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MR. McNEILL: We're going to get started. I realize that traffic is difficult today. But we need to get started so we can take care of business. We have quite a large agenda today.

I want to thank everybody for coming. This is the third quarter 2017 meeting for the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee for the state of Washington.

I'm Rob McNeill, the Chairman. I'll start introductions. I represent licensed elevator contractors.

Dave, why don't you start down there.

MR. NIEMAN: Dave Nieman with Kemper Development. I represent BOMA and business owners -- building owners I should say.

MR. JONES: Paul Jones, City of Seattle, Conveyance Program Manager.


MR. WOHLSCLAGER: Lyall Wohlschlager, Mobility Concepts, representing the licensure exempt group.

MR. NORRIS: Jim Norris, Local 19 alternate, representing labor.
MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

Comments Regarding May's Minutes

MR. McNEILL: The first item of business today is comments regarding May's minutes. I do have one comment that was brought to us by a stakeholder. On line 17, page 16, "assessability" should be accessibility is an issue. So if we can have that changed for the minutes.

Does anyone else have any changes to the minutes that they'd like to make?

MR. NIEMAN: No.

MR. McNEILL: Do I have a motion to approve the previous minutes?

MR. NORRIS: Make a motion.

MS. STANLASKE: Second.

MR. McNEILL: It's been approved and seconded. The minutes from the previous meeting are approved.

Chief's Report

Scorecard/Accidents

MR. McNEILL: The next item of business is the
Chief's Report. And Dotty will discuss the scorecard and accidents.

MS. STANLASKE: And handouts are available in the back. So if you would like handouts, they're at the back table.

So it appears as though we are hovering -- hmm, this isn't the latest and greatest, though, right? I mean, this is the latest and greatest.

MS. ERIKSEN: Yes.

MS. STANLASKE: I apologize.

So we are still way under 65 percent of what we are required to do. So we'll be looking at that. We're working on some changes within the program on how to address that.

So you can see our target is 65 percent, but we are way below that. And that's for annual and other inspections completed.

I'm just looking at this real quickly at the other inspections, and it seems as though our other inspections in some months are topping or equaling our annuals. So -- and those inspections would be new alterations, reinspects, that type of thing.

So we do have some thoughts on how we're going to increase that, and we will tell you about that later.

So accidents. Currently we have had between first
quarter of fiscal year 2016 up to recently we had a total of -- let's see; what's that 20 -- probably about 125, 130 accidents roughly. And elevator accidents we had 19 no fault and 15 at fault for the equipment. And escalators, we had 96 no fault and two that were the fault of the equipment.

Any questions on that?

MR. McNEILL: It looks like you have a misprint going on in escalator no fault over the last three quarters. It's starting to go down pretty well.

MS. STANLASKE: Unfortunately I wish the at fault would go down as well.

MR. McNEILL: Anything else, Dotty?

MS. STANLASKE: And that's -- that does it on that for scorecard and accidents.

MR. McNEILL: Great.

Open Seats on ESAC

MR. McNEILL: The next item on the agenda is open seats on the ESAC.

We need a position for registered general contractors. If you know anyone that's interested, there's a nice place right here for some representation for the general contractors. We'll also need an alternate
And we did have an alternate for the licensed elevator contractors. I don't think it got codified before, so I'll go back and see if that alternate's still interested in --

MS. STANLASKE: Perfect, perfect. That would be great.

MR. McNEILL: We also have a position for a registered architect and professional engineer. That would include consultants, wouldn't it?

MS. STANLASKE: I would think so.

MR. McNEILL: So consultants would also be able to apply for that position.

So if you're interested, please contact the state on their Web site, and they can guide you through the process which is very simple. And hopefully we can get some great representation and help get a wider spectrum of thoughts and people to help guide the safety in the state of Washington for elevators and escalators.

Old Business

Class B Permits

MR. McNEILL: The next topic is old business. And
the first item of business is Class B permits.

MS. STANLASKE: So Class B permits, we went forth to the legislature last session, and that did not pass. We intend to go forth with that again this year, this session. And before we go forward, we will be meeting with labor and major elevator companies, minor elevator companies to get input from them before we present anything to the legislature.

Any question on Class B permits?

MR. McNEILL: So this would be for the legislative session in the spring of 2018 or ...

MR. STANLASKE: Well, actually it starts in January. So we'll start having discussions on that very, very soon.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

Electronic MCP

MR. McNEILL: The next item of business is the electronic MCP. Dave Nieman has a report on that.

MR. NIEMAN: So we have gone through the inspection process, the survey process, got everything into the system. It's ready to go. I'm just waiting for my IT department to get the iPads ready, which hopefully will be done today or tomorrow.
The mechanics were part of the survey process and were somewhat indoctrinated into how the system works. They all liked what they saw. They said it made their job easier. Because my particular service group essentially has one form, and they have to go through and red line everything that's not applicable, or this system is based on the model of the equipment so it only brings up stuff that they need to pay attention to. So they thought that was very advantageous to them.

So by the next meeting we should have some pretty good data and an idea of how things are working.

MR. McNEILL: So will we be able to -- would we be able to have some feedback next meeting on how the interface will work with the state inspectors for them to ...

MR. NIEMAN: Yeah.

So essentially I can give anybody viewing privileges. So I just need the names of the people that the State wants to be able to view. And I'm willing to share that with just about anybody here. It's read-only privileges. I don't have anything that I need to hide from anybody.

So as soon as I get that list, we'll put it into the system. And Dotty and any of the inspectors that want to view the program and see what it looks like once it's up and running can do that.
MR. McNEILL: Fantastic.
And we were still looking for a small beta site ...
MR. NIEMAN: Oh, yeah.
MR. McNEILL: So ...
MR. NIEMAN: And I did talk to John Coshack (phonetic), and he's more than happy to beta a couple small sites so that we got something to look at there as well. So they're on board with that.
MR. McNEILL: Good. That'll be a good start for us to see the feasibility of it and we can expand it later.
Excellent. Thank you, Dave.

8.11 MCP

MR. McNEILL: The next topic is the 8.11 MCP. Just to refresh everybody's memory, the Advisory Committee recommended to the State that the 8.11 tasks stay with the inspector, otherwise known as the tasks found in 8.6, specifically tests and testing.
So Dotty will give us a little more input on where we are and where we're going with that.
MS. STANLASKE: Well, as Rob mentioned, we did have that conversation. We have had that conversation with some of the elevator companies. And we -- this is a little off topic, but we do have a meeting scheduled, a
Webinar meeting scheduled for August 24th, the evening of
August 24th with -- and we'll be inviting labor and the
mechanics. And we want to get their input on what has
been working and what hasn't been working. And I would
imagine a lot of the conversation will take place -- will
revolve around the 8.11 MCP.

So what Rob has said is correct, that the 8.11 should
stay with the inspectors except those items that require
witness testing and inspection. Those will go -- those
are part of 8.6, and those will revert to the mechanics.

So mechanics will -- so I've had this question that
if -- a mechanic has asked if it's an 8.11 item but it's
an 8.6 item, so the inspectors are doing it, right?

No. You need to take -- the mechanics need to
address the 8.6 items.

So that's where we stand right now. We will be
reviewing the WAC rules at next week's meeting on the 22nd
and 23rd. And in that WAC rule, we will also be -- or in
the review we will also be reviewing the portion that
specifically spells out 8.11 and whose responsibility it
is. So we will be looking at that next week.

I encourage everyone here to attend those meetings.
I think it'll be very beneficial.

MR. McNEILL: Great. Thank you.
MR. McNEILL: How about giving us an update on the Category 09 licensing.

MS. STANLASKE: Category 09 temporary mechanic licensing, the policy has been changed. And that was effective July 1st. And rather than it being -- rather than a temporary mechanic only being able to have a temporary license for two months and then having to take a month off, and then two months and having to take a month off, now the temporary mechanic can renew consecutively for 12 -- up to 12 months. However, in order to get the temporary mechanic's license, they have to have 75 percent of their education and experience completed for that category that they're seeking the license in -- that they will be seeking the full license in.

With that said, the reason why there's a year's limitation on that is because we looked at all the categories and we believe that any temporary -- anyone who is eligible for a temporary license mechanic should be able to fulfill the remaining training requirements, education requirements within that one year.

So they will still have to renew every month, every 30 days. However, they can renew consecutively up until 12 months. And that's in effect until July 1st of 2018,
with the caveat that we will be reviewing all the WAC rules and the RCW's and should something in that change before July 1st of 2018, then the Department will no longer adhere to the policy; instead, we will be adhering to the WAC rules. And those would take effect about May 4th. So there's going to be a little time frame in there that things may change.

MR. NORRIS: Could I ask a question, Dotty?

MS. STANLASKE: Sure, absolutely.

MR. NORRIS: The companies a lot of times are sending in the license application for a temporary mechanic. They get a receipt, you know, saying they paid. When does the temporary mechanic license take effect? When they see it on the Web site that they've been approved? When they pay? When ...

MS. STANLASKE: That's a good question.

Melissa, do you ...

MS. ERIKSEN: When they are approved in the system.

MR. NORRIS: So it's on the Web site?

MS. ERIKSEN: You can pay very much prior to ...

MR. NORRIS: Right.

MS. ERIKSEN: But until --

MR. NORRIS: Typically it's just the first one and it's --

And just for everybody's knowledge, when you're
looking on the Web site to see if somebody has a state license -- I'm not complaining -- there's a little glitch. Sometimes if you put their name in there, it doesn't pop up. So look under license, and it's the same as the driver's license. You put the first three initials of their last name in there, and it'll pop up under searching for license versus searching under a last name.

MS. STANLASKE: Yeah, we have unfortunately a lot of glitches with that system. We're working on fixing them.

Any questions on Category 09 licensing as it stands now?

Okay.

MS. CURRY: I did want to bring up one thing. The policy is available on the Web site for everybody. But I did notice that that link is broken. So we are working to get that fixed, just to let everyone know.

MS. STANLASKE: Okay, thank you, Alicia.

Category 03 Emergency Rule Licensing

MS. STANLASKE: Category 03 emergency rule licensing. That was for -- we did go forward with it. And it took effect --

When did that take effect, Alicia? Do you recall?

MS. CURRY: I'm sorry, I missed what you just --
MS. STANLASKE: Category 03, emergency rules.

MS. CURRY: It took effect May 30th.

MS. STANLASKE: Okay. And that Category 03 was for hand-powered manlifts only.

So we sort of carved out a little portion of the Category 03 license and made that available to the grain industry for hand-powered manlifts only.

That -- the emergency rule, when does that expire?

MS. CURRY: I believe the last day is the 26th of September.

MS. STANLASKE: 26th of September.

And we will most likely extend that for another 120 days to bring that up past the harvest season.

Any question on Category 03?

Rule Adoption Timeline

MS. STANLASKE: Zipping right along.

Okay, Wayne's not here. He's on vacation. I will -- I was going to say I don't know how he dare go on vacation, but I can't since I just came back.

The rule adoption timeline, Alicia's going to run us through that quickly.

MS. CURRY: We have filed the CR101 on July 18th, which is, you know, we give notice to everybody that we're
starting the rulemaking process.

We did send out notice I believe towards the end of July to solicit participation on the TAC.

The next step is to notify everyone of the rule proposal period, which is going to be September 1st through October 5th, and that's when the Department will be accepting rule proposals for stakeholders.

We are scheduled to have the rule review stakeholder meeting August 22nd and 23rd. So the program will be going through and looking at the current code and the WAC rules.

And we'll have some draft language, correct, Dotty?

MS. STANLASKE: (Nodding affirmatively.)

MS. CURRY: Of the language I guess that we'll be proposing.

So that's kind of the next steps in the rulemaking process. We're not scheduled to file a CR102 which is the next formal step. We'll be announcing the public hearing after that until January.

Then we're also planning on having some stakeholder meetings in November or December I believe?

MS. STANLASKE: (Nodding affirmatively.)

MS. CURRY: And we're planning on announcing the TAC -- was that the 26th? Yeah. Sorry, I don't have my rulemaking schedule with me.
MS. STANLASKE: It's the 26th I think might be the last day that they can apply.

MS. ERIKSEN: The 25th is. However, --

MS. STANLASKE: Oh, the 25th is?

MS. ERIKSEN: Yeah.

We're -- that's not set in stone at the moment.

MS. STANLASKE: Okay.

MR. WOHLSCHLAGER: A question.

On the proposed rule changes, so in the August 22nd and 23rd meeting is L & I's proposals for the WAC changes; is that correct? And then the 9/1 through 10/5 is stakeholder input to those proposed changes. And where does the TAC fit in?

MS. STANLASKE: Or the individuals in the elevator industry can also submit proposed changes during that time frame.

So we'll talk a little bit about the -- well, I suppose we can talk about the -- we'll talk a little bit about the TAC committee next, or after Rob speaks on a couple of things and what their roles and responsibilities are and how they fit in.

MR. WOHLSCHLAGER: And they apply, okay.

I just want to know when the last input was, whether it was 10/5 or -- related to the TAC.

MS. CURRY: 10/5 for stakeholder proposals, yes.
We're planning on convening the TAC I believe mid-November. So that way, it'll give TAC committee members some time to review stakeholder proposals before the meeting as well as Department proposals.

MR. WOHLSCHLAGER: Thank you.

MR. McNEILL: And when we get to new business, we'll give you a little more detail on that, and all of the stakeholders.

Thank you, Dotty.

MR. McBRIDE: Just for clarification, so did you expect to have the full rules proposal released at that August 22nd/23rd meeting, or is it just some ideas how they're going to be ...?

MS. STANLASKE: Basically it's going to be ideas where -- again, we'll go over that a little further down when we discuss the presentation of rule review.

MR. McBRIDE: Okay, thanks.

MR. McNEILL: So just as a point of order kind of information, with our new structure what we're going to do now as a committee is discuss things. And then after we're done at the end of new business we'll have public comment.

So we have to -- we've changed the format a little bit. So for everybody out there, it's not going to be as interactive during our part of the meeting.
The intent is that -- the intent is to get the agenda of the meeting out early so all of the stakeholders have it. Everyone who's been at the last two quarterly meetings was notified by the State that the agenda was out and to contact their committee members that represent them so we can get the input, and then we go through the business up here.

So we're still in the growing pains part of this. But I just want to make that clear of how this meeting works so we can streamline this meeting and have all the input from the stakeholders.

We also have a new business discussion on changing the format of the meeting so the stakeholders have more input prior to this meeting so if there are questions before the meeting, they can be answered.

Dotty, would you give us an update on that program?

MS. STANLASKE: Absolutely.

Elevator Program Study Results: Workstream Updates

MS. STANLASKE: So as far as the study results go, we have implemented a more regimented -- what am I looking for -- a more regimented method to adopt codes and look at the rules and do all of that. And we have definitely been seeking input from all the stakeholders.
We had a previous meeting. Our first meeting was with building owners. The second meeting was with elevator companies. We have a meeting scheduled for next week with labor, and that is basically the union as well as the mechanics, both signatory and non-signatory.

So we're hoping to get a lot of feedback from those folks. And all the feedback that we're receiving we're trying to integrate into a better way to make the program work. So we've been doing that.

Our inspectors -- five of our inspectors went for the -- sat for the QEI course and exam last month, and they all passed I'm proud to say. The remainder were looking at October. We hope to have them sit for October the course and exam. We cannot force anyone to sit for the exam or take the course because of our bargaining agreement, but we eventually will move down the line -- if the majority of our inspectors are QEI certified, we will eventually move down the line to change the hiring requirements so that these individuals are QEI certified when they're hired or agree to become QEI certified within a certain time frame. So that's what we're looking at.

We do have Leonard Fleming; he's our interim acting supervisor for Unit 2.

Leonard, stand up; raise your hand. I'm not sure everybody recognizes him. He's become so slim and
slender.

But Leonard is our interim supervisor for Unit 2.

And we have our technical specialists on board. We have Scott Rutter (phonetic), Jim Runyon (phonetic) and Candice Lau (phonetic). They will all focus on different areas. Jim will focus on education. Scott will be focusing on consultation. And Candice will be focusing on code review.

So we also have moved forward with the suggestion to have a program operations manager. We've got that -- the position has been through class and comp, and now it's been through payroll to be given a number, and now a determination will be made whether to put it out for recruitment or do a direct appoint with that position.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I missed the name of the position.

MS. STANLASKE: A program operations manager.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

MS. STANLASKE: We've been really, really busy. We have been reviewing all our rules and our policies, and those will be up for discussion during the upcoming meetings.

What else. We've done -- there is -- we've done so much that it's hard to describe all the work that we've been doing.
We are looking at making the inspectors more efficient in their inspections. We have a program specialist now, and that would be P'Oa (phonetic). He was a customer service specialist, and now he's working with the tech specialist to do preliminary review of the permits so that by the time the tech specialists get them, they don't have to look at the administrative information such as building owner, contact name, that type of information; they can focus just on the permit and whether to approve it or not approve it.

So there is some time that it's going to take folks to get up to speed, Candice and Scott, but Jim has been working with them.

Gosh, there's so much.

Go ahead, Rich.

"RICH": We hired a new inspector at the Kennewick office.

MS. STANLASKE: Yes, we did.

"RICH": Started July 10th. And then, of course, we hired an inspector at the Seattle office.

MS. STANLASKE: And we have interviews for an inspector position in the Spokane office this week. So we're trying to move along.

We also -- we had revamped our requirements for Inspector 1 position, and we released that position and
information to NAESA, QEITF and Elevator World, and they have distributed that information. We're hoping we'll get some more applicants.

Right now we're doing another class-and-comp study for -- to compare what our inspectors make compared to inspectors in the city of Seattle, the city of Spokane and across the country with the hope that once we do that and we go in front of the state HR board, that they will look at that and increase the inspectors' salaries or wages.

So there's a lot going on. And I probably only hit the tip of the iceberg.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'd be very surprised if the study came back and said not to increase wages based upon what I'm seeing out there in the market. How is that -- would we expect to see an increase in permits, costs, any -- (inaudible) -- to help offset that?

MS. STANLASKE: I would except that, yes, it's going -- it'll trickle down.

MR. McNEILL: Thanks, Dotty. That was a great report.

Anything else on that?

MS. STANLASKE: Just that we have a lot of people doing a lot of work. And it's considered an enterprise project, so the entire Labor and Industries is involved in
this, from Joel, Ernie, right down. So we have a lot of
people in a lot of different areas helping us with this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Dotty, you mentioned a number of
positions and new hires, things like that. Where are you
guys actually sitting with regard to number of open
inspection -- I'm sorry -- number of open inspector
positions and how many of those are filled? And are you
-- you're actually also going to be adding more inspector
positions as well or not?

MS. STANLASKE: We will not be adding more inspector
positions at this time. It's difficult for us to go in
front of the "leg" and say we need to add more positions
when we cannot even fill the positions we have.

So to answer your question about how many vacancies
we have, I believe we have seven inspector vacancies at
this time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is that -- how many is that?

Probably 20?

MS. STANLASKE: Out of 25. Is it 27? So seven out
of 27.

So a little -- I guess that would be a little less
than a third.

MR. McNEILL: Well, let's hope we can get those
filled, then that'll significantly improve the ability
of the State to make the annuals.
MR. McNEILL: The next item of old business is a discussion that the Safety Advisory Committee had, and that was to swap the times for the stakeholder and the regular quarterly meeting. And the discussion within the Committee was that with the new format, the formal quarterly meeting is more of an informational meeting and also a meeting to pass different motions and resolutions for subcommittees, changes that the Safety Advisory Committee recommend to the State to improve the ability for the State to manage the elevator operations and safety in the state and also to streamline the business.

So at this time -- and we'll have some discussion. This was just a point of information for the stakeholders. I need to see if there's a motion to start the stakeholder meeting at 9:00 a.m. for an hour prior to the formal quarterly meeting moving forward.

MR. NIEMAN: I motion.

MR. McNEILL: Is there a second?

MS. STANLASKE: I'll second.

MR. McNEILL: Is there any discussion from the Committee on what we want to do here or clarification and so forth?

Well, we're up for a vote then.
Just as a little bit more information for the stakeholders. Your input's really valuable. Generally -- right now it's vacation time, so we don't have as many people. But we've been packed every time. And we want to make sure that every stakeholder completely understands the items that would be on the agenda and the impact it would have on their business and the business in respect to the safety of the licensed elevator mechanics and the riding public and the inspectors that inspect the equipment.

So we're hopeful that if someone for some reason didn't get to see the agenda on-line, didn't have the opportunity to contact their representative on the Committee, that at least they have a chance to discuss things before the meeting so we can get fresh new information before the Committee makes any recommendations to the State.

So it's been moved and seconded. Any more comment?

All in favor?

THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

MR. McNEILL: Opposed? That motion passes. And the next quarterly meeting, we'll have the stakeholder meeting before the formal meeting so we can get further input from the stakeholders before we act on anything.

Thank you.
The next item of business -- old business, this came up about --

Oh, yes.

"CHRISTINE": Sorry. I'm not supposed to ask questions, but I'm just curious --

MR. McNEILL: You know, we're doing it anyway. So let's just do it --

"CHRISTINE": Well, I'm just trying to understand when is the opportunity to engage with you guys throughout the agenda.

For example -- so are you saying we're not allowed to ask questions during the formal ...

MR. McNEILL: That's the information and the guidance I've gotten from Wayne, that we're setting this up like the electrical safety advisory committee where the stakeholders are there, the electrical safety advisory committee goes through their business, and the expectation is that the stakeholders have contacted their Committee members prior, that they've seen the agenda, and the Committee members have a obligation to make sure the stakeholders that they represent know what's happening.

So this last agenda was published, and the State sent out an e-mail to all of the stakeholders that have been at the last two meetings saying, Here's the agenda, and then there was a paragraph that said, If you have any questions
or you have input, please contact your Committee member.

So the intent is that we have all the feedback from the stakeholders as Committee members before the meeting starts so then we can act on it. And by having the stakeholder meeting prior to the meeting just in case somebody didn't do that, at least we can get some more feedback.

Did that answer your question?

"CHRISTINE": It did. I just -- I mean, there's not a lot of detail in this. So I understand that. And so I'm just curious if there's questions that come up here, if the stakeholder meeting isn't afterwards, how -- where does that -- where do those questions get addressed?

So I mean, for example, like the timeline, the exact information isn't on here, so I wouldn't know the right question to even ask it if it came up.

So I -- I mean, I appreciate that you're trying to whittle down the back and forth that goes on, but maybe it's too -- I mean, because there's zero interaction going on right now even from you guys, so it's making me a little nervous.

MR. McNEILL: Understood. That's a good point.

"CHRISTINE": So anyway, just a thought.

MR. McNEILL: I appreciate that.

You know, at the last meeting, there was some pretty
direct and emotional impact from the stakeholders about,
You mean we don't get to talk and ask questions during the
meeting? And Wayne explained the format. And we made a
commitment that we would send the agenda out to the
stakeholders so they understood what was on there, and
that there was an obligation that if they did have a
question that they called us and we have all our input
there. I don't --
MR. WOHLNSLLAGER: Is there any problem with having a
short session afterwards for stakeholders as well?
MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I think --
MR. WOHLNSLLAGER: Once they get the feedback from
the Committee, we can just shorten it at the end or have a
short one at the start and short one at the end.
MR. McNEILL: Yeah, we have public comment at the
end, and I don't see why we couldn't have it after the
meeting too.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What do those do that have --
are not represented and they're vacant, those positions
such as consultants or something?
MR. McNEILL: Well, we have a quorum right now, so we
can still --
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm talking about who they call
if their position, their representative --
MS. STANLASKE: Oh, I see.
Well, what we would do is encourage -- forgive me for speaking for you.

MR. McNEILL: No, please.

MS. STANLASKE: But what we would do is we'd encourage those individuals if there is not representative here for them to become that representative.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In lieu of that --

MR. McNEILL: You can call me who's the Chair.

So if there is a -- that's a great point. If there is a vacancy, then call the State. Or I'm the Chairman for this set period until my period of time is over. And call me, and I'll either direct you to the right person or I'll take the initiative to find the answer or get your input so it can be shared with the Committee before we make any decisions.

Thanks for bringing that up. That's a great point. I'm going to make a note of it so we don't forget.

Since we're kind of open right now, any other questions? Go ahead, bring them up.

MR. McBRIDE: And I just want to echo the comment that -- I don't think anyone wants to throw the meeting off the rails in terms of time management. I think -- I'm actually extremely impressed with the amount of material and how quickly you're covering it. I think it's going really well. But just to add on what Christine said, if
there's an opportunity to have a little bit of interaction. And I'm not trying to ask you to change policy right now. I'm sensitive to that, and I applaud your efforts to keep things on a tight time frame; we need to do that. But I do share her concerns about whether we know enough at the front end to ask the question until we can, you know, appreciate the different perspectives that come out in a short dialogue. But I do think there's some value there that we should at least keep it under consideration.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

One thing Scott and I talked about -- and it wasn't in a formal meeting; it was just a discussion -- is we need to get the information out there.

My concern is that if the Committee members were sending out information to their stakeholders that is their personal opinion, that we may be constricting the input from the stakeholders. So let's say we have the agenda and the Committee member sends out a note to all of their stakeholders. Licensed elevator contractors is pretty easy; we have a list of everybody with their names. Architects would be a little more difficult, but general contractors -- but if the general contractor Committee member sent out something and said, We're talking about these things and this is what I can tell you about
Category 09 temporary mechanics, they may get conflicting information. And when Scott and I had the conversation it was, We need to let everybody know what the issues are, but we need to make sure that we're not putting our opinion on the issues so it muddies the stability for the stakeholders to give us genuine real impact that hasn't been influenced.

Does that make sense?

So we're still trying to balance that as a group.

Risk Assessment Subcommittee

MR. McNEILL: Okay. Let's go to Risk Assessment Subcommittee.

So one of the topics about two years ago came up from a stakeholder, and that comment was if the State wrote up their elevators and the costs to complete that task on the inspection report was financially difficult due to the scope of the project -- I think this was lighting in the hoistway -- that the stakeholder asked that the State be able to review that, and instead of having to have that done in 90 days, give the stakeholder or building owner or property management company more time to get that done. You know, if it's $150,000 project, it may not be budgeted in the year for the building.
At that time I remember I made the comment that -- and Jack Day at that time said he'd be fine with that. I made the comment that we should have a risk assessment on that specific item to make sure that the elevator inspectors, the elevator mechanics and the riding public all have a high degree of safety before anything is allowed.

So as a Committee we discussed this with the State. And there are three things that are important on the risk assessment. One is the rules and the code, and I think we're making changes what the impact is to the three functional groups that I just mentioned: elevator inspectors, elevator mechanics, the riding public, not necessarily in that order. So we keep everyone safe and make the state a safer place for everybody.

Discussing that as a group, we decided that if there's a one-off for a writeup on an inspection form, a risk assessment should be performed. For code changes, a risk assessment should be performed. And for fines, a risk assessment should be performed. And the State brought up a great comment -- and Committee members please add in if I miss something -- that if there's a write-up and a building owner gets fined for an administrative problem, does that have the same gravity as not getting their safety test performed for ten years. If we balance
it in terms of risk assessment, not getting a piece of paper signed versus not protecting the riding public, inspectors and elevator mechanics by not having a piece of equipment inspected longer than the State-prescribed inspection site. And it was decided that we should develop a risk assessment subcommittee, and that subcommittee would have an elevator inspector, a at-large position, licensed elevator contractor, labor such as an elevator mechanic. Really, the broad spectrum of everybody who's a stakeholder so we can assess items that come up during the year, and then bring those recommendations to the Advisory Committee to act on, and then either recommend them to the State or not.

So we will be asking for applicants for the subcommittee. The State will send out a notice in the next week, and we'd really like to get a broad spectrum of people so we can help manage the rules a little better, overall become more user-friendly with the stakeholders from the State's perspective if the State approves our recommendation. They may or may not. But we need to get everything looked at very specifically and carefully so we can help improve the Department and the input with the stakeholders moving forward.

So is that clear to everybody?

We'll be setting up a subcommittee to determine risk
assessment. We'll have the application request out for a
month, and then we'll set the subcommittee. I will be
chairing that committee. And then we'll do some risk
assessment work so everybody understands with the State
what the parameters are for risk assessment so we can
determine what the risk is, and then we can as a group
look at different things and improve the process.

New Business

Roles & Responsibility of TAC

MR. McNEILL: So moving on, we'll get into new
business. And the first new business is the TAC.

And I let you rest your voice for a few minutes,
so ...

MS. STANLASKE: Thank you. Thank you.

So the TAC committee, we're still looking for
volunteers for that. And this was -- back to this handout
for the volunteers on TAC, so the deadline for
applications is August 25th. We're looking for folks from
a wide area including fire marshals, elevator labor
representatives, grain industry representatives, so on and
so forth. And it's really important that we get people
from throughout the entire industry so that those folks
can have an input on how any rule changes or code
adoptions are going to impact their -- the people that
they represent. That is basically the role of the
volunteer on the TAC committee is to represent those folks
from your particular area in the elevator industry. If
you're a building owner, you represent their interests.
If you are in the grain industry and that's your position
on TAC, you represent their interests.

My understanding of how this is going to work is that
during -- so from now currently, we are accepting
applications for the TAC. And we will be accepting that
until August 25th, up to and including August 25th. After
that, we'll review them, and then based on the
individual's qualifications and the positions that they
have applied for, a decision will be made on who will be
appointed to the TAC committee.

So once that happens, there will be a period where we
will be accepting proposals to changes, to WAC rules,
codes, that type of thing.

MS. CURRY: And the licensing rules as well.

MS. STANLASKE: The licensing, renewals of licensing.

And we will be, as I said, accepting proposals. The
proposals should come in the form of obviously what is
being proposed. And if it's an alternate to a WAC rule or
an RCW or I'm going to call a national standard such as
A17.1 or A18.1, it should state what the original language
says and what the proposed change is along with the
rationale. And that rationale has to be in the format of
this should be changed to this because blah, blah, blah,
please not "because I don't like it." "I don't like it"
is not a good rationale. So it has to be a logical
rationale as to why you are requesting or an individual is
requesting that that change be made.

So once all the proposals come in, those will be sent
to the members of the TAC committee for review. The TAC
committee will meet, and I'm -- I don't know if it's one
day or two days. It may be that this time around --

MS. ERIKSEN: (Holding up two fingers.)

MS. STANLASKE: And Melissa tells me it's two days.

This time around it will be two days. Because we'll
be looking at not only A17.1 and A18.1, but the RCW, WAC
rules, everything is open for discussion. And the TAC
committee will not make a decision on -- or I should say
TAC, not TAC committee; that's a little redundant.

They'll not make a decision on that proposal other than
whether they believe that that should move forward or
whether it shouldn't move forward.

And for -- if they decide that it shouldn't move
forward, they also have to give a rationale as to why it
shouldn't move forward, not just because, as I said, "I
don't like this." They have to give a rationale -- a 
logical rationale as to why it will not move forward.

And so once they determine what moves forward, that
went to the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee. Then the
Safety Advisory Committee will review it and make
recommendations to the Chief as to whether the proposals
should go forth or not go forth and provide their
rationale. And the Chief will make the ultimate decision
based on the recommendations provided by the Safety
Advisory Committee.

So I'm sure some folks might be saying, Well, why
wouldn't the Chief just accept everything that the Safety
Advisory Committee puts forth?

It is possible that there could be some
administrative issues or something else that the Chief is
aware of that the Safety Advisory Committee isn't aware
of, and that might be a reason to decline their
recommendation.

Again, the -- I believe the Chief will still have the
responsibility to indicate a rationale as to why that
would not be going forward.

So it's not just, again, when it gets to me, "No, I
don't like this."

So there's a process. It's much more formal than it
was in the past. And I'm really excited about it. I
think it's going to be great to have everybody's input.

So then once that all happens, the actual time frame
-- we've been asked, What's the actual time frame for
folks that are involved in the TAC?

Well, it will be two days of meetings. But prior to
that, as much time as you think as a member of the TAC --
as much time as you think it will require you to become
prepared to discuss that at the -- discuss the various
proposals at the TAC meeting.

MR. McNEILL: Do you foresee the TAC coming together
once a year? twice a year? Does it depend on how many
proposals come in or ...

MS. STANLASKE: The TAC will be dissolved after this
code adoption review and rule review.

However, next year if we have additional code
adoption or rules that we need to be reviewed, we will
have -- bring together another TAC, and they will review
those next year.

Now, it doesn't mean that if you're on the TAC this
year, you'll automatically be on next year. That doesn't
mean that at all. So there's a good possibility that many
of the folks on this year's TAC could be on next year's
TAC. There's a possibility that few of them will be on
next year's TAC. It all depends on who's interested in
continuing.
And truthfully I would assume that it will also depend -- this year it's kind of a major overhaul on rules and code adoption. So it's going to be a major overhaul. Next year I'm not so sure that it will be quite so intense. So maybe next year there is nothing of interest for certain people. So it all depends on what comes up.

But the same thing, the same process will be repeated every year, just so that you know. All right?

MR. WOHLNSCHLAGER: Is the format of the WAC intending to change this year in order to make it streamline and coincide with the national codes a little easier?

MS. STANLASKE: Yeah.

MR. WOHLNSCHLAGER: So looking in a particular area of the national code, you know where to go look in the WAC instead of it being spread out through the entire WAC.

MS. STANLASKE: Yes.

MR. WOHLNSCHLAGER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. STANLASKE: We're hoping to anyway. There's a lot of work that needs to be done.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

Dedicated Fund Passage

MS. STANLASKE: All right. So Dedicated Fund Passage. At the 11th hour, thankfully, somehow we got a
dedicated fund. But that dedicated fund is not just for elevators; it's for elevators, factory assembled structures and general contracts -- contractor registration.

So now those three programs -- Jose' is working with those three programs to sort of see how things should be divvied out, who has the most needs. And, of course, I believe we do. He may not see it that way. But it's very exciting now that we have dedicated funds.

However, any penalties do not go into the dedicated funds; those go into general funds. And that makes sense because we don't want inspectors out there handing out penalties to sort of increase our funds. So that makes sense to me.

Overtime. Overtime will go into -- if we have overtime requests, and there will be charges for those, that will go into the dedicated fund. But again, it doesn't necessarily go to elevators.

So we're kind of struggling on how that's going to work right now. But we did get dedicated funds for those three programs as a group. So we're really excited about that, and it was at the 11th hour. And I don't know who the legislative angels are, but we thank them.

MR. WOHL SCHLAGER: Rumor on the street is it could take three or four years to understand dedicated funds and
implement them. So we may not see any effect in the next year.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, most of L & I is dedicated funds, so it's not new.

MS. STANLASKE: Not -- I don't know that most of L & I is.

So we don't -- my understanding is that there's no account for it right yet, but they're in the process of setting one up. And there is a requirement for I think it's the next -- I'm not sure if it's seven years that we need to pay back to the general fund 7 percent of whatever comes into our dedicated fund. That needs to go back into the general fund.

MR. McNEILL: I have a question and a couple comments.

This is a great opportunity for the State to be able to improve -- they're great on annuals. If a inspector is working on a inspection and he has an hour and a half left in the day and is able to work overtime, then we save all that windshield time. It also helps the stakeholders, the contractors and the owners and the riding public, because we can get that inspection done. The elevator companies don't have to spend another half a day getting an inspection done and can use that labor somewhere else in their business.
But the question I have is: How -- well, I have two
questions. So first question is: How fast can we get the
overtime process in place so inspectors can finish these
inspections in a day if they're almost done? And you may
not have the answer; that's fine.

And the second question is: What is the best avenue
for us to get feedback to Jose' so the stakeholders can
help the State understand what we think we need to make
the State and our businesses more effective?

MS. STANLASKE: Two good questions.

So as far as overtime goes, we have already been
allowing inspectors to work overtime. So -- and we'll be
discussing that at next week's meeting. All right?

MR. McNEILL: Okay.

MS. STANLASKE: But if you know that, for instance,
you have emergency power, emergency generator test that
needs to take place on a Saturday or an evening, then
contact the supervisor in that area, and they will assist
with that.

That's the first thing.

The second thing, how do you get feedback to Jose'?
I would say write him directly. Send him an e-mail.

MR. McNEILL: Okay. So I hope everybody's hearing
that.

MS. STANLASKE: And also just so that you know, yes,
we had a meeting with the building owners. We had a
meeting with elevator companies. And next week's meeting
is with labor. However, those meetings weren't a one and
done; those will continue. So attend the meetings. And I
envision that just at the beginning we're having the
separate meetings, but then we'll be bringing everybody
together. Because some of what we heard at, for instance,
the elevator -- the building owners' meeting was their
frustration regarding elevator companies. So we're going
to need to come together to work on all of those issues.
But definitely continue to attend and provide your
feedback.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

So I believe what I heard on the overtime -- and this
is selfishly for the licensed elevator contractors or
non-licensed contractors -- right now if we have an
inspection and it's almost done, we can ask the inspector
if he will work overtime to complete it, and that we as
the elevator contractor would pick up the additional
costs? Is that right?

MS. STANLASKE: I don't know how that's going to work
as far as billing goes. So I would like to verify that
portion of the overtime with Jose'.

MR. McNEILL: Great.

MS. STANLASKE: But in my mind if an inspector is on
the job, and he's -- you know, he's got one more elevator
to do and it's going to run into overtime, that inspector
should call the supervisor and get permission from the
supervisor just so that it's not abused.

MR. McNEILL: Okay.

MS. STANLASKE: And I don't see any issue with that
personally. I would much rather have the individual stay
on the job, complete the inspection rather than have to
set it all up again.

MR. McNEILL: Good.

MS. STANLASKE: So -- but have the inspector call
their supervisor.

MR. McNEILL: Good. Thank you.

Yeah, I know my stakeholders are very anxious to have
this opportunity so we can get things done and not be
subject to damages from contracts and so forth.

MS. STANLASKE: Sure.

MR. McNEILL: And be able to get the buildings turned
over.

Great. Thanks for that information.

MS. STANLASKE: Sure. Makes sense.

MR. McNEILL: Any other questions on that from
anybody?

MS. STANLASKE: However -- one comment. Do not
expect the inspector to stand there while the elevator
company is -- the mechanic is fixing something that should have been taken care of prior to the inspector arriving.

The instructions that I've given to the inspectors, especially for new inspections and alterations, finish your inspection. It doesn't matter anymore whether there's -- it used to be if you had I believe three issues, then the inspector would stop the inspection.

Now the instructions we've given them is finish the inspection, complete as much as you can, write up what you find wrong, present it to the contractor -- to the elevator contractor or their representative on the job site, and the way I see it is that the next time that we go out for an inspection, all of the items that the inspector wrote up should have been addressed and hopefully the unit will pass.

Now, I'm not so naive as to not recognize that sometimes the inspectors are going to go out there, and they're not going to be able to finish fire service for whatever reason, or emergency power for whatever reason. And the next time they go out, they may find something because now they can complete that and they may find something. But our hope is that we'd like to see one and done, but definitely two and done. No more than two.

So that's what our hope is. So we want the contractors to understand what they need to complete.
Now, I will tell you that as far as I know, most of
the inspectors do not have an issue continuing with what
they are doing, even if they find something wrong
continuing with what they're doing and allowing -- if
there's two mechanics on the job or however, allowing one
of those folks to go back and try to address the issue --
one of the issues that they found, provided it doesn't
interfere with their inspection. So however -- they're
not to stop their inspection just to allow a contractor to
be able to make repairs. Okay?

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

MS. STANLASKE: All right. You want me to tackle the
next one?

MR. McNEILL: Yes, please.

MS. STANLASKE: That was so hard.

Wage Increase For Inspectors

MS. STANLASKE: So our inspectors did get a wage
increase. And they got a 2 percent increase beginning
July 1st, 2 percent for next July, and 2 percent for the
following January. So in two and a half years -- or a
year and a half actually, they will have gotten a 6
percent increase.

At the same time, they received a -- the inspectors
received a 5 percent increase this legislative session. 
And again, I'm not sure who the legislative angels were, but we need to thank them for doing that.
With that said, the Department is going to go for another bite at the apple, and they're going to request an increase in the supplemental budget, increase for wages.
I've spoken with some of the inspectors and let them know that with this increase comes responsibility. And that responsibility is that they are to be as efficient at their job as they possibly can be, that it's not -- you're just -- they're not just getting rewarded to get rewarded, that they have a responsibility to be efficient as they possibly can be, and also to go out and interact with their customers in a positive light.
So I would hope that they do that. If they do not, then I would hope that we would have some communication regarding that.
So -- and we're also doing some things in house to make them more efficient and responsible.
So that was rather exciting too because that was 11th hour as well.

Code Presentation & Rule Review

MS. STANLASKE: Code presentation and rule review.
Next Tuesday and Wednesday, we will be doing a review of the WAC rules and some of the RCW's I believe, but mostly focusing on the WAC rules. And the comparison will be what the WAC rule says and if it's covered in a national standard.

And there'll be some discussion as to whether we are going to propose to move forward with that or appeal the WAC rule and adhere to the national standards. So that will set the stage for preliminary discussions.

I hope that anybody that can attend will attend because we've had a lot of concern over the WAC rules and the fact that there is a lot of confusion with it because some of the WAC rules, the language was taken right out of the national standards. And if that's the case, we should be following the national standards.

And some of the WAC rules were put in there for personal preference, not because it assisted the industry at all and certainly not because it assisted building owners, but just because of personal preference, and we'll be looking at those as well.

So I would encourage as many of you as possible to attend the meetings on the 22nd and 23rd. It's being held in Tumwater at the TC3 building which is across from the post office. And we're hoping to get a large amount of participation. So please spread the word and let others
know that we're really looking for some participation on this.

MR. McNEILL: So a question. What's the format? So the State will have the WAC rule and the national standard, and then the stakeholders can add comment or whatever?

MS. STANLASKE: Well, right now this is more of a presentation for people to understand where we either align with the national standards or we don't align with the national standards and a preliminary comment by the Department on whether we're going to consider appealing it or not. It's not the time for stakeholders to present their proposals.

MR. McNEILL: But we can do that through the TAC.

MS. STANLASKE: Yes. Yes, do that through the TAC.

"JAN": Will we have access beforehand to the --

MS. STANLASKE: Presentation?

"JAN": Yeah, so that we can make comments and ...

MS. STANLASKE: I don't know if we'll be able to get that out to you beforehand.

"JAN": That would be really helpful.

MS. STANLASKE: I don't know, Jan. I'll check.

We'll try to get it -- we'll try to get it out.

///
Stakeholder Meetings

MS. STANLASKE: All right. We've already talked about the stakeholder meetings, but we will continue to have the stakeholder meetings, and there'll be additional stakeholder meetings particularly during the code adoption process and the rule review process because we do want to get input from folks on how they see things going and how they see things transpiring.

Our intent is really to have as much open dialogue, and I know this meeting might not seem like that, but our intent is to have as much open dialogue with our stakeholders as possible so that perhaps not everybody will be in agreement with the changes, but at least we hope to have it such that they've had their opportunity to have input, they feel they've been heard, and that they're somewhat comfortable on why the decisions are being made.

MR. WOHL SCHLAGER: Did we agree in this meeting that we will now have an additional stakeholder's following the normal quarterly meeting in addition to prior to and a short one after?

MR. McNEILL: We haven't. So if you have a motion to do that ... 

MR. WOHL SCHLAGER: I motion to allow two stakeholder
meetings, one prior and after to assist with comments.

MR. McNEILL: Is there a second?

MR. NIEMAN: Second.

MR. McNEILL: Any comments?

MR. NORRIS: I guess a question would be: How long are the stakeholder meetings going to be? Are we going to have a stakeholder meeting from 9:00 till 10:00, and then people will wind up not showing up till 9:30. What's our intent?

MR. McNEILL: The intent from the first one was to have it from 9:00 to 10:00, and the Advisory Committee meeting would start at 10:00 and go -- right now it's set for two hours, but if we can go longer, we can go longer. And then the stakeholder meeting -- well, let's discuss that. That's a good question. It could go an hour or it could go 10 minutes or whatever ...

MR. WOHLSCHLAGER: But you don't want to start the Advisory early if you -- let's say 9:00 and no input after 9:30. You're not going to start the Advisory at 9:30; I can't do that.

I'd be an advocate for 30 minutes prior and 30 minutes at the end so we still get an hour of total -- so if they can't address it before the Advisory, still have an opportunity after.

MR. McNEILL: Okay.
MR. NIEMAN: The other comment I'd make, I think once we get into doing the format that's planned, these meetings will actually in likelihood shorten up a little bit because you're dealing with the information at hand versus comments going back and forth. So there may be a little bit more time either before or after to add to that as well.

I mean, I'm not a huge advocate of keeping open dialogue as you all know, so I don't want to see that stop. But I do think for the sheer order of things and getting done what needs to be done that adopting Roberts Rules of Order and what we're going to do is going to expedite things more than anything.

So I do think there's stuff that comes up in these meetings that requires gotten comment from the stakeholders. So if we limit them to just beforehand, then it's another quarter until we get to the next --

MS. STANLASKE: Right.

MR. NIEMAN: And that's not going to work. So I think before and after is the better solution.

MR. McNEILL: Do you want to revise your motion?

MR. WOHLSCGLAGER: Well, my motion was to have one after. But I guess I would revise the motion to a 30-minute-prior meeting and a 30-minute scheduled after for the stakeholder input.
MS. STANLASKE: And I don't think that -- especially the stakeholder portion maybe afterwards, I don't think that that necessarily needs to be limited to 30 minutes. And the reason for that is during this -- during the rule adoption -- the code adoption and the rulemaking process there's going to be a lot of questions I would think.

MR. WOHLSCGLAGER: So you want me to revise that motion one more time? 30 minutes prior and scheduled for 30 after, but take as much time as needed.

MR. NORRIS: I'll second that.

MR. McNEILL: Any more comment? All in favor?

THE COMMITTEE: Aye (and raising hands).

MR. McNEILL: Motion approved.

Stakeholder Comment(s)

MR. McNEILL: Now we're open for stakeholder comment. So if any stakeholders would like to comment on anything, this is the time. After we have stakeholder comment, we will take a 15-minute break and start the stakeholder meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What's the difference?

MS. STANLASKE: Basically it's stakeholder comment is on our -- what happened here. And then afterwards the stakeholder meeting can be anything you want.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, I do have a comment on this.

I think your efforts to formalize your board time and subject matter is obviously shortening this meeting, and I applaud that. I'd like to amplify on something that Jan and a couple of other people mentioned in terms of the input.

There are a number of ways that we have input to you folks and certain timelines that go with them. And the thing that I noticed was that I'd ask you to pay some attention to what happens after the meeting. And the reason for that is that in the main meeting you put in the requirement that recommendations for agenda items for our meeting are now subject to a 30-day deadline ahead of the meeting. Unfortunately -- and that was detailed in the minutes. But there is no requirement as to when the minutes actually get published. And sometimes I imagine in the heat of battle in Olympia that isn't something that always gets attention. And I would like you to consider the fact that the May minutes weren't published until I believe in July, which came very close to the 30-day deadline for this meeting. And what I see is that the minutes are a very valuable resource for stakeholders. If we miss a meeting or if we want to go back and verify the particulars of what was said in the meeting, we
really need to have those. And what I'm seeing is that if the minutes were published, say, no later than 30 days after your quarterly meeting, that would then give us roughly a 30-day window to consult with our other stakeholders, explore whether an agenda item is appropriate or not.

Sometimes it's -- as we talked about last meeting, sometimes a lot more can be done informally and networking. Once you put it out into an agenda for a meeting, sometimes it changes the character of the discussion. And, you know, there's a -- you're pardoning maybe a position that could have been handled in another way.

And so what I would ask is that the 30-day-prior deadline for agenda items for the quarterly meetings or 30 days after the published date of the previous minutes. Rather than putting a hard 30-day requirement after the meeting, allow a 30-day period after the publication date, and hopefully that will give you a little bit of administrative back pressure to expedite the publishing of those minutes. But if we have 30 days after the publishing of the minutes to submit an agenda item, that gives us that opportunity, and I think we could do some good work in talking to other people. Otherwise, if the minutes are late and we're held to the 30 days, a window
closes and now we're looking at another three months. But more importantly, we've lost an opportunity to explore and get further thought and talk to our constituents.

MR. WOHLSCALLAGER: So if L & I can commit to 30 days to get the minutes out, we resolve all the issues.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, the reason I phrased it that way is I would rather see it say that the deadline is 30 days prior to the meeting or 30 days after publication of the minutes, whichever is later, and let L & I worry about what is required and what bookmarks and calendar flags they need to put up in order to accomplish that.

MS. STANLASKE: We should be able to commit to that 30 days, though.

Don't you think, Melissa?

MS. ERIKSEN: I'll do my best. It's not just me who does it. There are a few components, and we do try to get it published as soon as we receive it. But it's a multiple process, so ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's why I'm asking for relief on the 30 days or 30 days after publication. That's our self interest.

MR. McNEILL: Great input. Thank you.

Any other ... Bill.

"BILL": In the way of comment, and this has to do
with your meeting, Lyall made a proposal that you do 30
minutes before and 30 minutes afterwards for stakeholder.
You all voted on that and it became a part of your future
agenda. But that came up at this meeting. It was voted
on at this meeting. And stakeholders had no opportunity
to comment as to whether or not they felt that was -- and
it might be a minor decision, but it is an example of not
allowing stakeholders an opportunity to hear .... I just
wanted to make that comment.

MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

"BILL": It could very well be that in the future if
30 minutes prior isn't enough time, that you could
reconsider that decision.

MR. McNEILL: Tom.

"TOM": Two quick things. I think getting back to
the discussion about the rules review next week, the 22nd
and 23rd, I know that's not the time for proposals from
stakeholders, but just to clarify, that will be
opportunity to provide input on the discussion that is
going on? Or is it just a presentation without any kind
of input?

MS. STANLASKE: There's a lot of material to cover,
so I think we're going to stick more to the presentation
format.

"TOM": Okay. So it's really -- it's just
presentation? Don't count on people being able to have
time to make comments or feedback?

MS. STANLASKE: Right.

MR. WOHLSCHLAGER: And will that presentation be
available for those that are unable to attend after the
meeting?

MS. STANLASKE: Yes.

"TOM": And then, if I may, do the second one.

On the TAC, I appreciate -- I was going to ask a
question, and you really answered it, Dotty; I appreciate
it, that, you know, what kind of time commitment should
people prepare for if they want to be part of that. And
that was helpful to know that it's going to be two days
this year and the time necessary to prepare to make the
most of those two days. But what I didn't understand --
and it's probably my own fault -- was that the TAC will be
dissolved after that rulemaking cycle.

And so I just wanted to ask for a little
clarification. If -- because looking at that, you know,
that sheet, looking at the purpose of the TAC, I could see
where there could be a policy in place that wouldn't be --
that maybe could be considered or reviewed or maybe some
input be required on a policy, or even a rule that wasn't
part of that regular cycle. Because there could be some
rulemaking in the interim between that model code
adoption process. It's every two or three years, or one
or two I think.

So would the TAC be formed again on an ad-hoc basis
as necessary or is it really just for the model code
adoption process, the bigger cycle of the rules?

MS. STANLASKE: That -- my understanding of the TAC's
responsibility and roles is more that it's for the bigger
process.

"TOM": And is that -- I'm assuming that's kind of
how the electrical does it too because that's what it is
modeled after?

MS. STANLASKE: Yes.

"TOM": Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So the two meetings next week,
do you think we can get -- do you have -- will we be able
to meet again if we need to? We don't get --

MS. STANLASKE: Yes. Yes, we absolutely will.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You talked about the inspectors
getting a pay increase. Congratulations. That's good
news.

Will that in the very near future so I can forecast
correctly for budgets, will that increase permits in the
near term? Or when will we -- should we expect to see
that?

MS. STANLASKE: We're not planning at this time on --
we haven't had any discussions at all on a fee increase at this time.

So I think that -- I think that there is a percentage that gets increased every --

Do you know what it is, Alicia? Every so often.

MS. CURRY: Are you talking about like a fiscal growth factor?

MS. STANLASKE: Yes.

MS. CURRY: It would depend on if we were to need a fee increase.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I haven't seen an increase in a couple years.

MS. CURRY: It's been since I believe 2013 was the last time we did a fee increase for the program.

You're talking about an overall fee increase, correct?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just annual operating permit cost increase.

MS. CURRY: Oh. That would be -- have to be included with a fee increase. And usually we do fee increases by like the fiscal growth factor. And this year I believe it was like four point something percent.

But I haven't heard any word that the program needs a fee increase at this point. So ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.
And I guess kind of the same thing, we had discussed being shorthanded inspectors. But now there's a couple raises on the table, and you may be able to fill your positions. I guess my concern is permits are taking a while to acquire and reinspections are taking longer to set up. Even Dave and I both expressed interest in, you know, how do we -- and this is -- you know, just to get our conveyances that are increasingly critical back up and running.

So I think that combined with the fact that some raises are on the table, my concern is we collectively need to ask for more inspector positions. My concern is the legislative cycle would be -- by the time we ask for it again, it'll be -- it's too late, and the business impact is right now.

And I understand you're shorthanded. But I wonder if there's a way to in a sense to put it on autopilot commensurate with a number of conveyances that are increasing in the state.

MS. STANLASKE: That's what I believe the City of Seattle does, isn't it, Paul? that every time that so many units are put on, then ...

MR. JONES: A additional inspector would be added, yeah. That's the way it's set up now. They just apparently set it up 550 to 600 annually per inspector.
That excludes like any type of repair inspection or modernization inspection or new construction. It excludes that. That's just annuals and annuals only were set up at 550 to 600 per inspector per year. It seems to work out.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I agree.

I just -- because it's already affecting us now, you know. And I think that the impact of just our economy in general is -- more than offsets the cost of additional inspectors. I know that's kind of hard to capture. But I'm pretty -- what can we do to help support that kind of argument with the State? You know, say put it on autopilot for every 600 conveyances that are added to the state may be commensurate -- (inaudible) -- additional position authorization.

MR. JONES: And we'll be adding at least two to three more positions by this time next year based upon the new equipment turnover coming into the system and getting them set up for annuals. We added two or three more positions, hopefully.

MS. STANLASKE: Are you fully staffed now?

MR. JONES: We're probably one person short. But with some of the things that are going to be happening through attrition and with, you know, Jan and some of our other staff doing other projects within the city and for the city obviously, but, you know, we got to add some more
people on to carry the loads that they're currently
carrying. So yeah, we're pretty much there. We're pretty
much there. But we still need vets. We can free up those
guys to do code work, especially doing our code work.

We've got this new "Acella" (phonetic) based database
system coming on board which is -- could be a nightmare,
so we'll need some additional help with respect to that.

MR. NIEMAN: So the big event, onto Luke's comment, I
mean, from a stakeholder's standpoint, we're highly
interested in figuring out how we can get an inspector
after hours and on weekends when for some of us that's the
most critical time in our business cycle. And it has more
to do with who's available right now on an overtime basis
than it has to do with the number of inspectors that we're
going to add based on equipment count.

And I know personally I have called in the past to
try and get that, and there's been no -- nothing in place
that would allow that in the structure. And it would be
nice if there would be -- since you have dedicated funding
and the option for overtime if you have a ready, willing
and able stakeholder that says, "Look, I don't care. I'll
pay to get somebody out here," what the process and
procedures is going to be for that, and hopefully we can
get that into play long before we get some of this other
stuff figured out. Because if we're a ways away from
being able to understand how the funding works, it's just a killer.

MS. STANLASKE: Yeah, I agree. I agree.

And we are looking at some other things in-house that we -- how we conduct our inspections on alterations and residential incline chairlifts, for instance. We're looking at some things in-house that maybe we can dedicate some people to performing those inspections and thereby freeing the inspectors up to do more annuals and brand-new installations.

Last year 54 percent of the new installation permits that were issued were for residential incline chairlifts. So -- and the issue with residential incline chairlifts is they don't take so long to inspect, but they're here and there and there, and so the travel time is the killer on those. So we are looking at how we can better address those inspections and alterations for -- those alterations that -- door edges, for instance, and -- these are things that we're exploring. I don't want anybody to go away from the meeting and saying, Oh, they're going to do residential incline chairlifts a different way or they're going to perform alteration inspections a different way, and she specifically said they were going to do this.

We are looking at different types of alterations that can be inspected in a different manner. And the benefit
to that and the residential incline chairlifts that I see, if we can get them inspected quickly, the benefit for the homeowners for residential incline chairlifts will be amazing. We'll be able to turn those over quickly.

Alterations. The benefit for building owners, and truly for the elevator company's relationship with the building owner, if we can get those -- some of those alterations taken care of in a method that they're addressed quickly rather than you have to wait a week or two weeks, that's a win-win all the way around.

So we've got something that it's a secret -- super secret project but -- pilot that we're going to be doing. And we're really excited about it.

MR. NIEMAN: Are we talking SR71 here or what are we talking?

MS. STANLASKE: Yep.

MR. McNEILL: So any other public comment?

MR. NIEMAN: I have another one.

So one of the things that would be advantageous, you know, one of the things that we continually have problems with are injuries on escalators that are not associated with the escalator itself. And we typically have -- in many cases we have cameras at the top and the bottom of the escalator. So it's really readily apparent as to what took place. It would be nice to come up with something
that if an owner has video footage available and it's viewed by a competent person in the field, say, the elevator mechanic or somebody else that understands the equipment, the service provider can come to a conclusion that obviously we don't have a mechanical issue; we have an alcohol problem or we have some -- you know, kids were running backwards on the elevator or any number of things that happen, that we're not forced to take that piece of equipment out of service for a duration until we can get an inspection done. Because that's one of the things that kills us. And, of course, it's always on a Friday evening and it's always on a four-day week or a three-day weekend. And in our industry, for instance, when we have the arts fair, we bring in 120,000 people a day for three days. And we can't let them use an escalator because somebody cut their foot on it because they were wearing flip-flops and they were running up and they caught the edge of the stair.

That's kind of the, you know, synergy we're looking for is that we can all agree based on the video footage that is there that there is no issue with the escalator. So how do we get that unit back up and running without having to wait a long period of time?

MR. McNEILL: That's a great example --

MS. STANLASKE: Yeah, that is.
MR. McNEILL: -- of something that can be reviewed by the risk assessment subcommittee is set parameters on what can and can't happen, at least make those recommendations to the committee here.

Just as another example is annual inspection frequencies.

So good. So if there's no other public comment, do I have a motion to adjourn?

MR. NORRIS: Motion to adjourn.

MR. McNEILL: Second.

It's been approved and seconded. We will adjourn the meeting at 11:00. At 11:15 we will start the stakeholder meeting. Thanks.

(Whereupon, at 11:00 a.m., proceedings adjourned.)
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