17 maybe we should reach out to IORs working at other places. Ms. Janssen
18 responded that staff has sent the email to the several hundred people on the
19 Interested Party list.

20 Mr. Coleman stated that of field staff, representation is needed from the
21 Compliance Officer, the District Structural Engineer (DSE), the Fire Marshall,
22 and the Field Supervisor. Also, representation is needed from both Northern
23 and Southern California because of their different ways of doing business.

24 Mr. Gritters agreed that demographics of the respondents (north or south,
25 profession) are important to know when evaluating opinions by group – as
26 opposed to evaluating opinions of all the respondents in general.

27 Mr. Coleman felt that if Southern California representation is lacking, we
28 should do additional outreach to that demographic.

1 Mr. La Brie suggested sending another email blast requesting additional
2 demographic information (big/small project, discipline, northern/southern,
3 etc.).

4 B. Committee members discuss content of seminar topic related to materially alter
5 and begin developing guidelines and examples of the types of work that should and
6 should not be considered as materially altering a project

7 Mr. Donelan asked the committee whether they wanted to include the topic of
8 materially alter in the seminar. Mr. La Brie responded that the topic could be
9 addressed in the statements having to do with construction. The committee
10 agreed that materially alter can hinder or enhance a project; how to integrate it
11 into the overall program was the question.

12 Mr. Coleman stressed that we should include materially alter as it relates to
13 relationships and roles, not to the specific details of what it is and is not. Roles in
14 decision-making, documentation, and the process should be addressed, as well
15 as how the relationships between the different entities affect materially alter.

16 Mr. La Brie suggested having each of the four sessions take a small portion of
17 time describing what code says about determining materially alter. Mr. Coleman
18 agreed.

19 (E. Assign seminar preparation responsibilities to committee members and
20 FDD/HBSB staff)

21 Mr. Donelan enlisted volunteers for each session with two members of each
22 subcommittee working on the sessions. Results were as follows.

23 Mike Gritters: Case Studies, Session 2

24 Mike Hooper: Session 1

25 Bert Hurlbut: Session 3

26 Eric Johnson: Session 4

27 Patrick Sullivan: Session 3

28 Pete Kreuser: Session 4

29 John Donelan: Session 1

1 Joe La Brie: Case Studies, Session 2

2 Ms. Janssen reviewed the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act regulations for
3 meetings of committee members with OSHPD staff.

4 Mr. La Brie said that he would provide an overall umbrella of coordination behind
5 the scenes, supporting the different subcommittees as needed. This would result
6 in seminar cohesion.

7 Mr. Donelan mentioned the need for support from FDD staff during the seminar.
8 The group decided that Ms. Scaturro (Case Studies), Hussain Bhatia (Session
9 3), and Richard Tannahill (Session 1) would be assigned. For the panel
10 discussion, Mr. Coleman assigned Gordon Oakley, Chris Tokas, or their
11 delegate. Mr. Karpinen suggested Mr. Dunger for the panel discussion as well.
12 Mr. Sullivan suggested Eric Reslock from Public Affairs for the poll group.

13 Mr. Coleman felt that OSHPD staff who could determine successful projects for
14 the case studies would be Mr. Tokas and Mr. Oakley.

15 Mr. La Brie suggested using Outgoing Board Member Bert Hurlbut, Incoming
16 Board Member Mike Gritters, and Chair John Donelan as facilitators. They
17 consented.

18 C. Committee members discuss and determine content of seminar topic related to
19 roles, responsibilities and relationships for successful projects

20 Mr. Donelan emphasized that the core of all the sessions needs to be
21 relationships.

22 D. Committee members discuss and determine topics for the "Panel Discussion"
23 portion of the seminar

24 Mr. Donelan stated that the committee had now established the topics.

25 The committee returned to the list of survey questions.

26 Mr. La Brie suggested for the committee to sift through the questions quickly,
27 eliminating any questions that were not useful. Questions whose results show a
28 disparity in understanding could be targeted and addressed during the seminar.

1 The committee proceeded through the questions.

2 #4: Committee will flesh out the question.

3 #5: Eliminate.

4 #6: Committee will clarify “recent.”

5 #8-10: Committee will consider multiple choice format.

6 #11-13: Committee will fine-tune. Multiple choice.

7 #14-16: Committee will fine-tune. Multiple choice.

8 #17-22: Committee will consolidate. Multiple choice.

9 #23-26: Eliminate – demographic information will be included in the email. Mr.
10 Coleman noted that the FDD Quality of Service Survey begins by obtaining
11 information up front on the respondents (role in project, geographic location, cost
12 of project). This provides more insight into their responses.

13 #27-31: Committee will consider.

14 #32-35: Multiple choice.

15 #36-37: Committee will improve.

16 #38: Committee will improve.

17 #40: Committee will consider.

18 #41: Committee will consider.

19 #43: Committee will look at responses, then consider whether the subject is
20 appropriate for the seminar.

21 #44: Very similar to #42.

22 #47: Delete “...are required to...” per Mr. Coleman. The committee will refine.

23 Mr. La Brie clarified that the purpose of the survey is to find misunderstandings
24 among the stakeholders that do this work. The first three sessions are sources of
25 information that should all be in alignment. The fourth session should be the place
26 to talk about the right answer: what the code says, what we are actually doing, and
27 what we think we should be doing. The panel may be not only question/answer, but
28 also a discussion of disconnects identified in the poll.

1 The group decided to move the poll results session to the first timeslot; second will
2 be the code session; third will be the case studies; fourth will be the panel
3 discussion.

4 #54: Committee will consider. Possible multiple choice.

5 #55: Committee will consider.

6 #57: Committee will consider.

7 #58: "Stakeholders" should be defined.

8 #61-65: Multiple choice.

9 #71: Eliminate.

10 #73-75: Multiple choice.

11 The group noted that there was much repetition in the questions that could be
12 eliminated by the committee. They all preferred to decrease the number of
13 questions.

14 #76-77. Eliminate.

15 #79: Instead of "courteous and professional," change to "open to collaboration
16 and cooperation."

17 #80: May not be relevant. The FDD Quality of Service Survey may be
18 appropriate for the question.

19 #83: Eliminate.

20 #85-89: The committee will consider; relates to the Quality of Service Survey.

21 #91: Eliminate.

22 #95: Eliminate.

23 #96: Eliminate (duplication). Rerword to "The frequency of field visits by OSHPD
24 field staff is sufficient to maintain relationships and the progress of the work."

25 #100: Eliminate.

26 Mr. Coleman requested a question regarding people reluctant to complete a survey
27 or use the Comment and Process Review (CPR) because of fear of retaliation.

28 #102: Change to "Contractor should have a quality control program to address
29 the more rigorous criteria for inspection."

- 1 #104: Committee will rephrase.
- 2 #112: Eliminate.
- 3 #113-118: Group into multiple choice.
- 4 #122: Eliminate.
- 5 #127: Committee will consider.
- 6 #128-129: Eliminate.
- 7 #130: Committee will reword.
- 8 #131: Ms. Scaturro suggested a question about the implications of not closing a
- 9 project correctly. Mr. Coleman felt that for this seminar, the issue is who has
- 10 responsibility for ensuring that projects are closed in compliance.

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

13 Mr. La Brie felt that the committee should press ahead to hold the seminar this year.
14 Mr. Donelan pointed out that the subcommittees had substantial work to accomplish
15 before the committee meets again.

16 Mr. La Brie stated that the subcommittees should come to the next meeting ready to
17 make recommendations. Details will be finalized then.

18 The committee settled on July 7 or 10 for the next meeting; Ms. Janssen will check
19 on meeting room availability.

20 Mr. Gritters asked what has been done to regarding educating owners and
21 stakeholders about SPC-4D – how it might affect their master planning. Mr.
22 Coleman responded that education has been somewhat limited because SPC-4D
23 has not yet been adopted by the Building Standards Commission. Some information
24 has been given out to the industry via meetings and a webinar to make them aware
25 of this option. OSHPD plans to give a presentation shortly after the first of the year.

26 **5. Adjourn**

27 **MOTION:** (M/S/C/) [/]

28 The committee voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:26 p.m.