WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

Minutes for School Environmental Health and Safety Rule Project
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
December 4, 2024
Hybrid Meeting
ASL (or CART)
Department of Health
111 Israel Road
Tumwater, WA 98501
Meeting Room: Building TC1 Room 163/164
Virtual meeting: ZOOM Webinar

Technical Advisory Committee members:

In-Room Participants

Brian Buck, Lake Washington School District
Brian Freeman, Inchelum School District
David Hammond, Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA)
Erin Hockaday, Benton Franklin Health District
Jared Mason-Gere, Washington Education Association
Jeff Rogers, WAMOA and Auburn School District
Kevin Jacka, The Rural Alliance
Lauren Jenks, Washington State Department of Health
Laurette Rasmussen, Whatcom County Health & Community Services
Morgan Powell, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Nicole Daltoso, Evergreen Public Schools (Clark County)
Preet Singh, Bellingham Public School
Steve Main, Spokane Regional Health District
Suzie Hanson, Washington Federation of Independent Schools
Tammy Allison, Washington Association of School Business Officials

Online Participants

Patty Hayes, RN, MSN, Chair
Becky Doughty, Spokane Public Schools
Brook Wilkerson, School OPS
Devon Kellogg, Washington State PTA (reside in Lake Washington SD)
Doug Rich, Washington State Catholic Conference/Catholic Schools
Gina Yonts, Association of Washington School Principals
Kate Espy, South Kitsap School District
Kellie Lacey, Richland School District
Laura Peterson, Washington State PTA
Laura Peterson, Washington State PTA (reside in Everett School District)
Samantha Fogg, Washington State PTA (Seattle Public Schools)

Technical Advisory Committee members absent:

Anders Lindgren, School OPS
Bailey Stanger, Benton Franklin Health District
Dan Steele, Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA)
Geoff Lawson, WAMOA and Auburn School District
Jacob Cook, Parent

Jaime Bodden, WSALPHO
Jessica Sankey, Bellingham Public School
Julie Salvi, Washington Education Association
Kelly Cooper, Washington State Department of Health
Kelly Cooper, Washington State Department of Health
Kelsey Greenough, Richland School District
Kenney Johnson, Lake Washington School District
Nicole Roel, Washington Association of School Business Officials
Pam Schwartz, Washington State Catholic Conference/Catholic Schools
Randy Newman, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)
Richard Conley, The Rural Alliance
Roz Thompson, Association of Washington School Principals
Sandra Jarrard, Spokane Public Schools
Sandy Phillips, Spokane Regional Health District
Sharon Ricci, Washington Federation of Independent Schools
Susan Baird-Joshi, Washington State PTA (reside in Lake Washington SD)
Ted Dehnke, Evergreen Public Schools (Clark County)
Tyler Muench, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)

Technical Advisory Committee staff present:
Andrew Kamali, Project Manager
Nina Helping, Policy Advisor
Marcus Dehart, Communications
Michelle Larson, Communications
Mary Baechler, Community Outreach Coordinator

Guests and other participants:
Karen Langehough, FirstRule, Facilitator
Ali Boris, Department of Health subject matter expert (SME)
Donald Westfall, Department of Commerce SME
Emily Salzberg, Department of Commerce SME
James Witherington, Department of Commerce SME
Luke Howard, Department of Commerce SME
Morgan Powell, OSPI SME

1. Minutes Review

Patty Hayes, Committee Chair, welcomed committee members and convened the School Rules Technical Advisory Committee meeting at 9:00 a.m. Chair Hayes presented meeting minutes and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Chair Hayes welcomed the American Sign Language and Spanish language interpreters and appreciated their patience and support as the team navigated technical challenges.

2. Reminders

Chair Hayes stated that the meeting will be recorded and posted online shortly after the meeting then reminded everyone to speak slowly for the translators.

3. Objectives and Meeting Agreement

Karen Langehough, Facilitator, reviewed the meeting objectives and committee agreements on how to work together.

Facilitator Langehough explained the general agenda for the day, which included reviewing language for routine inspections, specialized rooms, and lighting.

Chair Hayes reinforced Facilitator Langehough's comment that the language could be finished with this meeting and thanked each of the committee members for the incredible amount of work they have done.

4. Workshop

Funding Opportunities

Morgan Powell, Office of Superintendent and Public Instruction (OSPI) subject matter expert (SME), discussed various topics:

- Healthy Kids, Healthy Schools physical and nutrition grants. These grants can fund any project that improves student nutrition or health.
- Indoor air quality assessments that districts can apply for and funding for smaller schools for HVAC and other equipment.
- Lead in Water Remediation resulting from E2SHB 1139 from the 2021 legislative session. The program expects additional funds in 2025.
- The small district energy assessment from HB 1257 (Clean Buildings) provides grant funding for energy assessments in small districts. This grant is still open, and first come, first served.
- The small district modernization grant program is for districts with less than 1,000 enrolled or State Tribal-Compact schools. The advisory committee prioritizes the funds.
- School district Health and Safety is an emergency repair pool with limited availability. The urgent repair pool provides additional funding for upgrades.
- The American with Disabilities Act (ADA) equal access grants are capped at 100,000 per district. It is closed, but they anticipate funds to be available again next year. These funds improve accessibility for students with special needs.
- The Career and Technical Education (CTE) grant is for career and technical education equipment used for career connected learning and work integrated learning opportunities.
- Washington Sustainable Schools is not a grant, but there is a 2023 update to the sustainability guide for construction projects to follow based on legislation.

Kevin Jacka, Committee Member, asked whether any of the grants were able to be written in collaboration with another school district as opposed to specific districts.

SME Powell responded that follow-up is required.

Susie Hansen, Committee Member, expressed appreciation with OSPI keeping up with laws to keep students safe and commented that as laws change, the private schools are trying to make important updates without any funding, and it's challenging.

SME Powell commented that a handful of funding (lead and water remediation) is available to private schools but acknowledged that most are for public schools.

Member Jacka commented that CTE would be most helpful as a collaboration or partner grant.

Devon Kellogg, Committee Member, asked about addressing the amount of direct pay tax credits available for things like ground-source heat pumps, solar, electric bus charging infrastructure, etc. They asked how OSPI is considering this and helping schools address the rebate model.

SME Powell responded that their role is with state funds and can't speak to federal funds.

Emily Salzburg, Commerce SME, explained that the IRS allowed for direct pay, so schools can participate in a way they haven't before. They offered technical assistance and resources for those that are interested.

Member Kellog said that the challenge is getting up-front funding and suggested that OSPI could advocate for money to be available for up-front costs so schools can access it and pay it back. The rebate model adds extra challenge for schools that get funding from bonds and levies.

SME Powell responded that OSPI does advocate every year for up-front funding for schools and it is usually on the agenda at the legislature.

Facilitator Langehough asked committee members to introduce themselves. See the list of in-room and online participants above.

Andrew Kamali, Program Manager, explained the plan for the next meetings.

Perspectives

Department of Commerce (Commerce): Clean building Performance Standards

SME Salzburg introduced the state's clean buildings law.

Luke Howard, Commerce SME, explained the Clean Buildings law passed in 2019 and the associated rules developed by Commerce in 2020. The standard prescribes measures to take to make buildings efficient. Rules are found in WAC 194-50.

SME Howard then discussed:

- The compliance schedules, which depend on the size of the building. Larger buildings have earlier compliance dates.
- The basic requirements for the tiers of buildings. For tier one, they must have operations and maintenance programs, an energy management plan, and compliance with an energy performance metric.
- Benchmarking.
- Ventilation impacts on energy use intensity (EUI).

Doug Rich, Committee Member, asked whether commerce anticipates the EUI being adjusted upward as air quality measures are implemented

SME Salzberg responded that they would consider that with sufficient data and that the change would need to be made through rulemaking, which takes time.

Brian Freeman, Committee Member, asked a hypothetical question about the levels.

SME Howard explained Clean Buildings Performance Standard (CBPS) exemptions, including financial hardships, and the penalties for noncompliance.

SME Salzberg discussed funding opportunities for CBPS specifically and other commerce funds.

Brian Buck, Committee Member, asked whether EUI targets were based on data out of Seattle.

SME Howard replied that they used local and regional data.

Member Buck asked whether the targets were developed before 2019.

SME Howard responded they were developed in 2020.

Member Buck asked whether the targets considered COVID.

SME Howard answered that they used data pre-COVID.

Member Buck asked whether there were plans to address the impacts of COVID on energy usage.

SME Howard responded that they are discussing that more in breakouts and working with the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) to look at this.

Member Buck asked how the EUI targets compared to a warehouse or a hospital.

SME Howard explained that schools are one of the lower targets.

Member Buck asked whether school districts could provide input in the PNNL study.

SME Howard responded that the study is based on modeling and is close to being published, so they are not sure.

Member Freeman asked about the impact on British thermal units (BTUs).

SME Howard responded that EUI is essentially BTUs, as it is BTUs per square foot.

Member Freeman asked whether adopting the higher threshold would increase utility bills proportionally.

SME Howard confirmed.

Member Kellog asked about Bellevue School District's zero energy building that used IRA dollars to pay for installations. The district has incoming money from the utility and good air quality and asked how much research is going into these kinds of solutions and accessing federal dollars.

SME Howard responded that PNNL is familiar with these research projects and directed Member Kellogg to their website.

Member Buck commented that geothermal heat pumps are preferred for new construction, but retrofitting is not feasible.

Department of Health (Department): Healthy Buildings Healthy Environments

Ali Boris, Department SME, discussed:

- Poor indoor air quality is a problem for Washington students.
- Indoor air quality management principles and sources, and Department key guidance documents.
- Ideal ventilation and considerations.
- Health-based recommendations for filtration.
- Outline for an indoor air quality plan.

Member Freeman explained that their attendance rate is not relevant to funding. They asked to confirm some of the language choices related to indoor air quality intended parameters.

PM Kamali confirmed Member Freeman's question regarding the language.

Member Rich asked what standards local health authorities will use when reviewing renovations.

Member Buck asked SME Boris about the consultation with a design engineer in establishing the 21 cubic feet per person (CFM).

SME Boris confirmed they did consult with a mechanical engineer.

Member Buck stated that their consultant said it is not achievable in a new building and asked whether it is something that can be discussed.

SME Boris agreed it would be great to have that conversation.

Member Freeman commented that the assumptions of students being present had an impact on the measurement.

Steve Main, Committee Member, responded that they have talked about plans for review and approval with several architects and that even large spaces may only have a few students depending on the curriculum. That's why they base it on curriculum.

Member Buck discussed the occupant load factors of different classrooms.

SME Boris discussed temperature parameters and the ideal case situation and explained health-based recommendations for source control.

Break at 11:00 a.m. Returned at 11:10 a.m.

Technical Advisory Committee: Practical Application

Chair Hayes reminded the group that they must notify Senator Robinson of any conflicts that may exist so the legislature can fix that. They have asked PM Kamali and staff to take a closer look at certain applications of the rule.

Chair Hayes asked SME Boris what the science-based standard is for healthy spaces for children and youth.

Lauren Jenks, Committee Member, commented that the standards seem abstract and it isn't possible to go into a classroom and know whether the standard is being met. They'd have to rely on the team for the measurement. K-12 guidance needs to be clearer about how to find what is incorrect.

Members asked questions about the assumptions that go into CO_2.

Member Rich commented that agencies need to coordinate on new initiatives and that owners acting in good faith could delay implementation. People want to get things done but it is going to create difficulties.

Erin Hockaday, Committee Member, commented that it's difficult to measure a past plan review. The 21 CFM value is backed by data, but if local health officers have reviewed the building, it may sit best as a recommendation to incorporate into a plan review. Member Hockaday also commented that CO_2 is not a perfect proxy, but in setting minimum health and safety standards, it is something that is more easily measurable.

Member Jenks commented that 21 CFM only applies to new construction and pointed out that there is still a question for older buildings and how to get clean air for them. Perhaps guidance could address older buildings and asked if there is a conflict with new construction and guidance.

Various members agreed that indoor air quality is difficult to measure.

Facilitator Langehough asked whether a crosswalk of the requirements and their associations would be helpful.

SME Howard offered to put something together.

Various members indicated a crosswalk would be valuable due to the many variables and factors involved.

Members discussed potential conflicts.

Chair Hayes indicated a crosswalk relating to the language drafted in the rule would be helpful to look at. If the group agrees that there is a conflict for current buildings, they need to flag it. Chair Hayes brought back Member Rich's idea to coordinate with other agencies as a recommendation to include in their report and that it would be positive. The timing of implementation is relevant to the timing of this conversation.

5. Breakout Sessions

Facilitator Langehough introduced the breakout sessions and procedures.

Online session

Chair Hayes said this may be difficult since they can't see each other and discouraged using the chat function for this purpose.

James Witherington, Commerce SME, offered to speak to the issues of funding, incentives, grants, and phasing implementations.

Member Kellogg said that the Clean Building Standard is important to prevent increasing warming fires, burst pipes, and those types of things. It's challenging, but they are willing to solve the problem.

Chair Hayes asked if a local school district could receive the Commerce exemption if they failed to pass a bond or levy.

SME Witherington, said some of the language is vague, but providing documentation of financial hardship and attestation may work for an exemption. Exemptions are decided on a case-by-case basis.

Member Rich asked about the private side, such as Catholic schools, and the funding mechanism for capital improvement.

SME Witherington said much of this is on a case-by-case basis and encouraged Member Rich to reach out to Commerce.

Member Rich said that Commerce recently visited Yakima. It was an excellent connection.

Brook Wilkerson, Committee Member, asked how this applied to charter schools that get some funding but wouldn't have access to the capital funds.

SME Witherington said it would be the same as for public or private schools. There are specific breaks for public and private. Public buildings have the energy audit. There is still 10 million in funding this year to pay for energy audits. One big focus is to find unique or different funding mechanisms. The website fundhub.wa.gov is a great resource for opportunities. There is no penalty for combining different pots of money to serve needs.

Member Kellog said the website has some technical assistance. They asked SME Witherington how to access some of the funding.

SME Witherington said they are trying to work with the Department of Energy on this process. It is a lending program, but a mechanism. A federal funds grant writing process is also just beginning at Commerce.

Member Kellogg talked about energy as a service and asked how schools can meet performance standards.

SME Witherington talked about ownership of assets. SME Witherington said Commerce will provide case studies. They've been working with the Department of Energy and Mead School District and hope to make their findings public soon.

Chair Hayes talked about the next steps and what the committee is required to write regarding the minimum health and safety standards for schools. It's not the committee's intent to create a conflict, but if there is already conflict between standards and what the Legislature has set up, we need to identify and navigate through it.

Chair Hayes said we could use Commerce's partnership when reviewing the language and other opportunities to make sure we are in sync as much as possible. The committee's report is not a place for grants. It's about the health and safety rules. Chair Hayes thanked the partners from Commerce.

Funding Opportunities Session

SME Salzberg asked if members had any questions.

Member Freeman mentioned that several small schools have met with consultants to work on the energy calculations for their schools. Once that was calculated, the schools had asked the consultants to put the calculations into practical use and were changed again to do that work. Is it that complicated that you must pay someone to figure out if you comply with a requirement? If yes, then there is something wrong with the compliance piece. It should not be that complicated. A layperson should be able to do the paperwork needed to conform with the compliance standards.

SME Salzberg said it is a lot easier if you meet the energy target.

Member Freeman said that none of the schools in their area meet the energy target.

SME Salzberg explained two options:

- Pursue the investment criteria pathway that would include paying for the audit that you mentioned.
- File for a financial hardship

Funding is available to cover the cost of audits.

Member Freeman would like to have a discussion with Commerce and a few other schools on possible funding opportunities to meet the Commerce requirements.

SME Salzberg mentioned that SME Howard works on a team that provides one-on-one conversations with organizations seeking funding. Commerce and the state recognize that there is a cost to comply with the Commerce regulations. Commerce is continually pushing ideas to the Legislators to fund the work that needs to be done to achieve compliance. Commerce was able to get 20 million dollars to perform energy audits for publicly owned buildings like schools.

Juan Gamez Briceno, Public Guest, asked how much it costs to perform an audit.

SME Salzberg said it depends and it varies. The funds to do audits on publicly owned buildings covers audits at $0.50 per square foot. That appears to cover most of the audit costs. Some buildings could qualify for up to $1.00 per square foot, but $0.50 appears to cover the expense.

Michelle Davis, Public Guest, asked for examples of qualifying for a financial hardship. For example, failure of a bond might constitute a qualifying event, but that is consistent across the state. Are there other exemptions as it feels like a school failing a bond is too late?

Member Main said the problem with bonds is that they are targeted for the specific needs of the school and not necessarily to do these audits.

SME Salzberg said areas where there is no capacity to even run a bond would qualify as a hardship. If you run a bond and you reach the cap of your deferred maintenance criteria then you will not have any extra to defer to building compliance and you could file for a hardship. Commerce would also like schools to help identify additional criteria that they should be looking at to identify hardships. Commerce has some discretion for what might qualify as a hardship.

Member Allison said they passed a bond seven to eight years ago and built new schools, but they do not meet the energy code requirements. Now they are at the end of those funds and do not have enough to update the new buildings.

SME Salzberg said that could qualify as a hardship. If you scope the financial problem, you see that the original standards were scoped by building type and about 50% of the buildings are meeting those requirements. Those buildings will need to benchmark, have an operations and maintenance program, and have an energy management plan, which also has costs, but many of the staff can cover those items.

Member Feeman said that is not always the case. Not many of the schools in their district could generate those, and there have been many employee cuts.

SME Salzberg reframed the issue. The buildings that already benchmark will still have costs, but those costs will be much lower. The schools that do not meet the benchmark can easily lower their energy use by fine tuning their operations and maintenance program—possibly minor, low-cost lighting upgrades. There will still be a small percentage of schools that will need to do far more costly upgrades.

Member Allison asked if solar panels help.

SME Salzberg said yes, they can if it can offset your net-energy usage. There’s a lot of funding available for solar panels in the state.

SME Salzberg added that there is a new funding opportunity called the BEACONS Fellowship Program that offers fellowships to different organizations that can do the professional consultation needed for the benchmarking, operations, and maintenance planning and the energy management plan. If your school is a Puget Sound Energy customer, they already have fellows that they can “lend” out for this work. More information about the program can be found at https://www.commerce.wa.gov/washingtons-first-in-the-nation-clean-buildings-fellowship-selected-for-7-78-million-federal-grant/

Member Main asked whether an existing building being turned into a school is considered a new school.

SME Salzberg said that such buildings would have to be brought up to the current code, which includes the energy efficiency codes.

Member Allison asked if Tier 1 schools are required to meet all the reporting features needed to be done by the June 1, 2026, date.

SME Salzberg said yes.

Member Allison asked who is following through with compliance.

SME Salzberg said there is a database that the building owner needs to request access to from Commerce. The owner can then delegate the reporting requirement to someone within school personnel. All reports will be logged in on the database.

SME Salzberg said other exemptions would be vacant buildings based on a certain square footage of the building being vacant.

Member Allison asked where the money from fines go.

SME Salzberg said that they go back into the Commerce program, which pays for weatherization and helps support the clean building program, like statewide capacity issues or a grant program.

SME Salzberg said there are funds available to help with benchmarking, operations and maintenance plans, and energy management plans. Those can be found at www.commerce.wa.gov/cbps.

Technical Requirements Session

SME Howard asked members for questions and comments.

Member Buck discussed their findings with trying to achieve 21 CFM per person. Their discussions with consultants concluded that the system limited ventilation to about 17 CFM based on energy limitations.

Member Buck asked if Commerce has used data from real buildings to determine if they can be compliant.

SME Howard replied that the targets are based on national averages and modeling. Commerce doesn't expect every new building to pass with flying colors, but not passing is an indication that something may need to be fixed.

Member Buck asked whether Commerce has factored in new infrastructures like vehicle charging stations.

Donald Westfall, Commerce SME, replied that they do have provisions for end use deductions specific to EV charging and some other infrastructure that may be attached to a building. These systems are sub metered, so you can track specific energy use. You can deduct that from your EUI calculation.

SME Howard added that renewable energy production that's exported back to the grid (such as solar) can be deducted. Electrical utilities are mandated by the Clean Energy Transformation Act (CETA) to have 100% renewable electricity by a certain deadline. So, they're looking for opportunities to improve the grid and clean up that energy use. Schools can meet with local electrical utilities to potentially free space for the utilities to install solar on the facilities at the cost of the utility that would help improve EUI metrics.

Member Buck asked if they could sub meter a data center.

SME Howard said that depending on the size and percent of energy use, a data center could be sub metered and deduct that from the rest of the building. Then the data center would need to meet its own target for EUI.

Member Buck asked about pools used by the community. We would like to find a way to sub meter or separate if from the school facility.

SME Howard said there's no specific exception. Commerce has identified pools as a concern.

Suzie Hanson, Committee Member, asked if that might change.

SME Howard replied that it might change by 2029.

SME Howard described how schools could audit, plan, and demonstrate what it would take to reach that plan and where the gap in funding is. You could then apply for a grant or a financial hardship exemption. You also have insights on your building that can help you make phased improvements over time.

Jeff Rogers, Committee Member, asked how to determine which school districts you want to file for financial hardship.

SME Howard recommended identifying the schools that are performing the worst and using the most energy. They referred to the example of Capitol High School in the presentation. It was built in the 70s and went through major renovations and now it's meeting the target for EUI. They added that there's going to be some funding through the Climate Commitment Act for private schools.

Member Hanson described their plans to review mechanical equipment and what might need to be replaced in the future. That takes an enormous amount of time. So, when we talk about an indoor air quality role, we have already had to create a position for the Clean Building program. We've had to replace that person, which is expensive. We don't want to have to do that with another role for air quality.

Member Hanson also asked about the process for updating the targets that don't have to go through the Legislature. Perhaps a sliding scale could be used.

SME Howard replied that there is a weather normalization factor, but it doesn't coordinate with ventilation. That's something for us to think about. Anything is possible, but how complicated do we want it to be and how much money do we want to invest in it.

Member Hanson mentioned the fact that if schools are fined, that increases the difficulty of achieving the goals of energy efficiency and a healthy environment as they try to pay off the fines while needing to invest in improvements.

6. Key Takeaways

Facilitator Langehough asked breakout groups to report on their key takeaways.

Online Group Session

Chair Hayes said they are not sure of any key takeaways other than good conversations and funding opportunities.

Preet Singh, Committee Member, said the conversation was pretty good, but agreed with Chair Hayes that there were no key takeaways.

Funding Opportunities

Tammy Allison, Committee Member, said that SME Salzburg brought up a lot of different funding opportunities they could use such as a fellowship program coming out. We just have to look into what Commerce has.

Technical Requirements Session

Member Buck said they have a data center and asked if they could exclude that from the EUI target. They can't do that for a pool, which is unfortunate. They haven't measured if the current energy code is compliant, but all indications are that the newer buildings are compliant with the current energy code. An option is an audit and life cycle plan of the assets that you can schedule your energy improvements based on the life cycle of existing assets. If funding isn't available, the school can apply for a financial hardship.

Chair Hayes thanked the Commerce guests for their partnership. They asked Commerce to consider how the language we are drafting relates to the legislative requirement, and if there is a seeming conflict, how do we flag and support the system moving forward for the health of kids.

Break at 12:38 p.m. Returned at 1:15 p.m.

7. Language: Routine Inspections

Facilitator Langehough reviewed the November 20 agreements and intentions. The focus today is on the language in (2)(c).

Agreements

> *On November 20, 2024, we:*
> - *Approved Sections (1) – (2)(b)*
> - *Postponed voting on Section (2)(c)*

Intent

> *The intent of this section is to provide minimum requirements for routine inspections of school facilities by the local health officer.*

Routine Inspections (2)(c)

Facilitator Langehough introduced the language.

Proposed Language

> *(c) Allow a school official or qualified designee to conduct the required additional inspections under a program approved by the local health officer, if the program includes provisions for:*
> *(i) Assuring that the school official or designee conducting the inspection has attended training in the standards, techniques, and methods used to conduct an environmental health and safety inspection;*
> *(ii) Completing a standardized checklist at each inspection;*
> *(iii) Providing a written report to the local health officer detailing the findings of the inspection, within 15 days of completing the inspection.*

Member Rogers said they don't see where it says that students need to be present during inspections.

Member Rich expressed concerns about students being present, especially during asbestos testing.

Member Hockaday said local health officers generally prefer having students present during routine inspections. They try to get one person to inspect classrooms, and then another to inspect shop rooms, or someone who understands the intricacies of those areas. They do provide a self-inspection template. They provide a fall workshop every year, so everyone involved in self-inspection and self-re-inspection are aware of all the protocols to follow.

Member Main said 15 days for the schools to do the self-inspection is a bit stringent as the local health jurisdictions have 30 days. Anyone completing the training can do the inspections.

Member Hanson said Member Main's program is a leader in the state and they appreciate it. They'd like to encourage other jurisdictions to have a system like that with training and trust involved.

Member Hanson asked about (b)(i) and (ii). Are we suggesting those jurisdictions that are now doing inspections every two to three years go to three years?

Facilitator Langehough said their understanding is the benchmark for frequency in (1)(a) is every three years. They can decide to go up to five years or less than three years based on the data they collect during their inspections.

Member Jenks recommended clarifying the language.

PM Kamali said there wasn't time to fix since the last meeting, but it will be worded more clearly at our next meeting.

Member Kellogg asked if we completed the imminent health hazards requirements.

PM Kamali said we did finish that section, but they agreed it's hard to follow. An imminent health hazard has different procedures that would take place.

Member Kellogg said the other question is about (c)(ii): completing a standardized checklist. Is there a standardized checklist? And how do we measure air quality?

Member Hockaday said the language says a local health officer "may" allow schools to reinspect if the program includes provisions for it. So, they can only allow schools to self-inspect if they provide the schools with a standardized checklist and training for the schools to be successful in self-inspections.

Member Kellogg asked if a local health officer uses a standardized checklist.

Member Hockaday said they have a K-12 Health and Safety Guide that many jurisdictions use. However, it's up to the jurisdictions to refine the list as they see fit.

Member Jenks said it's normal for the jurisdiction inspection program to make sure the WAC is being fulfilled.

Nicole Daltoso, Committee Member, gave an example in Clark County, based on proposed and existing language. They might go into a specialized room, see a 3-D printer, and ask what kind of ventilation or air filter is available. They are also looking for cleaning supplies brought in by teachers. There are various things found based on broad language in existing WAC. The broadness helps on the inspection side based on the type of room and space.

Member Kellogg said this seems contingent on how the local health officers conduct and perceive the WAC.

Facilitator Langehough moved to a vote based on fist to five for the language with a change from 15 to 60 days.

Voting Results

Fist	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	3	7	10

Facilitator Langehough announced consensus for the revised language.

8. Language: Specialized Rooms

Facilitator Langehough introduced the terminology.

Established Terms

> *"**Emergency eye wash fountain**" means a hands-free device that meets the ANSI Z358.1-2014 standards.*
> *"**Emergency shower**" means a hand-activated shower that meets the ANSI Z358.1-2014 standards.*
> *"**Magnetic switch**" means a non-contact device used to monitor the position of machine guards, gates, and doors by sensing the presence or absence of a magnetic field and signaling the machine to shut down or enter safe mode if the field is interrupted.*
> *"**Source capture system**" means a mechanical exhaust system designed and constructed to capture air contaminants at their source and release air contaminants to the outdoor atmosphere.*

Facilitator Langehough introduced the proposed definition for Specialized Room.

Definition: Specialized Room

> *"**Specialized room**" means a room that has a specific function that requires equipment, furniture, or supplies not found in a standard room. This includes, but is not limited to, a career and technical education room, laboratory, auto shop, art room, or health room.*

Facilitator Langehough discussed where to review the language and asked the committee to read it. Established definitions do not require a vote; they exist elsewhere.

Member Rich asked whether we should include things like personal protective equipment (PPE), such as eye guards and ear guards in this definition.

Facilitator Langehough asked if the committee wanted to add a definition for PPE.

Member Allison mentioned that PPE is under section (7), so there's no need to add it to the definition.

Member Rich agreed.

Member Jenks asked what "established terms" meant that wouldn't need a vote.

Facilitator Langehough explained that there are terms that already have a scientific or legal definition that we're continuing to use, so we don't need to vote on the language.

Member Jenks replied that the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standards may not be the appropriate reference. They recommended using the Department of Labor and Industries (L&I) standards that are in a different WAC.

PM Kamali said regardless of whether we use ANSI or L&I, it's an established term that has a specific meaning that we are not going to alter. They gave the example of an emergency eyewash fountain is defined explicitly already in other rules or standards, so we're not going to write a new definition. PM

Kamali thought that L&I refers to the ANSI standard. The staff captured an action item to double check the source.

Laurette Rasmussen, Committee Member, had a question about whether specialized rooms would include a special education classroom. They have different types of equipment like swings and lifts.

Member Freeman replied that the language says, “is not limited to.” Most special education rooms would be very similar to a general classroom as far as hazards. If there is a room that has additional hazards, it would be a specialized room. It is more about the activity that goes on in the room.

Gina Yonts, Committee Member, asked if sensory rooms with swings and sensory materials fall under specialized rooms.

Facilitator Langehough confirmed that they would be included as specialized rooms.

Laura Peterson, Committee Member, noted that some special education rooms have changing rooms that are not bathrooms. They are not ventilated properly. They don’t have a sink with running water. Would they be included here?

Facilitator Langehough replied yes. This would fall under the “not limited to” language.

Member Kellogg asked if we should include cafeterias, or places with gas-powered cooking equipment, that can trigger asthma in children.

Member Hockaday answered that food service areas would be covered under food safety WAC 246 215. They have had situations with a lack of ventilation in cooking spaces, like family and consumer science or special education, where they had installed stoves but no ventilation.

Member Buck asked whether specialized rooms are specifically classrooms. There are all kinds of rooms that are not designed for kids but are classrooms. Career and technical rooms, which are classrooms, and then laboratories, generic lab spaces where they learn robotics, and durable surface rooms for project labs.

Member Hockaday answered that for the term room, there is a section, either the purpose or the authority section, that references that the code applies to spaces that are primarily used by students. The local health jurisdiction would treat a robotics lab, or something similar, like a general classroom if there are no safety concerns, such as contaminants of public health significance.

Member Freeman commented that after hearing Member Hockaday, the language perhaps should be “this may include,” because it doesn't say this includes, because it may include a laboratory, may not include a laboratory. It depends on what's going on. Auto shop adds confusion, based on what is taught in the room. Eliminating the auto shop would add clarity. The “may” is a nice addition.

Facilitator Langehough asked Nina Helpling, Policy Analyst, to remove “auto shop” from the language. Facilitator Langehough asked if we needed it to say classroom.

PM Kamali replied that we do not want to say classroom because health rooms are not necessarily classrooms. They agreed with Member Freeman's statement, writing it as “this may include but is not limited to…”

Member Main commented that when they inspect areas like a kiln or a scene shop that is on a stage of a high school, they inspect the construction as a CTE location. The language for specialized rooms says it “a room that has a specific function that requires equipment…”; Should it say that it “utilizes equipment.” The use of the room drives the requirements.

Facilitator Langehough asked if they are recommending replacing the word requires with utilizes

Member Main confirmed that was the intent.

Member Hanson asked if the focus should be on a space instead of a room.

Member Main replied that yes it could be a space, for example, a scene for a play; it may not be in the actual high school shop.

Facilitator Langehough asked if there was a recommendation to replace a room with a space, does that make it too broad?

Facilitator Langehough the language and called for a vote on the revised language using fist to five.

Revised language

> *"**Specialized room**" means a space or room that has a specific function that utilizes equipment, furniture, or supplies not found in a standard room. This may include but is not limited to, a career and technical education room, laboratory, art room, or health room.*

Voting Results

Fist	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	1	2	7	13

Facilitator Langehough announced a consensus for the revised language. They asked if the person voting 2 had recommendations.

Member Buck replied that if including health rooms, is it going to require eyewash stations?

PM Kamali replied that things like eyewash stations are needed only if applicable to the function of the room. So, if a room has it, then it must meet these standards. It's not saying a health room must have all these pieces.

Language: Specialized Rooms (1) – (2)

Facilitator Langehough introduced the language.

Proposed Language

> *A school official shall ensure specialized rooms that are part of a school facility include, if applicable:*
> *(1) Single-use soap and single-use towels at handwashing sinks.*
> *(2) Emergency first aid fixtures:*
> *(a) Emergency eyewash fountain in each room where hazardous materials are used, or eye irritants are produced;*
> *(b) Emergency shower in each room where hazardous materials are used and the potential for chemical spills exists; and*
> *(c) All emergency eyewash fountains and showers must have unobstructed access and be within 10 seconds of use and less than 50 feet from anywhere in the room.*

Facilitator Langehough asked for clarifying questions.

Member Kellogg said that the comparison chart had “shall” and gave specific examples like the eyewash fountain or the shower. This looks like it all got lumped into one and then put in “as applicable.” How do we evaluate if it's applicable?

Member Hockaday recommended aligning this language with L&I language. They have a Division of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH) directive on emergency eye washing facilities. L&I requires to provide emergency washing facilities where employees are exposed to corrosives, strong irritants, or toxic chemicals. We could align with L&I’s language or cross-reference to their language. Applicability would be evaluated based on what is used in the space, such as what type of chemicals. It could be using baking soda and vinegar or much more toxic and corrosive chemicals.

Facilitator Langehough thanked Member Hockaday and asked if the L&I language covers eyewash and showers—sub section (c) or just (a).

Member Hockaday answered that it does cover all three. Subsection (c) appears to align with L&I language, but (a) and (d) don’t. L&I’s directive states that a shower is required if major portions of your body could be exposed to hazardous substances. We should avoid tweaking the language when there’s already a standard that exists.

Facilitator Langehough said that there’s a recommendation to align with L&I.

Member Main agreed. In addition to L&I language, the safety data sheets for chemicals will indicate if an eye wash or showers are needed.

Facilitator Langehough asked staff to take an action item to align the language with L&I and bring it back on December 16.

Language: Specialized Rooms (3)

Facilitator Langehough introduced the language.

Proposed Language

> *(3) Emergency shut-off valves or switch for gas and electricity connected to stationary machinery. Valves or switches must:*
> *(a) Be located close to the room exit door;*
> *(b) Have unobstructed access; and*
> *(c) Have signage posted adjacent to the valve that room occupants can easily read and understand from the opposite side of the room during an emergency.*

Member Allison asked if this is standard.

Member Main answered that local health officers generally think of this as a recommendation, not a requirement in a shop.

Member Freeman shared their experiences in three districts where they did not have these features. For small districts, this is going to require significant electrical work. If this is going to be a WAC, very few of them will have the electrical infrastructure to do this. It’s going to be a significant expense that could be $50,000 but might be higher.

Member Hockaday agreed with Member Main about this being a recommendation, not a requirement. They requested additional research on the emergency shutoffs to see if they are reflected in another code or L&I’s core safety rules. We've broadened the definition of specialized rooms a bit from the old code. There are many other rooms with electrically powered equipment that are not going to have shut offs. Additional research could help clarify this language.

Facilitator Langehough documented an action item to do additional research. They called for a vote using physical thumbs up or thumbs down on whether the rule should require this or not.

Voting Results

Thumbs up	Thumbs down
3	18

Facilitator Langehough announced a consensus to not requiring sub section (3).

Member Main said that for new construction, this is a good thing. For an existing school, this could be a large expense.

Member Hanson said that based on the definition of specialized rooms, a school couldn't use a theater space to do sewing or what have you, because of the requirement to have a shut-off switch.

Facilitator Langehough clarified that the requirement was for stationary machinery. Sewing machines would not meet that classification.

Member Rasmussen agreed with new construction needing that requirement. They've been in shops where there wasn't a shut-off switch, and it would be exorbitantly expensive to add one. It should be a recommendation for existing spaces, but for new construction, it should be a given.

Member Yonts said that in some specialized rooms with lifts for diapering and changing special education students, we have some of our most at-risk children with some of our least-trained paraprofessionals in a space. We need to note that we use standalone equipment that is specific to handling the health, care, and well-being of these students.

Member Allison asked if this is already in place for new construction.

Member Jenks said that in the Departments K-12 guide we recommend a shut-off for gas.

Facilitator Langehough said that the committee took an action item to research that question. To confirm, our count is no, we are not going to require this right now, but we have the action item to do additional research. Is that correct?

Member Kellogg asked if the $50,000 was for both gas or electricity; or is one cheaper to accommodate.

Member Main said that we would generally apply it to shops as well as labs.

Facilitator Langehough commented that if we know that gas is a requirement, we don't need to reiterate it here.

Language: Specialized Rooms (4)

Facilitator Langehough introduced the language.

Proposed Language

> *(4) A prohibition of use and storage of compounds that are:*
> *(a) Considered shock-sensitive explosives, for example, picric acid, dinitro-organics, isopropyl ether, ethyl ether, tetrahydrofuran, dioxane; or*

> *(b) Lethal at low concentrations when inhaled or in contact with skin, for example, pure cyanides, hydrofluoric acid, toxic compressed gases, mercury liquid and mercury compounds, and chemicals identified as the P-list under WAC 173-303-9903.Discussion*

Facilitator Langehough asked if there were any clarifying questions.

Member Buck asked if the storage of compounds listed here is already monitored by the fire department.

Member Daltoso replied that it depends on the jurisdiction and the fire inspector coming in. It's valuable to have the local health jurisdiction look.

Member Allison asked if schools can even order these types of chemicals.

Member Daltoso explained there is a list of the banned chemicals. There are often leftover chemicals in a back cupboard inherited by a new teacher. Some teachers bring stuff in and create a mystery chemical cabinet.

Member Hockaday confirmed that teachers can still order these. They have found chemicals dating back to 1912. We had an experience recently with one school that had almost 80 banned chemicals. A fire inspector will look at chemicals under subsection (a) because shock sensitive chemicals are going to be more of a fire safety risk because they can detonate. A fire inspector wouldn't likely look at any of the lethal chemicals under subsection (b). The fire inspector is likely just going to make sure that they're in a fire cabinet.

Member Rasmussen commented that it is not so much that schools are purchasing them, but they are still there. They found things from the 60s. It's important that someone keeps an inventory and that it is checked by a chemical hygiene officer, which most districts don't have.

David Hammond, Committee Member, commented that as a high school principal, they interacted with the fire department. They care how you store chemicals, not necessarily what you have.

Member Hockaday mentioned that including a health room in the definition of a specialized room might be an issue. Health rooms might store items like epinephrin pens or confiscated vape pens. These may contain some compounds that are identified under (b).

Facilitator Langehough asked if the phrase "if applicable" addressed that concern. If not is there a more specific recommendation?

Member Hockaday replied that they would have to think about it.

Member Freeman asked if this excludes prescription medication.

Member Rich asked if schools are allowed to possess these chemicals by law.

Facilitator Langehough replied that we discussed the restricted list, and how some chemicals are brought in anyway.

Member Rich replied they are prohibited in material, right? Because it looks as if we are saying you can no longer have these chemicals on your property.

Member Hockaday answered that they are not prohibited materials. We are discussing whether we want to make them prohibited in schools due to safety concerns or health concerns. Going back to your language "if applicable" statement, that language is OK if it allows us to interpret that there may be exceptions to what can be used or stored on site.

PM Kamali replied that we can put clarifying language in guidance, that if it's medically prescribed or necessary it would be exempt, or if the material was confiscated.

Member Hockaday commented that some schools are storing those because there are difficulties with disposing of them. We don't want them to not confiscate them because they are concerned about this requirement.

Facilitator Langehough asked if there is a recommendation for (b), such as unless medically necessary.

Chair Hayes didn't think so. They're talking about confiscated items like vape pens that have toxic compounds in them. PM Kamali is suggesting it would go in the guidance.

Facilitator Langehough said the recommendation is that it goes in the guidance, that items can be confiscated, and that medical exceptions will be made.

Member Rich asked if it is our place to make this decision that these materials are prohibited on school grounds.

PM Kamali replied that it is. The committee is here to set the health and safety standards for schools.

Member Hockaday said that there's established guidance with the Centers for Disease Control and others, that the risk of the chemicals listed here outweigh their educational utility. These are very dangerous.

Facilitator Langehough asked to move to the vote as is or with edits.

Member Hanson asked if that includes additional guidance?

Facilitator Langehough replied that it does.

Voting Results

As is	With edits
21	0

Facilitator Langehough announced a consensus for the language as is.

Language: Specialized Rooms (5) – (7)

Facilitator Langehough introduced the language.

Proposed Language

> *(5) Safety procedures and process for instructing students regarding the proper use of hazardous materials or equipment.*
> *(6) Appropriate personal protective equipment when exposure to potential hazards might occur.*
> *(7) Situation-specific emergency and protective equipment during demonstrations with hazardous materials and with hazardous procedures. Examples of protective equipment include, but are not limited to, safety shields for eyes, protective gloves that are fire retardant and chemical resistant, respiratory protection, and fire extinguishers.*

Facilitator Langehough asked for clarifying questions.

Member Daltoso asked whether (7) was captured in (6) when referring to PPE.

Member Hanson asked why we have number (7). Whether there is a demonstration or the students are using it, they need PPE.

Facilitator Langehough mentioned that the comments in the room suggest that the language is very wordy and confusing.

Member Freeman commented that (6) and (7) are not the same. Sub section (6) address the need for personal protective equipment while (7) addresses the need for general protective equipment, such as fire extinguishers.

Member Hanson asked if we need situation-specific equipment in (6).

Member Freeman endorsed the language in (6) based on when exposure to potential hazards might occur.

Member Hanson commented that (6) is about students using equipment and (7) is for when there's a demonstration or the use of potentially hazardous materials.

Member Main commented that students are going to need PPE when they are using things like band saws.

Member Daltoso said that situation-specific emergency equipment should be there anyway and that wearing PPE when exposed to hazards in that classroom should always be practiced.

Member Hockaday agreed that it must be there all the time.

Member Freeman said that appropriate situation-specific emergency equipment should be available when exposure to potential hazards might occur.

Member Hockaday said that they would agree with combining 6 and 7.

Member Daltoso suggested putting examples into the Departments K-12 guidance.

Facilitator Langehough asked if we should use "and/or" during demonstration.

Member Freeman replied that the language has them separate just because one is related to PPE when there's exposure. The other is related to demonstrations that are happening and that's the intent of having them separated.

Member Yonts commented that there are times when students are involved and there are times when a teacher is involved. It's just important that there's a delineation there from a school leadership standpoint.

Member Hanson asked if we combine them, we could say "situation-specific emergency and protective equipment during demonstrations or use of potentially hazardous materials with hazardous procedures."

Member Main replied that PPE will be needed when they're using equipment like bandsaws and lathes, so it would be better to not be limited to just potentially hazardous materials and hazards.

Member Daltoso added that situation specific emergency equipment is setting dependent; you are going to have the other emergency equipment there, that is applicable.

Member Hockaday agreed and cited the language in (7), and that this should apply to demonstrations.

Member Freeman discussed how the room should have appropriate situation-specific emergency and protective equipment when exposure to potential hazards might occur. The PPE is included in (6).

Facilitator Langehough read the language back.

Member Rich asked if we want to include and space along with rooms.

Facilitator Langehough replied that space is included based on the definition of specialized room we approved.

Member Hanson commented that it should be clear that PPE is needed for demonstrations.

Facilitator Langehough replied that this is talking about the room.

Member Buck asked if there are no demonstrations, then is 7 not applicable.

Facilitator Langehough replied that when there is exposure potential, (7) covers demonstrations and use.

Member Freeman answered that if it's a demonstration or use, and if there's exposure to potential hazards, then you need the appropriate situation-specific emergency equipment.

Member Rasmussen asked in sub section (5), since we are talking about the room, do we want posted or signage?

Member Freeman commented that in teaching building trades, students cannot use equipment until they have completed training and demonstrated safety protocol.

Facilitator Langehough said the language is more action oriented about instructing the student versus just posting.

Member Kellogg had a question regarding (1) through (7), and whether adding the word “use” of a specialized room would make it clearer.

Facilitator Langehough stated that “use” is captured in the definition. They called for a vote with edits based on fist to five.

Revised language

> *A school official shall ensure specialized rooms that are part of a school facility include, if applicable:*
> *(5) Safety procedures and process for instructing students regarding the proper use of hazardous materials or equipment.*
> *(6) Appropriate personal protective equipment when exposure to potential hazards might occur.*
> *(7) Appropriate situation-specific emergency and protective equipment is available when exposure to potential hazards might occur.*

Voting Results

Fist	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	2	8	12

Facilitator Langehough announced a consensus with the revised language.

Language: Specialized Rooms (8) – (9)

Facilitator Langehough introduced the language.

Proposed Language

> *(8) Magnetic switches on all stationary machinery to prevent machines from automatically restarting upon restoration of power after an electrical failure or activation of the emergency shut-off.*
> *(9) Appropriate ventilation or source capture systems that prevent the recirculation of air into the room or transfer of airflow into other parts of the school facility.*

Facilitator Langehough asked if there were clarifying questions.

Member Freeman noted that (8) should no longer be included.

Facilitator Langehough said we are focusing on (9), which will become the new (8).

Member Jenks asked if without the electric shutoff, would this be relevant if the power went off.

Member Freeman replied that no, the equipment does not have this capability.

Member Yonts asked about diapering lifts for special education students: would those switches apply?

Member Freeman replied that in their shop, of all the stationary equipment, only one has a magnetic switch.

Member Yonts asked how the magnetic switch applied to diapering lifts.

Facilitator Langehough replied that we don't know. That will be a parking lot item.

Member Hockaday mentioned that (9) is written to prevent the recirculation of hazardous air. It does not capture the language that was previously proposed in 366A under (8), which talks about not letting contaminants enter the students' breathing zone. We also need to encourage spot ventilation to pull the contaminant out of the student's breathing zone.

Facilitator Langehough discussed edits.

Member Hockaday replied that the language 366A references appropriate source capture.

Member Freeman asked if source capture systems would qualify.

Member Main commented that in reading this, it would require mechanical exhaust to the outside.

Member Allison asked if we could just put ventilation back.

Member Hanson commented that it's a fume extraction system.

Member Main commented that it is an approved fume extraction system.

Facilitator Langehough suggested revisions.

Member Hockaday commented that in the code, air contaminants of public health importance are supposed to be directly exhausted outside the building, but sometimes there are portable ventilation units or a welding shop that had a giant roll-up door on their shop. So sometimes there are situations where you could approve it even though it is not a direct inline exhaust system.

Member Daltoso recommends putting ventilation back in as an option. Other systems could be used, like opening the garage doors, or 3D unit.

Member Freeman discussed including source capture.

SME Boris described filtration systems and their effectiveness at removing potentially volatile organic compounds. Sometimes filters are not effective or can fill up fast. Right now, we are exhausting to the outside for a good reason. There are contaminants of concern that are not removed, and currently, we require that they be exhausted.

PM Kamali suggested using appropriate ventilation or source capture system or other equipment approved by the local health officer.

Member Daltoso recommended putting ventilation back in.

Facilitator Langehough called for a vote on revised language using fist to five.

Revised Language

> *(8) Appropriate ventilation, source capture system, or other equipment approved by the local health officer to prevent the recirculation of air into the room or transfer of airflow into other parts of the school facility and to prevent contaminates from entering the students breathing zone.*

Voting Results

Fist	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	1	4	10	8

Facilitator Langehough announced a consensus for the revised language.

Member Hockaday discussed that in streamlining it, it has become vaguer, which will make it harder to enforce and for schools to interpret and recommended that we should have left it as the language that was suggested in 366A, which is clearer on what requires exhaust and what requires source capture.

Facilitator Langehough acknowledged this.

Language: Specialized Rooms (10)

Facilitator Langehough introduced the language.

Proposed Language

> *(10) If a school facility includes a designated health room, a school official shall ensure that the health room includes:*
> *(a) The means to visually supervise and provide privacy for room occupants;*
> *(b) Surfaces that staff can easily clean and sanitize;*
> *(c) A handwashing sink in the room;*
> *(d) An adjoining restroom; and*
> *(e) Mechanical exhaust ventilation that ensures that air does not flow from the health room to other parts of the school facility.*

Facilitator Langehough asked for clarifying questions.

Member Rich asked if we need to include PPE in this as well.

Member Main discussed that PPE would be required by the employee, which is covered by L&I.

Member Allison replied that they had looked at the old language in 366A, and it did not change much.

Facilitator Langehough called for a vote on the language as is or with edits.

Voting Results

As is	With edits
22	0

Facilitator Langehough announced a unanimous approval for the language as is.

9. Language: Lighting

Facilitator Langehough introduced the section.

Intents

> *The intent of this section is to maintain the current lighting standards to ensure that there is minimized eye stress and fatigue for students.*

Established Terms

> *"**Foot-candle**" means a unit of measure of the intensity of light falling on a surface, equal to one lumen per square foot.*
> *"**Total solar energy transmission factor**" means the measurement of solar gain due to the glazing of a window or door.*

Language: Lighting (1) – (5)

Proposed Language

> *A school official shall:*
> *(1) Provide light intensities that meet or exceed those specified in Table X.*
> *(a) Natural lighting, energy-efficient lighting systems, lighting fixtures, or bulbs may be used to maintain the minimum lighting intensities.*
> *(2) Control excessive brightness and glare in all instructional areas. Surface contrasts and direct or indirect glare must not cause excessive eye accommodation or eye strain problems.*
> *(3) Provide sun control to exclude direct sunlight from window areas and skylights of instructional areas, assembly rooms, and meeting rooms during at least 80 percent of the normal school hours. Sun control is not required for sun angles less than 42 degrees up from the horizontal. Sun control is not required if air conditioning is provided, or special glass is installed having a total solar energy transmission factor less than 60 percent.*
> *(4) Provide lighting in a manner that minimizes shadows and other lighting deficiencies on work and teaching surfaces.*
> *(5) Provide windows in sufficient number, size, and location to enable students to see outside at least 50 percent of the school day. Windows are optional in specialized rooms.*

Facilitator Langehough noted that there were no substantive changes to this section of language. The Board staff recommended only minor editing changes without changing the intent.

Member Freeman requested clarification that the language onscreen was that of the current WAC and not the proposed WAC.

Facilitator Langehough confirmed this was the case.

Member Rich asked if there were any changes to Table X: Minimum Foot Candle Intensities.

Facilitator Langehough confirmed there were not.

Member Hockaday noted that the current WAC contains a consistency error with the Washington Food Code. They noted that it required a minimum of 30 foot-candles in kitchen and food storage areas, whereas the Washington Food Code requires 50 foot-candles.

PM Kamali said that staff can update that piece to align with the newest code.

Facilitator Langehough called for a physical thumbs-up, thumbs-down vote on whether to revert to the previous WAC 246-366-120 language for lighting.

Voting Results

Thumbs up	Thumbs down
22	0

Facilitator Langehough announced a consensus in favor of reverting to the original language in WAC 246-366-120.

10. Recap/Next Steps

Facilitator Langehough announced that the committee completed their review of the proposed language. Board staff will follow up on the next steps with an email.

Chair Hayes and Facilitator Langehough praised and thanked the committee for their work.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hayes adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF HEALTH

_____
Patty Hayes, Chair