



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



**Hospital Building Safety Board  
Collaborative Inspection Approach to Field Inspections  
Webinar Development Subcommittee**

**April 24, 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

**HCAI Staff Present**

Chris Tokas  
Monica Colosi  
Joe LaBrie  
Andia Farzaneh

**HBSB Staff Present**

Veronica Yuke, Executive Director  
Marcus Palmer  
Evelt Torres

- 1     **1. Call to Order and Welcome**
- 2     **Facilitator:** Michael Davis, CHI, CEO Emeritus, DavisHBC, Inc.; Subcommittee
- 3     Chair
- 4     Michael Davis opened the meeting at 10:00 a.m., welcomed attendees, and
- 5     turned over facilitation to Veronica Yuke for roll call and meeting advisories.

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

2             **Facilitator:** Veronica Yuke, Manager, HCAI; Executive Director

3             Veronica Yuke conducted the roll call and confirmed a quorum. She then outlined  
4             the rules of engagement and identification protocols.

6     **3. Draft Meeting Reports/Minutes**

7             **Facilitator:** Michael Davis

8             **Discussion and Input**

9             Michael Davis opened the item by reviewing the draft meeting reports from the  
10            February 27, 2025, and March 27, 2025, subcommittee meetings. He  
11            summarized the key activities and outcomes of each session.

12            For February 27, 2025, Michael Davis explained that the subcommittee:

- 13            • Discussed and finalized the presentation sequence: Ownership,
- 14            Design Professional of Record, Contractor of Record, Inspector of
- 15            Record and Testing Lab, then OSHPD/Field Staff. This order aligns
- 16            with the actual sequence of field construction events.
- 17            • Scheduled future meetings for March 27 and April 24.
- 18            • Set goals for continued progress.

19            For March 27, 2025, Michael Davis reported that the subcommittee:

- 20            • Reviewed each presenter's progress on their assigned webinar
- 21            content.
- 22            • Confirmed April 24 as a dry-run session to refine presentations.

23            Michael Davis concluded his overview by recommending the subcommittee  
24            approve both draft reports.

25            **Subcommittee and Public Comments:**

- 26            • None.

27            **Informational and Action Items**

- 28            • The subcommittee confirmed that both meeting reports accurately
- 29            documented subcommittee proceedings.
- 30            • Approval of the reports formally acknowledged prior decisions and
- 31            actions, ensuring continuity in webinar planning.
- 32            • No revisions or amendments to the draft minutes were proposed.

1       **Voting:**

- 2               • **Motion:** Cody Bartley moved to approve the February 27 and March
- 3               27, 2025, draft meeting reports of the Collaborative Inspection
- 4               Approach to Field Inspections Webinar Development Subcommittee.
- 5               • **Second:** Gary Dunger
- 6               • **Vote Results:** Unanimous via roll-call vote.
- 7

8       **4. Mock delivery of webinar presentation outlines**

9       **Facilitator:** Michael Davis

10      **Discussion and Input**

11      Michael Davis introduced the mock presentation segment by acknowledging that

12      Scott Mackey was absent and that he, Michael Davis, was not yet fully satisfied

13      with the development of his own section. He proposed beginning with

14      presentations from Gary Dunger, Cody Bartley, and Monica Colosi, followed by

15      an overview of his updated material. He framed this session as a critical progress

16      checkpoint, estimating the webinar outline to be about 80% complete.

17      **Gary Dunger – Ownership Section**

18      Gary Dunger delivered a draft presentation emphasizing the owner’s pivotal role

19      in ensuring inspection success. His content covered:

- 20               • The importance of early and continuous involvement.
- 21               • The owner’s duty to hire qualified teams, allocate resources, manage
- 22               risk, and make timely decisions.
- 23               • The unique long-term perspective of owners as stewards of healthcare
- 24               facilities.
- 25               • The consequences of inadequate inspection, including safety failures,
- 26               operational issues, and legal liability.
- 27               • Best practices, including maintaining documentation, collaboration, and
- 28               administrative support for inspectors.

29      He previewed real-world case examples and acknowledged that his draft

30      remained a work in progress, inviting suggestions for improvement.

31      **Cody Bartley – Contractor of Record Section**

32      Cody Bartley presented the “Build to Pass” contractor perspective. His outline

33      emphasized:

- 34               • The contractor’s QC responsibilities, including subcontractor oversight
- 35               and internal verifications before IOR review.

- The need for early collaboration with IORs, especially through mockups and first-in-place inspections.
- A layered QC process that reduces failed inspections and schedule disruptions.
- The importance of a team culture, open communication, and proactive issue identification.

Cody Bartley proposed showing a sample QC checklist during the final presentation and discussed the value of aligning subcontractors with contractor expectations.

### **Michael Davis – Inspector of Record Section**

Michael Davis introduced the “Inspect to Pass” mindset, focusing on the inspector’s philosophy, responsibilities, and ethical role. His outline included:

- Attitude toward team members (contractor, DPOR, owner, OSHPD).
- Misconceptions about “Inspect to Pass” implying leniency or bias.
- The need for proactive, transparent, and respectful communication.
- Ethical conduct and collaboration with the design team and ownership.
- The role of inspectors as guardians of public trust, not adversaries.

Michael Davis emphasized the importance of inspectors being included at the decision-making table and proposed framing the IOR role within a larger ethical and operational context.

### **Subcommittee and Public Comments:**

- Joe LaBrie supported Gary Dunger’s points, emphasizing that owners often disengage after project startup. He urged highlighting continuous oversight and the importance of including inspectors in early and ongoing conversations.
- Chris Tokas agreed and stressed that a disengaged owner is one of the biggest risks to successful construction. He supported the idea of integrating case studies and real-world failure examples.
- Michael Davis echoed these sentiments, referencing OACI meetings and early close-out planning as mechanisms for long-term engagement.
- Cody Bartley suggested that ownership should introduce the OACI model early in the process. Gary Dunger agreed and offered to incorporate this into his presentation.
- During Cody Bartley’s segment, Chris Tokas emphasized clarifying the difference between QA and QC, urging Cody to clearly define

contractor responsibilities. Cody welcomed the input and agreed to strengthen that portion.

- Joe LaBrie raised concerns about subcontractor alignment, noting that most inspection issues stem from subcontractor performance. He advocated for a strong culture of expectation alignment from the general contractor down through all trades. Cody Bartley acknowledged the issue and proposed reinforcing this through QC documentation and proactive engagement.
- Chris Tokas shared an example of fabrication failure caused by poor oversight in the QC chain, reinforcing Cody Bartley's point about systemic redundancy and the need for deep contractor involvement.
- Joe LaBrie and Chris Tokas both strongly endorsed the development of this seminar, calling it a critical advancement for the construction industry. They suggested the potential for the current content to evolve into a full-day seminar, due to its national relevance and value.
- Michael Davis concluded with a request for all members to actively share feedback and ideas to help refine each section.
- A member of the public suggested pointing out during the webinar, the usefulness of the OSHPD survey for relaying good and bad experiences
- A member of the public noted there were some topics that overlapped between presentations and suggested using Google Docs to facilitate collaboration.
- The same member of the public recommended Nanci Timmins for the role of seminar facilitator.

### **Informational and Action Items**

- The subcommittee confirmed that each presenter would continue refining their material based on feedback.
- Members were encouraged to collaborate across roles by providing input on each other's sections.
- Gary Dunger agreed to introduce the OACI model in the ownership section.
- Cody Bartley committed to clarifying QA vs. QC and improving subcontractor-related QC strategies.
- Michael Davis planned to rework portions of his ethics segment to emphasize accountability without implying inspectors should prioritize cost savings.
- Chris Tokas and Joe LaBrie proposed expanding the webinar content into an eight-hour seminar with deep dives and case studies.

- The subcommittee agreed to revisit the roles for the introduction and conclusion in a future session but did not make final decisions during this meeting.

## **5. Discuss ideas for the introduction and conclusion of the webinar**

**Facilitator:** Michael Davis

### **Discussion and Input**

Michael Davis opened the discussion by revisiting past conversations where the subcommittee had considered assigning either Scott Mackey or another member to deliver the introduction of the webinar. He acknowledged that no final decision had been made in prior meetings and emphasized the importance of crafting an effective opening and closing to set the tone and leave a lasting impact.

Michael Davis observed that Gary Dunger's mock presentation already included introductory content, which could potentially serve as the webinar's actual opening if the subcommittee opted to keep the flow streamlined from ownership into the rest of the presentation.

He stressed that the introduction should do the following:

- Welcome attendees and establish the webinar's purpose.
- Emphasize the importance of inspections in healthcare construction.
- Outline the structure of the presentation and speaker roles.
- Set expectations for what the audience will learn and why it matters.
- Regarding the conclusion, Michael Davis noted that it should:
  - Recap key takeaways from each speaker.
  - Reinforce the value of a collaborative, accountable inspection approach.
  - Encourage attendees to review their inspection protocols.
  - Invite further training or certification if appropriate.
  - Include a Q&A segment to clarify any outstanding issues.
- He asked the subcommittee to consider whether the introduction and conclusion should be delivered by one individual or shared between members.

### **Subcommittee and Public Comments:**

- Cody Bartley suggested working on getting the content done first, then figuring out the introduction and conclusion.
- Gary Dunger expressed the need to determine if this was to be a webinar or a seminar and added that he believed there was enough

1 content to warrant a full day seminar. Chris Tokas agreed but  
2 explained that he wouldn't know if an in-person seminar was feasible  
3 for 2026 until the State budget is released on July 1<sup>st</sup>.

- 4 • Gary Dunger stated that having "Inspection" in the title twice was  
5 redundant and to consider reworking the name.
- 6 • Gary Dunger expressed openness to incorporating his introductory  
7 remarks into the formal webinar opening. He acknowledged that his  
8 content was designed to set the tone for the entire presentation and  
9 would flow naturally into his ownership section.
- 10 • Michael Davis supported this approach, saying it may be most efficient  
11 and effective to have Gary Dunger open the webinar directly,  
12 especially since his presentation already establishes the foundational  
13 context of inspections from the owner's point of view.

#### 14 **Informational and Action Items**

- 15 • The subcommittee will continue to evaluate options for delivering the  
16 introduction and conclusion in a cohesive and compelling manner.
- 17 • Michael Davis advised all members to remain open to assigning or  
18 adjusting responsibilities based on the final structure and narrative flow  
19 of the webinar.
- 20 • The final decision on who delivers the introduction and conclusion was  
21 deferred to a future meeting.
- 22 • Members were encouraged to continue submitting ideas and draft  
23 remarks for both segments for future review and integration.
- 24 • The subcommittee should prepare content for a full-day seminar and  
25 condense it to a webinar later, if necessary.

#### 26 27 **6. Plan for future meetings and practice sessions**

28 **Facilitator:** Michael Davis

#### 29 **Discussion and Input**

30 Michael Davis initiated the discussion by highlighting the need to schedule a  
31 refined practice session in late May 2025. He proposed that the upcoming  
32 session should serve as a rehearsal of the full presentation, incorporating  
33 feedback from the April 24 mock deliveries and addressing final refinements.

34 He reiterated that the subcommittee had made significant progress, estimating  
35 the overall presentation was approximately 80% developed. The next meeting  
36 would therefore focus on:

- 37 • Completing the final 20% of content.

- Practicing transitions between speakers.
- Incorporating the introduction and conclusion segments.
- Finalizing slides and coordinating presentation flow.
- Michael Davis also introduced the idea of beginning to identify potential dates for the public webinar presentation, depending on the readiness and performance during the May session.

### **Subcommittee and Public Comments**

There were no additional comments from subcommittee members or members of the public specifically during this agenda item.

### **Informational and Action Items**

- The subcommittee will schedule a meeting for June 19, 2025 for a refined practice session.
- The focus will include:
  - Delivery of finalized presentation content.
  - Practicing speaker transitions.
  - Including finalized introduction and conclusion sections.
- The subcommittee will also begin identifying target dates for the official webinar delivery.
- Subcommittee members are expected to submit any final edits or updates to their presentation sections prior to the June meeting to allow for a focused rehearsal.
- HBSB Staff will provide the subcommittee with deadline dates for submitting PowerPoints and agenda items.
- Michael Davis reminded all members to continue collaborating and sharing updates or suggestions via subcommittee support staff before the next session.

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

**Facilitator:** Michael Davis

### **Discussion and Input**

Michael Davis opened the floor for comments from both subcommittee members and members of the public regarding issues not listed on the agenda. He clarified that although the subcommittee could not act on these matters during the current meeting, suggestions and concerns raised could be added to a future agenda for formal discussion or action.



1           **Subcommittee Comments and Public Comments**

- 2                   • None

3           **Informational and Action Items**

- 4                   • None.

5

6       **8. Adjournment.**

7           Michael Davis adjourned the meeting at 12:23 p.m.

This page left intentionally blank.