BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Meeting was held at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, August 21, 2018, at the Department of Labor & Industries, 7273 Linderson Way SW, Room S119, Tumwater, Washington.

Committee members present were: Scott Cleary, Garry Wood and Jim Norris. The Department of Labor & Industries was represented by Dotty Stanlaske, Chief Elevator Inspector.

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were held, to wit:
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August 21, 2018 - Tumwater

1. Introductions/Purpose
2. Comments Regarding May Minutes
3. Chief's Report
4. Scorecard/Accidents
5. Open Seats on ESAC
6. Combined Stakeholder Meeting in September
7. Old Business
8. MCP Subcommittee
9. IVIP
10. Public Hearings for Rules and Licensing; Rule Adoption Timeline
11. New Business
12. Potential RCW Changes
13. Next Code Adoption Cycle
14. Proposed Fee Increase

Introductions/Purpose

SECRETARY STANLASKE: All right. This is the ESAC meeting.
Let's go around the room again and introduce ourselves for those that weren't in the room. We'll start with Gary.
MR. WOOD: Garry Wood, Exxel Pacific General Contractors.
MR. CLEARY: Scott Clear, Mobility Concepts, representing the constituents exempt from licensure under 270.
MR. NORRIS: Jim Norris, Local 19, representing labor.
SECRETARY STANLASKE: Dotty Stanlaske, Chief Elevator Inspector.
(Introductions made around the room and on the phone, including Al Sorenson who is present by phone.)
SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay. Anyone else?
Is there anyone else (on the phone), Melissa?
MS. ERIKSEN: There are four other people.
SECRETARY STANLASKE: Four other people.
Okay. So I will remind you that this is the ESAC
portion of the meeting. And this is when the ESAC conducts their business. We will not be taking any comments or questions from those in the audience.

Comments Regarding May Minutes

SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we'll start with May minutes. Are there any question regarding the May minutes or any corrections?

Hearing none, gentlemen, I would --

MR. NORRIS: I'll make a motion to accept the May minutes.

MR. CLEARY: I second.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: All in favor?

THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Thank you.

Chief's Report

Scorecard/Accidents

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Next is the Chief's Report, scorecard and accidents.

As you can see, yes, the trend in the annual inspections continues to be low. And that's nothing new.
It's been happening over the years unfortunately.

We did have a spike it appears in -- let's see -- in April and May. Not quite sure why that happened. Perhaps because we had more people on board and the -- there were no vacation times. So you get into summer, and we start having people off on vacation.

We also have a number of other inspections completed. And those seem to be up ironically in April and May as well.

So April and May were fairly good months. So we'll have to research that, find out why the numbers increased during that month. And hopefully we can identify that and implement some of the reasons why that improved during those months.

Any other questions on scorecard and accidents?

Open Seats on ESAC

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Open seats on the ESAC. Unfortunately Mr. Nieman has resigned due to his workload. So we have an open position for building owners or managers, a representative for them.

We do have a new -- I'm surprised he's not here -- a new committee member. And his name is -- I know I had that somewhere here. And he is an engineer. So we
finally have an engineer on our Committee. And that
gentleman's name -- forgive me for one moment -- is Brian
Thompson of Aegis Engineering. And he is our
representative of registered architects or professional
engineers. So his appointment was approved on August
14th. And we had hoped to see him at this meeting, but
unfortunately he is not here.

Combined Stakeholder Meeting in September

SECRETARY STANLASKE: There will be a combined
stakeholder meeting in September. And that will be --
I'm sorry -- October. It's been moved off to October.
And that will be -- we anticipate we'll have
representatives from labor there, building owners and
elevator companies.

That is the Chief's Report.

MR. NORRIS: Patrick says he's on the phone, but we
couldn't hear him.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: All right. So I will entertain
a motion to approve the Chief's Report.

MR. NORRIS: I make a motion to approve the Chief's
Report.

MR. CLEARY: I second.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: All in favor?
THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Thank you very much.

Old Business

MCP Subcommittee

SECRETARY STANLASKE: We'll move on to old business. MCP Subcommittee.

I'm going to ask Leonard Fleming to come up. Leonard was the chair for the subcommittee. And I will ask him to come up and provide you with some information on the subcommittee's work.

MR. FLEMING: I'll just give everybody a brief history.

We spun off the MCP subcommittee, and its main focus was to standardize the MCP and also look at electronic MCP's. And Dave Nieman started out as the chair. And we focused mostly the first couple meetings I think it's fair to say on just electronic MCP and a certain product by a vendor.

And as Dave got busy and stepped away, that's when I stepped in as the chair.

We realized we needed to get into the code of what the MCP was about. To make it standard, we needed to
follow the rules.

So everything that the handouts -- you have some that look like this (showing), a couple that look like this (showing), and a couple that look like this (showing).

Everything's based on 2016 code and the new WAC. There's only I think really one set of references to the new WAC. Everything else is out of 17.1 -- 2016 17.1.

So we went through 17.1 literally line by line trying to identify what an MCP is comprised of. And the one thing that has come out of it that we are going to recommend to the board is that we only focused on traction and hydraulic elevators. The test sheet which is the standard, the Cat 1, Cat 5; and on hydraulic, there will be a Cat 3 section. And down at the bottom is the key switch testing and the smoke testing. We're going to recommend that this goes back on the wall like when we had the blue and yellow sheets when life was good and everybody seemed to be on board. And so this is going on the wall. It's going to stay on the wall for all companies to use for five years so anybody can take a glance and see the testing situation on that elevator.

Still have the requirement in the code for the metal plates to be attached to the controller. So yes, it's duplicate. That's just a fact of life.

So this is the documentation that the testing's been
done.

The other one, the maintenance record, this is the 8.6 minimum requirements right out of 17.1. And that is part of -- this first sheet here, it says, "To be available per A17.1-8.6.1.2." The first one is maintenance procedures. This is our infamous maintenance procedures manual. Code says that it's to be available upon request I think, words to that effect. So that's what we're going to live by. That's what we're going to recommend.

The other one is "To be available Onsite ...." And these are required things -- this would be a binder that would be common to all cars in a, say, a five- or six-car machine room. Why do we need six sets of evacuation procedures when it's the "the" for all those.

So this is a list out of the -- out of the 17.1 that is -- we didn't make it up. It's just that's what it is. We just transposed it onto here.

At the end of the day, there's very little change from what we were doing. We've just cleaned it up and put it in a format that's understandable.

Then this is the sheet, the second sheet here that says "MCP Record of Onsite Documentation," that would be the front page of every -- of individual binders as traditionally we have now; everybody's used to seeing
Number 1 is maintenance records. And that would be this (showing). Minimum 8.6 requirements. Still required to have a frequency indicated.

So -- and it'll be the same. So every -- mechanics, owners, inspectors all will be looking at the same piece of paper and understand it easily.

And then the rest of it is maintenance records -- repair and replacement records, record of oil usage, callback log, and acceptance and test records need to be in that binder for that car should there be some.

And then down here, it says that the key switch testing and smokes need to be back on the wall.

The end.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: So Leonard, I'd like to thank you for all the work that you've put into this, along with the other members of the subcommittee.

Do any of the Committee members have a question for Leonard?

MR. WOOD: I have a quick question, Leonard. You said these will be -- or these are now on the machine room walls.

MR. FLEMING: Right.

MR. WOOD: When is that going into effect?

MR. FLEMING: We are -- we would like to see the test
sheets in this current cycle for the new year. We think it's unrealistic as a group to produce the documentation for the companies to get the 8.6 minimum requirements published. And these will be a format -- a recommended format.

And also, there will be a recommended format for the callback log, not required but recommended. So -- because we don't want to start owning tons of documents as the State. So we're going to put these on our Web site probably for the companies to copy. It makes sense to everybody to have the same ones, but we're not going to require it. The 8.6 stuff will -- the 8.6 minimum requirements will be the same for everybody that needs a state and, you know, form number and things like that.

MR. WOOD: This is well done.

MR. FLEMING: Yeah. Leon put in an extraordinary amount of time in the testing section.

And we'd like to say we think that it's realistic to get that on the wall by January for the new year. We don't think the companies have time to embrace and print the new 8.6 requirements and get those out. So unfortunately this next year will still look like this year as far as looking at MCP logs, but then hopefully next year it'll be -- we'll have everything in place. We just think that's unrealistic to get there this year.
SECRETARY STANLASKE: (Addressing a raised hand)

Excuse me, we're not taking any questions or comments
during -- we can do that afterwards.

MR. NORRIS: But if a company wants to start with
this the next year, they could?

MR. FLEMING: Yes. Because it totally meets the
requirements of an MCP. It would just -- it would be
cool. I mean, hopefully everybody will embrace and say
that's -- you know, why think about it ourselves if it's
already available.

It's just that we think that being into almost
September that the companies -- I mean, they'll start
sending out mechanics with the new sheets soon. So ...

SECRETARY STANLASKE: So -- go ahead.

MR. CLEARY: So it's all going to be downloadable
then, right?

MR. FLEMING: Right.

MR. CLEARY: By then? Do you know?

MR. FLEMING: No, I don't. We have to --

SECRETARY STANLASKE: We have a process that we have
to go through.

MR. FLEMING: Yeah. So that's why there's more work
to do after the ESAC blesses it. Because we've kind of
run into the wall where, you know, effort put into it and
stuff, if it's not going to move ahead, we need to know
that. If it is, then we go to the next step.

MR. CLEARY: Not being at the meetings, is there anything here that you think needs to be looked at or was missed or you feel this is pretty inclusive?

MR. FLEMING: No, I think this is pretty inclusive. We actually spent a lot of time. We kind of all had to drag ourselves into the code, start reading code. What does the code say? We all had our ideas of MCP's. Then you get into line by line what does the code say. And we dissected and discussed.

One of the things you'll notice that's not in the list is the suspension log, the rope log. When we got into it and started discussing it, it didn't make sense to have it in there because -- and then that's the -- the committee, we spent a lot of time discussing the rope log.

MR. CLEARY: Though I know it's not required by code not having a signature block, I guess one of the reasons I understood that why the State in the past put that there is to make sure since we're a licensed state, that the people that were signing off on this were -- had the appropriate category license to be doing maintenance and everything else is -- you guys -- that's going away too, correct?

MR. FLEMING: Right. There's no code requirement in the new codes for a signature block -- for a signature
page like we had. The only reference to any kind of
signature documentation is in the repair section of the
8.6 it talks about "shall be indicated by initials or
company name." And that's in the repair section; that's
not even in the maintenance section.

So there's no requirement to tell a guy to put his
name -- a mechanic, guy or gal, on a piece of paper.

So -- and to address that a little further, we know
that a huge percentage -- I don't know the number
obviously -- aren't signed anyway. So no signature is
just as bad as -- I mean, it's -- they're not there now.
And just a signature does not make a man competent.

MR. CLEARY: But the not being there is not I think
a valid reason not to make sure that who's doing the work
is a licensed mechanic categorized to be able to do that
work, right? Is that -- was there any discussion about
that?

I know when this first was developed, that was a big
discussion, that the State wanted to make sure -- and it
was driven by the State. The State wanted to make sure
who was doing that work and signing off on these logs was
appropriately categorized to do that work. So that's ...

MR. FLEMING: The only discussion we had was there
was no requirement for it, so -- we were not inventing
code, which we can through the WAC, so to speak, invent
code, but it wasn't done in the new WAC, if you will.

MR. CLEARY: As long as it was vetted. That was just
my question; I just wanted --

MR. FLEMING: Yeah. And that's -- you know, you guys
have your shot at, or it could be changed in the next
go-around if, you know, we make it to that point that we
think that's necessary.

Anything else?

MR. CLEARY: Thank you.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: So -- thank you, Leonard.

You -- as I said, you and the subcommittee, you did
an excellent job on this. I know there was a lot of work
that went into it. A lot of people involved. So please
extend our thanks to them as well.

MR. FLEMING: And way more meetings than I
anticipated.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct. That's
usually what happens.

So with that said, I'll entertain a motion to accept
the documents that were put forth.

MR. CLEARY: Do we have a quorum?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: We have -- you know, that's a
good question, Scott. That is a good question.

So we have Jim sitting in for Pat -- Patrick.

MR. WOOD: Patrick's on the phone as well, is he not?
SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

MR. CLEARY: But has Patrick had a chance to review these?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, we have three individuals that are not here and three individuals that are here.

MR. NORRIS: But -- and one other on the phone as well.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: But you can't double count that position.

MR. NORRIS: Not Patrick, but ...

MR. WOOD: Al Sorenson's on the phone, is he not?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Al, are you representing the City of Seattle in Paul's place?

Can you unmute your mic?

We'll give him a moment to respond. I believe he's -- he is -- I believe, Melissa, can you check? Is Al noted as Paul's alternate?

MS. ERIKSEN: Alternate, yes.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we have a quorum.

All right.

MR. CLEARY: Is Al available?

MS. ERIKSEN: He's unmuted.

MR. CLEARY: Is he unmuted?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: He is unmuted? Okay.

So I'll entertain a motion to accept the documents as
put forth.

MR. WOOD: I'm motion.

MR. NORRIS: And I'll second.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: All in favor?

THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

MR. CLEARY: I'm waiting to hear from Al.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Al? Al, can you perhaps even
send a chat message to Melissa?

Let's adjourn for a few minutes so that we can see if
we can get Al involved in this. And we'll come back.

(Briefly off the record.)

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Al, can you hear us?

MR. SORENSON: Hey, Dotty, this -- yeah, this is Al,
I'm here.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: So Al -- we'll go back into
session since we are able to hear Al now.

Al, are --

MR. SORENSON: Yes.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: You're Paul's alternate. So as
Paul's alternate --

MR. SORENSON: Yeah, Paul's out today. He's off all
week, so ...

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay. Well ...

MR. SORENSON: I am filling in as the alternate.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay. So has he discussed the
maintenance control program with you that we have
developed -- that the subcommittee developed?

MR. SORENSON: Correct.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Can you offer us a vote on
this?

MR. SORENSON: Yes, I can.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: And that would be? Do you
approve it or are you voting in opposition?

Is he muted again?

MR. SORENSON: Excuse me, can you hear me?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

MR. SORENSON: Okay. The paperwork I got from Paul
and reading any notes he had on it, I don't think he had
any issues with it. And I was looking it over. It looks
pretty good. There was a -- no, we're not going to do the
-- there was a question regarding the oil usage log. Are
we talking -- is that in this package?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: The oil -- this was done for
electric elevators, not for the hydraulic. We will visit
the hydraulic after this is finalized.

So your vote is on this, the paperwork that you have.

So I'm asking you if you would cast your vote please.

MR. SORENSON: Yes, I'll vote to approve it.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Scott?

MR. CLEARY: I vote present.
SECRETARY STANLASKE: You -- I'm sorry?

MR. CLEARY: I vote present.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: You vote present?

MR. CLEARY: Yes. That's in Roberts Rules.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: All right. So three of the four present have voted for this, so it passes.

IVIP

SECRETARY STANLASKE: All right. IVIP. We'll go on to IVIP.

We've had a lot of success with the virtual inspection program. And we intend to broaden that. It was my intention to do that sooner. But we will be sending out an e-mail hopefully in the next few weeks to those folks who haven't been involved in it to let you know what you need to do to get set up to participate. And it is our intention to do as many of the stair chairlifts -- it is just for stair chairlifts at this time -- through the virtual inspection process. And there will -- we recognize that there are some areas that we will not have connectivity -- wi-fi connectivity or 4G connectivity. And in those areas, we recognize that we will most likely have to send out an inspector. But our intention is to do as many as we possibly can during the
virtual inspection process. It will save time, travel

time, which will allow inspectors to perform more annuals.

At least that's our hope.

And as I said, it's going quite well. We have had

some issues with the electrical portion of the inspection,

but I think we're getting everyone on board as we speak.

So that's my report on IVIP.

Public Hearings for Rules and Licensing;

Rule Adoption Timeline

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Public hearings for rules and

licensing and the rule adoption timeframe.

So the rule adoption timeframe. September in 2018,

we expect to be filing -- is this correct, Alicia? This

is --

MS. CURRY: For the rule review? The next rule

review?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: For the next rule review.

MR. CURRY: I thought we had talked about changing

that. We're expected to file in November. That way

everyone would have, you know, an opportunity to be able

to have some time to review the new rules first.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's correct. That's
correct.
So is this date, January 1st of 2019, is that the expected effective date of those rules? Or does that get pushed out?

MS. CURRY: That was for the fee increase.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Oh. Thank you. Yes.

MS. CURRY: Sorry. You have multiple --

SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct. My apologies.

So let's talk about the public hearings for rules and licensing first. And the -- there were a number of comments that were brought up regarding A17.3. And the tech specialists and myself did a review of A17.3 to verify the number of items that hadn't previously been contained in Part D of the WAC rules that are now in A17.3.

There are seven items. Those seven items are 2.7.6. That pertains to blind hoistways. It was not in Part D. But that requirement dates back to the 1960 edition of the code. And enforcement would be by the code under which the elevator was installed.

The second item, protection of platforms against fire, 3.3.5. It was not in Part D, but it dates back to the 1955 edition of the code, rule 203.8. Again, enforcement would be by the code under which the elevator was installed.

The next one is 3.10.7, operating of driving machine
with hoistway door unlocked or hoistway of car door not in
closed position. That was not in Part D. However, this
dates back to the 1955 code, Rule 210.1e and regulates
leveling or movement of the car in tracking zones. And
that requirement is not necessarily restrictive as much as
it is permissive, meaning it is not something that needs
to be complied with. However, if you have that feature,
then there's certain things that must be done.

The next item is 3.10.12, system to monitor and
prevent automatic operation of the elevator with faulty
door contact circuits. This is not in Part D. It has
been in a requirement in A17.1 since the 1996 edition.
However, since this is an operational safety concern where
an elevator with a shorted door lock contact can run even
if the door is held physically open, that should be
something that we should consider.

Fire fighter service. And this is the major one.
Fire fighter service is not in Part D. However, the
following rule has been in the -- that was noted in Part
D. However, the way it was noted in Part D was different
than how it was noted in code. And Part D, it said if a
sprinkler -- it referred to when a sprinkler was added
and if the permit was installed on or after 1989, then
the fire service must operate to the code enforced per
the original. That is similar to what 17.3 says.
In addition to that, the TAC Committee and the ESAC voted to allow in the WAC rules building owners up to five years to address that issue.

With all of this said, there's one other item, 5.5.3, entrance and egress ends. That was not in Part D. It is a standard requirement for escalators and has been in the code since the 1986 addenda.

With those seven items noted, based on the concern that was brought forth by some of the stakeholders, the Department has made the decision to move forward with the adoption of A17.3 with the exclusion of those seven items. So what we are doing basically is moving forward and just incorporating the items that were in WAC Part D into A17.3 for those items that were removed from WAC Part D. They are now incorporated in A17.3.

Scott.

MR. CLEARY: What is the State's position on Section 10 of 17.3?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Section 10, that has to do with residential inclined elevators?

MR. CLEARY: No. It has to do with residential elevators. So there's no exemption in the WAC nor is there any exemption in 17.3.

What's the State's position?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: We will most likely -- because
we don't -- that will only be applied during alterations. Because we don't have the ability to go into a home after that's initially installed.

MR. CLEARY: The concern that -- I also represent the residential crowd -- is that since you have to be licensed in the state of Washington to do repairs in a house, if you're going in and working on a noncompliant piece of equipment as a licensed elevator contractor, we will lose our license, correct?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

MR. CLEARY: And that will come up if somebody gets hurt. And the big thing I'm talking about is there's a plethora of elevators that have more than three and five on the doors, right?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

MR. CLEARY: So if we go in and do a repair on an old elevator that we didn't put in that's not code compliant per 17.3, Section 10, and we go tell the customer that we got to do this, this and this, is the State going to then agree with the service provider and inform that homeowner that yes, that piece of equipment needs to be compliant? Because by -- we can't work on it, and I don't want an unfair advantage of being up-front and saying that these are the "regs" that are in place, there is no exemption, and I can't work on it because I'm licensed, but somebody
else will come and do it. So we want a level playing
ground, and we want some guidance from the State.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: I agree. I agree that that
will be an issue.

And what we've done in the past is when those
conveyances have been identified, we've asked the
homeowners to provide us with documentation as to when it
was purchased. And that would most likely be the code
that would apply.

MR. CLEARY: Okay.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: However, it would have to apply
-- it would have to comply with the entire code, not bits
and pieces of what was in place at that time.

So that hopefully answers some of the questions that
have come up regarding adoption of A17.3.

I do want to make note that A17 is a national
standard, and the State is not required to provide a
cost-basis analysis when adopting a national standard.

With that said, there were some other questions
regarding other comments submitted regarding the code
adoption and the rule process. And I will tell you that
those responses are being reviewed. We have made our
responses; we've completed that. They are being reviewed
before they will be published and released. And we
anticipate that hopefully that will be soon.
Unfortunately, it's nothing that I have control over.

As part of the code adoption, I wanted to -- we'll move into new business. Do the Committee members have any other questions regarding that?

MR. CLEARY: Yes. What -- for everybody that hasn't been privy to all the different meetings, TAC, ESAC and all the other different vetting meetings, how much time has the State put towards vetting the new 18.1, the A90.1 and the 117? Has there been time put into vetting those? Because I know the major impact is going to be on the commercial community. But for the residential and commercial accessibility out of 18.1 which are some changes and also with the A90.1 "regs," has there been -- how much time's been put into those?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: I will tell you that most of our efforts, as you know, have been on the WAC rules and on 17.1 and 17.3.

MR. CLEARY: Okay.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Any other questions regarding that from the Committee members? No? Thank you.

New Business

Potential RCW Changes

///
SECRETARY STANLASKE: New business, potential RCW changes.

We have submitted a number of proposals for changes to the RCW.

One has to do with construction-use operating permits and our ability to lengthen that time to 90 days.

The other has to do with allowing homeowners -- since we do not have the ability to police stair chairlifts or actually any conveyances in a home once they are initially inspected other than when they are altered, we -- we had a number of phone calls from individuals who -- homeowners who wanted to take out their stair chairlift or have a licensed contractor take it out. The licensed contractor was not an elevator contractor. And as required by law, we had to tell them that no, they were not able to do that. So we are proposing a change to the RCW that will allow homeowners or a contractor -- licensed contractor that they hire to remove stair chairlifts and wheelchair platform lifts.

The reason for that is we know they're being removed. We know that those people that call us to ask that question, once they find out what an elevator company charges, we know that they're going to go ahead and remove it themselves or hire a general contractor to do that. So rather than have them be fearful of breaking the law, we
are taking this route in the hope that they will be --
they will come forward and tell us when they remove that
equipment. We are certain that we have many conveyances
in the non-active status because once a private residence
conveyance gets inspected, it goes into a non-active
status. We are certain that once that goes into a
non-active status, there's many conveyances that are being
removed out there, and we're not being informed.

So the purpose is two-fold, to allow them to do that
without fear of breaking the law, and also hopefully for
them to inform us so that we can update our database.

We are also requesting an extension on the temporary
mechanics license. That will allow the license to -- a
temporary mechanic to be licensed for one year, providing
they meet the requirements of the WAC rules. And that
would be 75 percent of experience and 75 percent of
education documented within their category.

So we are looking to extend that. We recognize that
the industry is very busy right now and that there is a
huge need for temporary mechanics and that the current
policy in effect is not efficient for anybody including
the State. So we're going forward with that.

Scott.

MR. CLEARY: I'd like to get some clarification.

I think the State -- I think it's written that it
must be State-approved curriculum based on the subcommittee policy that was put out in I think '12. Is that being followed or is that still the case or can you get your curriculum from anywhere?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: The curriculum has to follow the outlines in the policy. That was policy.

MR. CLEARY: Yes.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: And policies can be changed, as you know.

However, it was -- it has been recognized -- brought to us and recognized that quite frankly some of the curriculum does not suit some of the categories.

For instance, those individuals that work on construction personnel hoists only, there is no need for them to be educated on ADA requirements.

So it has been reviewed when requested, and the hours are still required; it just may be that the hours are shifted into other areas where it makes more sense.

MR. CLEARY: So has the policy been changed? And if so, where can I find what the changes are? Is it being published on the Web site so everybody knows --

SECRETARY STANLASKE: The policy has not been formally changed. Because what we need is input from the groups that are affected by the policy to say, yes, this pertains to me; no, this doesn't. And that will be
something we will be doing in the future.

MR. CLEARY: Okay. Thank you.

Proposed Fee Increase

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Fee increase. The fee increase will be effective January 1st of 2019. And it is the 4 percent -- it's nothing above the 4 percent that we are allowed annually by the legislators. So this will go out for public hearing, and we'll accept comments. But we anticipate that the 4 percent increase across the board will be effective January 1st of 2019.

Any questions about that?

MR. WOOD: A question on the RCW changes. Do we have a concept of timing and when they might go into effect or what the time table would be?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes. That'll be October 1st.

MR. WOOD: That will be October as well?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: We anticipate that'll be October 1st.

MR. WOOD: Okay. Thank you.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: When I say that will be October 1st, please recognize that there's always the possibility that it can be postponed again. But we're anticipating it will be October 1st.
Any other questions from the Committee members? Any other items under new business?

MR. NORRIS: I'm not sure if we want to talk about this now or in the stakeholder. Where are we going to be at on the emergency rules for temporary mechanics? Because ---

SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's a good -- very good question. And David signed off on that last night. And what's the next step, Alicia?

MS. CURRY: It was actually a policy to extend the renewals of temporary licenses, not to confuse it with the emergency rules for Category 3 that we filed. Those expired; it's been over a year ago.

But that policy has been approved. So now it's just going through the process of getting it filed. So it should be soon.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: But regarding the policy for the temporary mechanics licenses, as Alicia said, that should be soon.

We did -- David did review it last night and sign off.

What is the next step, again, Alicia?

MS. CURRY: The next step will be to file the policy with the Code Reviser's office. We did extend the policy until December 31st even though we're aware that the rules
will be changing, and the rules surrounding temporary
mechanic licenses which basically will reflect what's in
policy now takes effect October 1st. So what we do is
when the rules become effective, then we just rescind the
policy since it would become -- it would be in rule.

Did I make sense on that? Or did I confuse ...

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Do you have any idea of
approximately how long it takes for that process?

MS. CURRY: For -- to have a policy filed?

I think it would be soon. I am not sure if they go
by the next cut-off date or they can file a policy
anytime. I would have to double-check on that. But I
would think within the next week or maybe two at the
latest.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay. All right.

Any other questions from the Committee members? New
business? Any items?

All right, with that, that's a bit of -- I think
we're done with our meeting. So I'll entertain a motion
to adjourn.

MR. NORRIS: I make a motion to adjourn.

MR. CLEARY: Second.

THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

///

///
SECRETARY STANLASKE: Thank you. Thank you, everybody.

(Whereupon, at 9:51 a.m., proceedings adjourned.)
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