

From: Kokot, Dave [DKokot@spokanecity.org]
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 1:13 PM
To: Nogler, Tim (DES)
Subject: SBCC Processes

As part of the continuing process review, I have the following thoughts based on my time spent presenting to the Council and being a member:

1. It seems that there is resistance to receiving proposals that have been reviewed previously. The council needs to have an open mind and understand that conditions and culture changes on a regular basis. Each proposal needs to be carefully considered and reviewed by the TAGs if they are submitted correctly and completely. The TAGs need to make the recommendations to the Council. If the application is not complete or not within our scope of work, then the Council should not allow it.
2. The public testimony hearings are the main times that the general public participates. In other public hearing meetings, there is normally a timer or light that indicates a signal when time is close to and when it is up, etc. We need to evaluate how to best conduct this so that there are no complaints about the amount of time spent testifying. In addition, the guidelines for the hearings need to be provided prior to the meeting, and at the meeting so that there is no question regarding the process. There should be a provision that once testimony is provided verbally, no additional verbal testimony is allowed but can be provided in writing.
3. To minimize the "hovering" over the sign up table for hearings, it should be the standard of practice that the order of testimony shall be by random. To facilitate this, one of the Board (or staff) can call out the names for testimony and will need to ensure that all of the signup citizens are heard from.
4. The meeting agendas need to be clearer stating at what point will public testimony be allowed and when it will not.
5. The technology used for the meetings (webex, telephone, etc.) needs to be reviewed and thoroughly tested before it is utilized by the Council. Having been involved in many call-in meetings, I would have been better off not calling in at all. The equipment used creates echos, time delays, etc. We need to bring the Council into the current technology age – even if it means using a web connection to stream the meetings (without time delay). THIS IS A CRITICAL ITEM to get more public participation from those who are not able to travel to the meetings. We may need to setup satellite locations that can properly serve this need.
6. We need more involvement. We are perceived that we are a closed group of individuals that are protecting our own turfs and not allowing strangers from participating. That needs to change. We need to be perceived as receptive and friendly, but it needs to be understood that this is a code making authority only.
7. The SBCC needs to provide training opportunities for the members. Parts of meetings should be set aside for presentation of new technologies, successes, and failures of projects using the codes. We need to know more about what we are talking about as a group rather than the specific individuals who are representing those areas.
8. We need to consider having meetings across the State and just not focus on the west side. The one meeting a year in Spokane has become one of the most attended meetings, but it took a

little time. The outlying areas need to be involved with the process, and face to face is still the best way to develop that.

9. There needs to be a better connection between the legislature and the Council. We have been victim to legislation that is becoming more restrictive on how something needs to be done rather than just the direction that something needs to be done. This is painfully obvious with the CO detection, for example. This is a big challenge for those from the east side, unfortunately.
10. We need to step back and redo the economic analysis process. It was going in a particular direction, but it appears that timelines have caused it to take a back seat. The economic committee has just not caught traction yet. It would seem that examples and clearer documents need to be developed to ensure that we do not have confusion.
11. I think that the process for developing State codes is a very good one. Its biggest fault is that many people do not become involved until it is something that affects them directly. Some cities use meetings such as "Town Hall" meetings to get out more into the community to be able to hear about the concerns that people are actually experiencing rather than focusing on what we think will be the issues. This can be done by using Council Members and having them attend general meetings around the State. They would not be hearings, but would be open public hearings.
12. We need to work on our image. As I have heard many times, we are not respected by several of the agencies or associations that should be rallying to our cause.
13. All in all, I feel that we are doing a great job with the current economic conditions and its impact on the construction industry. We need to keep up with the technology so that younger people become interested in what we do and how we can affect construction in the State. We need to set goals to be able to measure our impact on the perception.

David F. Kokot, P.E.
Fire Protection Engineer
Spokane Fire Department
(509) 625-7056