



2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 800
Sacramento, CA 95833
hcai.ca.gov



Hospital Building Safety Board
“Collaborative Inspection Approach to Hospital Construction”
Webinar Development Subcommittee

June 19, 2025
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Locations:

2020 West El Camino Ave, Conference Room 930, Sacramento, CA 95833
355 South Grand Avenue, Conference Room 1901, Los Angeles, CA 90071

Subcommittee Members Present

Michael Davis, Subcommittee Chair
Cody Bartley, Subcommittee Vice-Chair
Gary Dunger
Bert Hurlbut

Consulting Members Present

Belinda Young

HCAI Staff Present

Arah Altoonash
Richard Tannahill
Monica Colosi
Joe LaBrie
Camille Dixon

HBSB Staff Present

Veronica Yuke, Executive Director
Marcus Palmer
Evet Torres

1 **1. Call to Order and Welcome**

2 **Facilitator:** Michael Davis, CHI, CEO Emeritus, DavisHBC, Inc.; Subcommittee
3 Chair (or designee)

4 Michael Davis called the meeting to order at 10:03 AM, welcomed attendees.

5

6

1 **2. Roll Call and Meeting Advisories/Expectations**

2 **Facilitator:** Veronica Yuke, Acting Executive Director

3 Veronica Yuke conducted roll call, confirming quorum. She noted that Scott
4 Mackey had resigned as of June 10, 2025, after the agenda was posted.

5 She reviewed virtual meeting guidelines, public comment procedures, and voting
6 protocol (by roll call, if needed). She also confirmed that Belinda Young is under
7 consideration as Scott Mackey's replacement.

8
9 **3. Discuss changing the name of the webinar to "Collaborative Approach to**
10 **Field Inspections"**

11 **Facilitator:** Michael Davis (or designee)

12 **Discussion and input:**

13 Michael Davis opened the discussion by addressing the current title of the
14 webinar, Collaborative Inspection Approach to Field Inspections. He noted the
15 redundancy inherent in the term "inspection" appearing twice and stated that the
16 title could benefit from simplification and greater clarity. Drawing from prior
17 suggestions made by Chris Tokas, he recommended alternative titles that could
18 reflect a broader educational mission. One such suggestion was Collaborative
19 Inspection Approach to Construction.

20 Gary Dunger offered an alternative, proposing Collaborative Approach to
21 Hospital Inspection. He questioned the necessity of the term "field" and asserted
22 that a concise and accurate reference to hospital inspections could be more
23 effective.

24 Arash Altoontash agreed with the removal of "field" from the title and emphasized
25 the importance of avoiding confusion with public health inspections. He stressed
26 the need to retain clear and specific references to "hospital construction" to
27 accurately reflect the scope and intent of the webinar.

28 Cody Bartley suggested the title be broadened to Collaborative Approach to
29 Inspections, arguing that it would encompass both pre-construction and
30 construction activities. He asserted that such a title would maintain relevance
31 across multiple phases of the project lifecycle.

32 Richard Tannahill responded with a suggestion to simplify the title further to
33 Collaborative Approach to Hospital Construction, which he believed maintained
34 clarity while embracing the full scope of project work. This led to further
35 deliberation on the balance between specificity and inclusivity in the title's
36 wording.

1 Bert Hurlbut expressed concern that by removing the explicit reference to
2 inspection, the new title could potentially understate the core focus of the
3 webinar. He cautioned against language that might diminish the inspection-
4 centric nature of the content.

5 Jamie Schnick inquired whether the term “hospital” sufficiently captured the
6 broader scope of facilities overseen by HCAI, specifically skilled nursing facilities
7 (SNFs) and psychiatric hospitals. Arash Altoontash clarified that under HCAI’s
8 statutory and regulatory framework, the term “hospital” is inclusive of such
9 facilities. He added that this understanding is consistent with how the term is
10 used across state agency documentation and reporting structures.

11 Michael Davis summarized the options discussed, noting that consensus
12 appeared to be forming around two principal title revisions: Collaborative
13 Approach to Inspections and Collaborative Inspection Approach to Hospital
14 Construction. He highlighted the need to select a title that is both precise and
15 aligned with the subcommittee’s overarching goals of promoting clarity,
16 engagement, and relevance to the target audience.

17 **Committee and Public Comment**

- 18 • Among the subcommittee members present in both Sacramento and
19 Los Angeles, verbal consensus strongly favored adopting the title
20 Collaborative Inspection Approach to Hospital Construction. Members
21 expressed support for the clarity, inclusiveness, and accuracy of this
22 phrasing in representing the educational goals of the webinar.

23 **Voting**

24 A formal vote was not conducted. Veronica Yuke confirmed that under applicable
25 meeting procedures, verbal consensus was sufficient for action. The
26 subcommittee agreed informally to proceed with the updated title.

27 **Informational and Action Items:**

- 28 • Informational: The committee reached a consensus to adopt a new title
29 for the webinar.
- 30 • Action Item: The webinar will now be referred to as Collaborative
31 Inspection Approach to Hospital Construction in all future planning
32 documents and official references.

34 **4. Mock delivery of presentation outlines**

35 **Facilitator:** Michael Davis (or designee)

36 **Discussion and Input:**

1 Michael Davis introduced the agenda item by clarifying that the subcommittee
2 would not conduct a full mock delivery as initially planned. Instead, each
3 presenter would provide a status report on the development of their assigned
4 presentation section, including key messages, progress on slide preparation,
5 anticipated duration, and any technical or content concerns.

6 **a. Ownership Section – Presented by Gary Dunger**

- 7 ○ Gary Dunger reported that although his slide deck had not yet been
8 developed, he had fully outlined the content he intends to present.
9 He acknowledged delays due to overlapping professional
10 obligations but affirmed his commitment to completing the slide
11 development before the next subcommittee meeting.
- 12 ○ Gary Dunger's planned content draws from the core themes
13 outlined in the presentation materials, specifically emphasizing
14 early engagement by ownership teams, collaborative
15 communication with design professionals and inspectors, and the
16 importance of project alignment with healthcare facility needs. He
17 stated that his section would explore how ownership sets the
18 cultural tone for project collaboration and clarified that the owner's
19 perspective is essential for establishing trust and accountability
20 from the outset.
- 21 ○ Michael Davis thanked Gary Dunger and noted that the
22 subcommittee understood scheduling constraints, acknowledging
23 that ownership's role is central to the collaborative model being
24 promoted.

25 **b. Contractor/Subcontractor Section – Presented by Cody Bartley**

- 26 ○ Cody Bartley provided a detailed verbal walk-through of his draft
27 presentation, titled Build to Pass, which was structured around six
28 slides. He emphasized that his section focused on embedding
29 quality control (QC) into every stage of the construction process,
30 starting from design coordination to final inspections.
- 31 ○ Cody Bartley highlighted the following key points:
 - 32 ■ QC begins at the subcontractor level, with accountability for
33 installation standards.
 - 34 ■ The general contractor must conduct internal reviews before
35 inviting the Inspector of Record (IOR) to inspect.
 - 36 ■ Predictable and transparent inspection scheduling reduces
37 project delays and supports trust-building with IORs.

- Coordination with Design Professionals of Record (DPORs) and IORs is critical when field conditions require timely RFI responses or modifications.
 - Early engagement and mockups can prevent costly rework during close-in phases.
 - Failed inspections have a cascading impact on productivity, scheduling, and team morale—analogized through the concept of a “derailed train.”
- Cody Bartley also discussed adding visual aids, such as a quality control checklist and inspection sequence diagrams, to enhance engagement. He projected that his final presentation would run approximately 10–12 minutes once refined.
 - Joe LaBrie commended Cody Bartley for crafting a presentation that effectively captured the spirit of the collaborative inspection approach and stressed that the message was particularly valuable for general contractors and field managers.
 - Michael Davis praised the Build to Pass framework and encouraged Cody Bartley to preserve the balance between technical depth and practical storytelling.

c. Inspector of Record and Testing Laboratory Section – Presented by Michael Davis

- Michael Davis presented an overview of his section titled Inspect to Pass, a 12-slide segment centered on redefining the inspector’s role from gatekeeper to collaborative partner.
- He outlined the philosophical foundation of his presentation, based on three pillars:
 - Collaboration – Emphasizing that the IOR is part of the project team and shares in its success.
 - Communication – Stressing open, honest, and timely communication with all stakeholders.
 - Proactivity – Encouraging anticipatory action by IORs to identify and resolve potential issues before formal inspection points.
- Michael Davis clarified that Inspect to Pass does not mean leniency or overlooking non-compliance. Instead, it is a mindset and process alignment focused on supporting compliant outcomes. He distinguished his role as one holding ethical and legal

responsibilities to both the project owner and the public, citing relevant provisions of Title 24.

- Richard Tannahill suggested moving the slide that defines Inspect to Pass closer to the beginning of the presentation to establish the conceptual framework early. Michael Davis agreed with the recommendation and stated he would revise the order accordingly.
- Cody Bartley echoed that repositioning the definition would improve audience comprehension and continuity, especially when transitioning between presentations.
- Michael Davis also confirmed that Inspect to Pass would be reinforced during both the introduction and conclusion of the webinar to drive home the core message.

d. OSHPD and Field Staff Section – Presented by Monica Colosi

- Monica Colosi updated the subcommittee on the revised direction of her presentation, originally titled Observe to Pass. Based on prior feedback, she proposed renaming the segment to Support to Pass, a shift that reflects HCAI's commitment to being a proactive and constructive regulatory partner.
- Monica Colosi emphasized that the goal of her presentation is to humanize the field inspection process by promoting engagement, humility, and shared accountability. She discussed tools available to inspectors and field staff, including Construction Administration Proficiency (CAP) materials and daily report templates, to strengthen documentation and communication.
- Her key talking points include:
 - Field staff must approach inspections with a public service mindset.
 - Effective inspections require the field team to work with—not against—the contractor and DPOR.
 - Inspectors should avoid arrogance and strive for solution-oriented dialogue.
 - The inclusion of a Quality-of-Service Survey allows the public to evaluate performance and drive continuous improvement.
 - HCAI's role extends beyond enforcement to include education, support, and technical guidance.

- Joe LaBrie endorsed the term Support to Pass, stating it aligned with broader cultural shifts toward collaboration.
- Arash Altoontash, Michael Davis, and Cody Bartley also voiced strong support for the change.
- Michael Davis noted that Monica Colosi’s approach complemented the philosophical tenets of the IOR and contractor presentations.

e. Q&A Planning

- Michael Davis proposed allocating 20 minutes for a live Q&A session following the core presentations. He acknowledged this time limit was likely insufficient for full audience engagement but accepted as a standard window based on previous webinar formats.
- Richard Tannahill confirmed that a 20-minute block aligns with typical GoToWebinar logistics, especially if utilizing an online chat format. He suggested adjusting the number of questions answered live based on audience interest.

Committee Comments:

- Joe LaBrie encouraged presenters to begin their sections with a clear articulation of their goals and to emphasize shared terminology (Build to Pass, Inspect to Pass, Support to Pass) throughout the webinar to maintain narrative consistency.
- Bert Hurlbut emphasized the importance of performance metrics and proposed defining target inspection outcomes, such as achieving a 90–95% first-time pass rate. He suggested integrating these benchmarks into the conclusion to offer the audience actionable standards.
- Jamie Schnick and Richard Tannahill noted that HCAI collects inspection performance data that could be used to inform these metrics and evaluate long-term impact.

Informational and Action Items:

- Verbal feedback affirmed alignment with the webinar’s collaborative framework.
- Gary Dunger will complete slide development before the next meeting.
- Cody Bartley will finalize visuals and reduce slide density while maintaining key concepts.

- Michael Davis will reorder slides and reinforce Inspect to Pass during the intro and conclusion.
- Monica Colosi will rename her section to Support to Pass and finalize updates reflecting her revised messaging.
- All presentation materials are due to HBSB staff by July 18, 2025.
- Final timed run-through scheduled for August 13, 2025.

5. Discuss ideas for the introduction and conclusion of the presentation based on current level of development of primary content

Facilitator: Michael Davis (or designee)

Discussion and Input

Michael Davis introduced Agenda Item #5 by reiterating the importance of crafting a strong introduction and conclusion for the webinar. He emphasized that these bookends should clearly communicate the objectives, unify the overarching themes across presenter segments, and deliver a lasting message to the audience. He acknowledged that the sections were not yet assigned and opened the floor for creative input and structural suggestions.

Joe LaBrie recommended incorporating concise, memorable language into both the introduction and conclusion. He proposed that the key terms Build to Pass, Design to Pass, Inspect to Pass, and Support to Pass be visually and verbally highlighted at the beginning of the webinar. These terms, he explained, encapsulate the philosophical and practical aims of each role in the construction and inspection process and would serve as a thematic guide for the audience.

Michael Davis agreed with the suggestion and proposed creating a “pithy” slide that would serve as an anchor for the webinar’s message. He envisioned the introduction as an opportunity to ground the attendees in the shared purpose of collaborative inspections.

Gary Dunger supported the thematic framework and proposed that the introduction include a slide displaying the photographs, names, and titles of each presenter. He noted that this visual element would establish credibility and humanize the delivery by allowing the audience to connect faces with voices.

Michael Davis responded positively to the idea and noted that it would also help differentiate the presenters' roles in the construction and inspection continuum. He suggested that the introduction be tailored to explain the rationale for this multi-perspective format, emphasizing the value of hearing from ownership, design professionals, contractors, inspectors, and regulators.

- Discussion then turned to who should deliver the introduction. Gary Dunger proposed that Chris Tokas might be an appropriate choice, given his leadership role and visibility within HCAI. Michael Davis agreed and noted that Chris Tokas' endorsement of the webinar's purpose would reinforce its importance to both internal staff and external stakeholders. Joe LaBrie also supported this suggestion, emphasizing that Chris Tokas' presence would demonstrate institutional alignment and elevate the perceived authority of the event.
- In the event that Chris Tokas is unavailable, the committee discussed backup options. Gary Dunger volunteered to deliver the introduction if needed, and Michael Davis noted that he himself could also step in.
- On the matter of concluding the webinar, Michael Davis proposed that the closing statements reinforce the themes discussed throughout the webinar, summarize each presenter's core message, and leave the audience with actionable takeaways. He emphasized that the conclusion should not simply be a recap but a unifying call to action underscoring shared accountability across all roles.

Gary Dunger and Joe LaBrie agreed that the conclusion should explicitly revisit the terms Build to Pass, Design to Pass, Inspect to Pass, and Support to Pass as a structured framework for collaboration. Monica Colosi added that reiterating these terms helps institutionalize a cultural shift and provides participants with a vocabulary to implement the concepts in their daily practice.

Michael Davis concluded the discussion by noting that further work was needed to finalize the introduction and conclusion scripts. He committed to collaborating with presenters offline to draft content and stated that the subcommittee would review a proposed version during the next meeting.

Committee and Public Comments

Committee Members Supporting the Introduction Structure and Presenter Visuals:

- Joe LaBrie initiated the framing strategy based on the "to pass" terminology.
- Gary Dunger proposed including presenter headshots and credentials.
- Monica Colosi explicitly supported both the visual and thematic proposals, noting the value of humanizing the delivery.
- Michael Davis endorsed both elements as aligning with the webinar's goals.

1 Committee Members Voicing Support for Chris Tokas as Introductory Presenter:

- 2 • Gary Dunger first suggested Chris Tokas due to his position and
3 recognition.
- 4 • Joe LaBrie seconded the recommendation, emphasizing its symbolic
5 and practical value.
- 6 • Michael Davis supported the nomination and committed to reaching
7 out to Chris Tokas to confirm his availability.
- 8 • No public comments were offered during this agenda item.

9 **Informational and Action Items:**

- 10 • Introduction will center on four thematic concepts: Build to Pass,
11 Design to Pass, Inspect to Pass, Support to Pass.
- 12 • Visual slides will feature presenter photos, names, and titles.
- 13 • Conclusion will unify the core messages and reinforce shared
14 responsibility.
- 15 • Michael Davis will contact Chris Tokas to determine his availability to
16 deliver the introduction.
- 17 • Gary Dunger and Michael Davis will serve as backup introduction
18 speakers if needed.
- 19 • Committee members will collaborate to draft proposed language for
20 both the introduction and conclusion.
- 21 • Final versions of the introduction and conclusion will be reviewed and
22 rehearsed at the next meeting on August 13, 2025.

23
24 **6. Plan for future meetings and practice sessions**

25 **Facilitator:** Michael Davis (or designee)

26 **Discussion and Input**

27 Michael Davis initiated the discussion by reiterating the need for a final
28 preparatory session prior to the official webinar delivery. He proposed that the
29 next subcommittee meeting be held in early to mid-August to allow adequate
30 time for slide development, content review, and practice presentations. He
31 emphasized the importance of a structured and collaborative final run-through to
32 ensure clarity, consistency, and adherence to the allotted timeframe for each
33 speaker.

1 Michael Davis initially suggested August 5, 2025, as a tentative meeting date.
2 However, several members reported scheduling conflicts with that week. After
3 brief deliberation, August 13, 2025, emerged as the consensus date, with general
4 availability confirmed by all attending members.

5 Michael Davis stated that the upcoming session would serve two distinct
6 purposes:

- 7 • Slide-by-Slide Content Review: Each presenter will walk the
8 subcommittee through their slides, explaining content, context, and
9 messaging. This process will allow committee members to offer final
10 feedback, resolve any inconsistencies, and ensure thematic alignment
11 across all presentations.
- 12 • Mock Timed Delivery: Each presenter will rehearse their segment in
13 real time, with an approximate target of 12 minutes per section. This
14 timed approach will validate pacing and ensure the total webinar
15 remains within the scheduled duration, including time for Q&A.

16 Gary Dunger supported this two-part structure and emphasized that a dry run is
17 essential not only for timing but also for fluid transitions between speakers. He
18 noted that the webinar's professional credibility depends on smooth handoffs and
19 a unified tone.

20 Cody Bartley and Monica Colosi expressed agreement and confirmed their
21 availability for the August 13 session. Cody Bartley asked whether the Q&A
22 format and technology platform would be finalized in that meeting. Michael Davis
23 confirmed that logistical and technical issues would also be reviewed at that time,
24 including the webinar platform (e.g., GoToWebinar or Teams), hosting
25 responsibilities, and the order of presentation.

26 Veronica Yuke reminded presenters that all finalized slides must be submitted to
27 HBSB staff by Friday, July 18, 2025. She explained that this deadline allows
28 adequate time for staff to compile, format, and return the complete presentation
29 to subcommittee members for review prior to the August session. She
30 emphasized that the early deadline is necessary for ensuring accessibility
31 compliance and technical functionality across presentation platforms.

32 Michael Davis acknowledged the deadline and confirmed he would begin
33 outreach to presenters not in attendance (e.g., Belinda Young, who is anticipated
34 to fill the architectural representative role) to ensure they are briefed and on
35 schedule.
36
37

Committee and Public Comments:

- Michael Davis led the planning discussion and confirmed the revised meeting date.
- Gary Dunger supported the two-part structure and emphasized the need for transitions.
- Cody Bartley confirmed availability and raised Q&A logistics.
- Monica Colosi confirmed attendance and expressed support for the proposed plan.
- Veronica Yuke established the July 18, 2025, deadline for slide submission and outlined next steps for staff coordination.
- No public comments were offered during this agenda item.

Voting

No vote was held. Agreement on the next meeting date and planning steps was reached by consensus.

Informational and Action Items:

- Next subcommittee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 13, 2025.
- Meeting will include full content review and mock timed delivery.
- Each presenter will be allotted approximately 12 minutes.
- All final slide decks must be submitted to HBSB staff by July 18, 2025.
- HBSB staff will return compiled and formatted presentations to subcommittee members by August 1, 2025.
- Michael Davis will conduct outreach to absent presenters, including the new architect representative, to ensure alignment.
- Logistics regarding hosting, platform, and Q&A format to be reviewed and finalized during the August meeting.

7. Comments from the Public/Subcommittee Members on Issues not on this Agenda

Facilitator: Michael Davis (or designee)

Discussion and Input

Michael Davis opened the item by inviting comments from the public on matters not listed on the meeting agenda. He noted that the subcommittee values public input as part of its commitment to transparency and stakeholder engagement. He then paused to provide sufficient time for virtual or in-person attendees to submit or voice any comments.

Veronica Yuke reiterated that public comments could be submitted through the Teams platform chat or verbally requested through standard virtual meeting protocols. She confirmed that no written public comments had been received.

Committee and Public Comments:

- None.

8. Adjournment

Michael Davis expressed his appreciation to all committee members, presenters, and HBSB staff for their continued engagement, thoughtful input, and collaboration in advancing the development of the *Collaborative Inspection Approach to Hospital Construction* webinar.

Michael Davis then officially adjourned the meeting at 11:24 a.m.