

1 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

2 STATE OF WASHINGTON

3
4 _____
5
6 ELEVATOR SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

7
8 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

9
10 Tuesday, May 17, 2016
11 _____

12
13 BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Safety Advisory
14 Committee Meeting was held at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May
15 17, 2016, at the Department of Labor & Industries, 12806
Gateway Drive South, Tukwila, Washington.

16 Committee members present were: Robert McNeill,
17 Phillip Scott, Al Sorensen, and Patrick Strafer. The
18 Department of Labor & Industries was represented by Jack
19 Day, Chief Elevator Inspector; and Becky Ernstes, Elevator
20 Technical Specialist.

21 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were held, to
22 wit:

23 Reported by:
24 H. Milton Vance, CCR, CSR
25 (License #2219)

EXCEL COURT REPORTING
16022-17th Avenue Court East
Tacoma, WA 98445-3310
(253) 536-5824

A G E N D A

	May 17, 2016 - Tukwila	Page No.
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	Introductions/Purpose	3
6	Comments Regarding November & February Minutes	4
7	Nominate and Vote for a Vice-Chairman	4, 7
8	Chief's Report	8
9	Scorecard/Accidents	8
10	Maintenance/Testing	9
11	MCP Logs; update, edit by adding or removing	
12	items, creating a new layout	18
13	Old Business	29
14	Existing machine room enclosure and access	
15	to the machine room	29
16	Type "A" Permits and Inspections	6
17	New Business	30
18	ASME A10.4 Inspections and Manpower Training	30
19	Factory Built Conveyances	41
20	Incorrect Installation/Code Design Reset	62
21	Determine the next steps for future agenda	67
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

Introductions/Purpose

MR. McNEILL: Welcome everyone to the Elevator Advisory Committee meeting. A great crowd today. Thank you very much for coming out. There's a lot going on within the state, and we're looking forward to letting you know what's happening and also comments from you.

We'll do introductions first. I'm Rob McNeill. I'm the chairman. And I represent licensed elevator contractors.

Phillip, why don't we start ...

MR. SCOTT: Sure. My name's Phillip Scott. I represent the BOMA organization, Building Owners and Managers Association. And I work for Kemper Development Company.

MR. DAY: My name is Jack Day. I'm the secretary for the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee, and I'm also the Chief Elevator Inspector for the state of Washington.

MR. SORENSEN: Alan Sorensen, City of Seattle chief elevator inspector. I'm representing the city --
(inaudible)

MR. STRAFER: Patrick Strafer, the business manager of Local 19. I'm also on the Safety Advisory Committee

1 for elevator licensing.

2 MS. ERNSTES: Becky Ernstes, elevator technical
3 specialist for L & I.

4 (Introductions made around the room.)

5 MR. McNEILL: Great, thank you.

6

7 Comments Regarding November & February Minutes

8

9 MR. McNEILL: The first item of business is to
10 approve the November and February minutes. We didn't have
11 a quorum last meeting, so we couldn't approve the minutes.
12 Is there a motion or any comments regarding these minutes?

13 MR. DAY: I move to approve.

14 MR. McNEILL: Is there a second?

15 MR. SCOTT: Second.

16 MR. McNEILL: It's been approved and seconded.

17

18 Nominate And Vote for a Vice-Chairman

19

20 MR. McNEILL: The next item of business is to
21 nominate and vote for a vice chairman.

22 One thing I want to mention before that is we do have
23 one vacancy on the committee, and that is for an architect
24 or engineer. That vacancy occurred with the member moving
25 to California. So if there's any interested architects or

1 engineers that you know of that would like to be part of
2 the advisory committee, please let us know.

3 We've been without a vice chair for a while. And I'd
4 like to open up for nominations for vice chair if anyone
5 has any.

6 Jack Day.

7 MR. DAY: I nominate Phillip Scott.

8 MR. McNEILL: I will second that.

9 Are there any other nominations?

10 MR. STRAFER: I'll nominate Jim Norris.

11 MR. DAY: Jim Norris? Did you say Jim Norris?

12 MR. STRAFER: I did.

13 MR. McNEILL: They have to be part of the committee.

14 MR. STRAFER: No problem. All right.

15 MR. SCOTT: But I will second you, Jim.

16 MR. DAY: If we could.

17 MR. NORRIS: And I will nominate Patrick Strafer.

18 MR. SCOTT: I'll second Patrick.

19 MR. McNEILL: So we'll need to vote unless there are
20 other nominations.

21 MR. DAY: I think we should probably do a silent
22 vote. So let's postpone this for a few minutes while I
23 get it ready.

24 MR. McNEILL: Okay, all right. So let's hold tight
25 on that.

1 MR. DAY: Continue.

2

3 Type "A" Permits and Inspections

4

5 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, continue on. We're going to
6 bypass the Chief's report for now until Jack gets back.
7 And I'll talk about old business with Type "A" permits and
8 inspections.

9 So we've had four subcommittee meetings on Type "A"
10 permits and inspections so far. Todd Baker was kind
11 enough to chair the last one while I was out of town.
12 Made really good progress. Have a great team of people
13 that are working on the subcommittee, and you're all
14 welcome to join.

15 What we want to do is we want to define what a Type
16 "A" permit is, develop a process for the Type "A" permit,
17 determine who is eligible for a Type "A" permit, and work
18 through all of the mechanics of how that permit system
19 will work.

20 So far, we have a good definition of what it is.
21 We'll do a little bit of fine tuning of that definition.
22 We are working diligently on eligibility, and that will
23 determine how a company will remain eligible. We're very
24 close to finishing that. And I foresee us having maybe
25 one or two more meetings, then we should be done.

1 We'll be working with L & I for a quick easy
2 checklist for everyone to use to make sure that they've
3 covered all of the requirements that will be necessary for
4 successfully completing a Type "A" permit, minor
5 alteration -- (inaudible). And the intent of doing that
6 is to make everyone successful and make our stakeholders,
7 whether they be owners or elevator companies or elevator
8 mechanics successful and able to turn over elevators
9 safely and quicker than we have been.

10 So the next meeting for that is on May 31st. It's in
11 Tacoma at 9:00 a.m. Please visit the L & I Web site for
12 more information on that. We'll also provide the latest
13 set of notes to the state and post that on the Web site so
14 if you want to see our progress you can see it.

15 Any questions on the L & I -- excuse me -- the Type
16 "A" permits? Good.

17 So we'll move back to the vote for vice chairman. So
18 if you will bear with us for a moment, we will let the
19 members of the committee vote for vice chair.

20 Patrick Strafer and Phillip Scott.

21 (Committee members "silent voting.")

22 MR. DAY: (After collecting up the pieces of paper)
23 Becky, could you add up the winner, just who had the most,
24 not -- don't count them.

25 MS. ERNSTES: It looks like Phillip is our new vice

1 chair.

2 MR. DAY: Thank you.

3 MR. McNEILL: Congratulations, Phillip.

4 MR. SCOTT: Thank you.

5 MR. DAY: We didn't tell him what it meant. We will
6 later. Yes, we will.

7

8 Chief's Report

9 Scorecard/Accidents

10

11 MR. McNEILL: Mr. Day, I'm going to turn over the
12 Chief's Report to you at this time.

13 MR. DAY: Okay. Does everybody have the handout?
14 The first one looks like this (showing).

15 But this is a representation of the annual
16 inspections as compared to what was performed last year.
17 You can see for April of this year, 353 inspections done
18 this year. 679 were done last -- the previous April. It
19 is important to know that the Department is down about 30
20 percent of its total allotted inspectors, which is playing
21 a significant role in the number of annuals. Also playing
22 a role in the number of annuals being performed is the
23 sheer volume of correction per conveyance to include as
24 well the number of new installations. Specifically in
25 that realm there is a large commercial but an even larger

1 residential incline chair inspection process going on.

2 Just the volume on that.

3 So there's a few things that are standing in the way.
4 Personnel, other inspections, and the volume of
5 corrections per annual, which we're going to get into here
6 in a little bit, so I won't dwell on that.

7 The next page is the accident counts per quarter.
8 And the third quarter is incomplete as I am behind
9 processing about 30 accidents. Sorry.

10 MR. McNEILL: So are you saying another data isn't
11 there? Are you seeing an increase in any specific type
12 of accidents?

13 MR. DAY: Probably the increase that stays the same
14 or maybe a little bit higher are escalators. They
15 continue to be our number one problem. However, I do see
16 that elevators are making strides to -- not to be in
17 direct competition with the sheer volume, but they are
18 increasing. And they are starting to increase as we're
19 recognizing the lack of maintenance and safety tests being
20 performed on them.

21

22 Maintenance/Testing

23

24 MR. DAY: Okay, maintenance and testing. So we're
25 about to come close to the end of the resetting of the

1 safety test. To bring us a little bit up to speed with
2 that, in 1/1/2014 there was approved rule to be able to
3 issue a civil penalty when a safety test is not performed
4 within 13 months -- or excuse me -- on its anniversary
5 date plus a 30-day grace period. The civil penalty is
6 \$500 per month past the one-month grace period of a safety
7 test not being performed. This definitely recognizes that
8 a safety test is the last means of being assured that the
9 conveyance itself is safe to operate.

10 We have three companies so far that have turned in
11 their own report indicating how well they're doing with
12 their safety tests. The remaining companies have not
13 abided by that instruction to turn in their Scorecard for
14 how they've done their safety test and are they up to
15 standard today, at least to an 80 percentile range.

16 So one of the things I wanted to open this up,
17 especially with the group up front is do they have advice
18 from the Department on how to treat the situation when
19 they run into a safety test issue not being performed out
20 in the field. We know, for example, that the City of
21 Seattle will send in a process -- or begin a process to
22 red-tag the elevator. We also know right now we have the
23 ability to give a \$500 civil penalty. At the current time
24 it's to give the civil penalty to the owner. And we're
25 interested in how the owner feels about that.

1 And lastly, we're looking for some alternatives. Is
2 there an alternative? And we would -- I would enjoy any
3 conversation from the audience for that particular thing.
4 Do you see an alternative to \$500 per month to get this
5 done, this very important process done?

6 So I'll open it up with those discussions. Hopefully
7 we can take about five, ten minutes, Rob, to discuss this.
8 What to do. What to do now, today.

9 MR. McNEILL: I'll start off. I'm really concerned
10 about the reporting not being complete. We went to the
11 State with the recommendation to give us a year to get
12 caught up, "us" meaning licensed elevator contractors.
13 And they trusted us to do what we need to do to reach the
14 requirements that the code wants us to do. I don't know
15 what the right answer is, what we do to make sure that
16 everyone complies and gets caught up. But I certainly
17 don't want the elevator contractors to lose the trust of
18 the State. And if we don't as a collective group do
19 something quickly, we're going to lose that which would be
20 a shame.

21 So Jack, I think that there needs to be some recourse
22 if the reporting isn't done. I don't know legally what
23 avenues the State would want to take. But every elevator
24 company has a responsibility to maintain the equipment and
25 follow the law so we can keep the units safe for the

1 riding public and the elevator mechanics that work in
2 them.

3 MR. DAY: As well as the inspectors that inspect
4 them.

5 Well, that's what I'm looking for. Advice. The
6 Department and the agency is looking for advice what to do
7 now. Here we are, and we definitely didn't expect to be
8 here this time last year.

9 MR. NIEMAN: So I have some thoughts on this.

10 One is seeking to understand the problem. Why is it
11 that the safety test can't be done? Is there a labor
12 shortage? Is it -- you know, what's overall driving the
13 issue?

14 And second is: From an owner's standpoint -- and I
15 told you this before, Jack -- we are not in a position of
16 being able to force companies to comply with the WAC.

17 We have it written into our contracts. We pay for
18 our contract. And we can talk till we're blue in the face
19 oftentimes, and we don't get the results that we should
20 get. And at the end of the day we're the only ones paying
21 anything, and we're getting fined for lack of compliance
22 when we have zero input at times to get the problem
23 resolved.

24 So I think in terms of the civil fines, they're being
25 levied against the wrong folks. We're doing our part by

1 paying for the contract. We cannot force a contractor to
2 comply as things are structured.

3 So again, I think it comes down to understanding why
4 there's a problem in the first place. And I would like
5 for the contractors in the room to voice their opinion as
6 to why it can't be done. I think everybody agrees they
7 have to be done, and everybody understands the safety
8 issues involved.

9 We're currently going through five-year testing on
10 some of our equipment, and we're having issues for several
11 reasons. One is, you know, the age of the equipment and
12 some issues there that we're trying to overcome. And the
13 other, as you know, is proprietary testing equipment.

14 So again, we're held at bay because we don't have
15 what we need to ensure that the process can be completed.
16 But yet we're the ones that get fined when it doesn't
17 happen. And I don't -- there's an inequity there.

18 MR. McNEILL: Would it be appropriate to have a
19 meeting with the elevator contractors in the state to
20 flush out some of the root causes?

21 My only concern is we might get into an antitrust
22 area with that meeting, and that would be delicate. We'd
23 need to have some representatives there to guide the other
24 contractors with their company so we don't get into the
25 antitrust areas.

1 MR. DAY: I don't know the answer to that question.
2 I don't see an antitrust issue. What I see is a complete
3 separation. Somebody talked about not enough manpower.
4 Yet we can man the construction sites all across the
5 Pacific Northwest. So where the manpower is chosen to be
6 directed, so -- and also Dave had a very important point.
7 And how far can an owner go in forcing the issue? And how
8 much of a civil penalty can L & I issue before the issue
9 is forced? You know, we're playing a game here that's
10 really not getting the job done, you know, with the owner
11 or with the civil penalty. It doesn't appear to be
12 anyway.

13 Jim.

14 MR. NORRIS: I guess I have a question and a comment.
15 My question was: Was the self-reporting, is that for all
16 elevators in the state or strictly those under the state's
17 jurisdiction? And my comment would be --

18 MR. DAY: I don't know what you mean. Did it include
19 Seattle and Spokane?

20 MR. NORRIS: Seattle and Spokane.

21 MR. DAY: It's supposed to?

22 MR. NORRIS: It's supposed to.

23 Because we can't pit the city and the state against
24 each other and have the companies give preferential
25 treatment to the state elevators because they know that

1 the city's not fining the -- do you see where I'm going
2 with that? -- as far as our allocation of manpower. It's
3 got to be even across the board.

4 MR. DAY: You had two, Jim?

5 MR. NORRIS: That was it. That was it.

6 MR. McNEILL: If it's applicable, I think we should
7 have a meeting with all of the contractors. We just --
8 going back to the antitrust, I want to make sure that
9 we're careful that costs, methods and such the companies
10 use aren't brought up, so we'll have to set some
11 guidelines based on our legal counsel.

12 MR. SCOTT: And I would want to be part of that,
13 absolutely, yeah.

14 I can add to the frustration from the BOMA
15 perspective that the lack of control and getting fined for
16 something that we can't control is a frustration for most
17 owners. So I think it's a problem. It would be a really
18 great way to go about it. But finding the root cause
19 makes absolute sense. If we can identify the issue, we
20 can resolve that. But recognize it's a shared
21 responsibility.

22 MR. DAY: Okay. So you want to put a special meeting
23 together in the next 30 days?

24 MR. McNEILL: Yes. Yeah, we will -- if it's
25 acceptable to the committee here, we'll pull together a

1 special meeting with the state. We'll contact the
2 elevator contractors and owners, and stakeholders
3 obviously are welcome so we can determine what barriers
4 exist that are stopping the companies from completing the
5 work.

6 We got plenty of time to work on this to develop a
7 good plan. There's no reason for not getting it done.

8 MR. SCOTT: A great idea.

9 MR. DAY: So the decision there is to convene a
10 special meeting. I want to make sure that the building
11 owners are specifically invited. We want to hear the
12 rationale, the reasons. But more to the point, moving
13 forward, you know, another year of lack of safety tests?

14 And also to add to this, one of the things we're
15 dealing with on that Scorecard report are just the
16 conveyances that are under contract, not the conveyances
17 that are not. So they're equally as important for the
18 safety test.

19 And to echo this quite seriously, the Department
20 needed to be dealing with the people that are refusing to
21 do safety test now, not the people that pay for it now.

22 This is the path. Again, to say it one more time, we
23 didn't expect to be here. Did not expect to be here.

24 Okay. So it's an important meeting. We're going to
25 get some folks together and have it in the next 30 days to

1 figure out what we're going to create and do on or around
2 July the 1st of this year.

3 MR. CLEARY: Is the issue a lack of work -- a lack of
4 workforce to do it or other priorities on the safety test
5 getting done? Because to me it's unclear. As a merit
6 shop, you know, there's -- I don't understand if you have
7 a contract why work isn't getting done in a timely manner.
8 I mean, it's part of the -- this is part of your contract.
9 So is there just not enough workforce in the state? It's
10 not clear to me --

11 MR. SCOTT: That's part of this discovery I think
12 that we will go through in this meeting is to really
13 answer those questions I believe.

14 MR. McNEILL: And one issue is if they haven't
15 reported, we don't really know where they are. Maybe they
16 are in great shape, but they're not reporting. Maybe
17 they're not -- we need to get to the bottom of it quickly.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We've been talking about this for
19 a long time. We keep kicking that can down the road. We
20 need to put it to rest.

21 MR. DAY: Yeah, I don't want to keep kicking a dead
22 horse here, but yeah, this was supposed to be the last
23 time kicking the can. Your point is taken.

24 MR. McNEILL: Any other comments on the safety
25 tests?

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Rob, I will say this. I mean, I
2 have gone out myself and looked at the union Web site,
3 looked at membership, and when you look at the number of
4 buildings that are coming out of the ground, obviously a
5 good portion of the labor force is dealing with that. But
6 more importantly, we're adding a huge number of
7 conveyances to a system that's already dwindling in
8 membership over the years. And if I'm misstating that,
9 somebody tell me. But I think the elevator union's
10 suffering from the same trade issues that many companies
11 are suffering from, and that's finding qualified people to
12 do the work, much like the state's having with inspectors.

13 So I -- I don't want to come across as saying it's a,
14 you know, contractor issue. I think it's everybody's
15 issue. But I think -- I clearly think that finding out
16 what the real issue is is going to lead to the solution
17 that's going to work or at least an understanding of why
18 we can't accomplish what we need to accomplish.

19 MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

20 Jack, you got a ...

21

22 MCP Logs; Update, Edit by Adding or Removing Items,
23 Creating a New Layout

24

25 MR. DAY: The next one, really quick. MCP logs.

1 Update, edit by adding or removing items, create a new
2 layout.

3 This has been on the advisory agenda for at least the
4 last three. And what I'm interested in in doing this is
5 available time. So for me, I'd volunteer my time, but it
6 keeps getting stolen away from me.

7 So I have an interest in is there anybody in the
8 audience or in the group up front here that's interested
9 in this, in pursuing this project, MCP logs, updating the
10 logs for the workgroup?

11 Go ahead.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A question. I thought the last
13 time we got together we all signed up on a piece of paper
14 the parties that were interested in that.

15 MR. DAY: Uh-huh. So who's wanting to chair it
16 basically?

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The chair?

18 MR. DAY: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Would it have to be one of the
20 five up there?

21 MR. DAY: It would be better if it is, but if it's
22 not, then no.

23 MR. McNEILL: I was willing to chair it. When we had
24 the last meeting, I mentioned that I wanted to get the
25 Type A permits complete first so I'm not overly leveraged.

1 We're making really good progress on that. We'll
2 probably be done with that in June.

3 And so if there is somebody else, I'd love to have
4 them do it, and I'll help. But --

5 MR. WHEELER: Is the objective to create a standard
6 MCP layout, a log or -- I'm not sure what the objective is
7 on this.

8 MR. DAY: The objective is -- we've been doing this
9 maintenance control program since 2007. So many, many
10 years. And unfortunately the beginning of every year
11 since then, since that period of time, we've had to assign
12 our technical staff and myself to review MCP logs that
13 were sometimes a little missing the mark and sometimes a
14 lot missing the mark.

15 We still have logs today where the individual who's
16 doing the fireman service initiation division test can't
17 do it. There's no place to log it. Today what, we're in
18 May. We're in May.

19 So we still struggle with the ability or capabilities
20 of companies to produce a code compliant log that matches
21 or comes to close to matching what's on the Web site
22 without having to assign elevator personnel to sit down
23 and babysit and hand-walk elevator companies through the
24 MCP log process.

25 So the intent here is on both sides for an owner to

1 have a log and be able to put a log on the site January,
2 say, 15th, somewhere around there, that their alarm
3 company and they can use and that the owners and the
4 elevators companies and mechanics and the inspectors could
5 inspect line 3 on every single one to be the same if we're
6 talking about a traction elevator. So it's not a
7 different log, finding the task in a different place, or
8 not finding the task at all, and then having to assign our
9 workforce to fix logs.

10 So I'd like to do this one more time. But this would
11 be it. This is the log.

12 So yes. And I still do want to be part of it; I just
13 can't chair it. I can't be there and run it day in, you
14 know, time after time. So we have volunteers that want to
15 participate, but I'm looking for somebody that wants to
16 chair.

17 MR. McNEILL: I'm still willing to do it. I think we
18 could tentatively set it up for the first meeting on June
19 28th contingent on the Type A permits going well in the
20 next two sessions, then we should be at a point where we
21 can move on from that.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So I was going to volunteer my
23 time as long as I can get Rob to help me when he's free.

24 The other thing is I personally would advocate that
25 we go to an electronic system for the purpose of

1 management. I'll speak from my own experience. When you
2 have one key person that's managing a portfolio, and the
3 MCP logs are disbursed in the elevator machine rooms, and
4 the only way I can use it was to get up from the desk and
5 travel sometimes blocks to get to them is very, very
6 cumbersome, to say the least. Whereas if there's an
7 electronic filing system of some sort, everybody has
8 access to them from wherever they are as long as they have
9 access to the Web.

10 So I don't know what we have to do in order to get
11 there. If there has to be a WAC change or some other
12 change which obviously extends the life cycle of this
13 project quite a bit. But pen and paper in the machine
14 room locked away behind closed doors is very ineffectual
15 from an owner's standpoint.

16 MR. McNEILL: So let's plan on starting June 28th.
17 And at that time just to make it clear, we'll define what
18 we want to accomplish. I believe there'll be some
19 push-back from licensed elevator contractors on the form
20 and what they want and what they don't want. But the
21 subcommittee is the place to work out all of those
22 details. So we can through that subcommittee at that time
23 determine what we want to accomplish, how we want to
24 accomplish it, how we can streamline things, and how it
25 can work better for everyone.

1 So everyone who had signed up before, we'll contact
2 you. And if you want to sign up, please contact us before
3 the meeting -- at the end of the meeting.

4 Jack.

5 MR. DAY: Dave, would it be possible for you to put a
6 little charter together, what's the goals. You said
7 electronic standardization. Just a short little chart so
8 that it's followed.

9 Also, as a recommendation by me, in regards to
10 electronic, I would imagine that if we do not define and
11 outline and specifically say this is the electronic
12 method, period, that we're going to end up with something
13 similar or worse than what we have now. So the interest
14 of this would be a standard electronic method, period, not
15 30 different electronic methods. Because we already have
16 that.

17 MR. SORENSEN: Jack, the other issue with electronic
18 is the building -- those records belong to the building
19 owner. It's the elevator company. So the electronic
20 device for storing those has to be provided and
21 maintained by the building owner, not by the elevator
22 companies so that the building owner has control over it
23 and no one can go in there and change anything or alter
24 anything once an entry's made in there.

25 We've been talking about this in the city of Seattle

1 how we file electronic records in general, and it would be
2 maintained and done by the building owner. They're
3 responsible for it. You can have access to it. Nobody's
4 going to be -- you can only make changes when you're in
5 the machine room on the computer terminal. You can't make
6 them remotely. And once the entry's made, it's there in
7 PDF. It cannot be changed. If you scratch it, you can
8 scratch -- (inaudible).

9 But that's the big rub. How are we going to get all
10 the building owners to go along with the extra cost of
11 putting in a special system in for monitoring the
12 elevators.

13 MR. McNEILL: Thanks, Al.

14 MR. WILSON: Would -- my question is: If going
15 through this process with the City of Seattle, take this
16 -- I know that you guys are in the process of going
17 through a new writing a chapter 30. And would this format
18 be acceptable to you guys as well? So we'd have just one
19 format goes through the whole state rather than having one
20 for the city of Seattle, one for the city of Spokane and
21 one for the state.

22 MR. SORENSEN: You mean an actual layout of the MCP
23 format?

24 MR. WILSON: Yeah.

25 MR. SORENSEN: Yeah. I mean, we get a common title

1 page, a front page. You've got your elevator company name
2 on it. You've got the building name on there. It's got
3 the site name, site address and what elevators it covers.
4 That would be page 1.

5 I'd like to make a suggestion on that. Simply have
6 an A17.2 has some fairly comprehensive checklists on
7 elevators. The format they use in A17.2 for those
8 checklists is -- let's say they start at the machine room,
9 section 1; pit, section 2; inside hoistway, section 3;
10 outside, section 4. Just arrange all the sections in the
11 same order as the acceptance inspection check sheets are
12 in A17.2. So most of the work's done for us there.

13 And whatever proprietary information each elevator
14 company has for their equipment can go in different
15 sections. But when anybody goes out there and looks at
16 section 1, they know that they're going to be looking at
17 the machine room. Section 3, they're going to be looking
18 at stuff outside the hoistway or inside the hoistway. So
19 that makes it that much simpler.

20 Now, we can't go into each individual section and
21 actually list those. I'm not sure how we can do that
22 because each elevator company has their own proprietary
23 test dates and that type thing. But we can specify it has
24 a place for the date and test and the signature. If we
25 need more room than that, we'll -- (inaudible)

1 MR. WILSON: So that's where the contractors in the
2 room is going to help out. Obviously I don't have any
3 idea on any specific piece of equipment that they have
4 special compartments for, what those would be. But I do
5 know that there's been a huge frustration with the lack of
6 consistency and how the forms are laid out.

7 If you've got multiple contractors on the site, then
8 you -- you know, at one time we had three, we would have
9 three different MCP's and every one of them's different.
10 And as an owner trying to manage and understand what's
11 going on in your portfolio, it becomes very cumbersome.
12 Not to mention from a, you know, state standpoint of
13 having to do inspections and every time you're looking at
14 an MCP it's different than when they looked at the last
15 time.

16 So to the point that we can get some consistency and
17 clarity of how things are laid out, I agree 100 percent
18 with your comments. If there's something out there
19 already that everybody's familiar with, then let's try to
20 follow that.

21 MR. McNEILL: Good.

22 Yes.

23 MS. ERNSTES: Is that committee going to look at --
24 also we talked about how often certain things have to be
25 done so that we're more standardized across the board

1 about one company does it every five years, and another
2 company does it every year.

3 8.11 items are every year. But there's a huge
4 discrepancy about items being done at certain times, and
5 it's not necessarily based currently on the vintage or the
6 criteria in 8.6. The company said, okay, we're just going
7 to do this task every five years. So ...

8 MR. McNEILL: At this point everything's open.
9 Everything's on the table. If we're going to do it, we
10 might as well do it right.

11 MR. DAY: Becky, can you make a note of that
12 interval? The frequencies?

13 MR. McNEILL: I think this will be a great
14 subcommittee, and there will be a lot of feedback from all
15 the stakeholders and we can develop something that's
16 simpler and work better for everyone.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I will say just working on
18 the Class "A" permits, it's been -- personally it's been
19 rather rewarding for me to sit in those discussions and
20 see the process that takes place.

21 For any of you that are interested in joining this
22 endeavor, I wholeheartedly suggest you -- (inaudible) --
23 because you'll walk away with a better appreciation of
24 what it takes to actually get things done at the state
25 level and other levels.

1 And just -- you know, the biggest complaint
2 oftentimes is people don't feel like they have a voice.
3 So this is your opportunity to get in the room and
4 actually air out what needs to take place.

5 Personally I'm looking forward to it. And hopefully
6 we get a whole host of people in there.

7 MR. McNEILL: I think we'll have a good crowd. Good.
8 Jack, I'll turn it back over to you.

9 MR. DAY: Hold on. We've got --

10 MR. McNEILL: Oh, I'm sorry.

11 MR. WHITEHEAD: One of the things that I'm seeing or
12 we're seeing in our construction MCP logs is that the
13 company that we have, they're marking like in month when
14 the work is supposed to be accomplished, and they're
15 graying the boxes in their logs, which is great, but then
16 not all of the tasks are really reported to be done. So
17 we're seeing initials and sign-offs on some of the boxes
18 and others are N/A. And the question I have back to them
19 is why is that? What's the -- so what I guess I'm saying
20 is that I would like to see better accuracy within those
21 logs so that it's not just a blanket all the boxes are
22 checked and they're doing some. Because the explanation I
23 got back is well, those aren't required at that particular
24 point in time. So if they're not required, why are they
25 being, you know, being grayed in to be accomplished, you

1 know.

2 MR. McNEILL: Thank you.

3 MR. DAY: Jeff, could you get a little bit more with
4 Dave and explain that in more detail to him?

5 MR. WHITEHEAD: Yeah. Be happy to.

6 MR. DAY: Thank you.

7 MR. McNEILL: If there's no other comments on this,
8 we'll move on. If there are, we'll simply stay on it;
9 it's important.

10

11 Old Business

12

13 Existing Machine Room Enclosure and Access to the
14 Machine Room

15

16 MR. DAY: Let's see. Old business. The first one,
17 existing machine room enclosure and access to the machine
18 room space. See Means of Access Analysis 2014-006.

19 The means of access analysis was on the last
20 advisory. I don't know if you have that note, that
21 analysis with you. But where it sits at the moment is
22 Rob, Mr. Phillip Scott, Mr. Rolf who's not here today, and
23 Mr. Wright. We would like or what we need is your okay
24 with this analysis so that we can move it into a product
25 that would be part of the next WAC rule change. But you

1 need to look at what it is. Because the intent here is if
2 there isn't safe and convenient access to an elevator
3 machine room inside the building space, this is a minimum
4 requirement. So if the machine room access is up the fire
5 escape at the top window to a 12-to-1 incline tile roof to
6 climb up that to a penthouse in the winter time, it is not
7 safe and convenient. And not only are elevator companies'
8 personnel put at risk, so are your personnel and so is
9 ours.

10 So what this is is a means to do this -- and when
11 Keith Becker was a former member of the advisory, when
12 Keith Becker put this together, as a building owner
13 himself, he took that into account. But we need to make
14 sure you all are okay with it before we want to move it
15 forward.

16 MR. SCOTT: You'll have to let me review it, and I'll
17 respond within this week.

18 MR. DAY: Oh, absolutely.

19 Okay, that's all I have for that.

20 MR. McNEILL: I went over the Type "A" permits, so we
21 can go to new business.

22

23

New Business

24

ASME A10.4 Inspections and Manpower Training

25

1 MR. McNEILL: The first new business is the ASME
2 A10.4 inspections and manpower training.

3 MR. DAY: Okay. Matt was going to do ASME A10.4
4 inspections and manpower training. However, Matt was
5 called away. As you might have noticed, his company was
6 involved in a death on their job site two days ago. So
7 he's not able to participate today. He does apologize and
8 hopes everybody understands.

9 So in light of that, I'll make a stab -- I'm take a
10 stab at this.

11 Okay. If you're looking at page 3 -- has folks had
12 an opportunity to review page 3 under Matt's name? By the
13 silence I'm going to say that you all have.

14 Okay. The first item on the agenda was availability
15 of inspectors.

16 There have been cases where we need to wait up to
17 three weeks.

18 I asked Matt -- obviously he didn't have time, but I
19 asked Matt to give any specific issues or instances of
20 this recently, and he was not able to respond.

21 I did ask Mr. Metcalfe who's my supervisor in the
22 King County and north area to reach out and see if there's
23 been a three-week waiting period.

24 And Rich, you put some figures together. Would you
25 please share them with the audience?

1 MR. METCALFE: Well, our normal turn-around time is
2 about a week. And we did have a couple cases this month
3 where we're down four FTE's. And we had a couple of staff
4 out sick. So we had to scramble around and find available
5 inspectors which caused a couple of delays there of maybe
6 ten days. But our normal time is a week. So a three week
7 would be an anomaly for the most part; a three-week wait.

8 MR. DAY: Okay. So for our experience there probably
9 is some three weeks out there somewhere, but it doesn't
10 seem average. Does anybody have contrary or contradicting
11 value to that? Pat?

12 MR. BLAKELY: Yeah, we're told -- we're doing
13 elevator modernizations and -- (inaudible)

14 MR. DAY: I'm sorry? Elevator modernization?

15 MR. BLAKELY: Yeah. And so we've been told it's a
16 three-week window in order to get that --

17 MR. DAY: You're talking about -- I'm sorry? I need
18 to understand what you're talking about. You're talking
19 about an elevator that is a passenger-type situation?

20 MR. BLAKELY: Right. But what we're doing is --

21 MR. DAY: These are --

22 MR. BLAKELY: -- (inaudible) -- total elevator
23 modernization for controls, cars, everything. So we've
24 been told it's going to take at least three weeks.

25 MR. DAY: Okay. Thank you.

1 So at the moment we're dealing with A10.4 which is
2 temporary personnel hoists, the hoists that are on the
3 outside of the building that are up there temporarily.
4 But we can get to that in a little bit.

5 I see some folks that are in this business out in the
6 audience. Do you have a difference experience?

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So for the most part, Jack, we
8 haven't had any issues with the inspectors. We deal
9 directly with Tim Stohlmeier (phonetic), Pat Kelly, and
10 they're both very eager to work with us and accommodate
11 our needs.

12 MR. DAY: Okay. Thank you.

13 If there is anything, please send us an e-mail,
14 communicate to us in some fashion. Okay? It's not our
15 intent for folks to wait three weeks for a temporary
16 personnel hoist.

17 Number two, rules appear to be inconsistent regarding
18 the applicants for licensure. When you read down through
19 this, one of the notes -- now, I want everybody to know
20 that Matt received this one from one of his stakeholders,
21 not him. Somebody sent this to him. So he's responding
22 to something somebody told him.

23 There doesn't seem to be clarity around what is
24 required at the time. So a majority of the licenses are
25 being provided to those based purely on time in the

1 industry. Should there be a different requirement for
2 temporary construction hoists?

3 I've communicated to Matt, and I don't know that he's
4 communicated to the individual or that particular
5 industry, but yes, there is a criteria for them.

6 Pat, not to put you guys on the spot, but you're
7 familiar with the education policy?

8 "PAT": Correct. Yes, I've been dealing with Becky
9 on the -- we're trying to submit ...

10 MR. DAY: So not to put anybody else on the spot, at
11 this point -- and I haven't heard any different, except
12 for this -- that the Department goes about this process in
13 any different way than following the education policy.
14 People have to have a certain number of educational hours
15 in specific subjects, and it must be documented, and they
16 must have three years of OJT to go along with it.

17 So if there is evidence to the contrary, we'd
18 certainly like to see it. But is there an issue -- does
19 anybody believe there's an issue with the education policy
20 surrounding temporary construction hoist mechanics?

21 If you do believe there is, not to put you on the
22 spot, send me your comments, and then we'll address it
23 through a different channel. Or -- and send them to Matt
24 as well if you wouldn't mind. His e-mail is on our Web
25 page under Elevator Advisory Committee.

1 MR. McNEILL: Jack, would you share what the
2 requirements are for an individual to maintain these units
3 just so everyone in the audience as well as the advisory
4 committee has a clear understanding?

5 MR. DAY: I would. I would love to share that.
6 That's item number 3 on this particular set of paragraphs.

7 We need everyone to be on the same page with
8 maintenance items in A10.4 and mechanic license
9 requirements.

10 When you turn to WAC 296-96-00910, it outlines the
11 criteria that a mechanic must have in order to -- or what
12 must be done in order to do this kind of work. And it
13 talks about installation, alteration, maintenance.
14 Maintenance.

15 So what that's saying, and why I'm quoting
16 maintenance is because in the past there's been a problem
17 with folks understanding that a licensed elevator mechanic
18 is the person that's supposed to be doing maintenance as
19 we define it -- or as it's defined in these two standards
20 that are adopted.

21 The one standard, A10.4, the maintenance chapter is
22 chapter 27 on page 69. That talks about what maintenance
23 has to be. Okay? I won't read that here, but maintenance
24 is to be done by a licensed elevator mechanic, okay? per
25 WAC 296-96-00910.

1 This other one is for material hoists. It's A10.5.

2 And in chapter 23 on page 25, it outlines maintenance.

3 So what had happened in the past -- and this has been
4 a year and a half ago -- is where folks would leave the
5 maintenance up to the general contractor on site. The
6 general contractor might have went down to the local --
7 pick up my local laborer to help with the job site and
8 assign that person maintenance. No.

9 So I do believe that is pretty clear today that the
10 maintenance is to be done by Okay? There's supposed
11 to be a log of it. When you read this, there's supposed
12 to be a log of it. There's a check sheet in both of
13 these. We didn't need to create one; it's in there.
14 Okay? It's right in there.

15 So inspectors. The Tim Stohlmeier and the Pat Kelly
16 on a jump inspection should be looking for that when
17 they're out doing a jump to see who's been doing the
18 maintenance, if anybody. And there is -- on some of this
19 is daily maintenance required, weekly and monthly.

20 So now comes the question that we had earlier. Is
21 there enough licensed elevator mechanics to do that? No,
22 there isn't.

23 So that becomes another discussion. Who's going to
24 do the maintenance? Same thing. The same thing as we
25 were talking about earlier.

1 MR. McNEILL: A question. Is there a special license
2 if they haven't gone through and become a union elevator
3 mechanic or a non-union elevator mechanic? Is there a
4 license that only allows them to do certain tasks on these
5 lifts?

6 MR. DAY: Not certain tasks, but only these lifts.

7 MR. McNEILL: A limited license?

8 MR. DAY: A limited license category 4.

9 MR. McNEILL: So there is.

10 MR. DAY: It's a limited license.

11 MR. McNEILL: Okay.

12 MR. DAY: It's not bound by union or non-union to us
13 in any way.

14 MS. ERNSTES: And that's why the education policy
15 reflects that there are less criteria. It's not the same
16 as a category full mechanic license. There are less hours
17 of classroom depending on which category of licensing
18 you're in.

19 MR. DAY: I'll run down through it really quick to
20 see the difference.

21 This is the education policy (showing). You can
22 print it out from our Web page. It says "Education
23 Policy" on the top.

24 It talks about the hours. For category number 4
25 needs documented 1,800 work hours per year for three

1 years.

2 The next thing it goes into after that is it talks
3 about book learning. Actually textbooks. And on a
4 category 4 they'll need a total of 270 documented hours
5 for book work. 8 percent of that or 22 hours will be
6 basic safety, rigging and hoisting. 13 percent of that or
7 35 hours will be basic introduction to maintenance
8 practices. 15 percent of that or 40 hours will be
9 electrical theory, electronic -- or electrical operation.
10 15 percent or 40 hours will be electrical wiring,
11 equipment, installation and maintenance of wiring. Sorry
12 about the redundancy. 7 percent or 19 hours will be
13 conveyance safety tests, whether they know how to do a
14 safety test correctly. 9 percent or 24 hours will be
15 suspension maintenance and testing. 10 percent,
16 installation of pit rails, machine rooms, hoistways, pit
17 structures. 5 percent or 14 hours, hydraulic theory.

18 And this keeps going on, and I'm sure I'm boring the
19 group. However, this is very specific to that type of
20 work.

21 Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Is there a specific requirement,
23 Jack, for the documentation of the education?

24 MR. DAY: Obtaining recommended education credit
25 hours is outlined in this paragraph right here (showing)

1 on the front page.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: When I submit an application in,
3 is there a specific requirement that the State is looking
4 for to document -- for me to prove those hours of
5 education?

6 MR. DAY: Anybody that doesn't go through a
7 nationally approved education program such as the elevator
8 union has or CET or CAT -- these are nationally approved
9 education programs. If you go through it a different
10 path, then you must be able to show proof that you've done
11 it.

12 It's -- you sent them to community college. They
13 graduated that course. You should have that.

14 But what we also look -- and this is the different
15 ways on this page. But what we specifically and
16 additionally look for is that you put your program
17 together so that it mirrors this, how this is laid out.
18 That way we understand it.

19 Consider it the same way as an MCP. If you
20 hodgepodge the thing together, if you put things in
21 different order, then nobody's going to be able to figure
22 out what you got going on including us. So we ask that
23 you follow the same profile as what this is (showing) so
24 that it's one thing right after another all put together.

25 If anybody needs a little bit of education on that,

1 please drop us a note; we'd be glad to go through that
2 with you.

3 MS. ERNSTES: It's -- actually this is the form that
4 I request be turned in. It's not a request. It's -- I
5 require this form to be turned in in this format for every
6 person who applies both for a temporary license and any
7 category license who has not given me a certificate they
8 went through a national program. So it's not based on
9 time alone; it's based on you have to meet these minimum
10 education. In fact, I've returned many applications
11 because I get something that says we have all the time and
12 we have all the education, but they have no document
13 showing hours or classes. So every person -- in fact, I'm
14 the only person that's been doing licensing since we
15 started licensing that I -- so it's all the same for
16 everybody.

17 MR. DAY: If you got more questions, give us a call.

18 MR. McNEILL: So it appears that the State already
19 has all the material to ensure that people that aren't in
20 the union or non-union can obtain a license, and you have
21 a process to make sure that these manlifts are safe and
22 being inspected and maintained; is that correct?

23 MR. DAY: We believe we have a process. What we
24 would like to hear from the organizations out there if
25 they -- and we haven't heard anything to the contractor

1 that there's an issue.

2 This paragraph -- Matt received this paragraph, so it
3 merited being discussed here. But we do need people to
4 step up or say there's an issue with it. And I don't know
5 -- some of these folks come from different -- a different
6 union than the elevator constructors as their issue there;
7 I don't know. So it would be fair for Matt; we could
8 leave this until we get more info. But it appears that --
9 (inaudible).

10 So I think right now the issue for us is the manpower
11 to do the maintenance since the maintenance needs to be
12 done by a licensed elevator mechanic because that's what
13 the rules say today. That's what I've heard the issue
14 being from somebody in the audience.

15

16 Factory Built Conveyances

17

18 MR. McNEILL: Well, let's move on to the next topic
19 then. Factory-built conveyances.

20 MR. DAY: Before we do, Pat, can you get with Matt
21 please and go down a discovery for the next meeting?

22 "PAT": (Nodding affirmatively.)

23 MR. DAY: Thank you.

24 MR. McNEILL: Pat, was this one yours?

25 MR. DAY: Al, could you start that while I make a

1 note?

2 MR. SORENSEN: We had three factory-built conveyances
3 show up in Seattle, Swedish Hospital. They're completely
4 modular elevators and hoistways built, the elevators. The
5 rails are in there. The elevator's inside the hoistway.
6 The machine room's -- (inaudible) -- by the way. The
7 machine room's on the top. Everything's -- (inaudible).
8 They're shipped sideways and sent out here.

9 Now, the state has some prerequisite regarding
10 modular structures and the inspection's required prior to
11 shipping. Apparently these were not inspected prior to
12 shipping. So we have a little issue with that.

13 The State has been out inspecting them. But I don't
14 believe that they've got back yet as to what they're going
15 to do for a fix.

16 MR. DAY: To be clear, the State out inspecting it
17 has been Factory Assembled Structures, FAS. Factory
18 Assembled Structures -- because that's what this is, a
19 factory assembled structure -- inspects according to the
20 building code and electric code. So they were looking at
21 the building code aspects and the electrical code aspects
22 of this installation. And currently I do believe they
23 made them remove the drywall because it wasn't building
24 code compliant. And I don't know the state of it at this
25 current time of the building -- of the FAS.

1 One of the things I do know that was supposed to
2 happen is Factory Assembled Structures requires an
3 inspection at the construction site where it's being put
4 together. And that didn't happen, so there was a special
5 inspection.

6 If I'm making a mistake here, there's a couple people
7 in the audience that may know more than I do about it, and
8 they can raise their hand and fill in the blanks.

9 So right now, you have --

10 MR. ERLICH: Matt Erlich, public affairs, L & I. So
11 part of what I do also involves FAS.

12 I've spoken to a planning supervisor in that program
13 who said FAS is waiting for the developer to come back
14 with a plan regarding what exactly they're going to do,
15 and the issue involves firewall safety. Apparently it
16 didn't meet code.

17 So that's one of the issues that I'm aware of. So
18 it's not the State trying to put something together. It's
19 apparently the developer trying to put something together
20 to meet code.

21 MR. McNEILL: Thanks, Matt.

22 MR. ERLICH: You're welcome.

23 MR. McNEILL: So how does the elevator L & I agency
24 mesh with the FAS to ensure that these units are complying
25 with all the WAC and ANSI requirements for elevators?

1 MR. DAY: That's really what we're here to discuss.
2 That's exactly what we're here -- at the current FAS, a
3 new product coming into us and to FAS, what do we do about
4 it? That's why it's on the docket.

5 First and foremost, what we would normally do is
6 issue you a permit, and your company would put it together
7 out in the field as a general rule, and then we call for
8 an inspection, and we run it through ASME criteria in
9 8.10. Does it pass.

10 So that would be the status. However, as most of you
11 know, you got a new product, there's some preliminary work
12 up front that we want to see. We want to see you got
13 documentation of one thing or another including a plan
14 review with reaction points and everything all about this.

15 So all of this now for this product is happening
16 without us knowing. We don't know what the reaction is.
17 We don't know where it's going until such a time as
18 somebody let's us in on it's going into Swedish Hospital,
19 and there it is on the truck with a crane. And it hasn't
20 been vetted at all.

21 So our concern is some vetting. It sounds like it
22 may be or it could be some MRL product. May or may not
23 be. Hydraulic. We know there was a traction one that
24 went into Spokane some years ago. Again, that wasn't
25 vetted through us either, through the State of Washington.

1 So there's some unknown things. And when we find
2 that -- Factory Assembled Structure found simple things
3 like their fire-rating hoistway assembly, and they didn't
4 meet that. What are we going to find, you know, when we
5 -- when either I or Al get in on this project in the
6 future?

7 And what it really matters is to the building owner
8 -- the building owners over here when they don't get their
9 elevator or their building at the time that they expected
10 to get it. Because it's still got to be vetted through
11 the process.

12 Before I continue on, I did want to give Patrick the
13 opportunity to speak as well, if you would like to speak.

14 MR. STRAFER: Yep, sure. I mean, obviously I have
15 major safety concerns for it.

16 We were invited -- you guys were invited to go to
17 Illinois, Mount Vernon, where they were manufactured. Why
18 did they fly them in? Why did they cross state lines?
19 When you issue permits, permitting -- or allow before
20 permits such as staging. What do you guys consider
21 staging? Taking them off the truck and putting them in
22 the hoistways, you know, even though it's a -- what's
23 staging? To me, staging is dropping them off the truck.

24 I think all the companies out there want to know if
25 they're getting theirs to pull permits for like for like

1 -- (inaudible).

2 MR. SORENSEN: First of all, the elevator company had
3 their permits. They submitted a permit for it. I am
4 about two weeks behind processing. Some of those would
5 have been processed before I even knew about what was
6 going on.

7 MR. STRAFER: Even if you weren't a part of the
8 inspection that you were supposed to be? I thought you
9 guys were supposed to go to Illinois?

10 MR. SORENSEN: I wasn't. I never knew anything about
11 that or heard anything about that.

12 MR. STRAFER: It was a part of the November meetings
13 -- I mean --

14 MR. DAY: So I do want to be careful and not throw
15 around blames at this time. Because what we're here to do
16 is solve the problem.

17 MR. STRAFER: Right.

18 MR. DAY: But to answer your question, who would have
19 been supposed to go. Would it be Factory Assembled
20 Structure to the factory because that's what they do.

21 MR. STRAFER: It would have been to check like the
22 welds or their rupture valves on there. I'm just curious.
23 Obviously they're red-tagged I'm sure because the
24 hoistways aren't good.

25 MR. SORENSEN: What they basically did is they stood

1 the hoistways up and they basically preliminarily welded
2 to a couple anchor points.

3 The State also found a couple of the weld points or
4 anchor points that didn't look right. So -- correct, so
5 they're working on that.

6 Now, there still hasn't been any power run up there.
7 We had limited access to look at the elevators. The
8 elevator is secured with blocks and bolted inside the
9 hoistway, completely assembled cabs and everything. So we
10 haven't really been able to get in the pit and really look
11 around like we should to see what's there. We did get a
12 preliminary look at the machine from upstairs. We did
13 have access to -- (inaudible). It's typical. It looks
14 like off-the-shelf elevator equipment. I don't know where
15 they have it.

16 But the one thing I believe we need to do is we need
17 to ask for a complete new equipment approval package on
18 the whole thing, not only the hoistway but also the
19 elevator components. And they have to show us that they
20 are not only ASME -- they meet ASME code but UL codes and
21 all the other -- local building codes.

22 Now, if they're going to ship these around the
23 country, they're going to have to pay attention to local
24 building codes as far as hoistway construction codes as
25 well as different state codes. So there's a lot to look

1 at before we approve any more of these.

2 Going forward with these, they haven't even got power
3 up to the machine room yet where they can do anything. So
4 they're just sitting there basically.

5 MR. McNEILL: So you gentlemen, the State and
6 Seattle, you're going to have to vet out the product,
7 right, see if it's CSA listed, if there's listed
8 equipment, UL label and label the equipment in it and code
9 compliant before we move on and interface with FAS? Or
10 what's going to be the step?

11 MR. DAY: FAS has to be completed first. They have
12 to be done. Because right now there isn't even any power
13 in the building -- or to the elevators. So it's not
14 running.

15 What do we have to do? Let's -- this is what I want
16 to talk about with everybody before I decide what we have
17 to do. There's a lot of brilliant people in this
18 audience, and what I'm looking for is the opinion
19 regarding the expected criteria when a contractor orders
20 an already assembled elevator, escalator or any other
21 conveyance for that matter. Because this isn't the only
22 conveyance that has arrived in Washington already built,
23 put together.

24 This is one -- this is a elevator for passengers
25 that's arrived in Washington already built. But I'm

1 looking in the audience, and I can name several others off
2 the top of my head that arrived in Washington built.

3 And what's the criteria for those?

4 Some of the criteria -- now, this is in A17.1 or
5 A18.1 or in other standards, there's criteria for those
6 things that are hidden and done behind. They meet a
7 standard already in existence. Become certified by a
8 certified organization that goes into the factory and
9 says, "Oh, yeah, that one's done right" and they put their
10 stamp of approval on it. And it comes to us with a
11 sticker applied. It may be a sticker that says this is
12 ASME A17.5 code compliant.

13 So this happens a lot more than we think, even to
14 escalators, those of you that's put escalators in here
15 lately in the last ten years. They're coming put
16 together.

17 So an elevator coming put together, is that -- is
18 there something on an elevator that somebody could hide
19 from us through the acceptance process? A ten point -- A
20 ten -- A point 10 I mean inspection process. What do you
21 guys think?

22 MR. McNEILL: I'll start it off.

23 MR. DAY: Okay.

24 MR. McNEILL: I believe that this equipment needs to
25 be certified by CSA and UL with the equipment that will be

1 installed clearly listed so there's no question about what
2 is code compliant and what isn't code compliant. And then
3 the expectation should be that the state and city agencies
4 vet it out to make sure that these certifications have
5 occurred.

6 As an elevator contractor and manufacturer, we have
7 to do this every day. And I don't see why any product
8 that would be installed in this state isn't completely
9 vetted and certified before it's installed so we have some
10 baseline of safety for the riding public and the people
11 that work on them and inspect them.

12 MR. CLEARY: I know when we've brought new products
13 in, they were vetted through the state pretty extensively.
14 But we've also had -- required to have written test
15 procedures that we have on site. And so it goes through
16 all the eight kind of steps that -- for that piece of
17 equipment. So having written test procedures that the
18 inspector can look at would take care of a lot of that
19 problem, would it not? That's already a requirement.

20 MR. DAY: I'm not sure. But it's a good point.

21 But I don't want to leave it up to inspectors to read
22 a written test procedure. And when we -- as we open that
23 pandora's box, a written test procedure not produced by
24 the manufacturer itself.

25 MR. CLEARY: But we're expecting now these days my

1 understanding is for the inspectors to vet new MCP's for
2 that equipment at that time too, correct? So that would
3 be just part of that same procedure is vetting the test
4 procedures as well as the MCP because they're going to
5 need an MCP that's compliant to that new piece of
6 equipment at that time that it's going to be accepted,
7 correct?

8 MR. DAY: Uh-huh. So that would be more like
9 witnessing the A.10 process and not reading it for
10 somebody but these are the things we want to see, go do
11 that. And if they can do that, then their process we
12 would assume must be sufficient. Their process must be
13 sufficient if they can do it in front of us.

14 But what isn't sufficient that we can't see?

15 For example -- I'll give you some examples. So let's
16 open this up.

17 You heard Matt talk about welds. So there was a
18 problem with a weld on a structural support of the
19 hoistway itself. Did they weld the brackets for the
20 rails? What else got welded? Because welding's supposed
21 to be done by a certified person. If it -- not
22 necessarily every single -- or all elevator company sells
23 doors. Those doors are welded assemblies. By code, those
24 doors being a welded assembly must have gone through a
25 certified organization that says yes, you're still doing

1 this in the right way; you're still welding these right.

2 But when we have a product coming in that's already
3 put together, who's certifying the welds on the rail
4 bracket? There is no code to say over there certified
5 welder on the rail bracket. So per chance, we would
6 expect by vetting through, that that arrives with a
7 certified welder certificate and it be somebody we don't
8 even know.

9 MR. CLEARY: Who is the certifying body for welders
10 in the state of Washington?

11 MR. DAY: There is no one certified body. And the
12 State of Washington doesn't designate that they have to be
13 state of Washington certified; they're a licensed welder.
14 There's a couple organizations to do it, but there's I
15 don't know how many organizations across the country that
16 do it.

17 So here's where the problems arise. But are they
18 such a big problem that we can't manage them? Maybe a
19 solution is that we go and vet it.

20 Pat? Patrick? Do you have --

21 MR. STRAFER: Oh, you know, yeah. I mean, there's a
22 number of different things. Are the doors fire rated, the
23 shaft doors? Are the seals compliance for 3,000 pound
24 capacity? Who put these seals on? Are they GAL seals? I
25 mean, there's many manufacturers. Nobody knows what this

1 equipment is. There is many, many questions today for the
2 safety of public or this elevator when they turn on -- you
3 know, when they get them on service. And we're putting
4 them in. I don't want the elevator coming down on
5 anybody, union or non-union. I feel they put these things
6 in behind our backs, and I'm mad about it.

7 MR. SORENSEN: We haven't even started the inspection
8 procedure on them yet. And we will go over them with a
9 fine-tooth comb.

10 MR. STRAFER: Please. Good.

11 MR. SORENSEN: Our guys -- have one guy that's
12 installed these in another state, so he knows what they've
13 done with them. And we will be looking for labels, tags
14 and everything. And if they don't have it, they're not
15 going to get it.

16 MR. STRAFER: Good.

17 MR. SORENSEN: They've also been notified that they
18 can no longer touch that elevator equipment. Since they
19 sat it in here, nobody touches it but a licensed elevator
20 mechanic in the state of Washington.

21 MR. DAY: That gets me back to one of my last
22 questions. Staging.

23 In the past, staging -- what the Department would say
24 is yes, we -- I mean, we care, but we don't require that a
25 licensed elevator mechanic unload the truck and put the

1 boxes in the building. You know, you're not assembling
2 that. If you start assembling that, then we care. If you
3 start opening the box -- if you open the box and start
4 pulling stuff out to put it where it needs or it's
5 supposed to go, then we care. Taking it off the truck, we
6 don't. However, this is somewhat unique and it's not
7 really the same thing. Or is it?

8 What do you guys think? Here's a complete elevator
9 coming on a semi truck.

10 I for one think should it be permitted before it gets
11 into the state or they can stay in a rest area until it is
12 permitted to be on site. That's one thing I would like to
13 say.

14 Unloading it. I have mixed feelings about that.

15 So Jim, you wanted to speak?

16 MR. NORRIS: Well, my concern from the safety
17 standpoint was when these elevators came in off the truck,
18 the hoistway doors were somehow held open, bolted open,
19 pinned open, and they got installed right in the building.
20 And -- I mean, I -- does the manufacturer have an assembly
21 process with these that step 1 is get in there and shut
22 those hoistway doors or barricade them so there's not a
23 fall hazard? Is the --

24 MR. DAY: So they drove cross country with the doors
25 open?

1 MR. NORRIS: Well, that's the way they came in.

2 MR. DAY: Hmm. Interesting.

3 MR. NORRIS: And that's the way they stayed until I
4 filed a DOSH complaint, and they mysteriously got closed
5 by whom.

6 MR. DAY: Interesting.

7 MR. NORRIS: So -- and is the method that's holding
8 these cars up, how long is that -- was that intended to be
9 used for since they came horizontal and now they're
10 vertical?

11 MR. DAY: Yeah, I have no idea. I don't know.

12 Well, we have three of them here that we can go
13 through with a fine-tooth comb and will most likely come
14 back with some answers for the interesting parties.

15 MR. WHEELER: Just a question. Module construction,
16 I mean, outside of the conveyance industry is becoming
17 more popular. You hear about apartment buildings being
18 built outside of Washington state and brought in. I guess
19 I'm wondering, is there anything we can learn --

20 MR. DAY: Bridges.

21 MR. WHEELER: Yeah, bridges, all sorts of things.

22 Is there anything we can learn from maybe the
23 building department or other agencies within the state as
24 to how they look at that before it gets to Washington?
25 Nail patterns on sheeting and different loads and

1 construction standards. Maybe there's something else
2 that's already in existence rather than reinventing the
3 the wheel here.

4 MR. DAY: Yeah, I'm not interested in reinventing any
5 wheel.

6 What I would think is really the best is that it
7 arrives here fully compliant. And us knowing that we
8 won't be sitting there holding jobs up like I think this
9 job was supposed to be open April 1st or something like
10 that, and it's not open yet.

11 So owners can expect a certain product coming into
12 the state and know that it's going to be vetted through,
13 not find out after they bought it and then it's sitting
14 there for months on months.

15 And I think it's in all elevator companies' best
16 interest here as of late especially -- to open up a little
17 bit more of pandora's box, this isn't the only company
18 that just shows up with new wares and expects us to drop
19 everything to see their product through. And that's
20 quite an unfair action.

21 We have several going on right now, not just this
22 one.

23 So I think really maybe when we get back to this next
24 meeting it's going to be a process for anybody that you're
25 showing a new product or new ware, do this first so we

1 don't impact the owner.

2 MR. CLEARY: I guess I'm a little confused. There's
3 been a process in place by the state that anytime you
4 bring new 18.1 or 17.1 equipment in, it is vetted through
5 the state before you can pull a permit or even bring it in
6 or even sell it, correct?

7 MR. DAY: (Nodding affirmatively.)

8 MR. CLEARY: So this would be no different whatsoever
9 than anything else. Right? I mean, it's the exact same
10 process.

11 MR. DAY: You're right. You're right.

12 MR. CLEARY: Because we have preassembled welds that
13 come from a manufacturer on some real -- (inaudible) --
14 but it's already been vetted and approved. So we never
15 would bring stuff in without having it vetted and sit
16 somewhere or try to put it in. So I don't -- we're
17 regoing -- we're rehashing stuff that we've talked about
18 for years, and there's already a process in place.

19 MR. DAY: This particular product's gone beyond
20 because there is no process for who welded that joint.

21 MR. CLEARY: But it's in the factory. If it's a CSA
22 UL approved piece of 18.1 piece of equipment or 17.1 piece
23 of equipment, they've already passed all their testing
24 in-house. They should have all that engineering in a
25 packet that should just hand --

1 MR. DAY: Exactly.

2 MR. CLEARY: -- here it is. Here's our stress
3 analysis. Here's everything we've done. It's all here.

4 So it's the same process for small or huge, right?
5 It's the same process. I don't really know why we're
6 discussing it.

7 MR. NORRIS: So does FAS have an actual elevator
8 person that works with them on this? I guess my question
9 would be: The contractor in this case, Blazer, was told
10 last August to discuss these modular elevators with the
11 chief elevator reviewer. So were they told to discuss
12 that with the city or the state? And did that take place?
13 I guess it didn't take place.

14 So when you're saying that they're getting delayed,
15 it doesn't bother me a bit because they were told last
16 August to have them reviewed. And it's in the meeting
17 minutes with L & I and the city there.

18 MR. DAY: I'm pretty sure that everybody expected FAS
19 to be vetting these.

20 MR. McNEILL: Jack, could you come back with a plan
21 with FAS and the elevator division is for the next meeting
22 on the process for proper permitting and ...

23 MR. DAY: Yeah. Well, in order to do that, we're
24 going to actually need to see it. And I have one of my
25 tech specialists going with the city to do the A.10

1 process so that we have a better idea of what we're
2 facing, to make sure it's as simple as what Scott Cleary
3 brought up. Hey, where's your packet that shows it's
4 compliant with the code?

5 MR. WILSON: The question is: FAS, they're using
6 guidelines that are out of the code book and building code
7 for factory assembled structures, not so much pertaining
8 to hoistway construction. Is that -- would that be true
9 or not?

10 MR. DAY: No, it would not be true.

11 MR. WILSON: They're using --

12 MR. DAY: The IBC is the factor for hoistway
13 construction. Chapter 30. So chapter 30 lends it to
14 construction of a hoistway.

15 MR. WILSON: Okay. So they're going in with a little
16 bit of background and knowledge on what the hoistway needs
17 to be constructed of.

18 MR. DAY: Uh-huh.

19 MR. WILSON: Okay.

20 MR. DAY: Not the elevator. Not the elevator.

21 MR. WILSON: Right.

22 MR. DAY: That's our -- or the city panel's deal
23 there.

24 So so far they're still stuck at the hoistway right
25 at this moment. That's where they're stuck. Haven't even

1 got to really our process yet.

2 MR. McNEILL: So I may not have said it clearly.

3 What I'm looking for is something where you and FAS can

4 get back to us, the stakeholders, to say if you haven't --

5 and it doesn't have to be this specific piece of

6 equipment, but any equipment that would fall in the realm,

7 these are the requirements that you, Mr. Contractor, need

8 to do to install this piece of equipment in the state of

9 Washington or in the city of Seattle or the city of

10 Spokane. But if you can help us with that, at least there

11 would be a clear set of guidelines that we would discuss

12 as a group for future installations.

13 MR. DAY: Is there any specific guidelines that you

14 all would be looking for us to ensure of at this moment,

15 other than A17 -- other than what I put down here. A17.1

16 is expected. IBC is expected. NEC is expected.

17 MR. McNEILL: Great. Okay, let's move on to the next

18 one.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, that -- that would even go

20 further into being, you know, any certifications that the

21 state requires here from the industry. They would need to

22 provide that from the factory of what they're doing there

23 as well. And that's what would be expected that they

24 would be able to comply.

25 MR. DAY: Comes in in a package; here it is. Or a

1 label that's already there. We don't know if it exists.

2 It may exist already; I don't know.

3 DIFFERENT UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It also brings into
4 question too some of the inconsistencies between how the
5 state regulates and how the city would regulate the same
6 piece of equipment. Because there are some differences.
7 We've noticed some of the equipment that, you know, we've
8 brought in, mainly PVE -- (inaudible). So getting it
9 vetted is real important. Because just getting it vetted
10 through the L & I might not be the same that the city
11 would accept or vice versa.

12 MR. DAY: We would hope that we enter into these
13 deals substantially the same. We don't want to be
14 different from each other, drastically different. That
15 affects many attitudes.

16 MR. SORENSEN: It's like the state came up with most
17 of the requirements for the vacuum -- (inaudible). We're
18 pretty much adopting the same standards.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's the same? Perfect.
20 Fantastic.

21 MR. SORENSEN: In fact, the information I sent back
22 with the approved plan permit has the list of all the same
23 state regulations and things we wanted done, everything
24 from screw heads on plates to everything else.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So that --

1 MR. SORENSEN: So it's the same.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right. Perfect. Thank you.

3

4 Incorrect Installation/Code Design Reset

5

6 MR. McNEILL: Let's move on to the next item. And I

7 look forward to working with the state and the city --

8 (inaudible).

9 MR. DAY: Mine's next?

10 MR. McNEILL: Yeah.

11 MR. DAY: Incorrect installation/code design reset.

12 We're tending to use that "reset" word a lot here lately.

13 So on the bottom of page 3, I want to talk about that
14 really quick.

15 First, to discuss a matter that the Labor and
16 Industries elevator inspection department is well within
17 the staging process of developing a training program for
18 elevator inspectors. With that being known, this
19 particular subject becomes more and ever increasing
20 important. As inspectors and elevator companies, so a lot
21 of times -- we were just talking about something -- a lot
22 of times people rely upon the elevator inspector to be the
23 person that defines was this properly done. Even though
24 the law says the elevator company is supposed to be the
25 one who's supposed to properly install, most folks look at

1 the inspector. And if the inspector missed items, then
2 subsequently it's found out the next year, five years, ten
3 years, up to 30 years later it's found out the bit ladder
4 is supposed to be 40-some-odd inches or the stop switch is
5 supposed to be here (gesturing). So it's found out down
6 the road that this wasn't installed to the codes and the
7 laws in the state of Washington.

8 As this becomes ever increasing an issue where better
9 trained inspectors are capturing as required now that they
10 recognize that the fuse that's supposed to be no more than
11 20 amp, as they start to recognize -- because they're
12 better educated, they start to write these corrections up.

13 And one of the things I was wanting to propose is, is
14 there interest in the Department coming up with a process
15 that would postpone a correction as long as the correction
16 could be mitigating in some fashion between the owner and
17 the elevator company, but put down as a recommendation
18 upon the next major repair or alteration that said
19 correction is addressed and fixed to compliance. Is there
20 interest in this?

21 And again, the reason I'm saying this is we've
22 already seen some of these issues come to light in this
23 past year where we have better trained inspectors. And as
24 we go down a path of increasing that training tenfold,
25 we're going to more than likely see a lot more of this

1 where an inspector's found the car-top lighting where five
2 foot candles is woefully insufficient. And what do we do
3 about that until the next major repair or alteration? Can
4 we do something? Is there an agreement to do something?
5 Would you like us to pursue that?

6 Dave, I see you're raising your hand.

7 "DAVE": Yes.

8 So from an owner's standpoint, I mean, we tend to do
9 everything around budget cycles. And if it's not set up
10 for the next major repair, at least perhaps we can come to
11 an agreement that we can take care of it at the next
12 budget cycle. Because depending on the number of
13 conveyances and the problems that are involved, it gets
14 very costly. And obviously it's not a budgeted item for
15 us because it's come up on an inspection that we were
16 completely unaware of. It would be very beneficial from
17 our standpoint to be able to at least push them off to the
18 next budget cycle, if not, the next major alteration.

19 MR. DAY: Okay. So you're saying instead of that,
20 just here's a correction for, say, a biennium budget, the
21 next biennium budget, so postpone the correction for a
22 year and a half, two years? That would be beneficial to
23 the owner?

24 "DAVE": Well, at least the next annual budget. It
25 doesn't have to be two years out.

1 For instance, we got written up -- I think I've
2 probably got 25 to 30 cars right now that I've got to put
3 new cab-top lighting in. And -- it's not a budgeted item.
4 We all -- you know, it not only impacts us; it impacts our
5 clients and everybody else. To the extent that we can at
6 least be allowed to -- (inaudible) -- next budget cycle,
7 we can, you know, dampen the load, so to speak.

8 MR. DAY: Okay. Any other opinions about this?

9 MR. McNEILL: So what criteria are you going to use
10 to determine an ability to postpone this in respect to
11 safety?

12 MR. DAY: Mitigate. Mitigate, we would be looking --
13 not us, but the elevator company in conjunction with the
14 owner has determined a mitigation factor. Some of these
15 things are pretty straightforward. If it's five candle
16 foot power and for permanent -- it's permanent lighting,
17 and it's supposed to be ten, well, in the meantime you're
18 going to put temporary lighting up there so that that
19 covers until such a time as -- or that's an example.

20 Dave.

21 "DAVE": Site specific conditions that --

22 MR. DAY: It would have to be site specific. Yeah,
23 it would have to be site specific.

24 MR. McNEILL: So would it be in the best interest of
25 the State to ask the elevator contractor and the owner to

1 provide a risk assessment so you can determine what the
2 risk is to allow this to be in place until the next budget
3 cycle or whenever we deem is proper in terms of --

4 MR. DAY: Yeah. I think that would be logical. Not
5 only proper, but logical. The owner's the one who's got
6 the risk. They're the ones who's got it all.

7 Okay. Thank you.

8 Yes, so I'll put that in my proposal as well.

9 Anybody else? Any ideas? If you have any, please
10 e-mail them to me. I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

11 MR. McNEILL: The next item isn't on the agenda, but
12 I'd like Todd Baker to give us a quick update on what's
13 happening with an audit of the Department.

14 MR. BAKER: Yeah. During the last legislative
15 session, the committee that we worked with requested that
16 there be an audit performed of the elevator program to
17 assess overall operations including the relationship
18 between the owners and the elevator companies, inspection
19 consistency, things like that.

20 So we've just finished the negotiations with a
21 company called Stellar and Associates. Starting next week
22 we're going to sit down with those folks and go through
23 the details and then set up a schedule for interviewing a
24 lot of the staff of the program as well as stakeholders.
25 So many of you may be contacted by these folks from

1 Stellar to get your thoughts about how the program is
2 doing and improvements we might be making.

3 The goal is to have a complete report to the
4 legislature I believe in December so they can take it up
5 next January during session.

6 MR. McNEILL: Thanks, Todd.

7 Any questions?

8

9 Determine the Next Steps for Future Agenda

10

11 MR. McNEILL: So the next item of business is
12 determine what will go on the new business for the next
13 meeting. And you can see, there is a list of potential
14 future business subjects on there in no particular order.
15 I'm open to comments from the committee as well as
16 stakeholders on what they'd like to see moved up.

17 Mr. Day.

18 MR. DAY: Since we -- since earlier we were talking
19 about A10.4 maintenance, let's leave that open. Maybe
20 Matt along with Pat with Morrow Construction would like to
21 address that in the upcoming future.

22 MR. McNEILL: Okay.

23 MR. DAY: Would that be okay, Pat?

24 MR. BARTELL: That would be fine.

25 MR. McNEILL: How about the code?

1 Now, on your agenda there's a ASME 2013 code and it
2 says no interest. But it meant that there isn't any
3 interest in it, but the 2016 code is just about ready to
4 come out of the oven, so to speak, in the near future. It
5 usually takes us a couple of years to get a code vetted
6 and through.

7 So is there any interest in getting that moving?

8 MR. CLEARY: Also in association with that would be
9 reworking the WAC too, correct?

10 MR. DAY: Correct.

11 MR. CLEARY: I'm more interested in doing that.

12 MR. SORENSEN: The City of Seattle will be adopting
13 the 2013 code coming up here probably the first of the
14 year.

15 MR. CLEARY: What version of the WAC have you
16 adopted?

17 MR. SORENSEN: We're still in the old WAC.

18 MR. CLEARY: You're still in the '08?

19 MR. SORENSEN: The 2007 version, the 2008 version.
20 As it was up until 2013 before you changed the new
21 WAC?

22 MS. ERNSTES: We changed in January of 2014.

23 MR. CLEARY: So you're working on --

24 MR. SORENSEN: We're still on the old WAC.

25 MR. CLEARY: So coming back to the question about

1 working on different state -- and the city working on
2 different kind of code. Because there's some things in
3 the WAC that are much different in the '14 than there is
4 in the '8. So how do we reconcile --

5 The reason that is, Seattle totally customizes
6 chapter 30. We take chapter 30 out of the IBC and we go
7 through it, and we'll find it -- always look to the
8 Seattle version. Don't look at the regular IBC version
9 because it's way different. You'll see strikeouts and
10 additions. And we do a customized chapter 30 is what we
11 do. We have for years. That's not --

12 MR. CLEARY: So chapter 30's more stringent than than
13 the --

14 MR. SORENSEN: In some ways. And in some ways it may
15 be more lenient. But since the IBC has declared hoistway
16 ventilation isn't required anymore up to 75 feet, we're
17 not going to be requiring that coming up in the new code
18 adoption. So there will be no hoistway ventilation up to
19 75 feet.

20 MS. ERNSTES: Al, that's not a true statement.

21 The IBC -- the State Building Code Council kept --
22 the State Building Code Council kept ventilation in, and
23 it was vetted through the last session of the legislature,
24 and it is still in chapter 51-50 through the IBC. So they
25 haven't done it the way you guys have, but it's still the

1 same as it was before. And that has been passed and
2 adopted and will still be in the July 1st adoption of the
3 State Building Code Council. It has not gone away in
4 Washington.

5 MR. SOERENSEN: But our building official has decided
6 he'd like to make it go away.

7 MS. ERNSTES: It can't supersede the IBC.

8 MR. DAY: It can't be less than.

9 MR. McNEILL: So actually I think that's a really
10 good example of why we need to work as a group. I hope
11 there's some interest so we can get consistency throughout
12 the state on various WAC's and codes and make life much
13 easier for every stakeholder in this room and outside of
14 this room.

15 So if there isn't any disagreement --

16 Yes.

17 MS. ERNSTES: Well, I suggest that -- and I volunteer
18 for this -- is that we sit down with Seattle and we go
19 through Seattle's codes to see that they still meet the
20 minimum standards for 51-50 and the WAC rules because we
21 need to be on the same page.

22 I do hear some complaints from stakeholders about
23 certain things Seattle does that we don't allow. So I'd
24 like to have -- vet that out. Because vetting is one.
25 Seattle doesn't have the authority per the IBC to vet that

1 out of their system.

2 Seattle has the authority to not follow the 51-50 on
3 high-rise. Other than that, they have to meet all the
4 minimum standards in 51-50 per the State Building Code
5 Council.

6 MR. McNEILL: Could you also include Spokane in that
7 so we're consistent?

8 MS. ERNSTES: I don't think we have any issues with
9 Spokane. But we can check with them.

10 MR. McNEILL: Okay. Why don't we put this on the
11 agenda -- do we have enough time between now and --

12 MS. ERNSTES: Sure, between now and November?

13 MR. McNEILL: -- the next meeting? That would be
14 great. That would be a great start to --

15 MR. DAY: So you're just referring to 51-50, Becky?

16 MS. ERNSTES: No. I'm talking about WAC versus what
17 -- the minimum standards in WAC because they're going to
18 adopt the current version of WAC, right, Al, coming up?

19 MR. SORENSEN: No.

20 MS. ERNSTES: You're not going to -- okay.

21 MR. DAY: They're going to stay at the 2008?

22 MR. SORENSEN: Yes.

23 MS. ERNSTES: Then you have to adopt certain things
24 that we adopt as the minimum standard so stay on the same
25 pace that are not in 2008 that are in 2014. Because

1 that's what the legislative law requires that you have, at
2 least meet the minimum standards that we've adopted.

3 So some of those things would be just as an example
4 is MCP enforcement on material lifts, that you guys have
5 to enforce those minimum standards.

6 MR. McNEILL: So this will be a great review to
7 determine what needs to be done to be consistent.

8 MR. DAY: We need bullet items and then those items
9 to be vetted so that we understand that there is a
10 difference, what are they.

11 Okay. August? Can we do that by August?

12 MR. McNEILL: That would be great. Helpful for
13 everybody.

14 MS. BREWER: So what about your code update? Are you
15 planning to start that or ...

16 MR. DAY: That's what I was just about to talk about.
17 So I actually don't plan on starting that. Is there
18 interest?

19 Well, one of the things I did want to say is the next
20 code 2016, if we were to review that, that would probably
21 be where we would start. That way hopefully we'd be ready
22 for the IBC on its next adoption so that it could be
23 parity and line up properly.

24 During the 2012 -- '13 code, I don't see us being
25 able to achieve that in that short period of time.

1 MR. CLEARY: This is for Todd as well as Jack.

2 With that audit coming up, how will that stretch the
3 already thin resources to allow the State to look at these
4 type of changes or needs, or is that going to really kind
5 of just tie everything up even more than we are now to do
6 any kind of new proactive looking at the WAC or anything
7 else?

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It won't make it any easier. But
9 part of the audit will be looking at the rule-making
10 process and how we go about that, if there's ways to
11 improve it. So there's some interest in seeing the
12 results of that assessment to guide whatever rule-making
13 we take on.

14 MR. CLEARY: So that's going to block everything for
15 any new change after that audit is done then?

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, we're not going to stop all
17 activity, but it will have an impact. I don't know
18 exactly how to address it.

19 MR. DAY: You're pretty accurate there, Scott.
20 Resources are already stretched pretty thin. And this is
21 going to stretch them thinner. And the more and more we
22 have a lack of understanding of how to -- what's allowed
23 in this state as far as equipment and those
24 inconsistencies there in and of themselves where elevator
25 design is changing without notification, and we find it on

1 the acceptance inspection -- right now we have three of
2 those cases going on. This used to be maybe one every
3 other, you know, every other month. Now we have three,
4 four of them at a time.

5 So -- and I want to get back to Christine's, but this
6 is really important. The elevator WAC code says that an
7 elevator from the car top of the machine is no farther
8 than 6 foot 6. 6 foot 6 from a sil-sil (phonetic)
9 arrangement at the top floor. And we have people putting
10 them in or wanting to put them in much much higher, which
11 then puts them in too low. And then either/or creates a
12 problem. So we've spent a lot of time with just the
13 simple little things that aren't so simple to some folks.

14 So we do really need to understand how we're going to
15 deal with this in the best Dale Carnegie method that I can
16 put forth. But we don't have time to deal with a sheer
17 lack of following the WAC rule, just plain and simple. We
18 just have to start rejecting them right off the bat.
19 There can't be a negotiation upon three or four fronts and
20 still be able to review the 2013 or 2016 ASME code.
21 Where's the best place to put our resources?

22 I'm ending this with saying, we expect you all to
23 live up to the A17 2010 and the WAC code as it exists.
24 And when you don't, we don't have resources to hold your
25 hand through it.

