

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

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

**Tuesday, July 7, 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
Eric Johnson
Bert Hurlbut, Consulting Member
Pete Kreuser, Consulting Member

HBSB Staff

Kathi Zamora,
Acting Executive Director
Krista Harrington
Evetts Torres

OSHDP Staff

Bob David, Director, OSHPD
Paul Coleman, FDD Deputy Director
Hussain Bhatia
Jeff Enzler
Gary Dunger
Roy Lobo
Gordon Oakley
James Pan
Diana Scaturro
Richard Tannahill
Chris Tokas

1 **1. Welcome and Introductions**

1 Chair John Donelan opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Board members,
2 OSHPD staff, and Interested Parties introduced themselves.

3 **2. Review and approve June 3, 2015 final meeting report / minutes**

4 Mr. Donelan noted that on page 4, line 16, the misspelled name “Hoover” should be
5 “Hooper.”

6 Mr. Hurlbut requested to have the word “accrued” changed to “tabulates” on page 2,
7 line 22.

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

9 The committee voted to adopt the June 3, 2015 meeting minutes as corrected.

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

12 A. Session 1: “Poll Group Outcomes” subcommittee

- 13 • Report on the final Poll Group, including the total number of participants
14 polled and their demographics

15 The Poll Group Outcomes subcommittee members are Mr. Hurlbut and Mr.
16 Sullivan. Mr. Hurlbut reported that he had reduced the number of questions
17 from 100+ to around 40. Mr. Dunger and Mr. Kreuser had supplied input.

- 18 • Report on the final Survey content, including the questions and format that
19 was used

20 A SurveyMonkey preview had gone out the previous week. Mr. Hurlbut asked
21 for discussion on whether to use “Agree” questions or the converse,
22 “Disagree.”

23 Mr. Gritters felt that many of the questions were leading – they would elicit a
24 lot of agreement and not much variety. He commented that the order of the
25 sections could be clarified, and noticed that the committee had discussed
26 using open comment boxes which were not yet inserted into the survey.

1 Mr. Hurlbut answered that the section monikers had been lost when the
2 questions went to SurveyMonkey; they could be re-inserted. In addition, he
3 felt that one comment box at the end was best.

4 Mr. Hurlbut said that the intent of the poll was to garner information on what
5 industry thinks of the process itself. This would form part of the basis for the
6 next three seminar sessions.

7 Mr. Hurlbut hoped to glean information from the survey on differing
8 perspectives between the profession categories. The committee agreed that
9 an initial question asking the respondent's profession was needed in order to
10 pull that demographic out.

11 Staff confirmed that the surveys would be taken anonymously.

12 Mr. Gritters suggested including comment boxes for each separate section.
13 Mr. Hurlbut agreed.

14 An Interested Party noted that critical questions should be mandatory – the
15 respondents should not be able to skip them.

16 Ms. Scaturro noted that some owners, design professionals, and construction
17 professionals may be working on multiple OSHPD projects of varying sizes.
18 Mr. Hurlbut liked the idea of checking multiple boxes for size of projects as
19 well as checking boxes for Northern and Southern California locations. A
20 note should be placed next to such questions.

21 Mr. Hurlbut proposed to input these changes so that Ms. Torres could send
22 out the revised survey to the group.

23 For the beginning of the survey, an Interested Party suggested including the
24 approximate amount of time the survey would take to complete. The group
25 agreed, and also decided to include the number of questions in the survey.

26 • Identify potential Presenter(s) for Committee consideration

27 Mr. Donelan stated that someone would present the poll group outcome data.
28 Mr. Hurlbut confirmed that Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Bhatia could fulfill that task.

- 1 • Discussion and public input

2 Mr. Hurlbut reminded OSHPD personnel of his request to have field staff and
3 plan checkers take the poll.

4 Mr. Kreuser asked about the timing, as themes of the survey would dictate
5 who would participate in the panel. He and Mr. Hurlbut agreed that “the
6 sooner, the better” would work best for sending preview surveys and
7 obtaining survey results. Mr. Hurlbut planned to send the preview survey to
8 the committee by July 17 with everyone responding by July 27. By August 3
9 they would “go live” and also send some reminder blasts out to the industry
10 asking everyone to complete the survey.

11 Ms. Torres had supplied venues and possible dates for the committee to
12 consider. They decided on October 21 in Anaheim and October 27 in
13 Concord. They also decided to reschedule the October 22 committee
14 meeting for after the seminars.

15 **B. Session 2: “What the Code Requires” subcommittee**

- 16 • Report on the subcommittee’s progress in developing program content
17 related to its seminar topic

18 Mr. Donelan reported that Mr. Tannahill had been developing a program
19 addressing the topic. It is comprised of the California Administrative Code
20 (CAC) and the California Building Code (CBC). He is trying to fit the wealth of
21 information into the seminar’s allotted time period.

22 Mr. Tannahill stated that he had broken down the information into 12
23 subcategories.

24 Mr. Coleman noted that some of the code sections were going to be changing
25 in the 2016 CBC and CAC (for example, Suspension and Revocation of an
26 IOR’s Certification). They may impact what Mr. Tannahill is going to present.
27 However, there was still the session time factor to consider – it would not
28 leave time for extensive detail.

1 Mr. Johnson and Mr. Donelan suggested spending a little more time on the
2 subject of Materially Alter.

3 Mr. Donelan stated that the committee needs a standard template for all the
4 slides. He had also discussed with Ms. Torres the idea of incorporating the
5 HBSB logo, identifying slides as products of OSHPD; Ms. Torres displayed
6 the result. Mr. Dunger requested to have it sent to him. He will work on
7 “Express Terms for the CAC” as well.

8 The committee discussed whether the hotels could handle HD 16:9 for the
9 screens. Ms. Torres responded that she could negotiate it into the hotel
10 contract.

11 Mr. Coleman stated that he wanted to go in the direction of wide flat screens
12 in all conference rooms and meeting rooms, instead of having drop-down
13 screens and projectors.

- 14 • Identify potential Presenter(s) for Committee consideration

15 Mr. Donelan stated that Mr. Tannahill and Mr. Hooper would be presenters.

- 16 • Review and approval of subcommittee recommendations

17 Mr. Donelan stated that by August 25 the subcommittee would have a
18 finished product; they just need the format and the additional information from
19 the CAC.

20 **C. Session 3: “Case Studies” subcommittee**

- 21 • Identify projects being considered for the seminar

22 The subcommittee members were Mr. Gritters and Mr. La Brie. Projects will
23 be the UC Irvine Hospital, Sutter Santa Rosa, St. Jude’s Fullerton, Children’s
24 Hospital of Orange County (CHOC), and Kaiser San Diego.

- 25 • Identify potential Presenter(s) for Committee consideration

26 CHOC: Waldo Romero

27 Kaiser San Diego: Joe [Stasi]

1 St. Jude: Jim Bostic or Fritz

2 Sutter Santa Rosa: Tom and Art

3 UC Irvine: Rebekah Gladson will discuss with staff there

- 4 • Report on the progress of the subcommittee's plan to work with the
5 Presenter(s) to coordinate the completion of its presentation

6 The subcommittee has sent out a fairly detailed list of questions to the five
7 sites; Mr. Gritters read from the list. The presenters were directed to respond
8 by next week. Mr. Gritters, Mr. La Brie, and Ms. Scaturro will then begin
9 collaborating with them on the presentation formats.

10 Mr. Gritters stated that the presenters will spend a minimum of 15 minutes on
11 their case studies. Mr. Coleman felt that 20-30 minutes minimum would be
12 necessary to cover anything of substance. He expressed concern that five
13 case studies may be too many.

14 Mr. Gritters suggested splitting the presentations among the Northern
15 California and Southern California locations.

16 Mr. Coleman suggested using UC San Francisco as another Northern
17 California location. Mr. Johnson noted that the two seminars could use
18 different case studies. The presenters' dates of availability may factor in.

19 The committee discussed the two Kaiser locations under consideration.
20 Kaiser San Diego is still under construction, while Woodland Hills has not
21 really started yet. For San Diego, Mr. Gritters suggested that the design side
22 and a bit of the construction could be covered.

23 Mr. Hurlbut noted that the committee had never really defined "successful
24 project." The seminar could be framed around the question, "What is a
25 success?" "Success" could have different meanings to a contractor versus an
26 owner, for example.

27 Mr. Gritters pointed out that the seminar theme is actually relationships
28 between the project team and OSHPD. During a conference call, the

1 subcommittee had asked OSHPD personnel to give their perspective, and the
2 hospital project list had come from that. Accordingly the subcommittee was
3 trying to have Kaiser choose what they considered the best project.

4 Ms. Scaturro suggested addressing the angle of the change in health care
5 since the Affordable Care Act and how the change is being delivered, causing
6 projects to work differently.

7 Mr. Gritters stated that the addition of the UC San Francisco project brought
8 the total to six case studies. One of the Southern California case studies
9 could be used for the Concord seminar while the other three would be used at
10 the Anaheim seminar.

11 Mr. Hooper commented that while the Kaiser projects are not completed, they
12 give a view into current code and current technology.

13 The committee confirmed that the total time for each of the four sections was
14 75 minutes.

15 **D. Session 4: “Panel Discussion” subcommittee**

- 16 • Identify potential Panel Members for Committee consideration

17 Mr. Kreuser stated that during the subcommittee’s conference calls, the
18 members had concluded that getting the survey results would indicate whom
19 the panel speakers should be. The survey themes will indicate what the
20 seminar attendees will be interested in hearing. Speakers could end up to be
21 OSHPD field personnel, owners, or architects.

22 Mr. Kreuser mentioned that some of the case study speakers would be good
23 panel speakers as well. Possibly the northern and southern locations should
24 figure in when selecting speakers.

25 Mr. Kreuser hoped to have a mix of speakers: OSHPD personnel, the
26 contractor side, the architect side, the engineer side, etc. Having more than
27 four speakers may limit the time available for questions at the end of the
28 session.

- 1 • Report on the progress of the subcommittee’s plan to coordinate panel
2 member discussion content, comparing and contrasting the results from
3 Sessions 1 to 3

4 For topics, Mr. Johnson suggested taking negative issues that people
5 grumble about. Ms. Scaturro suggested adding to the poll a comment box
6 where people could talk about challenges in their projects – what didn’t work.

7 Ms. Scaturro suggested for the case study speakers to talk about what hadn’t
8 worked in their projects although the projects had ultimately been successful.
9 The audience would already have a context for the information. The
10 speakers could explain what they had encountered and how they made it a
11 success in the end.

12 Mr. Donelan emphasized the importance of having a definition of a successful
13 project, perhaps from various viewpoints.

- 14 • Discussion and public input

15 Mr. Donelan summarized that the Panel Discussion subcommittee is waiting
16 for the results of the poll (and the comment boxes). The two different
17 geographic locations may even have different panel speakers. The number
18 of speakers should be limited to no more than five.

19 Mr. Donelan noted that the committee would need another meeting between
20 August 25 and the seminar dates. Mr. Coleman noted that a dry run was
21 necessary.

22 Ms. Zamora pointed out that the state printer requires a six-week lead time.
23 Mr. Hurlbut felt that much of the material should be available online only.

24 Ms. Zamora stated that in the past, Wi-Fi has been quite expensive at the
25 hotels; it may be less expensive now. Ms. Scaturro suggested making
26 seminar materials available beforehand that could be downloaded. Mr.
27 Kreuser commented that at recent seminars he has attended, no one
28 provides paper anymore. The committee decided that after the conference,
29 links to the PowerPoints could be provided.

1 Mr. Donelan said that everything should be done by the August 25 meeting
2 except the Panel Discussion.

3 For the dry run, Mr. Coleman suggested that the Case Study presenters
4 would not have to be present. They could just provide a copy of their
5 presentation to the committee.

6 By August 25, the committee will know better what the dry run needs to be.
7 At the dry run the committee can look at the PowerPoints for content – to
8 ensure a consistent message and to check the timeframe.

9 The committee decided on September 29 for the dry run meeting.

10 Mr. Kreuser requested for the subcommittee to receive a copy of the survey
11 results as they come in between August 3 and August 25, so the
12 subcommittee can start their own review. The group discussed making
13 August 20 the cutoff date for survey completion.

14 **4. Comments from the Public/Board Members on Issues Not on This Agenda**

15 Mr. Gritters ascertained that for the last seminar session, the OSHPD staff
16 assignment was Mr. Dunger.

17 **5. Adjourn**

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

19 The committee voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:00 p.m.