

Kansas Elevator Safety Advisory Board Meeting 2nd meeting-20231030_100854-Meeting Recording

October 30, 2023, 3:07PM

1h 59m 8s

JD Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 0:03

Uh in the meeting?

● Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] started transcription

JD Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 0:05

Ohh, first thing we'll do is roll call and just go will do the roll call.

OK.

Well, call, uh board members say aye or present Spencer Duncan present.

Senator Mike Peterson, present representative Sean Tarwater.

Upset Jared Mann present Mark Winland, Brent Snyder.

That's it.

Doug Jorgensen, person well, parks.

Absent all Houston present Julie Garcia.

Thank you very much.

And we do have a forum, so we'll continue.

We are working on getting a copy of last meetings minutes and when we get those, we'll share those with everybody and we can go back to approving the Minutes later in the meeting here and if we don't get that done this meeting, we'll at the next meeting and we'll just approve minutes for two meetings instead.

So we'll see how that goes.

I guess I'll open it up to the board here in a minute, but for those online.

Again, just like the first meeting and there could be some people attending this meeting virtually. Uh.

We don't have any board member, any board members on online doing.

That's good.

So won't work with the board members that are here in the morning.

Umm, we do have it looks like at least one public member and there'll be time towards the end of the meeting for public comments, either in person here or online. And for those online, if you do have a comment to make in the public section, please

raise your hand on the screen and then just go.

We'll announce who you are and what your question is, and then we'll, uh, try and stay in order from the people.

Ohm, the public attendees that are wanting to speak towards the end ohm.

They were that I think I'll open it up to the board members that are here.

We have a list of questions that came in that we can go to, but also open it up if you have anything else.

Comments.

Questions.

Before we start with the questions that we already have.

My question is about you.

So I see your replacement has been named.

So what is your schedule between be here at the next meeting?

Let's see.

Something is here.

That's a good question.

We can say the way right into my next my next suggestion is we'd already scheduled the next meeting for the 13th of November, but that is the first day of the new fire Marshall.

Donigain Paul left the meeting

Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 3:39

And so I'll probably be a little busy that day.

Umm.

Donigain Paul joined the meeting

Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 3:44

And he's gonna be way too busy, I think, to come to the meeting.

So it's gonna ask the board if there are any concerns if we reschedule it next meeting to the 20th.

Or any other day that might work besides the 13th.

Scrap.

So if that works, will reschedule our next meeting to the 20th and the new fire

Marshall will be here to take my position on the board.

And at that time, just for the board members information, you'll have to elect a new chair.

And whether it's him or whoever, but it'll technically will have to year the board will have to elect a new chair on the median of the 20.

So being start at the moment.

Uh, I will be staying on and the deputy position till my last day is December 11th actually.

So I will be here for that meeting on the 20th.

But the new Farm Marshall be here too, and I'll just be staff assisting him and the board.

And that next meeting so.

And so if there's issues that any of the board members have, or the public have, they can bring those up on the 20th and maybe you can get one by the guy.

I don't know.

We'll see what, but we'll go from there.

Any anything else?

My first question I'll just rewrite into it with point of clarification on my misses last meeting.

 **Donigain Paul** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 5:26

But are we auto adopting new codes?

So we're at a 17 one and the way the bill reads is that we just adopt the current version of the eight basically of the SME code.

It doesn't even say it's a 17 one, but currently we're a 17120 nineteen when the 22 code published by analyzed or we adopt him that place by the statute.

Yes, we have to, but the statute always a lot also allows us to use the new whatever the new A SME is as a reference.

So we're still able to adopt our own rules and regulations for Kansas.

We're not.

We don't have to adopt the new A SME 22 version and all we can adopt pieces and parts, we can adopt whatever fits Kansas the best, so we're not held to what's actually in the code and in the book, but we will use that as the base of the Kansas

codes and regulations.

But again, the rule regulation process is pretty lengthy and gets drawn out and there's no way that we'll have the state rules and regs done by.

I think it's April next year when the new code technically goes into effect.

So in April of next year, the state will be adopting the 22 code, but again.

The board or the state will be able to adopt the new Canvas code.

So I presumed that time we'll bring it before the board.

Look at the changes and figure out what's right or our state.

You know, Seattle is what we're going to adopt.

What we're not gonna adopt?

Yeah.

As the process goes forward, we have a full time, Assistant Attorney general at all, and he is already working on those codes.

And as the ward has meetings and even outside of the meetings will be sharing updates with what those codes look like with the board members and also accepting comment not only from the public but from the work numbers on things that are in the new code that maybe aren't necessary for Kansas, or if the codes miss something, then there's something that the board or different, excuse me, members of the industry or the public city that we maybe need to consider would be able that too. But the other board will be involved and and helping us put together whatever the we can't Kansas code, whatever that looks like.

OK, shut up.

It's pursuant to that.

So my question but.

A is to B 17.1 actually and three first to several other items like their code, but perfect.

We're building it up.

It doesn't give actual.

There's it just says referred well one.

So we're gonna have to figure out how to address that.

Is it current version?

He adopted delusion, you know.

But yeah, when we done codes on other things like with boilers and and different things like that, when it refers to a electrical code or another type of code, we look at what the state currently has to talk, OK.

 **Sean Tarwater** joined the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 9:22

And then we usually incorporate what the state already has adopted and and Washington.

 **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** joined the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 9:31

That's some cake we haven't adopted yet, but I'm.

Wondering like different jurisdictions like that in Wichita or the park or whatever they have adopted maybe different codes?

Umm, they going to be under?

Is the inspection going to be under those codes that are adopted in outlook?

Well, the because we don't have any statewide after.

Yeah.

What will have to do there?

Is Wichita is out on their own?

Because, yeah, I remember that.

Yeah, they haven't given us.

They did not give up the responsibility for elevators.

So what?

Which Todd does is up to which topic you're not.

There's a state statute that says that I'm municipalities and counties can have adopt codes that are more stricter than the state current state code, but they can't be less correct.

So that's what we operate on on those things.

And then if Kansas doesn't have like a don't work triple code adopted, that'll be something that the committee will will have to also work on right on adopting.

And whatever codes are necessary to meet the elevator codes.

So if it's Kansas doesn't have that particular code adopted, then we'll have to work on that too, and not necessarily.

Will we have to do a full adoption of electrical quote statewide?

Sure, it'll just be up to the committee to pick the current, probably the current

electrical code that they want to include with the elevator code, right?

But then it'll also.

It's gonna take some work because we'll also have to look at that full electrical and decide if there's anything in there that doesn't fit canvas or what does fit.

OK.

And even maybe reduce the amount of rules and that electrical code that the elevator code is going to adopt.

So it's brother call.

Yes.

There you go.

Yeah.

And it's gonna take a while.

Should I tell you there's like there's like 7 codes that are involved.

Elevator.

Yeah.

Umm.

And and that's probably something we can put on the agenda for the next meeting is to look at what additional codes umm the 22 code is going to.

Adopt A reference and then we can have a discussion on all those and and get an idea of what the board's thinking of those other codes, because we can do the research and see out of those seven which ones the state currently has adopted, right and which ones they haven't.

So we know where our focus needs to be going forward, starting with the ones that the state has got them, they're kind of segues into my question and actually like 35, umm should have said cover for inspections because umm, it says to inspect for the element.

My office state doesn't respond to survey those who responsible for state projects only statement.

So these and our office looks at hardware interfaces.

Sprinklers follow those issues that are in the other groups but attached to the elevator.

And so I'm just wondering how the order felt about the inspection.

What was the extent of the inspection that was anticipated or elevators?

Uh, in terms of where they going to look at turn burst fireworks associated the elevators.

You know what?

What were we requiring of being inspectors?

Are going out providing this report and I don't think that's real clear yet in terms of go.

Uh, we're asking the inspectors to go buy.

And I'm not familiar enough and and maybe you can comment or build can comment or whatever.

But what does it would be first place to start would be what the SME's?

Yeah.

And and a good example is the SME requires a record.

But all the recall functions are really addressed in part assemblies and inefficient too.

So you know from the asking the inspector, then to go to 72 and provide all the necessary devices.

Yeah, the installation license.

See inspecting that.

Make sure that the recall function works.

I don't know.

Yeah.

Yeah, that's fine.

I I can kind of answer that the when you're testing recall function more often than not what we're doing is testing that the elevator is going to respond to it recall signal, correct.

So we do that one or two ways.

We either turn the key switch in the hall just to make sure the functionality of all the key switches and buttons and all the bells and whistles work correctly, but we also lift wires or jump on the controller to make sure that the input coming from the fire alarm system works correctly.

Typically, we're not actually smoking smoke hits until you you're on an acceptance test for checking location of that require or questions.

You know it where the elevator.

Just to see.

Yeah, right click.

Yeah, I mean, they may have completely unique.

And miss install firework ships to tip will still provide a signal to the elevator test.

 **Madzey Jeff** joined the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 15:22

Ohh yeah, recall function works but fireman trying to stall and wouldn't that will happen too.

He's a I don't know.

That's what I understand.

And then there are built.

Maybe comment, but I I don't see us requiring an elevator inspector to go into that depth or that detail.

If they test the elevator, if they test the recall and it works, I think that's all the things that they need to go because the whether the fire alarms installed properly or not, that'll be up to a different inspector.

OK.

And it's either Inspector from our office, on the fire and my safety side, or a local inspector, depending on what Emily use we have.

And I I don't because we we can try and get it as least involved as possible just to make sure that deal Breakers are safe.

And that they're working properly.

And the reason I brought that up is because I've had some and.

Conversations with the agencies, the you know the the universities particularly and that's a lot of the questions that they have.

So there's a lot of things I think we just need to clarify what we're doing with that because they they haven't.

So I think a lot of that's gonna go back to design when they first come into play to make sure all of those devices are replaced, that need to be.

So a lot of that's gonna be caught through the plan review.

But then as you get into the annual inspections, they, the elevator folks will take care of the elevator side.

And then and then the building folks will take care of the building site of it.

So there's kind of a difference.

During that, we're just talking about that because we're getting a lot of agencies that are doing elevator upgrades, but we're not going to have plants.

Yeah, yeah.

You know, so there's a little confusion that.

Yeah.

I just wanted to clarify what what my just different elevators.

I think maybe another language that it's kind of like that would help and and that's a good point and it's again something that we can actually put into the rules and regulations of.

But you know it's it's specific.

Just elevators.

Yeah.

Yeah, it's whatever the board comes up with.

Whatever suggestions we get from the industry, I mean we have to take those all into consideration, I think.

And uh again, and it's gonna be a pretty lengthy process, but.

Yeah, I don't wanna.

I mean my my position or suggestion is we don't wanna put any additional burden on an elevator inspector outside of just inspecting the elevators and making sure that they're functioning and that the recall the two way communications, all those things are OK and leave the other side of that, that they're attached to, to to the building.

The reason in the building so to that end and this is my ignorance on the on the on the, the acceptance side of things being built, you know are there are there standardized forms that the inspectors are using that are industry provided and so they they lay out here are the things that you're going to test.

Here's what you're testing again.

So, right, so there is standardization of that right now.

So if we're leaving those in place and not changing that direction between vectors and that's another quantity, and you know, you know what's gonna addressed one has, I think of that. This.

Here's what the that's.

I was just tripping towards the the elevator inspection list. Right?

Don't I haven't looked at those.

I don't know the scope of them, but if that's the case, they're just confusion out there and all that.

So that's why sure clarified, it's not really expand, no, those are real questions asked me.

Inspect if you're on acceptance expectation on a new construction, that initial inspection will be very detailed on an annual typically will just keep it.

Don't places hospitals in buildings like this?

They will have an annual smoke inspection where they go around and they smoke everything, then the inspector will show up at whatever time that is, and accompany them that waited smokers.

The guys already there to smoke people, the alarm people inspector shows up and takes care of their part.

We don't smoke.

Kids play annual basis?

No, but at a hospital.

Yes, if you wanted at 5:00 o'clock on a Saturday, I'll be there at 5:00.

O'clock Saturday midnight Sunday.

That's that's what we do.

That's what the inspectors do and the inspectors.

All the inspectors tend to be pretty uniform, so that's that's our process.

Now what?

An annual inspection?

No, we're not gonna smoke five year.

Probably not.

When the building, if the building has an annual inspection where they go around and they check every head children's mercy, I'm gonna be there for.

Somebody's gonna be that's independent of the elevator.

Yes, that we're talking about.

Yes, that's part of that.

Yeah, yes.

Yeah.

OK.

Other agencies that response?

Yes, the type of inspections, that's one read it.

Verify that the problems with countries that don't have the same political comments that have been long delay codes, 2-3 years, or taking answer and sections.

Yeah, we don't have any.

So like 30 or so.

Yeah.

So I think that's probably probably a great idea.

That clarification in there, yeah, for sure.

OK.

Umm, you want to continue with your your section there?

Is there anything else that's pretty much what what I've done comma get clarified this because of the questions I was getting asked.

Sure.

Like server agencies, they yeah, sure.

So certified and if if you get any questions, then you're not really sure of and you don't wanna wait till the next meeting.

Just get ahold of Brendan, OK?

And share those with her.

And then we'll visit and house and try and give that business the university you little bit of direction in the interim because it is new to everybody.

Uh, you know?

Except for a few of the major cities, Johnson County area, Wichita, Topeka, there really weren't any elevator codes anymore.

I was going to stay.

So I'm it's not only is it really new to us, but it's gonna be new to everybody across the state.

So.

So the more we can answer some of those questions, I think going forward and the quicker we can answer you know the better for everybody.

And even though we.

Could maybe only give.

Sort of guesses or answers based on the current information.

We have that and you know that will change going forward as we start well, we're producing the rules surprised too.

Yeah.

Well, those are questions that you get from like the universities and stuff will be good for the board to know when we start addressing.

There's specific things we have to look at and I almost thought you guys can call me anytime that I've been working with elevators, the decade and all the different toads that go because the that's so good I.

Dig it through all of it for quite a while, so if you got any questions, bill.

That's probably been there.

Umm.

Anything on what do you have there?

Either the Minutes you got it, ask them and then.

Representative Sean our water is online.

OK.

Thank you.

Umm.

Well, that's sort of takes care, I think of marks input for this meeting questions or concerns or information.

Umm, we can move on to center Peterson.

He has questions too.

Question was there at the end we had that recommendation for the older elevators.

 **Russell, Brian** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 24:12

They be brought up to the 2518 me.

Yeah, the your path.

So I was wondering what the differences were between that and they're living.

We had past statues, umm and I think we had that discussion.

I don't know if we actually decided on a particular code.

I think the 05 is mentioned.

Uh, there's.

Yeah, there's me.

Maybe as a starting point, but I I think that was still open to discussion and and some more research.

And so I'm again, it's sort of what, what the board thinks is best.

We we've addressed the two way communication issue.

Uh, and we're not requiring what's?

Uh, in the current code and we're offering variances for that going forward.

We did, I think, agree on that and that the last discording to the date contract well on the old old ones though too, but.

We have actually set the bill actually took effect July of 22.

And so anything prior to July 22 is going to be for a better term, Grandpa.

So there won't be any issues with anything that was done.

Contracts that were signed, things like that, right to July of 22 after July of 22, except for Wichita, Topeka and Overland Park. Uh.

Thus were the contractor, the building owner can issue a ask for a variance, especially on mostly on the communication.

Umm Topeka, I think I had it in my email.

Overland Park is December of 22.

Anything prior to December of 22 and Overland Park or Johnson County?

Umm, there won't be any issues with from our office anything after December 22.

Then the contractor will have to ask for a variance on anything that comes up that's contrary to the current code. For Topeka.

Umm, it was.

They gave us their program March or April 23 and June, June 23, June 23.

So for Topeka, anything prior to June of 23, there's no issues with their for everything's grandfather contracts, different things like that.

After June of 23, then contractors to billing owners will have to ask for a variance, and most of the variances were getting requests on Russians were getting request on right now is the two way communication issue and we are issuing variances in that as long as they have two way audio and have a camera that sees the inside of the elevator including the floor will or given a variance on the required two way video communication on the elevators because we've had estimates from 20 and \$30,000 up to \$60,000 depending on the company of Wardell cost to put that new system in and so and most of the elevators that we're coming across at least have the two way audio either have a phone or a call button with a speaker and so we're just if they don't have a camera or having that matter camera it seems the inside and that can be more and that's sort of what we've come up with some of the range and I required like changing the capital division operator no it would be it would just be on and I don't know besides the capital on I don't know how many of those are still out there if if we the cage wanted the capital wouldn't be required because not only does it have an operator but it's completely open on each floor so it's you could see what's going on as it moves or if you need to look at so I don't know whether sorry. But yeah, it will.

Will won't be required at at the cage one, but it would be required the other.

Property 5 and they're just passed you.

Yes, because freight is excluded in the in the bill.

So I was just going to expand on what Senator Mike Peterson brought up that you know, we should look at different versions of a 17, three, I'll admit freely that I keep tell you the difference between every single code and what an introduces.

Umm, but one way or another, we should come up with a list of minimum standards like the two way communication.

You know that's that's a big one right there.

That's gonna immediately improve public safety.

But I think there's some flexibility.

I mean, there's a lot of different options of different versions of the code to adopt, and I think whatever we it is that we do adopt that we should go through line by line and look at some of the items, figure out what we're gonna include or exclude.

Umm, I think there's a better argument to adopt A newer version of the code, so a building owner might be able to map out what's going to be required in the future, and then we just make exclusions for a certain time period.

So it's not necessarily adopted, but they can see that it's gonna be possibly a future requirement.

I mean, when I'm talking, I'm talking down the road away obviously, but uh, I think that there's agencies, there's people that will don't, they'll send people to our meetings to educate us different versions of code and build knows a lot of this stuff too. So.

Only brought that 2015 was mentioned.

Yeah.

So I'm not that familiar message saying that this time said, we can. Yeah.

And I guess from our perspective, the state agency perspective and the regulator for perspective, umm, we've been the past, we've actually I again just to simplify things a little bit as we've adopted the current code, but based on the State Statute that requires things being inspected by the code that it was in place, it would be hard for the committee to pick an actual year code.

And I think going just throwing this out that it's better that we adopt the current code.

But then on a case by case basis, and I know that that's cumbersome that on a case by case basis, what the facilities or the companies apply for a variance based on the code that was in place, one that elevator was installed unless there's the distinct hazard because our hands are a little bit tired.

But that statue, so I think it's up to us to maybe consider just adopting the current

code and then letting people apply for variances based on the code.

That was in place when the unit was put in and because that's how we handle everything else on the fire and life safety side and it's sort of how we're directed to handle things based on that statute.

That's the place too.

So just throw it out for everybody to think about and we can maybe have a little more discussion at the next meeting after you have time to think of digest it, but we're gonna.

We're gonna be held to.

Whatever codes we adopt or used by that statute, so it really don't have the ability to pick and choose what color might work best for things in the past.

And it is as it will be cumbersome for the facilities and the contractors, but they'll just have to request the variance when under those situations.

Like I agree with that because over the years all the codes have been working towards getting sprinkler down below.

They keep giving you more and more ability to, OK, you know, sprinkle to do this.

So they they want water out elevator shafts and machines.

So that's something that they the question you're still current thinking is keep the water out and putting a sprinkler in an elevator.

It's not sick.

So so if we start from that, we.

So and based on that, there's actually advantages to adopting the new codes because it it makes things easier on some of the contractors and and the building owners when they're dealing with those whole.

So what does a new bill would have to default too?

From building a new building today, what code in my what law am I under?

What?

What code?

The most recent code I mean and does this it?

I guess my and the reason I ask that is who I have no idea.

And then my second piece to that is then, how does that impact, you know, Oliver and the answer that one, this current code for the elevator would be the 20222020.

OK, so does it all to you automatically always default to whatever the most recent code, it wins.

Updated coming on is adopted.

OK, gotcha.

So right now we're under the 2022, so that 2022 would be what the elevator would be.

OK, actually runs 1919.

Now we're moving to 20, but the point is so even if we adopted similar what you're saying, new builds would still be defaulting to whatever they were built.

So they'd be 19 or 22 or so that just keeps moving forward.

OK.

That helps.

Yeah, that the state on the fire and life safety code we're currently under the 06 and report we've been working for over a year now, almost two to adopt the 2018 because the two, there's a lot of places in the 2018 and the newer codes that are more lenient than the older codes.

So what we've been doing since we don't have not officially adopted dating when people bring to us parts of the 18 code that are more lenient than the current code at the states.

But we've been issued variances for those and and putting whatever the requirements are in the 18 in place because it's it's it's better for the industry and it's better for.

So and that I would see that happening are continuing that with the elevator code too.

So that even as you move forward and you adopt new codes, most of the time they end up in different sections being lenient than the passcodes were.

And so that actually gives the building owners, even if they have elevators that were put in the 90s, it gives them a little bit of a reprieve on maybe what the current code requires.

So there's a number of advantages and adopting the newer world's going forward.

And again, if there's issues that come up, we can address those on an individual basis using variances.

I guess how our office would look at it, sort of making it the most simple. Yeah.

And then the same thing office has been doing with like the electric code in and all the solar you know they because that technology is rapidly improving and we're still on the six year old code, it may not even match what's available.

So we we encourage our engineers too.

Bring us that the newest latest stuff and say you're doing.

Sure.

Gotcha.

So Dev point of clarification, if we're talking about a 17, three and adopting a current version of that as a bill, then you mentioned variances for things that are contained within that language.

Would it be a variance for anything or a the building the contractor can submit a variance for anything that they feel they need to, but there's no guarantee it's going to be approved.

OK, it's up to them to submit a variance on whatever they think they need to, but. As our experience has been in the past, at least with fire and life safety, umm, some of those variances, uh, we determine our detrimental to the safety of people in buildings and we don't approve.

We do as best job as we can to work with the facility, to work with the contractor and approve variances when we can.

I mean, it's just a matter of introducing common sense to the equation, but there are times where we don't approve all the variances, so it's gonna be on the case by case basis.

We always asked to, when they do the variances to come up with some compensatory measures to put in place of like say, like we're like we're doing with the two way communication we've asked for those two other devices to be able to put in place.

So that way it gives us a little bit of safety features that goes along with it.

So always keep that in mind when you're asking for a variance.

That wait, we have some safety measures that go with it and we can review those as the variances come in too.

So cold my my understanding from my last meeting was that so the the way that the that the current bill reads, it doesn't specifically list a 17 or 17 running three, but the title that it uses specifically safety code for elevators and escalators which is a 17.

And so I don't think I wouldn't attribute the the bill is written to require adoption of any 17.3 at all.

I think that would be completely under whatever rules and regulations process that we would go through uh for inspection of existing installations would be would be my assumption and if that's the case, then we can also choose for a bunch of old installations, perhaps a version of back version.

It's appropriate to save.

This is kind of the minimum standard.

Everything needs to come up too, right?

And working variance process from there.

Either way, I mean, even if we pick a newer version, there's we can line item exclude certain things.

Like I said, the advantage to that is that building owner might have the ability to see what potentially could be on the horizon in the future.

You know that we exclude certain things from a more modern code because you know, obviously a lot of a 17, three is it's simple stuff, it's signage, you know, plastic protecting over fluorescent tubes.

So they don't shatter.

The little stuff is no big deal, but the big ticket items are obviously going to get a lot of attention and people need time to catch up with that.

So I mean, obviously they can apply for variance, but I think there needs to be a little bit of a plan in place as to when people catch up depending on what version of the code that we adopt.

So we can just say 2008, we can say 2020, the advantage.

Again, the advantage of 2020 is just it gives them a look into the future because sometimes and I'm sure Bill can bachelor this, they they building owners get upset because they feel like they're getting hit with something new every single year.

I like the idea of the male to to see what's in a code and what we're excluding just so they can read through the book and see what what's not being required at the time.

But is potential for the future.

Is is this I mean code come out every three years.

Umm.

Is it on a 3 year cycle?

It yes, I think it supposed to. OK?

Because you met the target and then as an example of what we've we've done in past two with codes is we always don't try and adopt the newest version in three years like with the fire in my safety code.

Right now you're trying to get to 18 adopted and we would not revisit adopting a new code till the 24th.

So comes out.

So we're on basically A6 year time frame or scheduled because it's it's too daunting to try and adopt these new codes every three years, just can't get it done.

There's just too much and with the current state process, there's no way we can adopt new codes every three years to get them through the process.

So we're sort of on the six year time frame.

So even with the elevators, you know if if we adopt, if we do our rules and regs and in line with the 22 code it we wouldn't probably address it again till 28.

So we skipped those.

The 3rd that third year, but we also allow this again if there's anything in that new code that's more lenient, we don't address it with the variance rather than going through the whole code adoption processing and and then I'm not too sure we'll have to reach out to our assistant AG, but if if the bill says we have to adopt the current a SMB, I don't think the board has the authority to go back and pick an older code.

Uh, I think it's what's going to happen is it's that the building owners, the contractors are gonna have to study the 22 code and see what's in there and see what might affect them negatively on older installs.

And then again go the variance route to make those corrections speak because we we can't have, we can't adopt 2 codes at the same time of different years.

And so again, that's the state process, but we'll have to adopt the 22 parts in the 22, make changes corrections to the 22 and adopt the 22 code as a whole and then only be able to go back and look at older elevators using the marriage.

We won't be able to adopt the 22 and the like the 20 or the old five or anything.

One other question that got the asked me off was a lot of these elevators are gear out.

So if we, let's say they were an elevator in January, November 2019, it's not gonna be installed until the 22 is about umm.

And they may not apply for that permit inspection until after completing 22.

Not so.

Which code are they gonna be?

Response.

But the very 22, based on money that we're going through that right now because there's been a number of contracts.

Yeah.

Sign during this transition process and again, that's why we've sort of picked July of 22 as our cut off date because that's when the bill actually became off.

So anything prior to that and then anything prior to to be an old park giving us their

elevator responsibility for grant, uh, and that has come up.

But we also have companies that are well aware of the statute change and are signing contracts after July 2 and now coming back requesting a variance.

Umm, so that they don't have to do the two week occasion, but they knew at the time was contracts were signed.

What was going to be required or they should have should, but so we're also dealing with that.

So we're trying to hold fast to the July 22 date and and see how those things go, but we still are again considering variances at least on the communication.

So even though they signed the contract after July 22 or still giving them the ability through the variance to adjust that two way communication cost and the extra equipment that's so.

But I think that's gonna be ongoing.

If every three years when the new one comes out, you we're talking about April and next year's for implementing the 2022.

So if I have a client that signs a contract today but it's not installed until summer of 24 or they held to the 2019 or the 2022, well I think that will be up to the board to come up with some language that we put in.

That says.

 **Jared Smith [KSFM]** joined the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 46:47

To not necessarily the one the installation is being done, but possibly when the contract was signed that you know that will be the code that that new installation be under.

But if the new code at that time the installation is more then it went what they might they might want to use them so.

So I I think that's something that the board has to come up with this, whatever language that you see fit to address that issue, it seems like what happens in a lot of places is just when the building permits are pulled, right.

I I'm just not necessarily.

No, because the elevator permit doesn't align with the building permit.

OK, now there's there's locations that require a building permit for an elevator, but the only one left that I know now is is Wichita because they continue to run their own

elevator program.

So going forward, even if they have to do a building permit, they still have to get a permit from our office just for the site.

And so that's where we can or the board can make a recommendation of language that addresses that time frame difference from when the contract was actually signed and the code that was in place then to when the install actually.

Yeah, I think it.

I think Jared, if we set the date that they signed the quarter of the building, whatever it was copying words, then that's what it falls under and does when it delivered installed it doesn't, it would to me anyway.

It's unrealistic to try and hold the the facility people and the contractors to then after everything's ordered and especially with supply chain issues that people are having to try and then make them adjust to the new code that's in place, that at the time of installing that that's not fair.

So I think again, it's easy for us to put language in the rules and regs it that address that and be specific and clear on what codes going to be used when the elevator is actually being installed.

Yeah.

And that that they could show up on there for that code version could show up on the the permit application or elevator order here under this code.

Then it would be very clear to everybody which one were apply.

Yeah, a lot of the times, the stuff that we're getting now we have them provide that documentation to us so that we can actually see when the permit was signed, when the contract was signed so that we have both documents that show us, you know the actual dates.

So that helps us in determining to be able to give that information to Mr Jorgenson to make a decision.

So far the only main thing that we've seen issue with the 2019 code has been the two way communication and we've received.

I don't think we received any complaints or any variance requests on my other accounts, so every everybody's fine with the current code and we have not taken the time to put 19 and 22 side by side to see what the changes are.

That's Bill's gonna be working on that in the very near future.

But so again, as we have these meetings, uh, not only with Bill Self and our staff, but with the industry folk, I think we'll be able to bring to the committees attention what

changes are coming from 19 to 22 and then we're 22 is either more restrictive or more lenient and be able to help the board determine what our final is looked like. Incorporating the 22 as a guide, but not necessarily adopting there in its whole department.

So the variances that you've been granting, they're largely just based around the the text communications that's that's the only variance as we've been asked for, is just on the two way communications that the voice is coming is in place before and you're still asking for the camera.

So it's just that text base, yeah, voice has been around since 87.

Yeah, there's been a lot of miscommunication on the visual.

But the rest?

Larson broke it down to us, and it's not that big of a deal.

It's you going to work?

Quick trip in a cup of coffee?

That's the communication, you know, quick trip, the credit card kiosk.

That's our communication.

That's all you need.

The camera is your doorbell camera.

That's all that it is.

So much of it is, uh, figure where they get scared.

It's something new.

You bring it down into its basic phone.

It's it.

Isn't that big a deal?

So once people look at it and they back up and they look at it and look at components scope.

But yeah, I'm just.

I'm just wanting to be crystal clear on that because I was having a conversation with Bill before the meeting.

Yeah.

The implication was that for a project that they were signing their PO, their elevator vendor.

Today, you weren't really entertaining any of those communication exceptions.

It was for the ones that were back.

Yes, prior to that.

So go forward if you don't.

You don't see many exceptions even for textual.

It's not going off direct today.

It's it's put it in there if it's caught in the design stage, it is really nothing.

No, I understand that.

Though, but still we need to know what we're gonna be.

Brand.

If we're right now, we're under the 19th, right?

So if a contract for a new elevator is signed today, it should be under the 19 code.

But that does not prohibit the building owner or the contractor coming to us and asking.

Right.

But what I heard is that it probably wouldn't be rated today.

No, that's not the case because the other side of the variance issue is not only so like industry standards or current equipment that's available, but they're also is a monetary hardship.

So if a contract is signed today and then two years down the road when it's actually being installed, umm, there will be a different code in place to start with.

 **Jared Smith [KSFM]** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 53:45

But, umm, we've also been granting variances right now.

Umm to like nonsense office churches that can handle the 20 or \$30,000 portion more additional cost for the two way communication.

So it's not only on the technology side that we're, you shouldn't variances, but we're also issuing variances on the cost side.

So we we can do both.

So as time goes on, I mean everybody should be aware of the changes in the elevator program state and they should be aware, especially the contractors should be aware of what the current code says.

So any contract signed today or tomorrow should be aligned with that perk and there should be no issues going forward based on that.

So again, most of our variances are on past contracts before this code actually.

It's gonna be up to the contractors that have the best game on and make sure that

any contracts that they're signing beat the current code so that there's no surprises to the building owner later on down the line when they actually started installing.

 **Jared Smith [KSFM]** joined the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 55:10

Thank you.

But again, we can't say that we're not gonna issue any clearances in those cases too, because we have no idea what's gonna come.

So the variance is probably less likely.

But the step just because you never know what situation should go to.

I just think the the the clearer we could be on the on the things that that you're seeing, it's as potential variances and umm.

There was like New York in a lot of a lot of requests that would never be granting, so it reduces the proposing for all of that review.

If you set up guide result so.

We could do that, you know, based on the conversations we're having, we can sort of put a little bit of a news blurred together and we can send it out to the industry folk and everybody and just do some periodic updates as we have these meetings and what the discussions going on.

We're talking about shared that your hardship there is gonna look like you said, a nonprofit or church or something.

Yeah.

First, taking football state, you put that in.

Yeah, it's two different.

It's two different things, but again the variance request is too full, so we can address it simply on the monetary hardship or we can address it on.

They're they're request for the more expensive equipment and that it's maybe not really needed and we're OK as long as on existing elk now.

Yeah.

On new, no, they they'll need to meet to come.

Yeah.

Yeah.

And and they should be well aware.

You know, even pay you, or even a nonprofit or a church going, they shouldn't be

very well aware of what the new code requires.

And so it shouldn't be a surprise to them.

Umm, when they give them a figure from the contractor.

What it's gonna cost to put it in, because that should cover.

There shouldn't be an issue of them having to come back and ask for a variance either on the monetary side or on the equipment side, because everybody's gonna be well aware of what's going to be required for that for that.

So the amount of variance is we get in the elevator side of things should go down dramatically after we get through this little time frame we're dealing with with what contracts were signed and when the bill actually took.

So we don't expect to see hardly any variances on elevators going forward on new contracts that are something shouldn't be an issue.

I think to add to that, I think the the large four elevator companies are pretty good.

I mean, they're making one product that they can sell and all 50 states.

Some states have differences, you know on fire keys would have you.

There's differences to state codes, but for the most part, everybody's adopted a 17 one and they'll just build an elevator that complies with that.

So they're gonna they're gonna.

They'll complier rather quickly.

You know the cause I it's already ready for other states.

Yeah, we should just change things.

Yeah, you can't buy anything.

It's not against either too, because that's the only product available.

Yeah, yeah.

Good.

Umm.

Anything else with?

With Senator Peterson's questions, he mentioned.

Merge.

Communications is required.

Uh ADA compliant telephone is satisfactory.

He mentions Roper is not required and I actually don't remember.

Just so do you.

Do you wanna enlighten us on the on the rope for her question?

That wasn't mine, just asking.

Ohh OK, I'm sorry.

It was.

It was Sunday.

Your section.

So there was a rope gripper question whether it was required or not.

Anybody just didn't know where that came from.

Talking.

No hurry.

3D door monitoring device it's not required.

And I think that's included in the variances were issuing along with I think that's included in the communication isn't the bill.

Yeah, it's all a package that's been the big thing. It's.

Major yeah.

Ohh, then we'll move on then to colds.

Uh question.

Discuss adopting a 17.

Three, which we sort of have.

Yeah.

And they make modifications to the adoptions of A17 3UH.

Is a 17.

Three is applicable to existing machines.

Umm any anything you want to add on the 17th three.

Well, I think the biggest argument for it is giving the inspectors consistency when they go inspect the existing equipment, it's gonna be tougher than to go in and inspect and apply it to the original code.

Depending on how old the equipment is this this is just gonna offer a little bit of consistency and I'm in my viewpoint.

You know, there's some minor items that I brought up before work, things that are easy to accomplish, and then there's some big ticket items and then you know, there's items that protect the public.

And then there's items that protect the mechanic.

So I really just wanna start the discussion on that.

If we're talking about adopting like the most modern version, or going back to an older version, we just need to have a clear path forward.

You know, to get minimum standards for the state basically.

So so besides the a 17 one, you would also recommend adopting a 17 three.

 **Kevin N 1Lift (Guest)** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:01:43

Yeah. OK.

Yeah.

Umm.

I mean, again, that's something that the board could look at and in the future, I guess if you wanted to do a presentation on what a general overview of what isn't a 17, three, right during the board up to speed on what, what we're actually talking about and then we can, we can have that discussion again, it's umm you know the amount of codes or the codes we adopt that's sort of up to the board and our office to figure out.

So there's nothing that says we only have to adopt A 17-1.

The bill just says we have to adopt A 17th one, but we can adopt other things and even again, I don't want to be repeating myself too much.

But even in a 17 one, there are things that we can take out or change or alter to again for whatever best fits the state going forward.

So and I think that's common with a lot of other states too.

You know why?

And items they come up with a plan, so to speak.

You know, like I said, there's some minor things, but the ticket I so it would make sense that we just came up with a little bit of a comprehensive plan for something that's gonna cost a building owner some money, you know, give them a timeline.

So they can project that cost out.

So no, but we've got people available that have offered to come in and do presentations, so we can, if we're gonna pick what version umm, that we're gonna apply for each state.

So, uh, if if everybody's good with that, we can try to work that out and get done by the next meeting, but we couldn't get a plan in place to give a presentation to the board.

Sure.

OK.

Yeah.

I mean, anything's over.

Then again, if that's what the majority of board would like, then that's what we could do.

So umm, I would guess that the majority of the boards in favor of that, getting the presentation on a 17, three and so we'll see what you can work out if it's not ready by the 20th, then we can look at maybe doing it at the next meeting.

OK, well, I'll try to try and get to something going here.

That's why, yeah.

Because again, the more information we can get, you know the better finished product.

I had one more thing that I did not put on the agenda going on around here. Uh.

 **Kevin Sullivan** joined the meeting

 **41262308-c4d7-44a9-b64d-ca2b2a62dd2d** joined the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:04:24

Cite the right place here, section 20, item B2, so it's rules and regulations shall include rules and regulations.

Item number 2's requirements and qualifications of licensure and elevator contractors mechanics to and inspectors.

It does not specifically line out that it's gonna be a Kiwi.

I inspector, I think that's what how bill your it's will be.

That's the way you guys are reading it this umm, I feel like that should be in the rules stated in the rules.

So you can get a combi accreditation umm from several different organizations.

It's not just one organization, but I also brought up last month as is kind of conflicts of interest, there is a standards book for Qi inspectors as well.

The Q.

I-1, the Code of Ethics or as a standard for qualification of elevator inspectors.

And there's a code of ethics in the back, so I feel like we should adopt these rules as well.

As far as making decisions, you know how inspectors are going to conduct themselves out the field so it can go to the back of that book and the appendix.

There's a code of ethics section.

Uh, because, you know, obviously the IT stands to reason that some point at some point the future will have them planes better.

Inspector, you know, might come before the board or your office.

Either selected, they're gonna be a standard in place as far as that's considered beautiful thing about SMB, say, write a lot of stuff out for us in advance.

 **Todd Stanton** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:06:00

So you know, it's not that we even have to debate.

We can look at it for sure.

So it's there, the work is done.

Good morning.

It never hurts to when it comes to complaints and disciplinary issues that might come before the board or our office, and never hurts to have actually a standard in place, right?

And to use something that's connected to the current a SME code to me makes sense.

So ohh, I mean, I don't think anybody would have any issue with that.

Again, it's we can sort of adopt anything we think is prudent and reasonable and needed.

So you know it's it's just gonna take some time and and again.

The only reason I bring this up is if you go to a different.

Jurisdictions you know, in other states, there are people that aren't Qi certified that just go out.

They'll have to check chart.

You know when they're watching it?

Inspection.

So I don't think it's common I, but again I think getting that getting that certification in places important.

So do you.

I mean, do you have any other suggestions besides you, the aye?

Or is that sort of the standard Qi?

Is the standard.

You can just get that certification from NASA or QITF, and I believe there's another one.

There's there's, there's a that the other member of Lisa.

Do you have the QB ITF?

Yes.

Yeah.

So if I think along with with the Code of ethics whatever I take, it would be prudent for the board and the rules and regs to set what certification will accept them through to, you know what I mean.

If there's two or three nationally accepted ones, so I think actually you stating those in the rules and regs, it's good because then you don't get a lot of off the wall request from from different people or whatever that we use sort of set of standard of what you're going to accept and what you're not right.

So I would I guess just make that suggestion when we get there that we include what certifications or from who we're going to accept even start.

 **Todd Stanton** joined the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:08:28

I think anyone that follows these standards would qualify.

 **41262308-c4d7-44a9-b64d-ca2b2a62dd2d** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:08:32

I'm just aware of three organizations, so.

OK.

Anything else from anybody else?

That's if we do adopt that 17. Three.

Let's say there's probably gonna be more hearings, so you know that people are submitting just because it's the newest version.

Ohh is there any way those variances can be brought to the board so we can kind of help alleviate that kind of stuff on the new fire Marshall when it comes in and we can review those.

Those things that come in, yeah, the board.

I mean, the board's world.

World.

Welcome to review anything.

It's just that I think with how the current build is.

Ordered the board doesn't have the authority to do anything, so again on the variances I think it's a great idea that any of those variances that we might have a concern our office might have a concern with it that we can bring to the board so that the board can see sort of what we're dealing with and have some knowledge of what's going on in the industry.

And we're always open to recommendations, but the final decision currently.

But I have to be for tomorrow, right?

Simply because the current statute plays the board out as an advisory right?

There's other states where they have boards, elevator boards, or different boards, regulatory boards that have the final say.

But the legislature did not put that in in ours.

So I just didn't know if it would alleviate any of the, you know, if he gets a slew of them.

Well, we can give our recommendations and then hand it over.

These are the ones that we would recommend accepting, and these are the ones that you know, I think it's a great idea and we can have that discussion at the time or umm what the current ohh rules and regulations say about it and we can enlighten the word on what data said.

We can enlighten the board on if there's been any changes in newer rules and regs that state hasn't adopted and then we can look at like we do now fire life safety of issuing variances on what's in the newer codes even though the state hasn't adopted it on specific issues.

So I think the more information we can share with not only the board but then the board can take back to their constituents, I think would be.

My list.

I think we've talked about just about everything.

Umm, that was on our list, so I'll open to any new ideas.

Concerns were were the board?

Ohh I could.

Ohh we we don't have any representation today from the elevator service provider for manufacturers, but I know one thing, the elevator companies are they're all concerned about the and the building owners.

Is that 30 day compliance with deficiencies and I have some thoughts on this as far as the time that it takes to to clear an inspection provisions or corrected, I think that 30 days is impossible in a lot of circumstances.

Yeah, it depends on what it is.

It's something minor.

We can correct it sometimes while we're doing the expansion, right?

It really depends on what it is, but the I know how the bill is written, but I think we need to break it down.

I mean, obviously there's some violations where inspectors are gonna be expected to put padlock or that tell the the person forming the test and shut the equipment off immediately, right?

A life safety device, I would think that we need to like A3 tier system right?

So really, if you're in that first category where it's a life safety issue, the three days, it's kind of relevant because you don't take padlock off until that, that issue has been corrected.

 **kevin noonan** joined the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:12:57

Whether that takes six months or a year, it's not gonna run till then.

Umm.

And then there's the other stuff that it's so minor that it would probably be better that the inspector come back just and check it again in a year.

Let's just say it's a data plate.

You know, per capacity at the elevator.

You know, if it's not there, umm may not require reinspect or anything like that, we'll just check it on the next 18 spection.

So that would be like the the third team, but in the middle, I think that's where that 30 day language comes into play.

Umm in my opinion, I mean it does say in the language that every 30 days they can apply for an extension of time, but 90 days seems a little bit more reasonable.

I guess it depends on what it is.

I don't know if if it's what we're currently doing or they just basically routing you and asking for an extension of time or how are we handling that, how we currently do it on everything that we deal with us even on the fire and life safety side is, is that once

the inspections done in the violations are found, those violations are documented, they're sending it to the report and then the facility person, the building owner, whoever it is, gets a copy of that and then they have 10 days to respond to our office on each violation and they can respond that they've already got it fixed.

They can send us a copy of the invoice or picture to show that it's been repaired and then we take that violation off.

They can tell that tell us that they can't get a company out or 45 days.

So then we'll extend that violation again, depending on the seriousness though, and give them 45 days or give them 60 days if it's something that they're not gonna be able to fix for a while, then it's not that serious because of supply chain issues.

All they need to do is state that and their response to the violation, and then we'll just follow up with them as time goes on and they can contact us when the part actually comes in.

So I wanted that's already in place.

OK, on how how we do those things.

They're not set in restricted just to the 30 days.

It's again, we work.

We have staff in the office that will be built that will review those inspection reports and the violations and then work with that even that agamic or the building people to get those things fixed.

And like you said, depending on the seriousness, we're open to extending those time limits as we need to, because again, each case is gonna be different.

Uh split chain issues are gonna be different.

So and we do have the ability outside of that 30 days, if we get an inspection report or the inspector is told them to shut the system down and by chance they have it, Bill will review that.

And if we determine an is unsafe, we have the ability to issue a cease and desist order outside of the violation side of things and actually shut that unit down until it's fixed.

So we we have a number of options available for those things when they come up.

But again, if the board decides they wanna put that in writing and add that we're fine with that because it's in place now and the fire and life safety side.

So we can just duplicate it on the elevator side so that nobody's fault or is held to that 30 day timeline at all, and we're willing to work with everybody again depending on the situation.

OK.

Well, I think the kind of the thing that I had on the was talking about whether any bill modifications needed to be requested as far as the cleanup coming up and and I think I have some most of my my said that something was discussed at first meeting I would be done timely that need to be done with that 30 day plus a 30 day extensions listed in the build right now.

A strict reading of that wouldn't wouldn't say that there's opportunity for you guys to use any constructive no.

Uh judge on that it it just says it has been correct in 30 days.

You can request a 30 day extension.

You can grab for certain limited reasons, but it also doesn't include any any forfeit mechanism.

It doesn't say the elevator should be shut down if it's not correct, it's there's no teeth in it.

So to me, that's something that if that were somehow revised to say.

You know the the correction periods shall be per fire Marshall's policies or whatever else, and get those 30 days out of there.

I think it would clean up all the concern that you're hearing the industry, right?

Yeah, that only in that something that's gonna happen too.

Is that something will get written up and it's not going to be corrected by the time that you wouldn't expect or the 30 days runs out?

Or even if we're pushing something back to the next next inspection, that's going to be a common place item.

See that there's gonna be outstanding deficiencies and what will the teeth be?

You know, are we gonna uh, that's another determination.

At what point do we?

 **kevin noonan** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:18:31

Uh, block off equipment.

You know, even if it's something minor, they're not correcting the issue so.

A lot of the times I think even with the elevator now that they're under our umbrella, they would fall under our statutes and regs, right?

So with our statutes and regs in place, our enforcement process that we have in

place falls within the elevator.

And for Graham and swell.

So if we deem a elevator or if you rip color red tag or you log out a elevator because it's distinctly hazardous.

Once that's noted on that report, it comes to bill that automatically tells us that that has been red tagged, and it should be shut down.

Bill will then follow up with the owner of the and the sterility to make sure that that has been shut down.

If it hasn't, then our cease and desist orders would be kicked into place at that point in time, so there's always a process in place for enforcement on the bigger ticket items like that.

The 30 day issue, if the violations you know not corrected and they need supply chain issues, you know whatever we have waivers you can put into place 60 days, six months.

You know, we work with them.

We have a paper mechanism that we work with so that we can track it once we track it.

That 60 days is up.

Build will then follow up with that facility that, hey, where we at with this, you know?

Are we done or, you know, do we need to extend so that way we have a paper trail of what's going on with that specific issue and that helps keep everybody on board and basically up, you know, to par where they should be.

But the specific things you know, like when we get into the bigger ticket items and such, you know with the lockouts and such, those are handled through our season desist orders and if it becomes a problem with the facility, that's how you know we handle that side of it.

And I do see George points too, because the bill is Cedric, right?

That's language, so I agree that we probably need to start list of things that we maybe wanna look at updating the build next session and that's what we need to see.

I would love to see that that section with the 3030 just removed and defer to the other projects that you already have in place.

Yeah, we are assistant AG that language together and we can share it with the board.

And so that's probably the first thing we can look at.

We put that on our list of addressing in the upcoming session with uh making some

changes to the current bill.

So as you guys come up with other things you see in the bill that maybe need to be. Clarified more or changed or removed or added.

Just be sure to share that either in the meetings or send the bill and Jessica and email and we'll add it to the list.

And then as we get closer to the session, our assistant AG can sort of put the language together that the board can look at it and then we'll get it over to the legislative revisors office and actually get it put into bill form and and then we'll see if represented in tar water or Senator Peterson wanna introduce.

And I don't those sort of clean up bills for a better term.

Those are usually aren't any issues.

I have a list of things that I've been tracking, so I'll put the list together and maybe send it out to you guys and then that way if you wanna add anything additional to it. That way everybody you'll be on the email and then you can add your list to what I took the notes for, and then that way everybody can't reply to that email.

Ohh you can.

Because I'd be a violation of our meetings.

Never mind.

It's in that in vision.

A lot of clicking.

But that's alright.

I can do it.

Still, a lot of skin chunk.

No, no.

Good point.

Thank you.

Anything else?

Anybody has current future?

Umm.

And then I'll open it up.

Any public comments, questions or concerns?

Yes, Sir.

I'm Richard Sargeant Reconstructors in Kansas.

Just a couple of things I was curious about.

Umm well, the attorneys this in general, it's working on the codes be available or

present at board meetings for questions, comments in the future sure, but. Will Wichita be expected to meet the Kansas minimums when established if their current code adoption does not meet the requirements?

The Yeah, the current statute is, is that Wichita?

Well, I I I think it's actually in the bill, but that anybody that wants to keep their program or have their own program has to meet the state program in order to do that.

So there's yeah.

So whatever final rules and racks that the state adopts for elevators, Wichita will have to at least meet those they can be more restrictive, but they can't be less restrictive. So they have to at least meet the it's been a mums to keep their program OK?

Umm.

Miss Garcia missed this earlier, but as far as like board, I've seen this in other states work well.

I know the part of our soul has the authority to make that decision, but as far as reviewing those variances and perhaps sharing the burden and somewhat maybe liability of those variances coming through optimally would be your decision to make that or whoever's in your position.

Position, but it sounds like that that was kind of so I'm just going over my notes.

You got a buddy breast?

That to to a certain extent.

Uh, let's see.

I wanted to ask, uh the board as a whole if the Advisory Board would be interested.

There's the the elevator industry work preservation fund that exists out there.

They they do the QR process, they do the education they do training of qualified inspectors, things that nature there, non priority to anyone but they would come and do a presentation and do a QA as far as a 17 three of the variance codes.

I mean the the they are experts in that aspect but might be a resource that they would gladly come out.

I imagine I have some points of contact to share some information and be available, you know, to go along with this.

What?

Mr Easton said if you guys would be interested in that.

Uh, in that context, I mean, I would help.

I shared that information with whoever you know need be if that's something you

would be interested in, which is of the board on that, that that's what I was referring to earlier.

So I mean that example are available.

That's a.

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

We can do that.

All that let you maybe work with with coal and and I'll definitely make sure you hug whatever presentation you thinks the benefit for the board.

That'd be great.

And just a point of reference and there's been a lot of conversation as far as the two way communication and I know the video aspect is a big deal.

Umm, just from my perspective and talking to you manufacturers, manufacturers here in town that cost for emergency phone for two way communication and I know it's not addressing video, it's 1200.

It's not an exorbitant expense to public safety for someone if that didn't exist, a lot of them do.

I mean bill reference that earlier, but there are all those cases that they don't.

And I think I'll believe that it's that, but it's it's off to, you know, have something like that for most cases.

That's.

Thank you for letting me.

Yeah.

And we're we're requiring.

Two way voice communication.

Yeah, even in the variance.

So because again, it's not that costly same way with just putting the camera in the elevator that can be monitored again, expenses very low.

And to us, it meets the the the requirement or the you know the intent of the code.

So again, that's what we're doing with the variances there.

I just want to end that little bit of information.

You that's good to know 3000 and I mean that's very much different number and ask.

Thank you, Jessica.

We have two requesting neighborhoods.

Their hand.

Maverick Elevator gym with maverick elevator.
On code Stanton.
You don't have to keep the bed rested on chat.
Just figure what the first one.
See what he has to say.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:28:57

Push it wants.
Leave it alone.
Hello, this is Jim.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:29:03

Go ahead, Sir.
You're you're in front of the board audio wise anyway.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:29:08

OK.
Thanks for hearing me.
First I want to thanks.
Thank Cole.
He took most of my talking points.
You did an awesome job.
As far as someone to talk in front of the board, I'd like to maybe suggest Jack Day.
He's with NASA.
He's fantastic.
He ran the.
Washington State program he's absolutely brilliant.
So that would be one contact for you guys.
I think he would probably do that for the board.
I was first.
I wanna say I was a fan of a 17.3 and older version, but you guys have kind of convinced me that maybe a newer version would be maybe OK with some exceptions.
So in the field as an inspector I'm running into.
Mechanic problems not having enough mechanics.

I'm hearing from some of the mechanics that they don't want to get there.
There are licenses and I kind of don't blame them because they're not getting.
They're not getting anything back from the state.
So I think the state.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:30:35
You mean by not getting anything back from the state?

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:30:39
Well, so, so the states requiring them to pay pay money for a license.
But what do they getting from the state?
So my recommendation is the state should.
The state should say nobody can work on an elevator if you don't have an elevator license.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:31:04
That's currently the position of the state.
That's what the bill states out.
If if you're not licensed and approved by our office, you cannot do work in the state again.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:31:17
OK, but what if I do?

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:31:20
Uh, and then we would have to take up civil or criminal proceedings against that individual depending on the situation, because of violation, they're violation of the State Statute.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:31:28
OK.
Well then that.
OK, that that would be fine.
And so.
So I think the board should also determine what is an elevator mechanic.

So we should determine that it takes so many years of schooling and so many hours of on the job training to do that because it's it's it takes a long time to get that that knowledge to actually be able to safely work on an elevator and also continuing education should be considered.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:32:03

We wait.

We agree with that, but we currently do that based on the certifications that they have to provide to us before we'll issue them a license so.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:32:17

So is that is that part of the rules and regs?

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:32:23

It will be, but it's also I think in the current.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:32:23

Or.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:32:30

Ohh, let's see the section 20.

Yeah, it's actually it's Section 8.

#2 it says an individual wishing to engage and installing, altering, repairing or servicing of elevators shall make application for an elevator mechanics license in such form and manner as prescribed by the State Farm Marshall, and shall pay the required initial application fee not to exceed \$150.00.

So those requirements are already in place and we're already requiring certifications of proof of training and years of experience before we issue a license.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:33:14

OK.

Then the other thing would be temporary mechanics.

Maybe the state?

Could issue temporary mechanics even if it's only for 3rd year apprentices.

We're just so short in the field right now and maybe this could be a come and go

thing, I don't know.

But right now we really need mechanics and I'm not saying I'm not saying to use them for testing.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:33:37

We actually.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:33:41

Maybe we can use them in other areas of the field.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:33:45

We're we're open to that and the the temporary mechanics are actually addressed in the bill, but.

It's probably something that the board needs to put on our list to have more detailed umm terminology or wording to address it and and try and maybe even to establish different levels for the temporary mechanics, because currently the bill addresses it but it's attached to major disasters and things like that.

So in order just to, I don't think the bill addresses just a shortage of personnel.

So that's something I think we should put on, but on the list.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:34:31

Yeah, because yeah.

Right now we got a short.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:34:35

Uh to address in the rules and regs and and the find that even but a couple different categories because we don't know.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:34:45

And someone brought up.

Sorry, someone up last week on like small churches and small operations that couldn't really afford, you know, having their inspections done.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:34:49

Go ahead.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:35:04

I don't know.

Maybe the state can come up with a fund or something that that we can do that. I mean, I know that the even the big companies are sensitive to that and we as an inspection company are sensitive to that and and we actually try to do something special for them, but maybe maybe we can come up with a way to get him some special funding.

I don't know.

That's something that I don't know about that, but maybe you guys can.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:35:32

We can definitely talk about it, but that's gonna be hard to do.

Because the state, the legislature, the budget people usually don't set dollars aside to help people that are maybe underfunded out to that degree, that's something we'll have will actually have to do some research on on.

We'll make a note of that and I'll get our assistant AG looking into it.

But umm, that's really hard to do for the legislature to appropriate state general fund tax dollars to a specific issue or problem when it's simply.

Insufficient funding for particular organization or whatever.

So we will look into that though and see what if there's anything we can do to figure it out.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:36:24

This.

There was one on.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:36:31

The bill says that we're going to do any.

Just a second, we got a board member that wants to speak to that.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:36:37

Go ahead.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:36:38

It's call.

What we were talking about last at our last meeting, the some of the concerns that some of the people in the public brought up were just basically the churches, the small institutions out in Western Kansas for instance, that are gonna have to bear the cost of having an inspector and a mechanic out there to perform the safety inspection.

My is that where you were going with that, Jim?

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:36:59

Yes, yes.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:37:01

So I mean, maybe not a fun, but you know it in certain cases, especially if you're you're way out there, you're entertain the notion that they they don't necessarily have to do that inspection every single year, maybe an every other year type of thing where the distance again mechanic and inspector out there is gonna incur a lot of annual cost on that organization.

Uh, you know, I I know that we floated some different ideas around, you know, Bill had mentioned in a previous meeting, not a board meeting, but that possibly we have Mechanic Act as the inspector.

But I think the better things to have both both people there present, but maybe look at the frequency of schedule and certain outline years and and you know we're aware of that and we put it on our list for the board to discuss.

But I also I guess need to remind everybody that the bill was introduced and written by the industry.

Yeah.

And so the industry is the one that put the requirements in the current bill or office actually testified against it because we didn't like some things in the bill itself.

So to me that's sort of I'll, I'll actually put the burger in a little bit on the industry to come up with some ideas or suggestions on how ohh those smaller entities that are lacking with the financial ability to pay for those inspections annually.

What?

What we do there, because currently it would have, we'd have to put that on our list.

The updates to the bill maybe in the next session, but we'll have to see how that goes.

OK, to to add to that, a lot of these you know the industry in that aspect, you know it's always building the visuals that have been this contract that's already they don't bear that an additional cost large by and large that's already covered, yes, not an addition too.

So there might be some unique instances where you know there's entities, buildings etcetera that are facing this new cost because they have been performing their own meanings and not utilizing you know a what's the board may have is deemed as a qualified person mechanic forever that's listed.

But by and large, a lot of these individuals, the maintenance providers are bearing the cost of that inspection because it's included in this contract.

But I think we're we're finding is we're finding a lot of facilities that they're elevators have not been touched in years.

And so I think that's where this issue is going to come into play because all of a sudden they now have to have it done annually where they have a spend any money on inspections of their elevators since they were put in.

So, so again, that's something that I think the board can look at, but or gonna need input from the industry on that because again they're the ones that set the stipulations bill, so.

That will keep that open alright, Siri continue.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:40:26

So one other thing is I'm doing a lot of industrial elevators right now and umm, so the newer stuff, but and then the older parts of the facility, the people are wanting me to do, they're old industrial elevators like the employees because of what they're seeing, what they're elevators, I these really need to be looked at.

These are the biggest violators.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:40:57

Yeah.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:40:57

These are the most unsafe elevators, probably in the country.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:41:01

OK.

We'll add that to our list of things for the board to discuss and maybe ask for a change to the bill in the next session because, Umm, again the, you know, one of these bills come before the legislature, there's all different groups that wanna have an input input and and so in order to sort of compromise and get a bill, there's give and take with all these groups.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:41:28

Right.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:41:32

And that was one of the things I think that came out of the yeah.

Like gas and oil, the grain industry, things like that.

And in order, I think to get the bill actually through and have a bill in place, there were concessions made to different groups on different things.

So again, that would be something for the board to discuss and maybe make her recommendation on.

But if the board wants to make that recommendation, then my suggestion would be is to bring couple of the lobbyist for the grain, the oil and gas people, things like that into our meeting and have that discussion with them because in order to get anything done, you're probably gonna have to have their buy in.

And so it's it's a a matter of communicating and sharing information the best we can with everybody involved.

I even out side the elevator industry itself and then seeing if we can find some common ground.

So that'll be something that we're probably has to work on going forward too.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:42:43

OK, Aria met a minimum.

I was thinking that if if the if the elevator's got buttons on the inside of the cab then it's meant to have a passenger and we should be inspecting it.

That that's that's my opinion and I'm done.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:42:56

OK.

No, that's fine.

We appreciate that and we will make a note of that and then we'll see how things go in the future.

MI **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** 1:43:05

Thank you for your time.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:43:06

You bet.

Alright, we'll go to our to comment on that.

He's he's he's right in that in other states, Missouri, particularly when they deem something to be a material list, they they just take the buttons out.

So it's not meant for passengers.

It's hard to such that way.

People aren't riding it.

You don't have to worry about the public safety aspect of it.

So but I I echo the fact that just outlining standards for mechanics, I brought up the inspectors earlier.

I think that's a great idea.

And possibly even a continuing education requirement.

You know, it's already in the Kiwi I, but we don't have it for the mechanics.

It isn't built, so something to review with the future.

Alright, don't go to our next public person online.

Was there, but now it's not.

Period.

Tied Stanton.

Feel what you unmute yourself.

Umm, go ahead.

In the Harris Todd.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:44:31

Can you hear me now?

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:44:32

Yes, we can go ahead.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:44:32

Yeah.

OK, I'm sorry.

I'm on a unfamiliar device here.

My name is Todd Stanton.

I'm the majority owner of a small historic building in liberal known as the landmark center.

This meeting has been very informative to me.

Uh.

I've become aware of a lot of things I wasn't aware that we're being discussed.

We're certainly not an insufficiently funded building, but what we're looking at are extraordinary additional costs for our size.

Umm, we've had an annual maintenance contract on our elevator for 40 years since the last major overhaul.

That maintenance contract is now \$7500 a year.

We've been informed by that company that the cost of just the initial testing to bring us into compliance is approximately \$6500.

Umm, that's 10% of our annual building association budget and it certainly is burdensome and we may have certain minority owners that simply aren't able to, you know, take care of their percentage of that.

And this is at a time where we're facing, you know, 8 to 9% operating costs inflation every year. Umm.

What is being looked at for building such as us and we're in the western part of the state, we've been told only two of the certified.

Uh inspectors are even willing to come out here, and that has to be coordinated through the maintenance company.

It it's leaving us and quite a financial quandary as to what this may cost us now, what it may cost us later.

I understand that what I'm hearing is that an elevator of our age would probably be grandfather on a number of things.

But the the cost that are being imposed on us with not much notice are of significant concern.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:46:46

I understand and and and want to let you know that you're not the only one that has contacted our office with those concerns.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:46:56

But.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:46:59

And quite honestly ohh the I mean the board can we can discuss it and we can maybe look and see if we can come up with any ideas or suggestions but.

The my recommendation or suggestion for you is the first thing you need to do is contact your local senator and representative and.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:47:12

The.

First thing you need.

Temperature.

He's on the line today in this meeting.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:47:24

Good.

And have them maybe review the bill and see where your concerns are in the bill and maybe they can suggest some changes to the bill next session that address your concerns.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:47:37

So.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:47:40

Because, umm, again, our board will look at it and we'll put it on our list on possible review and the upcoming session.

But in order to make, I guess any alternative options available and it's going to take some legislation next session in order to make changes in the bill itself.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:47:59

It's going.

I just one observation.

I was not aware that this bill was written by the industry, although I suspected it might have been when I saw some of the language.

It gives the appearance that this for at least some of the industry is is designed as a profit center.

I mean the the test fees are astronomical.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:48:33

Umm.

And and I understand that that view too, but unfortunately.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:48:37

Sure.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:48:40

Umm, I don't think there's anything to board can do to address the fees that the individual companies are charging.

It's sort of gonna be, you know, more of a demand type thing and whatever the individual facilities, building owners can negotiate with the different companies, but. Umm yeah.

The those fees are set by the companies and there's not really any unfortunately there's not really anything we can we can do about that.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:49:05

Yeah, so much.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:49:13

We we can only address the sort of overall operation of the program and the requirements for those companies that mechanics and the inspectors, but we we can get involved in setting any of the fees.

The only thing we have the ability to do is get involved and what cost of the licenses are because that affects the operation of our office and we can charge what's appropriate to pay for the program, but we can't do anything on the fee side.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:49:33

Yeah.

Just we can chill, right?

Is it possible for your office to make available or help facilitate other companies being willing to work in this end of the state?

We have certainly with the significant increases in the annual maintenance contract contacted a number of companies both in and outside of the state of Kansas.

And when you can get them to actually take your call and discuss it with you, they simply have no interest in operating here.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:50:18

Again, I know supply and demand, unfortunately, is gonna control that and we we can't make anybody go to different parts of the state and do business.

You know, we can invite them or encourage them to do that.

Umm and I don't know if it's any help to you, but on our website we currently list all the license companies, mechanics and inspectors that are licensed in the state.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:50:36

I.

OK.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:50:47

So I mean you can contact them and see if you can maybe get a better price out of somebody.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:50:48

I mean.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:50:53

But umm, I I know it's an issue, but unfortunately there's really nothing the board or our office can do about it at this point.

 **Fuller, Ryan** left the meeting

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:51:06

Trust me, if if we could, we would.
But right now we can't.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:51:13

Well, I I just would like to that will certainly make representatives aware, but the cost issue and this part of the state is a very significant issue and so far we or I personally haven't seen.

Any kind of schedule by when we're required to be in compliance.

That didn't seem to be included in the information sent when we did our elevator registration.

I don't know if that's available elsewhere on the website.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:51:45

Umm, I don't know if it's specific.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:51:47

The.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:51:47

I think it is, but what we're doing is is.

We're giving everybody from July of 22 through the next year or this year to get their units registered and if they're not, if the facilities not actually doing the registration and the registration of the unit will happen when it receives its its yearly inspection.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:51:53

Alright.

The.

JD **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:52:15

So within the next year.

All of the units that the industries that were aware of should be registered because they all should be getting their first annual inspection within this year.

TS **Todd Stanton** 1:52:23

I'm working.

JD Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 1:52:35

Hang on a minute or you have a comment from a public member here in the in the meeting. Go ahead.

I was just curious.

I didn't catch what the historic building he about, wondering if he provided him his provider is.

TS Todd Stanton 1:52:44

It would take.

Providers cone.

JD Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 1:52:53

And what?

What is the the building?

The historic building you represent.

TS Todd Stanton 1:52:56

The It's called the landmark center.

It's in downtown Liberal, KS, southwest corner of the state.

JD Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 1:53:06

Thank you.

I'm gonna try and make the call, you know.

TS Todd Stanton 1:53:07

Yep.

JD Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 1:53:15

You have any other questions or concerns?

TS Todd Stanton 1:53:18

That's all I have at this point, but thank you very much for listening.

JD Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] 1:53:22

OK.

If anything comes up on our website, we have an elevator, email address and just please feel free to send us an email so that we can add those things possibly to the agenda for the next meeting.

 **White Bradley** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:53:44

OK.

Anybody else?

Jessica raise their hand and I'll open it up then to any closing comments, concerns or questions from the board.

Senator, I think we need to even minutes before we approve them, asking 2 baths and multiple AI mistakes, you know, gotcha.

Like there's one spot where it said you talk about when you came into office in the farm Marshall's office, and it talks about building away with two foreign Marshalls off 2 bills doing with the Foreign Marshals Office.

Office when you ask us to contact Bill Orlinda, it says the bill for Linda.

The AI has several mistakes and military important, and I agree with that and what we'll do is if it's OK with the board, we will cut off the adoption of these minutes to the next meeting and we'll make those corrections and we'll send them out to all the Members ahead of time.

So you have adequate time to review, and if there's any other corrections that you find, you can let us know.

And then we'll adopt these at the next page.

I guess to that point I'm I guess this is a transcript.

This is how I'm used to saying for meeting minutes, meeting minutes are typically much more aggravated form that that documents actions taken by the board and I will transfer.

I noticed that too I I just saw those for the first time today and I will ask staff to put those more into a meetings or meeting those format and not actually transcript and we'll make the transcript available if anybody wants it.

But it's only on the website.

Yeah.

And we will definitely reduce the amount of pages here for the actual meeting notes.

Thank you.

No problem.

That one sure.

Are we still looking for that building facility manager, the governor's appointment office is still working.

So, and they had some names.

But uh, I think they're just a little.

They're always.

There's appointments there. But.

Umm, I'll actually I'll make a note.

I haven't checked with them for a while, so I'll double check with them today and see where they're at.

And then it's my understanding, I think that the industry this may be going to submit a a new candidate or false position since it's no longer involved with companies.

So there might be a change coming here, I'm sure.

So if you know anybody with the elevator manufacturers that might be interested in being on the committee, they can contact the governor's German office and give them their name.

That might help them.

Anything else as far as the minutes concerned?

You said you were gonna send out another copy of these.

Can we get the minutes of this meeting prior to the next meeting?

Because it might streamline the review process and we're not doing it here in the meeting.

 **Todd Stanton** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:57:01

Yeah.

We have three weeks now, so we will get you copies of the Minutes for both meetings to review before the and we will.

Uh.

In size.

Uh.

The information so that the meetings are the notes meeting notes are a little short

for your babies.

Pleasure.

And perhaps also the agenda, because I know they emailed us.

Just asking about what issues we wanna bring up just so we're prepared to talk about everything.

Just get the agenda out.

Certainly is not answer or we know what we know what the topics of discussion will be.

That will happen too.

And just one thing for me to clarify is it that it going through the bill and we have suggestions that we should talk about the open meetings law, we can still forward you our questions and those will be incorporated into the agenda for next meeting and that that's satisfying.

Yeah, this man, you know, everybody on where there's someone replies that goes out to everybody.

Yeah.

Ohh so we buy I have a.

Do you have a suggestion or comment you can send that just just to Jessica, Jessica, and then she could include it on to the board as well.

The agenda, that way we don't. Yeah.

Then she'll put it on the agenda for the board to address.

You don't have any discussions about it because yeah, submit that to you, OK.

That.

Thank you all very much for coming again for your input and I'm already looking forward to the next meeting, especially since I'll be handed to somebody else.

 **Maverick Elevator Inspection (Penni & Jim)** left the meeting

 **Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM]** 1:58:47

But thank you very much and.

I think you're a great job by everybody and I look forward to continuing the process.

See how things for you the no, I'm not doing anything.

But for me that hopefully.

Thank you, Doug.

Stephen Duerst left the meeting

Jessica Dunderdale [KSFM] stopped transcription