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MR. McNEILL: Welcome to the quarterly Elevator Safety Advisory Committee meeting. I apologize for the late start. We'll make that up at the end of the meeting. So we'll go to 11:15 this morning with the Advisory Committee.

My name's Rob McNeill. I'm the Chairman of the Elevator Advisory Committee, and I represent licensed elevator contractors.

We're going to have the introductions of the committee, and then we'll get started with the agenda.

Scott, would you mind?

MR. CLEARY: I'm Scott Cleary with Mobility Concepts. I represent the 270 exemption from licensure group of individuals. They include PUD's, the grain industry and the ports. So they're allowed to do maintenance as long as they're properly trained under the 270 law.

MR. NIEMAN: Dave Nieman with Kemper Development. I represent ownership through BOMA, Building Owners and Managers Association.

MS. STANLASKE: I'm Dotty Stanlaske, Chief of the State of Washington -- Chief Elevator Inspector -- sorry
-- for the State of Washington.

MR. SORENSEN: Alan Sorensen. I represent the City of Seattle.

MR. NORRIS: Jim Norris, Local 19 business representative representing labor.

MR. McNEILL: We'll go around the room just so everybody knows who is attending.

(Introductions made around the room.)

Thank you. We have a great representation of all parts of the industry, and we appreciate you coming today.

We will start with the agenda. The first item is the introductions and purpose.

We've been discussing with the State of harmonizing the format for the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee meetings. The last meeting we had kind of a free-flowing meeting so we could get some good stakeholder input.

Moving forward, we're going to be following the model that the electrical safety advisory committee uses. We'll be using Roberts Rules of Order with the committee to maintain protocol.

We will also change the format a little bit for the stakeholders. So the intent of this meeting is for topics and items to be brought forward to the advisory committee for action, either recommendations or not recommendations or adjustments.
You will be observing the Elevator Advisory Committee go through the topics on the agenda. We will be holding comments till the end. And then there will be a time for stakeholder comments to the committee.

So a little different format. It will be consistent and harmonized with the other committees in the state.

Thank you.

Comments Regarding February's Minutes

MR. McNEILL: So the first item of business is to approve the previous minutes from the last meeting. Do I have a motion from the committee to approve the minutes?

MR. CLEARY: I motion to accept.

MR. McNEILL: Is there a second?

MS. STANLASKE: Second.

MR. McNEILL: The minutes have been approved and seconded.

Chief's Report

MR. McNEILL: The next item of business is the Chief's Report. I'll turn this over to Dotty.

MS. STANLASKE: Can you hear me without this or should I use the microphone?
Rich, can you hear me?

"RICH": I can hear you now.

MS. STANLASKE: You can hear me now? Okay, good.

Scorecard/Accidents

MS. STANLASKE: So the scorecard is the -- scorecard and accidents, that's the first items on our list.

We are only achieving about on average per -- since July of last year approximately 20 percent of our inspections -- our annual inspections. However, new inspections -- new installation inspections, alterations, other types of inspections are running approximately pace to pace with the annual inspections.

So the inspectors have been pretty busy, but unfortunately because of the new installations and some accidents and also annual inspection -- I'm sorry -- alteration inspections, those have been keeping the inspectors pretty busy as well.

Accidents have gone down since the first quarter of 2016. So we're actually at less than half of the accidents in the first quarter of 2016, and most of the accidents reported in the -- let's see, we are now in our third quarter of 2017. So the -- is that right? Third quarter of 2017?
MS. STANLASKE: Okay. So we're in our third quarter of 2017 and -- the fiscal year -- sorry -- 2017. And most of the accidents have been escalators through no fault of the equipment. And there were a few elevator accidents through no fault of the equipment as well.

Any questions? Oops, we'll hold the questions till later. Sorry. I almost forgot the format.

Hot Topics

MS. STANLASKE: Okay. So we have a couple of hot topics we want to discuss with you. And one is penalties. So we -- I have directed the inspectors not to write up 8.11 items. That does not mean that elevator companies should not be doing the 8.11 items that are test items. They are still required to do those as they have always been required to do those along with the 8.6 items.

So -- and we will be looking at the penalties to see if we can -- and we're going to be enlisting you folks a lot and your friends and friends of your friends and -- we're going to need a lot of help with some of these items that we're going to be looking at.

So we'll be looking at sort of a risk base to penalties. So does the failure to post a fire sign, does
that have the same impact that not performing a safety test would have? To me, the answer is no. So the penalty shouldn't be the same. So we'll be looking at those type of things.

New installation inspections. Inspectors will now perform the entire inspection on new installation before they leave the job site. And that is so that -- we've heard a lot of comments from elevator companies saying, "Well, they stop, so we didn't know what the rest of the issues were, and they came back a second time and they continued on, so they found more issues." Well, the elevator companies said, "Well, it would be helpful if they found all the issues up-front."

Yes, it would be helpful if the inspectors found all the issues up-front. But what would be even better is if there were no issues to find up-front.

So we're trying to work with the elevator companies in that respect. And the inspectors will complete the entire inspection. However, the next go-around, if any of the items the inspectors cited at the first go-around are still outstanding, then all I can say is shame on the companies.

And if -- we'll be having some discussions on what the consequences will be if that happens. So we're trying -- we want to try to work with the elevator companies and
with their customers, but we also need that same thing from the elevator companies. We need cooperation from them and some assistance from them so that we can make everything more efficient.

Open Seats on ESAC

MS. STANLASKE: We have some open seats on the Safety Advisory Committee. The alternate position for representative for licensed elevator contractors is open. The position for the representative for registered general contractors is open as well as the alternate for that position. And in addition, an alternate position for an ad hoc member.

Dwayne, maybe we can talk to your boss and have you involved as far as that goes.

"DWAYNE": It's open for discussion.

MS. STANLASKE: Great. Super.

And then position representative for registered architects or professional engineers.

So if any folks in here, any of you know any registered architects or professional engineers, please reach out to them. We really want to have a well-rounded Safety Advisory Committee because that's the only way that we're going to be able to hear everybody's concerns and
everybody's needs and hopefully at least have discussion on them.

So those are the positions that are open. I would encourage any of you folks here to apply for those positions if you fit into those categories. So -- and all you have to do is send a letter of interest to me, and I will forward that on to whoever it needs to go to.

Category Testing

MS. STANLASKE: All right. Okay. I'm very pleased to tell you that the state of Washington has contracted with Elevator World to conduct the Category 1 licensing for mechanics.

So what that means is that rather than there only being one day a month available for elevator mechanics to take -- Category 1 to take their exam, they'll have multiple days that will be available, pretty much whenever they wish. It is a computer-delivered exam. It's pretty much the same format as it was before.

However, Scott, you'll be happen to hear this. It's based on the latest codes. So not the 1996 version or '98 version, but the 2013. Well, excuse me, this version right now is 2010 because that's what the State is using. So it has adopted.
So it will be more flex -- provide more flexibility for those folks seeking licenses. They won't have to wait. It's just an all-around better system. They can retake the exam, and they'll get a notice right away whether they failed or passed. And they'll have the ability to retake the exam. So we will be looking at Category 4 next because that's our next largest category of licensing. So we'll be looking at Category 4 next in regards to that. All right?

Shall I go into old business?

MR. McNEILL: Any comments from the committee or questions to the Chief?

MR. NORRIS: A question. As far as the test, is it still just going to be strictly down in ...

MS. STANLASKE: For the time being. For the time being. It is a computer-based exam. But I would say for the time being until we work out all the logistics, and at that time maybe we can spread out to some of the other offices as well.

MR. NORRIS: Okay.

MR. McNEILL: I have a question on the new installation inspections. Would you please provide some data as this proceeds so we can see what the improvement in the inspection results are for turn-overs --

MS. STANLASKE: Absolutely.
MR. McNEILL: -- so we can see if we're making progress or not.

MS. STANLASKE: Absolutely.

MR. McNEILL: Hopefully we're getting a lot of these either completed correctly the first time, ideally. And the reality at this point is we get them corrected the second time, then the State doesn't have to go back a third time. That's a great thing for the owners and the elevator companies as well as allowing the State more flexibility. So I'm interested to see our progress there.

MS. STANLASKE: Excellent. We'll do that.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

MR. CLEARY: Is it -- you also -- what about the contractors checklist? Does that have to be completely done as in the past for that inspection to go on?

MS. STANLASKE: That has not changed.

MR. CLEARY: So that has to be -- the inspection will not fall if that's not completed, correct?

MS. STANLASKE: It should not be scheduled until that is completed.

And what we've found is that some folks are handing that list to the inspector as the inspector walks in the door. That -- realistically, that should be completed by the time you call for an inspection. So that has not
changed, that checklist process, Scott.

MR. CLEARY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. McNEILL: Good point, Scott.

Yeah, I agree, we definitely need to have that checklist completed and ready to go. That's the responsibility of the licensed elevator contractors so we can prove that we've done due diligence before the inspection.

Great.

Old Business

Class B Permits

MR. McNEILL: So now we'll go into old business. Dotty, would you like to start with the Class B Permits?

MS. STANLASKE: I will.

So Class B permits, for those of you that may not be familiar with that, they would encompass alterations that do not require testing and -- or I should say witness testing, and residential incline chair lifts.

We had some discussions with labor and with the elevator companies. We were almost there. Labor has some concerns regarding the Class B permits. We have a little
extra time because the legislature went into special session, so we're still pushing to try to get that through. However, in order to do that, we feel that we need to try to meet labor's -- or at least try to understand their concerns and hopefully work with them on something that's more mutually acceptable.

So we have a meeting this Friday at 9:00 in the morning. And we'll be discussing that further. So there is still a possibility if we can work with labor and get their concerns -- if we can understand their concerns and address them.

So that's where Class B stands.

MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I -- just a comment. The subcommittee spent an incredible amount of time on this topic. Unfortunately, we didn't communicate or get consensus with labor while we went through this process.

The permits are a great step forward to allowing things to be turned over to the riding public safely and cut down that down time whether it's a private residential chair lift where someone may be in serious health needs and may not have a lot of time with their family, or just an owner that has a building and needs that elevator to take care of their customers and their tenants.

So I'm hopeful that we can resolve this and come to an agreement and move forward to help progress the ability
to turn elevators over safely and rapidly.

MR. CLEARY: And I want to make sure that we're very clear. That's just for residential stair chairs; is that correct? and not for commercial.

MS. STANLASKE: That is correct.

MR. CLEARY: So the public at large is not affected by this. This is only for residential. I just want to make that clear.

MS. STANLASKE: That is correct.

MR. McNEILL: On the chair lifts.

MR. CLEARY: On the chair lifts, correct.

MR. McNEILL: But on the other alterations, it --

MR. CLEARY: On alterations, it'll have to do with commercial, but residential conveyances will only be for residential. So it will help somebody that wants to come home and either age in place or pass in place, can get home for the weekend for Easter, get a call on Monday, be able to get it in so they can come and spend time with their family. So it's pretty important. There's very, very low risk with having this done this way.

MR. McNEILL: Good.

The next item is the MCP subcommittee.
Dave, I'm going to turn that over to you.

MR. NIEMAN: Okay. I've got a bit of a cold, so bear with me here.

I think we've had either five or six meetings with the subcommittee now. We've had good participation in all of those meetings. A lot of good ideas have come to the surface.

There's really quite a few things in the existing MCP that I feel like we can improve on.

One of the issues is uniformity due to the fact that each individual company rightly or wrongly was put in the position of developing their own system. It's made it difficult in times past, especially for the inspectors, to look at all the different forms and try to make sense out of them. So that's one of the things that we want to deal with.

Assessability is an issue, especially for building owners, because the current paper system has to be stored in the machine room. For large property owners or large portfolio owners, that is a very clunky and cumbersome way to do business. Oftentimes we don't even have access as managers to those areas.

We need something that's sustainable long term. The current system has in times past recordkeeping has been difficult because they can be lost or misplaced.
Security, therefore, is an issue, and we want to make sure whatever system we put in place that we feel like the people that are using it are the ones that are supposed to be using it and would limit access to those who should not have access.

Smoothness of the operation in terms of the mechanics using the system and those that have rights to look at the system, have access to it when they need access to it, and the ability to audit the system. That is, the owners and/or the State can randomly go in and look at the MCP's and see what the status is. And we feel like the easiest way to do that is to use an electronic system. And so we're recommending that we do a pilot. There are at least two systems out there available right now, and we're recommending that we do a pilot with one of those systems to find out whether or not it really does fit the bill. And, you know, we realize that there's not going to be a perfect system out there, but we certainly feel like we can come up with a system that's going to cover the majority of the subjects I just talked about. And that's really kind of where we're at to date. And we're open to continued discussion and/or comment regarding that.

I think all the stakeholders from day one have been represented in the meetings. And so we're looking forward to pushing that forward and to get everybody's input.
We have reached out through Thyssen to Ohio State University where this particular system we're looking at is in place. We talked to the mechanics there to get their input. They seem to be happy with the system. And we've reviewed it. The subcommittee actually had the company call in and give us kind of a quick demo of the system that they have, and it offers a lot of -- I'm not sure what the right word is -- but it offers the opportunity to fill most of these things that we just talked about.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

I'll add on a little bit.

So in the last meeting, as Dave mentioned, the subcommittee recommended that we bring this to the Advisory Committee to investigate and allow some beta testing before the next code cycle so we can determine the feasibility of this system and other systems.

We also at the meeting agreed that as a group, the majority vote, that we would bring to the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee a motion to rescind the 8.11 requirements for the elevator companies. They will still be required to do the testing and examination that's outlined in 8.6.

What this means to the elevator contractors is if this is approved by the Advisory Committee and moved to
the State for approval, that their procedures be revised
to allow exam to be performed under the 8.6.

So those were the two main items that came out of the
subcommittee.

Do I have a motion from the Advisory Committee to
recommend and allow electronic MCP's to the State with
beta testing?

MR. NIEMAN: I motion.

MR. CLEARY: Should we have discussion on the motion?

MR. McNEILL: Yeah, we should have. I'm sorry.

MR. CLEARY: At least have discussion on it first.

MR. McNEILL: Yeah, let's have discussion. I'm
sorry. Thank you. Discussion.

MR. CLEARY: Al, I think one of the questions that
came out. Who would own it or who would run it was one of
the questions that that was a good question to bring up.

MR. SORENSEN: That's a big question.

MR. CLEARY: So I think that needs to be discussed.

Who would be the ownership. Would it be individual?

Would it be L & I? Would it be the cities? Who would own
it?

MR. SORENSEN: I can't be -- well, it could be an
entity, a separate entity. The actual ownership of the
MCP belongs to the building owner, though. So I have
concerns with elevator maintenance companies putting out
1 electronic MCP's because some of the companies don't
2 necessarily like to share with other companies sometimes.
3 Actually, keeping this in the building where it
4 belongs is a different topic as far as -- (inaudible).
5 I'm worried they're going to have to get each individual
6 building owner I think to buy into this. Or we're going
7 to have to have something like the state agency or
8 somebody who wants to be the main repository of this.
9 MR. CLEARY: Yeah, I think that's the key for
10 discussion is who has oversight, who makes sure that it
11 works seamless.
12 That's one of the things -- consistency is one of the
13 things that came out of this that is really important. So
14 how is it administered? How is that stuff done? So I
15 think that's something we need to discuss and talk about
16 because that would be the key.
17 MR. NIEMAN: The system we're looking at is software
18 as a service; it's cloud based. The kind of the good
19 things about it is: One, there's no cost to the service
20 provider, and there's no cost to the State. It's paid for
21 by ownership as currently all things pretty much elevator
22 related are paid for by the owner.
23 In my mind, the simplest thing would be to have --
24 there's a maintenance fee -- an annual maintenance fee of
25 $10 per unit that keeps the system alive and going on. In
my mind, the easiest thing to do there and to make sure that it's sustainable is to have that cost added to perhaps the permit fee for each piece of vertical transportation. Then you've got sustainability long going, and it's perpetual, and you won't have to worry about whether or not an owner is or isn't paying for their service fee for that. It's very minimal. It shouldn't really be a problem.

So that's kind of where we're at with that. It's -- in terms of managing the system, there really is no management of the system since it is software as a service; it resides on a cloud.

Once the equipment data is uploaded into the system, it's permanent and it's there for, you know, in perpetuity until such time as the company either defaults or -- which is one of the things we'll have to talk about.

MR. CLEARY: So one of the things too is being able for inspectors to access it remotely so they don't always have to be physically on site.

Is that something that the State feels comfortable with, being able to do that?

MR. SORENSEN: Well, they have to be physically on site to do the --

MR. NIEMAN: Well, the software is wherever you are. So it's always on site. It's accessible from anywhere in
the world essentially.

In addition to that, anybody that wants a hard
document can print it out and have it stored wherever they
would like to store it or have it available for the State
or anyone else to view.

From a State standpoint, I would think it would be
very advantageous because they can look at any MCP at any
time from any place versus having to drive to a property
and walk into a machine room.

So if an inspector wants to audit a particular
facility, he can -- as far as the MCP's are concerned
anyway, he can literally sit at his desk and bring those
reports up and look at them and see where they're at
versus, you know, driving from wherever they are to a
property, going into the property. You've got security
issues oftentimes getting into the machine rooms, et

cetera. So it would be very advantageous I would think
for the State from that standpoint to be able to view and
audit the MCP's at will.

MR. CLEARY: It would add efficiency and cut down on
travel time.

And the other thing that we talked about too is you
were talking about so you can ensure maintenance is being
done because there's a proximity, there's devices you can
add to your equipment to make sure that maintenance is
being done.

MR. NIEMAN: Right. So part -- one of the things that are available is there can actually be proximity sensors located in machine rooms which requires that the person doing the input actually has to be on site to make the input.

So I know at one point there was a comment made, well, some guy could be sitting on a beach with his iPad and inputting, you know, information into the system. And so there are systems in place that would not allow that type of thing to happen. So they have to be on site within relative close proximity to wherever the sensor is placed. So that is covered.

In addition, the system that we're looking at currently is set up so that it has two things that it checks before you can input.

One is you have to input from your device. So a mechanic has to take his device or his computer, get into the system, and then input his codes for it to work. So I can't pick up Rob's device and start working with it and input information. The system won't allow you to do that. So it's got some firewall protections built into it that should I think cover anybody's concern about fraudulent input and/or manipulation of the system.

We can -- it can be set up so that anybody can view
it, but only the people that you designate can actually edit or change the information in the system.

MR. McNEILL: So I think it's a good idea. If we don't start on this, we're never going to see how viable it is.

The comments I've had from the subcommittee have been that this may not be a one size fits all. This may be very good for major campuses or complexes. And we have several of those in the state. I think it's a great area to do a beta test.

I'd also like to see some beta tests with the small mom and pops so we can determine how well it fits for the little owners that only have one building.

I think it sounds like it's what we need to do. I know New York City is allowing elevator companies to use their own. But you got to start somewhere, so this is a good starting point.

Also, when we talked about this in the subcommittee -- and I strongly agree with this statement -- we need to make sure that once we as a subcommittee recommend this, and it moves on, that we still manage this with the State, so we have quarterly meetings until we ramp up and get enough data to look at so we can continue to work with either the State or the city to analyze what's working and what's not working and how this could be effective for our
stakeholders. So we definitely want that to continue to happen. Having some quarterly meetings until we get enough data, and then go to monthly meetings so we can find the gaps and determine if these gaps are critical or if they're fixable so we can get a good product for the stakeholders.

Any other discussion? Comments?

MS. STANLASKE: There is a setup fee for each unit, and that has to do with inputting all the information into the system. So it's a survey that needs to be accomplished. And that can be done either with I would think the best source would be with the elevator company to perform that initial survey.

MR. McNEILL: So if there are no other comments, do we --

MR. CLEARY: So I want to clarify. We're going to vote on if we go to the beta test; is that correct?

MR. McNEILL: We're going to vote that we recommend that we investigate the feasibility of electronic MCP's with the State.

MR. CLEARY: And Dave has stepped up that they're going to be --

MR. NIEMAN: It will be a pilot.

MR. CLEARY: -- will be a pilot, correct? I just want to make sure it's clear what we're --
MR. McNEILL: But it just wouldn't be Dave's project.

We also want to find some little single elevator so we can also beta test that and see how it's going to work with the small entities as well.

MR. CLEARY: And that information would be brought back to the Advisory then, correct?

MR. McNEILL: Yes, at the regular meetings.

So really I believe the motion would be that we recommend electronic MCP's and testing of these systems to determine the feasibility.

MR. NIEMAN: Are you making a motion?

MR. CLEARY: I'll make a motion. Anybody second?

MR. NIEMAN: Second.

MR. McNEILL: All in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

MR. McNEILL: Opposed?

So the Advisory Committee recommends to the code authorities that we --

MR. SORENSEN: One other comment.

MR. McNEILL: -- (inaudible) -- electronics and we review feasibility.

MR. SORENSEN: One other comment regarding Dotty's comment where the information's going to come from for the original information from the elevator companies. There's already supposed to be an MCP in every elevator machine
room. So all the information's already there. It's a matter of just getting that to whoever we have to who has to do the input. Correct? I mean, a copy of it is there and the maintenance is there and what you have to do is there.

There may be other things you might want to add as a customer.

MR. McNEILL: And I think that while we go through this process, we'll find that out.

There's new systems all the time. So we don't want to lock ourself down and do one thing, but we want to do what's best for the stakeholders. Looking forward to it.

Good.

The second item we'll get some comment from the board is the recommendation by the subcommittee that we rescind the 8.11 MCP to -- for the elevator contractors and leave it with the State. As it is, they're already doing it now. So --

MS. STANLASKE: Except for the testing.

MR. McNEILL: Right, except for the testing and the 8.6 items that are also in 8.11.

So I'll make that -- if we get to that point, I'll make that -- I'll make the motion, but let's talk about it first so everybody on the Advisory Committee is clear.

So questions?
MR. CLEARY: So we're going to have discussion on this topic?

MR. McNEILL: Yes.

MR. CLEARY: I have two questions. One is: Is the State prepared to do the 8.11 examinations now or -- I mean, who's going to do them? Are they going to go into limbo?

MS. ERNSTES: Scott, we can't hear you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Can you use the microphone please.

MR. CLEARY: Yeah. Is that better?

My question is: Does the State right now have the availability to get it done?

MS. STANLASKE: To perform the 8.11?

MR. CLEARY: The 8.11 test. We're having a --

MS. STANLASKE: Well, let me put it this way. We have no more availability to get that done than we do to get, you know, all of the annual inspections done. However, I'll be covering some of that later on in a different presentation.

The 8.6, what came out loud and clear from the study was the 8.6 belonged to the elevator mechanics and the 8.11 belonged to the elevator inspectors.

Now, that does not mean that if an elevator mechanic is out performing 8.6 and that crosses over to an 8.11, that they should not perform that.
The issue came in from what I understand with the word "examine." And when individuals went to -- presented their MCP for approval, they were told that they needed to take the word "examine" out of the 8.6 process that they wrote up.

So the suggestion was, now that process should say "Examine, and if needed clean the pit." So that way individual mechanics can comfortably sign off on the 8.6 items. That was one of the reasons why mechanics were not signing off on 8.6 items. This does not absolve the mechanics or the elevator companies from doing Category 1, Category 3, or Category 5 testing. That is still -- it has always been that way in this state, and it will still remain that way in this state.

MR. CLEARY: One other question that I have. Under -- the group that I represent under the 270 exemption from licensure, under that statute, they're allowed to do maintenance as long as it doesn't -- they can't do testing. But as long as they're properly trained, they can do maintenance, but they've also been doing and been properly trained to do their 8.11 examinations. And I think it's been coming very efficient to do it that way since most have not had an annual inspection now for going on three years.

So I would like clarification for that group because
they're properly trained, and that's part of their protocol is they're doing their periodics which is once-a-year examinations. You don't see that going away, do you? Because this is different than the other industry.

MS. STANLASKE: I do not.

MR. CLEARY: Okay. So I want to make that very clear that they're still going to be responsible for 8.11 tasks.

MS. STANLASKE: Any -- the issue was "examine," the word "examine."

MR. CLEARY: Then I will say 8.11 tasks. Because 8.11 has --

MS. STANLASKE: If it's -- 8.6 says you will do, you will clean the pit, you will clean the top of the car, you will replace light bulbs, you will blah, blah, blah. But 8.11 says you will examine.

MR. CLEARY: Correct.

MS. STANLASKE: So 8 point -- the MCP procedures should be rewritten to say, "You will examine, and if needed, clean the pit." So it's -- they're really not going away.

MR. CLEARY: But there's still a requirement to do 8.11 tasks once a year under periodic examinations or periodic test.

MS. STANLASKE: That's correct.

MR. CLEARY: And that's something they've been
1 trained in, and it's been functioning very well because
2 they have that exemption and they have -- that's what they
3 do. So I want to make sure that the guidance that I give
4 to them is that they're still responsible to do that.
5 That's not changing?
6 MS. STANLASKE: That is not changed. Still have them
7 do that.
8 MR. CLEARY: Okay. Thank you.
9 MS. STANLASKE: That's a select group, though.
10 MR. CLEARY: Right.
11 MR. McNEILL: That is good. Well, and the big
12 problem is many of the majors when we went through the
13 process to get it authorized to perform 8.6, and then 8.11
14 tasks is -- was very specific when it said "in our
15 processes," and now the elevator mechanics oftentimes most
16 of the time won't sign off on it, and then fines occur
17 because it isn't signed off when really that item didn't
18 need to be done at that time. It didn't mean it's not
19 going to be needed to be done. So there's a little risk
20 there that items don't get done; it's the inspection
21 agency's responsibility to point those out and make sure
22 that the elevator contractors do what the code requires.
23 So nothing's really changed. It's going to give some
24 relief to the elevator mechanics where their licenses
25 aren't in jeopardy because they didn't do something where
they said they did. So if they've examined it, then you can sign off and say it doesn't need it right now.

So we're not taking any exempt responsibility away for work that needs to be performed.

Any other questions?

So I make a motion to -- yes.

MS. CURRY: I don't have a question, but it's really difficult to hear.

MR. McNEILL: Okay. We'll do better. Sorry.

MS. CURRY: I hear Dotty fine, but the rest of you it's difficult.

MS. STANLASKE: Are you saying I'm loud?

MS. CURRY: I think I just got used to your voice and I know how to listen.

MR. McNEILL: So I make a motion that we rescind the requirement for the licensed elevator contractors to perform 8.11 and leave that with the inspection agencies.

Do I hear a second?

MS. STANLASKE: With the clarification.

MR. McNEILL: Yeah, with the clarification that the 8.6 exam items still need to be completed as well as the testing that's required under 8.6. That's not going away.

MR. CLEARY: And 270's exempt.

MR. McNEILL: Pardon?

MR. CLEARY: And 270's not included in that.
MR. McNEILL: And 270's not included in that, correct.

Do I have a second?

MR. CLEARY: I second.

MR. McNEILL: All in favor.

THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

MR. McNEILL: Opposed? It passes and moves on to the State for review.

So Dave and I both co-chaired the MCP subcommittee so that I didn't have my name on there, but I was working on the 8.11 operational part, and Dave was working on the electronic just so you're not confused.

Temporary Mechanic Permits

MR. McNEILL: The next item is temporary mechanic permits.

Scott, would you like to discuss that?

MR. CLEARY: I think there's two different tasks that we need to talk about. One is going to be a change in temporary licensing for the 03 category, which will allow people that are in the 03 category to be able to do hand-pull work, examinations and maintenance repair and testing with -- we're breaking that off. Because right now, the 03, there's no way to get into the 03 category.
It was a grandfathered category. And it also includes electrics and belt and man-lifts. So there's not a whole lot of training and curriculum you can do with a hand-pull elevator with a rope and a counter weight and some springs.

So right now, that's the major portion of what needs to be done to keep the grain industry compliant. Marty's here from H & S, and he'll attest that there's just a lot of lifts and not a lot of people out there. So they're in a training program. And the temporary -- what we're proposing is the temporary will allow them to do that for hand pulls only. And that still does not preclude them from finishing up their course work. It just allows them to peel off hand pulls from the 03 and the electrics. This does not include any electrics, belted man-lifts or special purpose. It's just hand pulls only.

And I think we're pretty close to having that?

MS. CURRY: Yes, we do have some language here that we're sharing with everybody. These would be --

MS. STANLASKE: I'll discuss that. That will be later.

MS. CURRY: Okay.

MR. CLEARY: And so that's -- we've been working on that for a while, and that allows the grain industry to make sure that they get all their category testing done
and any maintenance that needs to be done. But it's mainly for category testing, Category 1 and Category 5.

MR. McNEILL: And that's only for hand pulls?

MR. CLEARY: Only for hand pull man-lifts. It does not include special purpose, electric or belted man-lifts, correct.

MR. McNEILL: One question. So what's the level of risk doing that? I'm not very familiar with hand pulls.

MR. CLEARY: Well, the risk is not being able to get them -- there's just not enough service providers. You either got to be an 01 or an 03 to do this work. There's really no one other than me and another -- and Lyle, an 01, that's been doing the testing. So it's been really a couple of companies. Only two -- or only three 03 licenses in the whole state. And that's to handle, what, close to 400 lifts. And 80 -- 70 to 80 percent of them are hand-pull man-lifts. So the large portion, what they've got to do is spread all over a large geographical area needs to be done. There's just not enough service out there to get it done.

So this way here, I think there's more of a risk of not doing the category testing than having somebody that's got a lot of hours, a lot of training but doesn't -- has not done their electrical theory course where you have no electrical whatsoever and a hand pull man-lift. So
they're more than -- they're very qualified. I think the
risk is extremely low for allowing this to happen. And I
think the downside is there's a lot of risk by not getting
the testing done, especially when these are out in the
middle of nowhere in old 1920 wood cribs.

So I think it's a good thing. It'll allow more
trained people to be out there. And we're working now to
going more people the 03 licensing. But there is no on-ramp
other than what we've created to get people trained in the
03 category.

MR. McNEILL: Thanks.

MS. STANLASKE: I'll address the temporary mechanic licenses.

Most of you folks know that the policy for the
temporary mechanics licenses sunsets in December of last
year. And nothing has taken place since that time
regarding the temporary licenses.

So we've had a few requests to review the policy, and
we have done that. And there is copies of the policy;
maybe you've received them.

If you haven't, Melissa, do you have copies of the
policy?

MS. ERIKSEN: (Nodding affirmatively.)

MS. STANLASKE: Melissa has copies of the policy that
we're proposing.
And we're hoping that we can get support from the Safety Advisory Committee on our proposal. And if we do, we'll implement this --

Alicia, how long does it take to implement it?

MS. CURRY: We just need to have review and approval. But we're planning to do that right after the meeting if we get support for it.

MS. STANLASKE: Perfect.

So for those of you that didn't hear her, all we need to do is get review and approval by our folks higher up. And we're planning on seeking that right after the meeting provided that we get the support from the Safety Advisory Committee.

So basically what the new policy says is that the extension remains in effect until it's rescinded, modified or withdrawn by the Director or his -- his or her designee.

The reason why we did that is because we'll have the ability to review the entire policy during our review of codes and rules during the adoption process. So we didn't want this to run out during that process. We wanted -- and we didn't want to have to revisit that because we're going to have so much other work to do.

So the requirements are pretty much the same, except the applicant must submit proof of enrollment and
participation in an education and training program with each application to renew their license.

The other difference is that the individual is limited to one temporary license, which may be reviewed up to 12 times in 12 months. An individual holding a temporary mechanic's license must complete education and training hours for a full license within 12 months.

The way we came up with that is if an individual is seeking a temporary license, they're supposed to have 75 percent of their education and their work experience completed. And the Category 1 category, I think it's everything except for Category 4 and 9, and I could be wrong on those two categories and the material lift category. Those require three years of work experience and education before you can apply to sit for the full mechanics license in that category.

So if you consider that you have to have 75 percent of that to apply for a temporary license, that's two and a quarter years. So that gives you another year to finish off the additional education and job experience that you need before you can sit for the full license.

What we're trying to do is eliminate the individuals that come back over and over and over again for temporary licenses, and they're making no attempt to complete their education or their experience to get their full license.
So that's what we're trying to limit here.

But again, keep in mind that the greatest number of years that anyone needs to sit for the category licensing is three years. So 75 percent of three years is two and a quarter. So it is possible that individuals with two and a quarter years in the industry can be temporary licensed if they can demonstrate their experience and their education.

So the possibility is there.

MR. CLEARY: I just want to clarify that 09 is the temporary category. So 09 stands alone. When you get a temporary, you're getting an 09.

MS. STANLASKE: That's correct.

And I think that's pretty much the crux of this. So I would ask that the Safety Advisory Committee if they would give us their support on that.

MR. McNEILL: I have one question on the renewal period.

So from what you said, I think I understand that the reason for the renewal period being 30 days and not longer is you want to make sure you're seeing progress on their education to become a mechanic?

MS. STANLASKE: Right.

We -- we cannot extend that 30 days without going through a more extensive process.
MR. McNEILL: Okay. So at this time we can't extend that.

MS. STANLASKE: Right.

MR. MORRELL: Could I ask you a question?

MS. STANLASKE: Go ahead, Bill.

MR. MORRELL: Will the format allow questions from --

MS. STANLASKE: The questions should be held till the end.

MR. McNEILL: Yeah, we'll have to hold those till the end, Bill.

MR. MORRELL: Before you vote on this issue? Can I ask a question before you vote on this issue?

MR. McNEILL: No. We need to wait till the end with the new format.

Moving forward -- and I was going to talk about it just before the stakeholder input at the end.

We're going to have to be very diligent as stakeholders in the future to make sure you're communicating with your Advisory Committee members so you're informed. We're also going to have the agenda posted 45 days after this meeting, the preliminary agenda for the next meeting, the final agenda posted 30 days before this meeting. So you'll have an opportunity to see what's coming up. Or if you have other items you want to come up, that we can get them on the agenda for the
meeting.

So we're going to follow the protocol that we should and hold comments until the end of the meeting by the stakeholders.

But in the future, make sure you're really engaged with your committee member so you can get what you want on here and get your voice heard.

MS. ERNSTES: Can I ask a question on that? So does that mean you're going to put the input out here before you vote?

MS. STANLASKE: There are no questions now. This is the Safety Advisory Committee's business. And the only people that will act on anything or discuss anything is the Safety Advisory Committee.

MR. McNEILL: So we're getting in line with the other advisory committee meetings as has been recommended to us. So we're following the same format as the other safety advisory committee meetings. And we haven't done that in the past. I may not have been clear at the beginning. But that's the --

MS. ERNSTES: But my question is: If we give comments, do you put them out to the public at the meeting before you vote? How do people --

MS. STANLASKE: In the future.

MR. McNEILL: Oh. In the -- yes, we will.
MS. STANLASKE: In the future.

MR. McNEILL: Yes, we will.

MS. ERNSTES: Okay, in the future.

MS. STANLASKE: Yes.

MS. ERNSTES: So if people have comments, you will state those comments before you vote? That's my question.

MR. McNEILL: That's correct.

MS. ERNSTES: Okay. Thanks.

MR. MORRELL: But you're not giving an opportunity on this issue to do that.

MS. STANLASKE: No.

MR. McNEILL: No.

MR. MORRELL: Isn't that a bit unfair?

MR. McNEILL: We're following the proper procedure, so ...

MR. MORRELL: I understand that. But you're not allowing it to be vetted at this meeting. You come and you present all this information --

MS. STANLASKE: Point of order.

MR. McNEILL: Yeah, point of order. We're going to have to defer that until the comments, Bill. So we're going to move on.

So do we have any action from the committee on where you want to go with this? A motion one way or another?

MR. SORENSEN: I motion to approve.
MR. McNEILL: Okay. So you motion to approve the administrative policy?

MR. SORENSEN: Correct.

MR. CLEARY: Are we going to have -- are we going to take two votes on both of them?

MS. STANLASKE: You're going to support it.

MR. McNEILL: To support it.

MS. STANLASKE: You're going to support it.

MR. CLEARY: I second to support it.

MR. McNEILL: All in favor of supporting this?

THE COMMITTEE: Aye (the majority).

MR. McNEILL: Opposed?

MR. NORRIS: Nay.

MR. McNEILL: Okay. So ... 

MS. STANLASKE: So we will take that to -- we'll take that back to Labor and Industries. We'll have them review it and get the necessary approvals. And it should be in place probably by the end of the week. Is that too --

MS. CURRY: I would say probably, you know, next week.

MS. STANLASKE: Next week?

MS. CURRY: Next week, yeah.

MS. STANLASKE: Okay.
Code Adoption Process

MR. McNEILL: The next item is the code adoption process.

MS. STANLASKE: And we can talk about that during I have a presentation to give. Did you want to give everybody like a five-minute bio break, and --

MR. McNEILL: That would be good.

MS. STANLASKE: -- then we can talk about the code adoption process under new business.

MR. McNEILL: Okay, let's take a -- if anybody needs a bio break, take a five-minute break, and at 10:25 we'll resume.

(Break.)

MR. McNEILL: So we're going to start new business in a moment, but I want to make one comment to the stakeholders just so it's really clear. In the past this Advisory Committee hasn't been operating in the past as it should, and we're changing this, and this is a little difficult. What the stakeholders need to understand is we're making recommendations to the State. We're not voting on things that are going to be codified. So your discussion as stakeholders at the end of this meeting is
important because those items will go directly to the
State for consideration. So we're not trying to exclude
you from the system. We need this meeting to really be
the Advisory Committee making recommendations either to
move things forward or not and to be very efficient while
we do it. Your comments are still important and they'll
still be taken into consideration by the State on any
recommendations we make or don't make.

So hopefully that clarifies it a little bit.

And as we get into this process, I think it'll be a
lot easier. But as I mentioned before, it's going to be
critical that you keep engaged with your member on the
Board so you can bring up what you want and we can discuss
it in the future and be effective when we do it.

Thank you.

New Business

Emergency Rules

MR. McNEILL: So now we are going move inform new
business. The first new business is emergency rules.

MS. STANLASKE: So we did, in fact, develop some
emergency rules for the hand-powered man-lift elevators
and to allow that to be carved out, and we did that
specifically -- carved out as a Category 3 license, and we
did that specifically to assist the grain growers in
getting that equipment tested prior to their harvest
season.

So we have the support of the Safety Advisory
Committee on that. And that will now go to --

Alicia, do you want to explain that process?

MS. CURRY: The emergency rules are effective for 120
days. And as part of the emergency rule-making process
we're also going to be engaged in permanent rule-making.
And as part of this permanent rule-making process, we're
going to be looking at all education and training
requirements for all licensing, temporary all licensing
categories. We'd like to begin that process as soon as
possible. So we'll be -- we're planning to file a CR101
here in the next week or two.

And then after 120 days, those rules will either need
to renew -- so the rules remain effective for the
hand-powered man-lifts only for another 120 days or the
rule will expire.

Does that make sense to everybody?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What's a CR101?

MS. CURRY: I'm sorry. The CR101 is like the initial
notice, getting it e-filed to let everybody know that
we're going to be considering rule-making personally.
And then everybody will have the opportunity to participate in that permanent rule-making process in developing the rules.

MS. STANLASKE: Okay. We have a second sign-in sheet going around here. And the purpose of this is we're going to have a lot of needs in the next, oh, I don't know, probably year, year and a half, and we're looking to you folks and maybe some other folks that you know in the industry to assist us on different groups.

So what this is -- we have a sign-in sheet. Please sign in again, and then you look down at the bottom, and there's a number of different areas where we're going to need some assistance.

One is in rules and code adoption.

Two is in the stakeholders and the Safety Advisory Committee. Stakeholders is more -- Benita Frost over here will be reaching out and chatting to you folks about that work stream and what they're doing.

The third is the workload. That's the inspectors workload. And we're looking not only to our supervisors and our inspectors but also people from the industry or building owners to assist in that project.

The fourth has to do with systems and tools. And when we talk systems and tools, we mean our electronic program and how we can utilize that.
Fifth is organizational development. We've made a lot of progress in that area. But if you're interested in assisting with organizational development, that would be great.

And the sixth one we have is that you'll partner however is needed.

And the seventh one is you're not able to partner.

So put your last name, first name, and your contact number, your e-mail address. And there's a spot here for partnering choice. So I urge you to fill that in. And please certainly if you could assist us, we have a lot of work to do based on what the study said and quite frankly some outside of the study, and we're looking to have as many people involved as possible. Okay?

So you want to start, Scott?

So we have a little bit of a technical issue here logging into the -- the smart board's a little smarter than we are I guess. So ... 

MR. McNEILL: Maybe do we want to move on and ...

MS. STANLASKE: We can move on.

MR. McNEILL: We'll move on and then do the presentation on the program results update afterwards. 

Elevator Program Study Results
MS. STANLASKE: How many of you folks are familiar with the study that the legislature requested?

(Some hands being raised.)

So for those of you who haven't read it, it is on our Web site. And that will -- that's the background for this presentation. We're going to visit that a little bit.

And first off, I wanted to tell you Jose' apologized for not being here today. He unfortunately had to take vacation. So darn all the bad luck. He works really hard, so I guess he deserves it.

So go ahead and start the show.

Okay. So the study was conducted by a third party at the legislature's request. And that was Stellar Associates.

The three focus areas had to do with the rule-making process. A lot of people felt that they weren't involved in the last rule-making process and didn't have a voice. So that's one of the things that he need to try to fix.

Quality and consistency of inspections and workload. We need to find a more efficient way of our -- to enable our inspectors to perform their job. And by doing that, part of that issue is consistency. So that if an inspector goes out to your job or one of your customer's jobs and writes something up, then if another inspector comes out and that's not fixed, you should expect that
Now, we're all human. People make mistakes. We can't catch every single thing. But the big things we should be able to catch and we're looking at getting more consistent in that area.

Three is the effectiveness of business relationships. I think it's an understatement to say that the relationship between L & I, elevator companies and business owners has been a bit strained. So we're looking at trying to improve that relationship as well.

The study came up with 11 conclusions and 37 recommendations. Don't worry, we're not going to go into every single one of them, just high level.

Adopt a more formal rule-making process. So that's one of the partnering areas that is on that sign-in sheet. So if you're interested in the rule-making process, then that would be where you would want to note that you would like to participate. So the way this rule-making process this year is going to work is going to closely follow the rule-making process that the electrical program used. We will have a page on our Web site that will distinctly call out what dates and what time frames we're going to do each step or perform each step. And our goal is still to adopt the 2016 code A17.1 in the first quarter of next year. At the same time we will be reviewing the WAC rules and
figuring out if they fit in with that or if they don't fit in with that, if they need to be revised. But we don't want to do that in sort of a bubble. We want you folks to be involved. So now is the opportunity to become involved with these things.

We need to adopt a more customer-centered approach to enforcement, educational and outreach and helping customers resolve problems. So basically what it's saying is we need to listen to our customers and we need to help them get their equipment up to the point where it's code compliant. But we need to do it in a manner that perhaps there's a special circumstances. Perhaps, you know, in a year or so they're looking at a total remodel. So maybe we need to consider giving them a little bit of a breather until they do the remodel based on their agreement that that equipment is going to be remodeled. So there's some different things here.

Enforcement. That's a penalty for a fire sign, should a penalty for a fire sign carry -- it's non-compliant -- if you don't have that sign, your conveyance is non-compliant. But should that carry the same weight as a misfunctioning safety? No, probably not. So we need to look at those.

And we need -- I'm going to say this over and over and over again. And then Benita's going to get up and say
this over and over and over again. We need your help. We need your involvement.

We need to identify options to manage workload and inspections backlog. And that's -- the workload project team is working on that. So we're looking at a few different items there.

Implement an inspector training program and culture of respect. One of the things that became really apparent to me was the hunger and the thirst that our inspectors had for training. And they haven't had any statewide training in quite a while. So we started -- we brought them together in March for two days to begin the review of the differences between A17.1 2010, A17.1 2013 and A17.1 2016. That was just the beginning. We're going to continue on with that.

And that's twofold. It accomplishes two things. It's going to assist us in our review, getting ready for the rule-making or the code adoption process and the rule-making, and it's going to provide our inspectors with education that they have wanted and needed quite frankly for quite a long time.

So along with that, I will tell you that we hired Jim Runyan. He used to be the chief for the state of Oregon. And then he was NAESA's educational director. We've hired him as a technical specialist in charge of
training. And he's very excited about the opportunity. We're excited to have him. He will be assisting us with developing training programs for new inspectors as well as current inspectors.

So his first official day was yesterday. And he is down in Phoenix at the ASME code meetings because for two reasons. One, he will provide a presence for the state of Washington at the table. And two, anything that transpires at the code meetings, he will be able to bring back to us and we can interpret that -- I'm sorry -- incorporate that into our training for our inspectors. So we're really excited about that.

He will be in the Tumwater office next week. If any of you folks are in the area, please feel free to come on by and say "hello" to him.

Okay. Next slide.

We have a project steering committee, and that's made up of a number of sponsors from the agency. It is not just the elevator program. We have the assistant -- the deputy director -- assistant deputy director for the agency sits on that along with a number of other people.

We have a project plan. I want to -- for those of you that don't know Wayne Molsworth, wave your hand. Wayne is our operations project manager. And so he's got the task of trying to bring all these separate
workgroups together and make sure they stay focused and on point.

Ongoing projects. The 2016 code review and adoption. We just finalized our schedule yesterday for the dates on what will start when. We will be finalizing or -- we will be seeking applicants for the technical advisory committee, and the same way that electrical does it. We'll be looking for people to send in their applications end of July, beginning of August.

MS. ERIKSEN: For the TAC?

MS. STANLASKE: Yep.

MS. ERIKSEN: That will be August 1st through the 25th I believe.

MS. STANLASKE: So -- but we certainly wouldn't discourage anybody if they were really enthusiastic and wanted to get their application in sooner, right?

So we've set that time frame out. And it will be published on our Web site shortly. We need to put our finishing touches on the Web page.

We are preparing for formal rule-making. When did we determine 101 was going to be filed?

MS. ERIKSEN: We were going to file at the very end of August.

MS. STANLASKE: And that's -- the 101 is what starts the whole process. The CR101, it starts the formal
1. process. All right?

The organizational structure. We've had meetings with our inspectors. We haven't finalized the mission, vision and objectives. We hope to do that soon. We had a lot of good feedback from the inspectors on that. And we want to make sure that the feedback that they provided us is reflected in those three items.

Operations manager. That's a new position that will be developed as part of our reorganization for the organizational structure.

Tech specialists. We're hoping that we'll get the blessing for three tech specialists. We have the blessing. Now we need the money. So we're hoping we'll get the money to support the three tech specialist positions. One will be focused on training. One will be focused on rule-making. And one will be focused on consultation. So for elevator companies and for business owners, that type of thing. And that will be in addition to plan reviews and those responsibilities.

In addition, we're looking at program specialists. This is a new thing for us. But the electrical section has had this before, and the special specialist will assist the supervisors in scheduling workloads for the inspectors and also take care of some of the administrative tasks.
That is a big, big thing right here: replacement of conveyance management system, the CMS. That's our computer program that drives everything. It drives annual inspections. It drives penalties. It drives everything. And it's very outdated, and we're looking to replace that. So we have a legislative decision package that's pending.

Is it pending or is it dead?

MS. ERIKSEN: I haven't been given an update. I assumed that it was dead.

MS. STANLASKE: Yeah, that's what I think.

So we're looking at other areas where we can -- hence, the alternate plans. We're looking at other ways that we can either file for a supplemental budget or maybe -- we're looking for some kind of magic to happen. What Melissa?

MS. ERIKSEN: Oh, this is -- I apologize. This is something different than the other -- I thought you were talking about the Class B's.

MS. STANLASKE: No.

MS. ERIKSEN: Oh, okay. Sorry. I'm not sure on this one. I don't have an update. My apologies.

MS. STANLASKE: That's okay.

So in progress we have risk-based inspections. We'll be forming a work -- a project team to be kind of looking
at is there something that we can do? Do we need to
inspect to stop hydraulics every year, for instance? But
we'll be looking at the data to help us support that.
There has to be a way that if we -- we've got to see if we
can manage our workload.

And that brings us into workload management
obviously. And then, again, that's all part of that.

And stakeholder relationships. We're really working
hard to improve our relationships with building owners,
company owned elevator companies, you folks, everyone we
touch.

So why is this important? To do a better job of
informing, educating, listening and responding to
customers needs.

One thing that study showed was that we didn't do a
good job of that. So we're really, really working hard to
make sure that we do a better job of that. And we don't
have a systematic process for engaging on a continual
basis. This process is good right here, but we need to
improve this process. And that's why we need to make sure
we reach out to you.

And Benita will be speaking to you about what's the
best way to reach out to you, what's the best way to
community with you. Because we really do need your input
to be successful.
Our proposed methodology is we will initiate discussions with building owners first -- building owners and managers first. And then after we've had those discussions -- and these will happen quickly. It'll be right after the other. It won't be months in between. But right after that will be the elevator contractors. And then right after that will be elevator mechanics. Because we want to sit down with each group and focus on their needs and their concerns.

Stakeholder meeting topics. Again, this -- these are things that we'll be talking about with folks.

Review and verify the elevator study findings. And we want to be able to get a measurement of how we're doing as far as those go. Are we correcting some of the issues that we found, or that they found? Do they need to be corrected? So we need to address those.

And we need to establish priorities. What's the big priorities from everybody's standpoint?

And again, assist with responses and solutions. So we're looking for a collaboration, a partnership. Not a dictatorship. A collaboration and a partnership. We're looking for discussion that goes both ways, not one way.

Communications with greater stakeholder community and stakeholder involvement.

And bring different stakeholder groups together for
industry-wide issues.

So the kick off for these meetings will happen -- I believe that we determined yesterday probably the end of July will be the first meeting. And then the -- end of June -- I'm sorry -- end of June. And then the others will follow after that.

So again, we need to work together. Collaboration. Partnership. Those should be the big words. And we need assistance and suggestions for reaching out to stakeholders to offer opportunities for participation.

So we've done a lot of things that the study has required. We reorganized our organization chart. And I think what we've come up with is very helpful. We're on track as far as our rule-making and code adoption. We have dates set. We'll be publishing those soon. They'll be on the Web site, so make sure that you visit the Web site often and check those and be involved in the meetings.

We've hired one technical specialist. We've gotten more aggressive with our inspectors hiring. We hired a new inspector. Scott is in the back there. And we have interviews this week for two more. And there's a potential that -- we interviewed two previously, so there's a potential that there will be other inspectors coming on. So we're really excited about that.
There's a ton of stuff going on. I wish I could remember everything. But it's all good.

So with that, I'm going to ask Benita if she can follow up.

MS. FROST: So thank you all for being here. Again, my name is Benita Frost, and I work with Jose' Rodriguez in central office, and he and the project manager has asked me to lead the stakeholder group, work stream group that I'll be working on. How do we reach out to you? How do we get information from you on the things that you need from us? How do we determine what it is that --

(Microphone handed to her.)

How do we determine how we can hear from you?

So that is the reason why you got your first sign-in sheet that went around. So thank you for filling those out. They had two separate purposes.

This one was really to just try to figure out what is the best way to communicate with you, to get information out to you.

But what we also need to figure out is how we can also get information from you. So, you know, our group is working on and having lots of discussions about how can we communicate both ways.

So you are probably going to be receiving -- you will be receiving information from us. But what I'm going to
ask you to do is you're only so many people sitting in this room, and there's thousands of people out there that are representing this industry. So if you have friends or partners or peers or people that you work with that also would like to be a part of this process in partnering with us and how we are working through building this stakeholder relationship, I would be happy to give you my contact information, or you can certainly work through Dotty or Melissa to get you that information so that I can add folks to this list.

But you're going to start getting more information from us asking you to provide us information because that's how we're working to answer the recommendations and the responses that we got from our study of how to build this relationship between the Department and the industry.

So again, very important that we are collecting contact information. And we are not asking you just to give us your phone number and your e-mail; we're asking you to think outside the box on how you can communicate with us and we can communicate with you.

So one of the ideas that we are thinking of, we're figuring out if we can do this, and I'm very hopeful that we can, is to build an engagement site on our Web page. So that's a site where not only can you go in and ask questions or look up information or have, you know, the
most current information of what's going on for the
elevator program and for your industry, but it's a way
also that we can share information with you. And it's not
necessarily that you're having to pick up the phone and
call somebody to ask the questions; you can go to this
site and see if the information that you need is provided.
And then if not, then you pick up the phone.

We're trying to find a way to give you just-in-time
information that you're needing in the everyday work that
you do. So that's one idea.

Another idea is we are looking into seeing about
creating a mailbox -- an e-mail mailbox. But again,
that's going to take some, you know, resources because
somebody's going to have to own it, somebody's going to
have to manage it and make sure the questions to comment
get to the right place. But again, that mailbox would be
structured for stakeholder development, for relationship
development; it's not going to be structured to if you
have a problem with your inspector or with our chief or
with the Department or -- you know, whatever -- that
that's where you send information.

In our engagement site, we'll also have a place to be
able to list your concerns, any issues you may be having
at the time.

So the reason why we are starting with building
owners is because they really have the responsibility for providing safe conveyances. So we weren't choosing one over the other. No one is more important than the other. But that's the reason behind starting with building owners is because they hold that ultimate responsibility.

And the purpose of what we're doing is reaching out individually, listening, having conversations, getting an understanding of where you are, where we are, where we both need to be together. And then from there we'll reach out to, again, the contractors and the mechanics.

And from those conversations, we're really hoping to figure out between all of us how we can build a relationship to where we're all in the same room together, having the same conversations, hearing the same information, sharing the same information, and building that community and that relationship between the industry and the Department as a whole.

So our ultimate objective is to really figure out where the areas of common interest or concerns are amongst you, the stakeholders, and us as the Department and figure out how we can build that relationship to be able to move forward in the future on better terms.

Wayne, Dotty, did I miss anything?

MS. STANLASKE: I don't think so.

MR. MOLSWORTH: I was just going to mention that
we're putting in place some different things like WebEx
for those of you who are from where I live in Spokane, for
example. If we have multiple meetings where you want to
attend, we're going to have them up via the WebEx so that
you can actually attend via that and be able to ask
questions and that type thing. So we're looking for a lot
of different technology so that you can get more involved
with maybe a little less exposure to being out of the
office or ....

So we're trying to put a lot of that together. The
reason for the big push here, remember that we really want
you guys to help us build this program back up. It was
kind of beat up in the study, and we understand there's a
lot of things that need to be done, and we're actively
doing it, and we've got a lot of commitment from a lot of
different people inside the agency, not just inside the
elevator program. We want you guys to be a big part of
that too.

I was going to mention the ESAC will actually be
tasked with developing a couple of different groups as
well such as one to discuss risk and a couple of different
types of risk out there for both inspection and for
penalties.

But I just want to let you know there's some
different technology we're going to be sending out to you
so you can participate a little bit easier.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

MS. FROST: Just -- sorry. One more thing.

Just so you know what we're actively working on right now is the planning for the first meeting with the building owners. So yesterday we were actually able to develop some milestone dates through planning, and we are truly looking to hit our end of July -- June, excuse me -- end of June date to be able to meet with the building owners. And then very quickly after that, hopefully by the end of June, be able to meet with the mechanics and the contractors.

So this is coming quick because we're not trying to extend getting this work done. We're trying to get it done quickly so that we can start working better for you.

So again, these are draft dates. We're working very diligently to meet these dates. And as soon as we have these specific date picked out for that -- we know we have to work around other committee work that's being done besides that. Am I correct in that?

So we're just trying not to hit up against other important meetings or committee meetings that are happening. So just so you know, we are in that planning stage that is for sure our timeline, that target that we're trying to hit. And we will keep you informed.
And please look for invitations. And if people you
know around you or the people in your industry, please
send them out to the folks who we may not have contact
information for. Because all we can do is reach out to
those who have provided us information. We are going to
ask you to partner with us to spread that information so
that people can come to these meetings and be a part of.

And again, as Wayne said, if you can't be there in
person, please try to attend by WebEx.

Thank you.

MR. McNEILL: Thanks.

Existing Code Enforcement

MR. McNEILL: The next item -- I want to make sure we
have time for stakeholder input. The next item is
existing code enforcement.

Scott, do you want to kick that off? This is a new
topic we're going to bring up at every meeting.

MR. CLEARY: Okay. What this is, I'm kind of
reaching out to the stakeholders too to see if this is
something they think will add value. But we've had
discussions in the past that we're looking for
consistency. And I think where this is really going to
help a lot out too is with bringing in new codes and how
they're enforced.

So the idea behind this is that if existing codes are being enforced differentially across the different parts of the state, that we get them figured out and get some consistency. So if things that haven't been called before are being called, no one gets blindsided. So as long as it's not a life-safety issue -- may it be doors, how shunt trips are wired, if things are going to be enforced that haven't been enforced in the past, it's brought up and vetted through this meeting. So something that you may have passed on last week, you don't get failed on next week.

So we have talked about this before, so I want some feedback and see if this is something people are interested in. But I think it really will pay a lot of dividends, especially with the new code enforcement. So everybody knows what's expected on an 8.10 acceptance, what's going to be accepted -- you know, going to be expected across the board.

So it's not that -- and it also will help us vet how the interpretation of the code is. Is it really something that's enforceable? Is there something being forced that really shouldn't be enforced? And to give us a platform and be able to give discussion and dialogue.

And we need input from the inspectors of this state
and from service providers that are going to be responsible for these inspections.

So it's something we had talked about a while back to make sure things were vetted so no one gets blindsided.

So I just wanted to bring it up again. And this comes back to the audit and being consistent and making sure that every inspection is the same no matter where you are geographically located in the state.

MR. McNEILL: Maybe we can start with that during the stakeholder meeting after this one.

MR. CLEARY: Yeah, okay.

So that's kind of what this would be. It would be a section that maybe at times doesn't have anything in it, but at times may have 15 minutes in it. And I think it really will be something that really comes to be of value when the new -- when we're going through new code. So make sure there's consistency with new code adoptions.

MR. McNEILL: Thanks.

There's one more item that isn't on the agenda, and then we're going to open this up for stakeholder comment.

On Thursday, a long active member of the state is going to retire. Becky is retiring on Thursday.

Personally as an elevator contractor, I want to thank you for your hard work. There were a lot of times where we had issues, and you were kind enough to allow us to
come down and sit down and talk with you and help understand the State's position much better. I really appreciate that extra effort that you've made over the years. You've really contributed a lot.

Thank you very much.

(Clapping.)

MR. CLEARY: I just want to say I don't think we're clapping that you're leaving. We're clapping for all the support. So I just want to say of all the time that I never thought -- well, maybe I did think I'd say this, but you're really going to be missed.

So I do appreciate the effort, no matter if it was the answer we wanted or not. You spent the time to really work and help us through it.

So thank you for all that too.

MS. ERNSTES: Thank you all. I'm going to miss it.

MR. McNEILL: So I can't impress enough. This is a new meeting format, and it's the way we're going to move in the future.

As you saw today, there are a lot of things happening. There are a lot of projects that are in place. There are a lot of actions.

As an Advisory Committee over the last two meetings, we've made more recommendations than we've made over the
last five years I think. And that's good. That's what we're here for. We want to improve safety, and we want to make sure that all the stakeholders are represented. But I can't urge again how important it is for everybody to get engaged. Because we're going to make decisions or recommendations one way or another at these meetings. So we need all of your feedback before that, and we'll give you communication on the Web site so you'll know what's coming up. And please contact us so we can add things.

So at this time, we're going to open it up --

Go ahead.

MR. CLEARY: Well, I just want to add that I think this gives you guys more voice. We really -- we struggle with we keep kicking that can down the road. So we want to be able to make decisions at these meetings and go forward. So it's really important that you get to your representative and really talk about what's really important. So we don't spend time discussing a lot of the minutia, but we actually are able to make decisions.

Stakeholder Outreach

MR. McNEILL: So I'm going to hit the mic up here. We're going to try to limit comments to three minutes so we can get through everybody. And at two minutes, I'll
put my hand up.

So if anybody has any comments, raise your hand and we'll let you speak.

And that way -- as I said before, we make recommendations to the State. They still need input. And today is a good day on anything we talked about to provide some input to the State before they determine what they're going to do.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Would you explain the process under the new rules? Bill Morrell's comment regarding not having an opportunity to have public input or stakeholder input. Is it very important? And there are several items right now that are on the agenda that may no longer be exposed to stakeholder input. I would believe those items should have been grandfathered so they could finish up the process they were currently under, but they were thrown into this basket of voting on them before there was stakeholder input.

But going forward, what is the process by which we as stakeholders have an input? Input is made available to other stakeholders to view before the board makes -- or the Advisory makes a recommendation.

MR. McNEILL: That's a great question. I'll start off, and then please everybody else assist.

The subcommittees are developed to get stakeholder
input. So the subcommittee meetings are posted. Notices are sent out to people in this room so you know when the meetings are. So that's a great opportunity to get input to this board.

The other opportunity is just being on the Web site. All of us are listed. Our e-mails are listed. I believe our phone numbers are listed. Call us. I got to tell you, I don't get enough calls. And I'm reaching out more than I'm getting feedback to me as an elevator contractor representative. I much prefer to be in a position where people are calling me and saying, "Hey, I'm worried about this. This is how I feel about that." I get more of that at the subcommittee meetings than I get at any other time.

So there's two really good avenues.

Any other thoughts here?

MR. CLEARY: Well, I agree that we're changing the rules of engagement without giving a lot of notification. So I think right after -- I mean, our stakeholder meeting I think is going to be very important to hear the discussion so the State can also weigh that in with what we did.

So we -- things were changed. We're trying to be consistent with other committees within the state. So it's going to be -- some things -- it's going to be new. So we just need to work through it. But it's not to limit
anybody; it's just so we can start making decisions and move forward at the Advisory. We only meet four times a year, so we need to do some stuff and ...

MR. McNEILL: Yeah. So I think that was a really good comment, and I really appreciate it. There's a lot of groups coming up. And that's where you have a great opportunity to give your input for the future of the agency as well as the stakeholders.

Anybody else? Go ahead.

MR. MORRELL: First of all, my name is Bill Morrell. I'm with Adaptive Installations.

I'm glad to see that the stakeholder meeting today is being recorded. This is the first time in the years that I've attended that the stakeholder meeting is being recorded.

Dotty, you're shaking your head. Please correct me.

MR. McNEILL: This is the -- this isn't the stakeholder meeting. Bill, that's going to start right after this meeting. But these are the stakeholder comments regarding the meeting today -- the Advisory Committee meeting.

MR. MORRELL: Thank you for correcting me. I didn't know where we were in the agenda.

I might say that I believe the stakeholder meeting should also be recorded. Because these stakeholder
comments many times are lost in the shuffle. And the agenda item that you were talking about in terms of temporary mechanics, and what I was going to ask is on this applicant must submit proof of enrollment and participation in an educational program with the application to renew the license.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no program for enrollment into an educational program for a company such as mine. We have searched. We have investigated. We have invested many hours trying to find such a program.

There was one program for continuing education that my understanding it's now been eliminated or not renewed. And so when my license comes up for renewal, I'm going to have to find some way of satisfying continuing education. But it's been referenced many times that the National Association of Elevator Contractors, their program for Category 1 mechanic and their educational programs called CAT for certified accessibility technician, we can't register for that. You have to be one to qualify to be one. Meaning that if I wanted to find somebody and educate them, I would have to become a CAT trainer. And I've qualified for a CAT designation, but I would yet to be able to qualify as a trainer. And unless I have a trainer, I couldn't train people.

So to the best of my knowledge, Dotty, there's no
And you're saying I have to have one to continuing temporary mechanics licenses, but there is no program. Correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. CLEARY: Can I -- the State has approved independent companies' training programs. We have one that the State allows us to train through. That's been the thing.

And going back to the CAT, you're talking about CAT-S. AEMA who's an organization has reached out and they have four different CAT-S trainers geographically close to here that will work with companies that want to participate in the CAT program through NAESA. But the State does allow programs -- training programs to be authorized per individual companies. You just have to develop them.

MR. McNEILL: So Dotty, I would ask the State how Bill would find that information.

MS. STANLASKE: To find what information?

MR. McNEILL: Different groups that can help him get the education that he needs.

MS. STANLASKE: Scott will provide you with the information. He's volunteered to provide you with the information with that organization that has -- I guess that would be CAT-S.

MR. CLEARY: CAT-S, yeah, correct.
MR. McNEILL: Thanks, Bill. Appreciate it.

Any other comments?

MS. CRAWFORD: I have follow-up on that. Amy Crawford, Metzler Systems.

Scott, when did that program start? Because our research had concluded all East Coast CAT-S's.

MR. CLEARY: AEMA has been working on it for a while. And they've got a couple in -- one in Canada and two on the West Coast and one down in Florida that is willing to work and -- they're working with NAESA to allow the flexibility.

MS. STANLASKE: NEAC.

MR. CLEARY: Okay, all right. NEAC. -- to allow that to happen.

So you got to just get ahold of AEMA or I can help you get ahold of that.

Don Zimmerman. And they'll help you with hooking you up with a local --

MR. MORRELL: What's the name again?

MR. CLEARY: AEMA is the -- it's the Association of Elevator Manufacturers Association.

So we can help you with that.

So there are resources. There's resources in this state for continuing ed for merit shops too that we have.

MR. McNEILL: Next?
MR. SHAW: (Inaudible). I was wondering if you're going to allow others to compete with -- (inaudible.)

MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I may not have been clear there. We recommended that as the Advisory Committee today that we move forward to investigate electronic MCP's. And any others that will be on there, we're certainly going to look at. So we haven't closed the door on it. That's why we're going to continue to have subcommittee meetings on a regular basis because there may be something better.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is it going to be posted on the vendor site for the state so we know when it shows up?

MR. McNEILL: The meetings?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. When you're getting ready to ask other vendors to come in. Because we're on the vendor's list for the state of Washington.

MR. McNEILL: Yeah -- (inaudible) -- before the meeting, and we'll certainly -- I'll get ahold of you. I actually went nationally on the Internet and contacted other agencies throughout the country and found very few people. So we'd be more than happy to look at your product.

MR. REID: Greg Reid with Pace Material Handling. I just want to volunteer our organization to participate in the electronic MCP beta testing.

MR. McNEILL: Anybody else?
Well, I know change is difficult, and we've made some changes today. I think it was a good meeting. I really appreciate everybody's engagement.

Moving forward, please contact your representative so we can get more items going forward and moving forward and to improve the safety in the state for everyone.

One thing that we didn't have on the agenda that we'll have on future business next time is the appointment of a vice chair. So we'll work on that. And please provide your input as I mentioned.

So let's take a 15-minute break, and at 11:30 --

MR. CLEARY: We got to motion to close.

MR. McNEILL: We will. We will.

We'll take a 15-minute break. I'm going to ask for a motion here shortly to close the meeting.

Otherwise, unless anybody else on the committee has something, do I have a motion to close?

MR. CLEARY: I motion to close.

MR. SORENSEN: Second.

MR. McNEILL: It's been motioned and seconded to close the meeting. All in favor?

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. McNEILL: Meeting is closed.

(Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m., proceedings adjourned.)
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