Original Transcript

CARNIVAL-AMUSEMENT SAFETY BOARD

TRANSCRIPT OF

PROCEEDINGS

August 31, 2010 12:03 p.m.

HINSDALE INTERNATIONAL INSURANCE AGENCY SUITE 308, 15 SPINNING WHEEL ROAD HINSDALE, ILLINOIS

before SHANNON J. SITTERLY



Telephone: 312.782.8087 Toll Free: 800.708.8087 Facsimile: 312.704.4950

> 311 Monroe Street Suite 1200 Chicago, IL 60606

		1
		>

CARNIVAL-AMUSEMENT SAFETY BOARD

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the above-entitled matter on the 31st day of August, 2010, at 12:03 p.m.

PRESENT: MS. CATHERINE M. SHANNON, Chairman;

MR. ANTHONY J. URBIK,

MR. DANIEL S. KIRSCHNER,

MS. PATTY SULLIVAN,

MR. JAMES WRIGHT, JR.,

MR. BERT RODRIGUEZ,

MR. MICHAEL HAGGERTY,

MS. SARA SCHERER,

MR. DOUG RATHBUN.

ALSO PRESENT:

MS. ELIZABETH CRAIG.

REPORTED BY: SHANNON J. SITTERLY, CSR No. 84-4369.



Toll Free: 800.708.8087 Facsimile: 312.673.8138

Suite 1200 311 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606 www.esquiresolutions.com

1	MS. SHANNON: The Carnival-Amusement Safety
2	Board Meeting will come to order.
3	Present today, I'm Catherine Shannon,
4	the chair; Patty Sullivan
5	MS. SULLIVAN: Finally.
6	MS. SHANNON: Dan Kirschner.
7	MR. KIRSCHNER: Here.
8	MS. SHANNON: Anthony Urbik.
9	MR. URBIK: Here.
10	MS. SHANNON: James Wright.
11	MR. WRIGHT: Here.
12	MS. SHANNON: The quorum is present. We also
13	have with us Doug Rathbun, the carnival safety
14	division manager; Michael Haggerty, our chief legal
15	counsel; Sara Scherer, our legislative liaison, and
16	Bert Rodriguez, our assistant director. We do have
17	one guest.
18	What was your name again?
19	MS. CRAIG: Elizabeth Craig.
20	MS. SHANNON: Elizabeth Craig? She's here
21	representing Margaret Vaughan.
22	Okay. Well, I think I I sent a draft

agenda to all of you by E-mail. Are there any

amendments or changes to -- additions to the



23

24

	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS August 31, 2010
	3
1	agenda?
2	MS. SULLIVAN: I would like to
3	MS. SHANNON: Patty
4	MS. SULLIVAN: I would like to well, not
5	I guess it's not an addition to the agenda as it's
6	an addition to the
7	MS. SHANNON: Just for the discussion?
8	MS. SULLIVAN: Yeah.
9	MS. SHANNON: Are there any changes or
10	additions to the agenda? Seeing none
11	MR. URBIK: Move to adapt.
12	MS. SULLIVAN: Second.
13	MS. SHANNON: All those in favor, say aye.
14	(Chorus of ayes.)
15	MS. SHANNON: Opposed nay. Okay.
16	The first item of business on the agenda
17	is the approval of the June 29th board meeting
18	minutes.
19	MS. SULLIVAN: And I actually read all those.
20	I move to accept them as presented.
21	MS. SHANNON: Okay. Is there a second?
22	MR. KIRSCHNER: Second.

(Chorus of ayes.)

All those in favor say aye.



23

24

MS. SHANNON:

Toll Free: 800.708.8087 Facsimile: 312.673.8138

Suite 1200 311 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606 www.esquiresolutions.com

MS. SHANNON: Opposed nay. Okay. The board meeting minutes for June 29th is approved.

So we have just a few items under "Unfinished Business." Patty was there, but for those of you that weren't, we did conduct our public hearing as required with Section 2-6 of the Carnival Amusement Ride Safety Act, and this was regarding the proposed rule change to implement the fee increases that were approved by the board at the June 29th meeting.

We had two representatives that attended. We had state representative Jim Sacia from the 89th House District, and Ed Meyer of Ski Snowstar who presented oral comments at the hearing.

Patty Sullivan and Bill Sparks were also at the hearing, and Patty also provided some comments. We also received written comments from state senator Mike Jacobs from the 36th District, which is the Rock Island area; Michael Murphey of Chestnut Mountain ski resort. Those were read into the record by Bert Rodriguez.

And then immediately following, in fact I think some of the comments even came in while we



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

were having the meeting, state representative Pat Verschoore, 72nd District, also in the Rock Island area, Karen Haywood of Villa Olivia ski area and Gary Pendleton of Sky Fair also sent in comments. All of those were sent to you by E-mail.

Most of them were very brief, but all of the commentors were opposed to the proposed increase for ski lifts, aerial trams. Coasters were in that category, too, but nobody representing coasters provided any written comments. We did not hear from Six Flags.

MR. RATHBUN: Uh-uh.

MS. SHANNON: But we did hear some very strong opposition from representatives and senators. Representative Jim Sacia, as you may have read in the comments, called it obscene and invasive. And actually, I don't know if you noticed this, but he is suggesting, as is I think Ed Meyer, that maybe the Department of Labor ought to get out of the business of even inspecting ski lifts and tray lifts, and he has indicated that he will be proposing such legislation.

I indicated, as you may have seen in the board meeting, that we would be opposed to that,



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

because we do think it's a public safety issue, but, you know, I do think that's how strong the reaction was against the proposed increase for the ski lifts and large coasters.

So -- and Patty did a very good job of explaining the board's rationale for proposing that larger fee increase for coasters, ski lifts and aerial trams. But I did commit to holding a board meeting just so that the board could consider the comments that were provided, and the biggest thing that they argued was that, you know, it's a 1500 or 1600 percent increase, depending on how you looked at it, and that it would be something that would make them less competitive with the neighboring states of Iowa, Wisconsin, some of the neighboring states, Indiana, that they -- I mean, it's a big -it's a big industry, at least in the Rock Island Where is -- Chestnut Mountain is the Galena area. area?

MR. RATHBUN: Galena.

MS. SHANNON: Yeah. That's where representative Sacia is from.

So I committed to doing that, and, you know, I am very concerned that in light of the



comments that we have received, that we will have a hard time proceeding through the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules process. It's made up of 12 legislators, six house members and six senate members, and I could see -- they don't often do this, but they have on occasion prohibited an agency from proceeding on the rule making.

It takes an extraordinary majority to do so, but I could see that happening, and so I just wanted the board to consider -- I'm not going to read through -- I'm going to assume everyone has read through the comments that were provided, but I just wanted to bring you all together today to see if, you know, we wanted to discuss any amendments to that.

And I did send around -- Marcia sent to all of you a proposal that we as the department put together, taking into consideration the comments that were raised by all of the commentors, and our rationale was just to make the intermediate coasters twice as high as the proposed -- the proposed fees for a regular amusement carnival ride or attraction, and then to make the large coasters ski lifts and aerial trams three times as high.



Toll Free: 800.708.8087 Facsimile: 312.673.8138

Suite 1200 311 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606 www.esquiresolutions.com

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So you stay with the theory that it takes longer to inspect and therefore they should pay a little more, but maybe not as much as we originally had proposed. So I wanted to give the board an opportunity to discuss that and suggest something else.

MR. URBIK: Since I read it, and if I read it correctly, the only objection was from the ski operators.

MS. SHANNON: Correct.

MS. SULLIVAN: Correct.

MS. SHANNON: And the representatives on behalf of --

MR. URBIK: On behalf of the ski operators, but not the coaster folks.

MS. SHANNON: Correct.

MR. URBIK: How many actual ski lifts and aerial lifts do we have in the State of Illinois, the lifts themselves?

MR. RATHBUN: I want to say 10 to 12. I've been on the road, so I apologize I'm not more prepared. Galena has six. I think Andalusia has like five. I know Villa Olivia has only got one. And then you've got the Sky Fair.



MS. SHANNON: At the state fair?

MR. RATHBUN: At the state fair. So that's

13.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

MS. SULLIVAN: And what about Ski Snowstar, they have four?

MR. RATHBUN: That sounds about right, Patty, three or four.

MS. SHANNON: They have different --

MS. SULLIVAN: Sizes.

MS. SHANNON: -- sizes of lifts, but I don't remember if he indicated in his comments how many he had, but --

MS. SULLIVAN: Well, he had --

MS. SHANNON: It sounded like -- he said it was going to cost him 6,000, didn't he?

MS. SULLIVAN: Something like that. Well, he said his were much smaller than Chestnut, for instance, where he had three to four towers with, I think it was, 25 to 30 chairs total on each line; whereas, say, Chestnut Mountain may have 12 to 15 towers, I think he said, and 120 chairs per lift.

And so I guess my thought after, you know, listening to that, if we're going to go with the same idea as the coasters, is perhaps put an



intermediate size ski lift or aerial tram and a large ski lift or aerial tram to kind of be even-handed about what we're -- how we're raising things.

MR. URBIK: But what if mine are wood and yours are steel and Mike's are aluminum, the towers? They're different. So thereby maybe the aluminum tower should have a different rate of permitting than the wood towers because the wood towers perhaps might be more susceptible to decay. I mean, where do we draw the line as far as how may classifications --

MS. SULLIVAN: Well, because the inspectors have to climb all the towers to inspect them, and that -- that presents a time issue of how long that it takes them and how much risk they are taking when they inspect, and if I'm climbing three towers, as opposed to 12 to 15 towers, it's not going to take nearly as long.

MR. URBIK: Unless your three towers are in much worse disrepair than my eight towers.

MS. SULLIVAN: You still have to climb every one and inspect every one.

MR. URBIK: I'm playing devil's advocate with



you, Patty, because if they're eight feet off the ground or they're 12 feet off the ground or they're 37 feet off the ground, at what level -- what is our criteria for putting different quantities on different rides? That seems to be the same thing. That's my question.

MS. SULLIVAN: It goes back to what my thought was, it goes back to if it's going to take two or three times as long to inspect it. Also, the number of chairs has a big -- big stake in how long it takes to inspect, because if you're inspecting 30 chairs as opposed to 150 chairs or 120 chairs, it's not going to take you nearly as long to inspect 30 as it is the 120.

MR. URBIK: Except that's not the argument that they're making. The argument they're making is the 1500 percent increase, which is obscene.

MS. SULLIVAN: Well, I'm not suggesting we stay with the dollar amount, but I'm suggesting that as we -- if we're going to scale down -- because I think the Department of Labor suggested some -- a different fee schedule, and I felt like that might be appropriate also for the ski lifts -- was it 269 and 369 or something --



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. SHANNON: Well, we -- the department had proposed that intermediate coasters be 260 and that large coasters, ski lifts and aerial trams be 390, which would be three times the 130.

MS. SULLIVAN: Right. So I felt like if the inspectors only had to spend, say, a half a day or one day inspecting a ski lift or, you know, a set of lifts, perhaps, and had to take two days to inspect longer lifts, then that seems like a reasonable thing to do to be comparable to the coasters.

MR. KIRSCHNER: Do we have a sense as to what the market rate is for the third-party inspectors in those states that allow third-party inspectors?

MS. SHANNON: How much they charge?

MR. KIRSCHNER: How much they charge.

MS. SHANNON: I got the impression that a lot of it was done by the insurance.

MR. RATHBUN: I wanted to ask, because we basically shut down the Sky Glider until -- which is the one at the state fair, until they had their third-party inspection.

Typically insurance inspectors make \$500 a day. Now, when they brought this guy in, they



paid his airfare, they paid his -- well, he didn't stay in a hotel, but they would have paid his hotel. It was in excess of \$1,000, had he spent the night, or right at that.

MR. KIRSCHNER: In terms of what I read in the minutes, there seems to be this disconnect between what we're talking about and what they're talking about, because what we're talking about is the number of hours it takes for an inspector to go out there and do their job, and they keep coming back to how many poles it is on top of what the old rate was and now it's going to cost me x amount versus y amount, and they're really talking a revenue issue, but they didn't really put forth any numbers as to how this is really going to impact their business.

MR. RATHBUN: Well, to the best of my knowledge, Ed -- Catherine, do you remember, I think it was Ed -- no, it was Chestnut said they had 90,000 --

MS. SHANNON: Visitors.

MR. RATHBUN: -- patrons during the course of a year, and we figured it would be less than a dime --

MR. KIRSCHNER: That's what I'm saying, when



Toll Free: 800.708.8087 Facsimile: 312.673.8138

Suite 1200 311 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606 www.esquiresolutions.com

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

you amortize it over all the guests that they have over the course of a season, even in off-season, it doesn't seem to be that much of an impact, even if they pass the full amount on to the consumer.

MR. URBIK: I don't think anybody on the board believes the difference between the \$1,000 inspection fee and the 230 inspection fee is going to put the ski industry out of business in the State of Illinois.

I mean, we're talking about three to \$10,000 industry-wide. So you're not talking a whole lot of money from a -- that standpoint.

Conversely, we're not talking about a hell of a lot of money for the inspectors either --

MS. SHANNON: And the political --

MR. URBIK: -- and the political fallout as a result of that as well.

MS. SHANNON: -- perception is that it's just an obscene increase.

MR. KIRSCHNER: What's obscene is how little has been paid over this period of time.

MS. SHANNON: Right.

MR. URBIK: I guess what we have to think about is what is truly our role here. Is our role



2.2

one of true safety and to fund the operation to the point where we've got the proper personnel to do the inspections, and that causes increased revenue, even with the political fallout, because if we have to deal with the political fallout of not raising these fees to a level that funds another inspector and makes the rest of the carnival and amusement industry taxed for their operations, then maybe we're not fulfilling the role that we're supposed to be doing. I'm kind of on the edge. I mean, the revenue is not that much.

MS. SHANNON: Right.

MR. URBIK: You're only talking about \$10,000, but \$10,000 more baggage than --

MS. SHANNON: Well, and, you know, timing is of the essence, and we don't have time to get held up, quite frankly, because then we will not get these in place before the 2011 season, and then we are going to have a tough time getting an inspector on board for next summer or even this winter's carnival season, because we're already -- it's going to take us, you know, a month or two to get anybody on board. So we've already wasted this season.



MS. SULLIVAN: And, if, in fact, you can get permission from the department of -- or the office of manageability to budge.

MS. SHANNON: And I think we can.

MS. SULLIVAN: If we get money in.

MS. SHANNON: Right. I mean, there is, as we all know, and no one's blaming the carnival industry, but there is a huge revenue gap for the state, and, you know -- and I think everyone acknowledged, even the representatives, every one of them acknowledged that they understood the need for an increase, and they didn't have any problem.

They said the increase for the regular rides and the inflatables, they thought was reasonable. It was just that this one was such -- it's the percentages. And, you know, I know you can play around with percentages, but that's -- that is the political fallout, and from a practical standpoint, I would like us to be in a position of getting another inspector on board as quickly as possible so that next season we have somebody who's read through the manuals and is trained and, you know, can get out there and do inspections.

Because it's been tough. I mean, you know, Bill



has --

MR. RATHBUN: Bill's ran, I've ran.

MS. SHANNON: You don't want worn out inspectors either, you know. Fortunately, we've made it through this season so far. Labor Day is just around the corner.

MR. URBIK: Would it make any sense then to take a stair-step approach, that our goal is to get the fees up to a level that is -- an appropriate level to charge for these inspectors, but we'll do it over a period of three or four years; thereby, the operators can adapt to this oppressive increase that is taking place; to go from 230 to 500 next year, to the following year, I guess, and then 750 the year after that, so they know what the road map is and they can adjust their ticket pricing, they can adjust their cost control measures appropriately to absorb this additional \$10,000 of expense industry-wide that we're talking about?

MR. WRIGHT: Are these voices of opposition strong enough to derail the increase?

MS. SHANNON: I think so.

MR. RATHBUN: Yes, it appeared that way.

MS. SULLIVAN: Oh, I think Representative



Sacia will go in there with fire and brimstone if there isn't a decrease, and I don't think JCAR will pass it if -- if he has anything to do with it at all, it will not pass.

MS. SHANNON: It's not hard to get the rest of -- it wouldn't be hard to get the rest of the general assembly, even if they don't have the facilities in their district, it wouldn't be tough to get them to be just as vocal in their opposition. They just haven't been made aware of it yet. It was on the news in -- in television news and --

MR. URBIK: It's effectively a tax increase --

MS. SHANNON: -- and in the newspapers.

MR. URBIK: -- and nobody wants to talk about tax increases in an election season.

MS. SHANNON: I mean, I think what you're saying has a lot of merit. I mean, part of me just wants to get something, you know, through as quickly as possible. I mean, we are prepared, you know, to go to JCAR with our proposed rules as soon as we have the board agreeing on what the level is, and, you know, and even that we're going to be cutting very, very close.



MR. WRIGHT: Did he give any indication what number he would find suitable?

MS. SHANNON: Well, one thing he did say in the minutes was that he thought \$300 -- if we were talking -- I think his quote was, If we were talking about \$300, we wouldn't even be here, is what he said. So I got the impression that he thought \$300 would have been fine and he wouldn't even have driven down to Springfield if that was the amount that was being charged.

Now, you know -- so we -- that wasn't the reason that we came up with the 260 and the 390. We were just -- we were trying to capture the board's sentiment that there ought to be some basis and we were trying to have some rational basis for charging, you know, so we just went with the base price of 130, and thought how much -- twice as much for intermediate coasters and three times as much for large coasters.

And it's not even capturing the fact that it's more than three times as long, but, you know, as I said before, we're talking about \$15,000 at most that would be raised by having this obscene increase.



Toll Free: 800.708.8087 Facsimile: 312.673.8138

Suite 1200 311 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606 www.esquiresolutions.com

I don't -- I certainly don't want to go -- I know Mike doesn't -- I don't think anybody, and I don't think any of you, want to go another carnival season with four inspectors. It's not -- you know, I would argue -- I would argue five isn't enough, but -- I remember when I came here I thought, five inspectors for the entire state.

Doug said the same thing. I mean, how many did you have in Tennessee?

MR. RATHBUN: I can tell you, I went to the state fair in Kentucky last week and there were nine inspectors there. And we had one and a half doing our state fair, because one of them had another appointment -- I can't remember, but it was where we were juggling two inspectors on each of the days prior to opening, and that's -- you know, that's just ridiculous.

I mean, that's -- well, we had Bill and I in DuQuoin because Matt had to do something else, had to go do another permit and deal with the electrocution issue, and so it was Bill and I doing 35 rides.

MS. SHANNON: And there were, like, hundreds of thousands of people that went through the state



fair. How many did they estimate?

MR. RATHBUN: I haven't heard this year. I want to say it was 350,000 typically, and then like 150,000 for DuQuoin. Those were the numbers I just remember reading somewhere.

MS. SHANNON: I mean, we -- in order to proceed and get this accomplished in time for the January -- actually, we send out the renewals in October.

MR. RATHBUN: In November.

MS. SHANNON: November, plus we will be moving. We're moving our Springfield office October --

MS. SULLIVAN: To where?

MS. SHANNON: To Springfield, but to south Spring Street, but it's going to be kind of hectic, and Marcia is leading that effort. So we've got to make changes -- we've got to make changes to our ride's program. And it's all manual. I mean, we have a really antiquated system. So at this late date, we're going to be really pushing to get this accomplished if we are ready to go today.

MR. URBIK: What does the staff suggest?

MS. SHANNON: We suggest our proposal that we



1.5

mailed out, which is immediate coasters at 260, instead of the 500, and large coasters, ski lifts and aerial trams at 390, instead of the 1,000.

I -- we hadn't considered Patty's idea.

I don't know, Doug, how easy it would be for the inspectors -- for us to know when we send out their renewal how much we charge them. I mean, how were you seeing that defined? Can you refresh the board's memory?

MS. SULLIVAN: I think I -- I think I suggested six or fewer towers per -- you know -- because we're just talking one lift line at a time. Six or fewer towers per lift, with, I think it was, 50 or fewer chairs for that lift. It would be -- so it would be kind of a -- because lots of them have, like, three towers and 30 chairs. It's -- I mean, the small ones. And then the big ones have, as I said, 12 to 15 towers and like 120 chairs. So they have about three times as many towers and three times as many towers and

So I was thinking that, you know, that we could make an intermediate area just as there's an intermediate and large with the coasters.

To be -- you know, to be fair, one --



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

and I say again, we're not trying to totally fund the agency. The industry was never intended to fund the agency, but we need to give Catherine some room to go to the OMB and say, Look, we're raising fees, I need that extra -- that fifth inspector back, and we have to give her some ammunition.

MR. WRIGHT: If it was a thousand dollars, I would say that, but at 390, I would say it across the board. I wouldn't distinguish it.

MS. SHANNON: I personally just -- I think we're being -- we're complicating things.

MS. SULLIVAN: Okay. It was just --

MS. SHANNON: No, I mean, it was a -- I just worry that --

MS. SULLIVAN: It's an arbitrary number.

MS. SHANNON: Yeah.

MS. SULLIVAN: It is a problem, and I -- you know, I didn't know how else to make it sound -- you know, make it, you know, look fair, and -- but if you think 360 for all -- all lifts.

MS. SHANNON: 390.

MS. SULLIVAN: 390 for all lifts.

MS. SHANNON: That would be our preference --

MR. RATHBUN: I don't think it's out of the



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

question either. I mean, it's still two trips up there. It's still two inspections, whether it's -- you know, I just -- I think it's such a small number of rides it's -- even Senator Sacia said he didn't think that was outrageous.

MS. SHANNON: 300 he didn't think. I think we'll have an easier time getting 390 through.

MS. SULLIVAN: Would you like a motion?

MS. SHANNON: I would love a motion.

MS. SULLIVAN: I would move that we change the intermediate coasters to 260, and the large coasters and the ski lifts to 390, and include the carpet conveyances and the tow ropes at the major ride level.

MS. SHANNON: And the ski lift would include the aerial tram.

MS. SULLIVAN: And aerial trams, yes.

MS. SHANNON: The 390.

MR. URBIK: I second that.

MS. SHANNON: Motion has been made and seconded. Any discussion? Questions?

MR. KIRSCHNER: One question. In changing the rule, do we put it back up for public comments?

MS. SHANNON: No, we've already had the



1 hearing. We think we've satisfied the 2 requirements. 3 So the motion has been made and 4 All those in favor. seconded. 5 (Chorus of ayes.) 6 MS. SHANNON: Opposed? 7 MR. WRIGHT: Opposed. MS. SHANNON: You're opposed? 8 9 MR. WRIGHT: Uh-huh. 10 MS. SHANNON: Well, then -- should we go through the rule? There's four ayes -- I'm an 11 12 aye -- four ayes and one nay. The motion carries. 13 So at this point, is there -- I'd like to pass out -- we just -- just in case we prepared 14 some rules, and I'd like to pass them out to 15 16 everybody. So what this reflects would be what 17 18 Patty's motion just covered and --19 MS. SULLIVAN: Is there an extra for our 20 quest? 21 MS. SHANNON: Yeah, there's extra. 22 There was a question that was brought up 23 by, I think, Ed Meyer from Ski Snowstar. 24 MR. RATHBUN: Right.



MS. SHANNON: Regarding the magic carpet. Not Aladdin's magic carpet. It's like a conveyor belt. It was always our intention that they would be covered as rope tows. So we've now in the fee section 6000.50, No. 7, we have added conveyors and surface lifts along with rope tows, which is what Patty's motion was.

So those would be 25 plus the 105, which would be 130. So they would be at the same level as other amusement rides and attractions.

MR. URBIK: Do we not have to include a definition of what they are?

MS. SHANNON: We did not include a definition of what they are.

MR. URBIK: Shouldn't we do that?

MR. RATHBUN: We've actually talked about that. The B-77, which basically sets the standard, is the standard for all rope tows and ski lifts, gives definition, and it's in the rules by reference, and so those people that are in that industry, they should have the B-77 and already know what the definition is.

MS. SHANNON: We did consider that. We don't have a definition of rope tow either in our rules.



MS. SULLIVAN: But it's -- you can kind of go to Webster's and find something like that, too, and normally you don't put a description in if you can find it in Webster's. So I would think that we wouldn't need to do that.

MR. URBIK: I don't think you would find the surface lifts in Webster's.

MS. SULLIVAN: Well, perhaps not, but -- but --

MR. RATHBUN: It is in the B-77.

MS. SULLIVAN: -- it is in the B-77, and if that's the reference.

MR. RATHBUN: Even a chair lift is a misnomer, to the extent that it is an aerial lift fixed grip, aerial lift detachable grip, but --

MR. URBIK: T bar could be --

MR. RATHBUN: Well, those would be tows. T bars and J bars are different. They are not considered aerial lifts. And it's broken down in the B-77. Each chapter represents one type. The tows are one section, the aerial lifts are another, and that's why I say, those in the industry can break it down already, and it's broken down in the B-77 with definitions.



	MS. SHANNON: Are we linished with that
2	discussion?
3	MS. SULLIVAN: Uh-huh.
4	MS. SHANNON: Okay. So as you can see, the
5	rope tows, conveyors and ski lifts will be at the
6	130 level. The coasters intermediate would be 25
7	plus 235, which is 260, and then the large coasters
8	would be at 25 and 365, which is 390, and then in
9	B, you have the ski lifts, aerial trams, 365 plus
10	the 25, which is 390, and that was really the only
11	changes that we made was just those amounts.
12	So if is there a motion to amend the
13	proposed rule making to reflect the discussion and
14	vote of the board today?
15	MS. SULLIVAN: So moved.
16	MS. SHANNON: Is there a second?
17	MR. KIRSCHNER: Seconded.
18	MS. SHANNON: Motion has been made and
19	seconded. Any discussion, questions?
20	Seeing none, all those in favor say aye.
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	MS. SHANNON: Opposed say nay. Okay. Five
23	voting in the affirmative. The motion carries.
24	And so these will be the rules that we proceed to



1.3

JCAR with. Thank you.

Is there any other business to come before the board?

MR. URBIK: Yeah, I have a question. Our engineering position on the board has been vacant forever.

MS. SHANNON: Right.

MR. URBIK: Would it make sense to change that position to someone from the ski industry, because we do have representation from the amusement side and the carnival side, but we don't have anybody from the ski industry, and that's a valid point. I mean, if we're going to tax them, they should have some say in what we're doing.

MS. SHANNON: And it's my understanding that they did have representation in the past on this board. I would say that that would require a legislative change. We could pursue that, but I don't think we would succeed.

Speaker Madigan had a -- and that engineering lobbyist had -- we at one point had a proposed change to our act regarding the engineer requirement, and it was opposed, and the speaker wouldn't even move it out of the rules committee.



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We could try it, but I don't know that it would succeed, and we have been --

MR. URBIK: That's fine. If they have interest in someone fulfilling the board in that capacity, I have no objection to that, as opposed to a vacant position on the board. And now we're hearing that we have no representation as ski folks. Perhaps we can modify that position to be engineering and/or ski slope people.

MS. SULLIVAN: I would rather -- I would not want to see the engineering position go away.

MR. URBIK: I would like to see it filled.

MS. SULLIVAN: As would I, because I know there have been applicants, and the governor's office is evidently -- is there anything you can do to go --

MR. URBIK: There have been applicants?

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes.

MS. SHANNON: Yes.

MS. SULLIVAN: There have been applicants. The governor's office just has not followed through with any of them.

MS. SHANNON: Unfortunately, there's a lot of vacancies on a number of boards' positions.



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. SULLIVAN: And they're just not doing anything.

MS. SHANNON: Well, I mean --

MR. KIRSCHNER: They're doing other things.

MS. SHANNON: -- part of it they know we have seven members. So it may not be as high on their priority list --

MR. URBIK: Sometimes.

MS. SHANNON: -- but, yeah, we're supposed to. You know, we communicate with them regularly, and, you know, I will certainly raise that with the governor's office. I think that's a good point, and I will raise again the issue of the engineer and how critical it is that we get one, and that maybe they might want to consider somebody representing the ski lift industry or --

MR. URBIK: Or expanding the board by one.

MS. SULLIVAN: Or the next time -- has anybody applied from the ski industry?

MS. SHANNON: Actually, that's a good point. I don't know that they have. We would have to check that out.

MR. URBIK: There's no place for them right now.



MS. SHANNON: But you can apply online.

MS. SULLIVAN: But then every year or two years, part of the positions --

MS. SHANNON: We have expired terms right now --

MS. SULLIVAN: -- roll over.

MR. HAGGERTY: And one vacancy.

MS. SHANNON: And one vacancy, which is the professional engineer. So that can only be a professional engineer. But I will raise that with the governor's office, and so, you know, I guess, we have to clear our legislative proposals through the governor's office, and timing is good because they're right now working on that.

We could look at expanding the board by one. So, you know, and we'll bring it up again -you know, if we get approval, we'll raise it at the
January meeting with Bill and bring you a copy of
the legislative -- I don't know if it would change
the quorum requirements. Sometimes when you have
more board members, it's harder to get a quorum.
It's the only downside.

MR. HAGGERTY: If we had nine board members, though, five would still be a majority of nine. So



1	there wouldn't be a need to change that
2	legislatively.
3	MS. SHANNON: Okay. All right. We will work
4	on that. Good suggestion.
5	Any other business? Does anybody want
6	to have another board meeting before January? We
7	have no plans, I'll let you know that.
8	MR. URBIK: Let's have one more public
9	hearing.
10	MS. SULLIVAN: Well, then you have to come to
11	it.
12	MS. SHANNON: So with that, in the interest of
13	time, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.
14	MR. URBIK: So moved.
15	MR. KIRSCHNER: Second.
16	MS. SHANNON: All those in favor say aye.
17	(Chorus of ayes.)
18	MS. SHANNON: Opposed nay. Thank you. The
19	board meeting is adjourned.
20	(WHICH WERE ALL THE PROCEEDINGS HAD
21	IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED CAUSE ON
22	THIS DATE.)
23	



TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

34

STATE OF ILLINOIS)

COUNTY OF COOK)

I, SHANNON J. SITTERLY, a Certified

I, SHANNON J. SITTERLY, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, CSR No. 84-4369, do hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the proceedings had in the aforesaid matter, and that the foregoing is a true, complete and correct transcript of the proceedings had as appears from my stenographic notes so taken and transcribed under my personal direction.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my hand this 14th day of September 2010.

Shannon J. Sitterly

SHANNON J. SITTERLY, CSR CSR No. 84-4369.



Toll Free: 800.708.8087 Facsimile: 312.673.8138

Suite 1200 311 West Monroe Street Chicago, IL 60606 www.esquiresolutions.com