

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

STATE OF WASHINGTON

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

of

ELEVATOR SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Date and Location

May 20, 2014	L&I Tukwila Training Room
Tuesday, 9:00 a.m.	12806 Gateway Drive
	Tukwila, Washington

BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Meeting was held on the date and location as set forth above. Those committee members present were: Scott Cleary, David Gault, Charlie Val, Skip Buntin, Keith Becker, and Bryan Wheeler sitting in for Robert McNeill. The Department of Labor and Industries was represented by Jack Day, Chief Elevator Inspector.

WHEREUPON the following proceedings were held, to wit:

Reported by:
Cheryl A. Smith, CCR, CVR
(License #3017)

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

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

August 17, 2013

Page No.

Introductions/Purpose

3

Chief's Report

21

Old Business

31

New Business

59

Conclusion

81

PROCEEDINGS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Introductions/Purpose

MR. CLEARY: I'd like to welcome everybody to our second of four Elevator Safety Advisory meetings for May 20th. We're going to go through quick introductions, and then a slight purpose, and then we have some -- we're going to be adopting some bylaws, and then taking a quick vote for vice chair, and then we'll move on to the agenda.

So introductions, I'm Scott Cleary. I represent the general contractors and commercial accessibility, and I am the chair.

MR. VAL: Charlie Val, I'm with the IUEC.

MR. WHEELER: Bryan Wheeler. I represent the elevator industry.

MR. BUNTIN: Skip Buntin, chief elevator inspector for City of Seattle representing the AHJ.

MR. BECKER: Keith Becker representing owner employed mechanics exempt from licensing.

MR. GAULT: David Gault. I represent the ownerships.

MR. DAY: Jack Day, L&I, secretary position.

MR. CLEARY: The purpose of this committee is to take advice from stakeholders and then put it back and advise the State on how to implement and work with the different

1 regulations, so it's really important that we get feedback
2 from the stakeholders. And that's encouraged.

3 Are there any comments -- moving on to the minutes
4 for February, are there any comments or feedback on
5 minutes?

6 MR. LARSON: As I was looking over the minutes from
7 last meeting, Ms. Brewer said that we went down and were
8 pushing a bill.

9 MR. CLEARY: Who is "we"?

10 MR. LARSON: It says, "And Charlie and Swen are
11 testifying. They're the ones pushing the bill. They're
12 going to introduce the bill." We didn't introduce that
13 bill. We did go down and testify on it. I testified
14 twice, once on the dumbwaiters and once on shortening the
15 time frame on the whistleblower legislation, but we didn't
16 introduce either one of those. I found out about one of
17 them the day before it happened and the other one about a
18 week before it happened.

19 MR. CLEARY: Can we have that reflected then in the
20 May minutes?

21 Anything else? I motion to accept the minutes with
22 that amendment. Second?

23 MR. BECKER: Second.

24 MR. CLEARY: All in favor?

25 THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

1 MR. CLEARY: Against? All right. They're accepted
2 with that amendment.

3 And we'll go ahead and move on now to the bylaws.
4 They're Attachment A. And we're going to get a short
5 little PowerPoint presentation.

6 We talked about them. We have not had bylaws except
7 for the Advisory Committee, so we thought it was a very
8 good idea to go ahead and put some bylaws together. And
9 Jack will go through that a little bit and will talk about
10 what they are. There's not a copy in here, though?

11 MR. DAY: No. There's one right there.

12 MR. GAULT: There is a copy in there, Scott.

13 MR. CLEARY: Is there?

14 MR. GAULT: About page 4 or 5. Attachment A.

15 MR. CLEARY: Okay. Great. So if you look at
16 Attachment A, and that kind of goes to each one of the
17 articles: name, purpose and the members, what our
18 responsibilities are, what the officers do, the duties of
19 the officers as well as the meetings, the form and how
20 everything should be run. There we go. It's easier to
21 see. Can everybody see that?

22 MR. DAY: Can everybody see that? There is an
23 attachment in your handout.

24 What I decided to do is come up with some bylaws, and
25 I'm going to go through them really quick. Under

1 consideration, everybody can read them at your leisure,
2 and I do believe they were sent out two weeks ago.
3 Anyway, in it is the name of our organization here.

4 The purpose: to organize, to advise the Department
5 of Labor and Industries' Elevator Inspection Department on
6 adoption of rules that apply to conveyances, methods of
7 enforcing and administering. That's the purpose of this
8 committee.

9 Members: One of the things we need to put in here
10 was participation, that they be present 75 percent of the
11 time. So as we meet four times a year, one missed meeting
12 a year is what will be allowed. And, B, what's important
13 on B is having a thorough knowledge of matters to be
14 presented before the Committee where written
15 correspondence was provided prior to the Committee
16 meeting. So review the material, have an understanding of
17 it. If you don't have an understanding of it in the
18 future, in my next presentation, you'll see who's
19 sponsoring whatever that subject is and you can call them
20 and ask them. But it will be your duty to find out, not
21 to show up the day of.

22 Officers: Currently we do have a chair, but this one
23 pulls in the need for a subchair. In the event that the
24 chair is gone for some particular reason, can't be here
25 and to divide up some of the associated duties that go

1 along with the chair position, we're initiating a vice
2 chair position. After this presentation we'll be taking
3 nominations and voting on that today.

4 Duties of the officers: The chairperson will preside
5 at all meetings, functions and affairs. The chairperson
6 is the one who is in charge of this meeting and runs these
7 meetings. All information comes from the chair to me. I,
8 being the secretary, put it in these agendas. That's how
9 this works.

10 The vice chair as well will be present at all
11 meetings and have a working knowledge of the
12 responsibilities of the chairperson.

13 Any questions so far? Good.

14 The meetings are set by RCW. Does everybody realize
15 that? And they're always the third Tuesday. Always,
16 always. We may one day, because the room is getting too
17 small, opt to have it somewhere else.

18 We have a quorum for a regular or special meeting of
19 the Committee shall be a simple majority. Everybody know
20 what that means? Everybody familiar? Anybody have a
21 question?

22 Amendments: These bylaws can be amended, so if
23 anybody wants to bring editorials up at any time, we can
24 do this. I do prefer that they be published and talked
25 about before we just make a change.

1 The other thing I want to talk about is conflicts.
2 In the event of a conflict between the bylaws and the
3 committee governing the statute, Title 70.87 RCW or the
4 laws of the State of Washington shall prevail. Always the
5 laws shall prevail.

6 Any questions in regards to those?

7 Scott, back to you.

8 MR. CLEARY: Now we're going to elect a vice chair.
9 So for the Committee, do we want to have this be silent or
10 do we want to have this be a raise of hands?

11 MR. VAL: Raise of hands is fine, I think.

12 MR. CLEARY: Anybody volunteering for that position?

13 MR. VAL: I'll volunteer.

14 MR. CLEARY: Anybody else?

15 MR. BECKER: I can.

16 MR. CLEARY: Would you both, Charlie, give a
17 couple-minute talk?

18 MR. VAL: I've been with the IUEC since 1973, started
19 off as a helper, went through, became a mechanic, took the
20 exam. I became a member of this committee after Jim
21 Bender became business manager in 2000. So from 2000
22 until the present time I've been sitting on this
23 Committee. I have a working knowledge of the past issues
24 and a lot of the history of what's happened here.

25 MR. CLEARY: Keith?

1 MR. BECKER: I represent the mechanics exempt from
2 licensing, been working with particularly the grain
3 industry and grain facilities, the conveyances in that
4 neck of the woods. I'm still learning how to spell
5 "escalator," so I've got a few things I'm still working
6 on. But I've been involved. This is my first term,
7 willing to participate in any way I can.

8 MR. CLEARY: Okay. With that, with a show of hands
9 on the Committee, everybody in favor of Charlie? Okay.
10 Keith? We have a tie.

11 MR. DAY: Keith.

12 MR. CLEARY: 4 to 3. Keith Becker now will be the
13 vice chair.

14 With that, we'll move on to --

15 MR. DAY: Hang on a second. This time I want you, me
16 and Keith to sign this.

17 MR. CLEARY: Please have the record show that Keith
18 Becker is the vice chair for the remainder of this term.

19 Now I'd like to move on to the Elevator Advisory
20 analysis form, another quick PowerPoint presentation.
21 This is basically put together so we've got some
22 consistency with our subcommittees. This form Jack and
23 I've been talking about will allow everything to be
24 consistent. As you go through and see it, I think that is
25 B.

1 MR. DAY: See Attachment B.

2 MR. CLEARY: And what that will do is for all
3 subcommittees existing and new, this form will be filled
4 out and then brought to the Committee to be able to say we
5 want to go forward with the subcommittee or not. So this
6 will add consistency and this will add -- it will have all
7 the questions that need to be answered filled out before
8 we start sitting down and going through these
9 subcommittees.

10 MR. DAY: An analysis form became a subject of
11 concern probably towards the end of last year. And what
12 this is intended to achieve is twofold. First, as the
13 Advisory gives advice and we make decisions on what we're
14 going to do moving forward in a rule or law or policy,
15 these things typically get put up somewhere and brought
16 back out in the event that we adopt the new rules. So
17 these things end up -- and forgive my phrase, but the
18 decisions end up in a basement. And as a 102 -- CR 102
19 intend to file and then we file for new rules, oh, they
20 get resurrected, and a lot of people go, "Where did that
21 come from? Why did you make that decision? Who is
22 involved in those?" And in the past it's been difficult
23 to follow along with that. So devising a method that
24 we're going to show on an ongoing basis what we're
25 discussing, the decisions that are made, and then put them

1 on our Web page so it's going to be in front of everybody
2 who has a care to go look and see to find out.

3 So to start off with, we needed a standard method to
4 keep track of these things as something is delivered to us
5 in its infancy and it's worked, per se, through a
6 subcommittee, and as decisions are made based on what and
7 who was there to make those decisions on why did they make
8 those decisions. So we needed to have a standard form to
9 report that so I could deliver it as the secretary for
10 this Committee in a standard method for everybody so that
11 everybody that's participating had a standard method of
12 reading and understanding it. Thus, the reason for this.

13 I'm going to go through it a little bit at a time.
14 This first section is a proposal number. Now, in your
15 handout, I do believe that I filled one out, and as you
16 follow along, you can see it's in regards to a comb impact
17 device for an escalator.

18 You'll notice it doesn't have a proposal number. It
19 will get a proposal number once we determine that that's a
20 subject we're going to pick up and work. This one being
21 the first one will probably be called something like
22 001-2014. The intent of that proposal number is to become
23 an attachment with this document and us to have a draft
24 WAC rule as well.

25 So as this is worked and comes to its completion and

1 a decision is made that we're going to move forward with,
2 say, a comb impact device -- I have a digital copy of the
3 WAC. It's in the Elevator Advisory section. Those of you
4 that went there recently probably saw this. It's a draft
5 copy of the future WAC. The intention is this will go in
6 as an attachment in the section denoted in the WAC, such
7 as a comb impact device will go in Part D under existing
8 elevators. In the comment section it will refer to this
9 thing as an attachment with all the supporting information
10 behind it. So that's the object of the proposal number.

11 Date: self explanatory.

12 Title: You can see I have a title for this one.

13 What's the title of the proposal? Who did it? Remember
14 earlier in the bylaws in that Paragraph B, so all members,
15 who are they going to call to figure out what that
16 proposal is about? Who will that be? So the contact
17 information will go in there right here. That and the
18 phone.

19 A brief summary goes in. What is this thing about?
20 What does it do? What's its purpose? You see I filled
21 that out on that sample there.

22 Does the proposal promote public safety, building
23 safety or worker safety? So that would go in. What's its
24 object? And then you check the boxes accordingly.

25 I can't tell if I skipped a page. And the next one,

1 "The effect of this proposal would be," is something like
2 a comb impact device a major impact? If you own an
3 escalator, it will be. If you don't, it won't. But to
4 explain that out.

5 And remember, this will become a living document as a
6 committee or as a group goes through that will add to it.
7 The intent is to add to it to keep it going, to have
8 assumption of substance down the road when we bring that
9 up in a CR 102.

10 If the proposal has an effect on the program, briefly
11 describe the effect. As you see in there, I have done
12 this. This is in a Word document so it's expandable.

13 If enacted, what type of physical impact will this
14 have? And you would put that down. And I expect that
15 that will grow for my sample there as the months progress
16 in relationship to working this proposal.

17 What other stakeholders would be impacted? Who else?
18 Who else is impacted by this? And then if we impacted
19 somebody, have we communicated with that somebody? So
20 it's to briefly summarize that impact. And if a
21 subcommittee is working this, they would realize this goes
22 further and further, how much will this impact and whom.

23 Would this require a new rule? And if it would, it
24 would go here. As you see in my sample, you can see where
25 I suggested that rule belongs. That's in Part D of the

1 WAC 296-96.

2 Are there general comments? Include background
3 information. Are we the only state that's gone down this
4 path requiring comb impact devices? No, we are not. I
5 showed you an example in there that we are not. But any
6 other general comments that one of the stakeholders may
7 have a question about this needs to go right here in
8 supporting documents.

9 That's the end of my presentation. Does everybody
10 understand why we're doing this? And it's not to create
11 more work for everybody. It's to keep the standard.

12 Any questions? Okay.

13 Moving on and moving forward, this is what we're
14 going to do. As we have some existing subcommittees
15 already, they're going to have to put this together and
16 bring back to us. Everybody on existing subcommittees
17 understand? Okay.

18 MR. CLEARY: Jack, now who is responsible for filling
19 this out? Is it before a subcommittee forms? Is it by
20 the subchair who is doing it?

21 MR. DAY: It will be either whoever's working that
22 proposal, whether it be a subchair, as we're going to call
23 them. Whoever is the chair of that sub, they're going to
24 be responsible. Most likely it will be one of you that is
25 leading that effort. One of you or me, whoever's leading

1 that effort.

2 MR. CLEARY: So that needs to be filled out and
3 brought to the Committee for approval for the
4 subcommittee, correct?

5 MR. DAY: What it needs to be is filled out and
6 delivered to me. Two weeks prior to this meeting I send
7 out all this information: notes, agenda. Whatever we
8 have, I send this out. That needs to be in my hands at
9 least two weeks and one day prior to our quarterly
10 meetings. We can discuss that further at length, if you'd
11 like.

12 MR. CLEARY: I just want everybody to understand what
13 their responsibilities are and how to get it in and how it
14 works.

15 MR. DAY: The responsibilities are to get this
16 information out to our stakeholders and to each other
17 prior to this meeting. That's the responsibilities. They
18 have to go out two weeks prior. I can't do anything with
19 them if you send them to me exactly two weeks prior, so
20 they've got to be here in my hands before that. As your
21 secretary, this is our information that's going to go out
22 to our public so that they see what it is as well.

23 MR. CLEARY: Keith?

24 MR. BECKER: So if there is an issue that we want to
25 bring forward and we're not sure whether it needs to go to

1 a subcommittee or just if I want to see a bowl of candy in
2 every elevator in the country and somebody for some
3 unknown reason says, "No, that's dumb," I mean, where do I
4 start and stop? I mean, do I just put a one-liner on here
5 and say, "Is this an issue of concern"? Or do you want
6 the whole thing filled out first and then presented to see
7 if it's an issue of concern?

8 MR. DAY: For you guys, I'm understanding -- as I'm
9 understanding your question, as a stakeholder -- one of
10 your stakeholders, I may bring a subject to you that they
11 want you to bring before the Advisory Committee, correct?
12 And it's a bowl of candy in every elevator. And you're
13 going to need to use your best judgment. Once you start
14 filling this out, is there any value to that whatsoever
15 for public safety? building safety? worker safety? Is
16 there any value to that whatsoever? Now you have
17 something to turn around and talk to your stakeholder
18 who's wanting a bowl of candy in every elevator. And Dave
19 is going to say, "Do you know how much that's going to
20 cost the building owners on an annual basis? And what
21 value does that lend?" You can hire more people to pick
22 up the trash.

23 I'm sorry. Did that --

24 MR. BECKER: If somebody brings that issue to me and
25 wants a response and I'm just going to blow it off,

1 shouldn't I bring that -- at some level bring that to
2 somebody beyond just me before we decide that it's a
3 nonissue?

4 MR. DAY: If you wish, to either the chairman or to
5 myself or to any other member here, anyone here to have a
6 dialogue about it and to come up with what's the proper
7 rationale.

8 MR. BECKER: Just a response. Because if I am
9 representing a group and there is a concern, whether it's
10 minor or major or it doesn't fall into a category of
11 dealing with, this should be -- it deserves a response.

12 MR. DAY: Uh-huh. But it may not rise to the level
13 of needing to be addressed to the Advisory Committee. Is
14 this a one or two issue thing or is this a broad issue
15 dealing with public safety? building safety? worker
16 safety? What is it? And then can we do anything with it?

17 MR. BECKER: I guess I'm --

18 MR. GAULT: I hear what you're saying, Keith. And
19 since we are an Advisory Committee, in the words itself,
20 we can only advise. We can't say "yes" or "no." And so
21 it has to rest with you, Jack --

22 MR. DAY: It does. It all does.

23 MR. GAULT: -- I mean, to say "yes" or "no." And so
24 just for us to push it off, we need to then, as a
25 committee, present it at the Committee and say, "Does this

1 bear any weight?"

2 MR. DAY: And if you're unsure, that could be exactly
3 what we do, or give me a call and I can let you know.

4 MR. GAULT: They're all not going to be quite as easy
5 as a bowl of candy.

6 MR. DAY: No, they're not. None of them are going to
7 be as easy as candy.

8 MR. GAULT: So I would think we would need to bring
9 it to the Committee and then the Committee needs to say
10 "yea" or "nay" and then you give the final --

11 MR. DAY: Maybe you can for sure, as long as we know
12 this is coming up so we can have a dialogue about it and
13 we're all on board with what the issue is.

14 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm hearing two different things
15 here. I think this is an excellent idea. You brought it
16 up in the previous meeting in February as the direction
17 you were going. And as far as administrating
18 subcommittees, this sounds like a wonderful idea.

19 But building on Keith's question, what I hear is, is
20 this now going to be a filter that the only thing that is
21 going to make it to your board --

22 MR. DAY: Committee.

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: -- is something that is worthy of a
24 subcommittee? Because it seems to me that's going to
25 eliminate a lot of things that could be brought up,

1 discussed and handled. It seems almost as though this
2 would be more applicable once you, as a board, decide that
3 you're going to form a subcommittee rather than before you
4 determine what items are going to be on your agenda. Am I
5 missing something here?

6 MR. DAY: Not everything that's coming before this
7 committee will make its way to a subcommittee. But there
8 will be decisions made about whatever it is that comes
9 before this committee, and this is a tracking method for
10 it.

11 MR. McLAUGHLIN: So this is not limited to
12 subcommittee --

13 MR. DAY: No.

14 MR. McLAUGHLIN: -- flow. This is also an agenda
15 item.

16 MR. DAY: It could be, yes. Very much. Why is this
17 on the agenda? What purpose will it do?

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Discussion items that could become a
19 subcommittee.

20 MR. DAY: It could. It has the potential to, yes.
21 And then it would be carried on from there.

22 MR. SPRAGUE: It looks like a great form in
23 organization, but I started thinking about it. From time
24 to time we redo the WAC codes and so on. Would each
25 little code item engender a form? Say we have -- you

1 know, we're going through the different changes that we
2 might make, would we then have a form for each item that
3 we're considering at a time like that? Or I can see, you
4 know, items being a series of items that would each need
5 consideration. Is that what we do is have a stack of
6 these filled out for each item?

7 MR. DAY: That may be, yes. Because as items go on
8 and go off, each and every item, every single "the," "I",
9 "and," "an," "or," "but" and "if" I get to explain to
10 somebody. So if we're making decisions here at this
11 level, then they need to get explained anyway.

12 MR. WHEELER: If we're asking stakeholders and us as
13 members of this committee to fill this out, would it be
14 appropriate to add a section of what action the Committee
15 took as a result of this or recommendation that this group
16 made --

17 MR. DAY: Good idea.

18 MR. WHEELER: -- so it's documented as well?

19 MR. DAY: I would like to put that up in the
20 beginning first -- one of the first sections,
21 recommendations.

22 MR. CLEARY: Any other questions on this at all?
23 We're trying to implement this to get some consistency and
24 some flow and so we can go back and check a month back,
25 six months back, a year back to see really what the issue

1 was, you know, who it's going to impact and give us a
2 little bit of history. Right now I'm trying to get some
3 recall on what's happening, and I'm having rather a very
4 hard time pulling anything up.

5 Okay. With that, I'd like to move on to the chief's
6 report.

7

8 Chief's Report

9

10 MR. DAY: Chief's report. I don't think I called it
11 an attachment, but if you turn back a few pages, you see
12 the first one that says Inspections Scorecard.

13 There's a lot of new faces in here, so I want to
14 explain what this is. This first page you're looking at,
15 Inspections Scorecard, is our method for tracking how well
16 we're doing with annual inspections. When you look at it
17 in the columns, FY13 Data was how we did last year, and
18 then we divide this up into quarters with the existing
19 quarter that we're in expanded by month and then with our
20 year-end tally.

21 One of the things to note is where we're at, and this
22 is in the row marked Percent on Time; we measure our on
23 time by 12 months plus 60 days.

24 So you see as percentage-wise that we're 53 percent
25 in the first quarter, 54 percent in the second quarter,

1 almost 44 percent in the third quarter, and thus in April
2 we've exceeded our 100 percent with having 109 for that
3 first month. We're expecting that our annual inspections
4 start turning around, although we are still a few folks
5 shy of -- our annual inspection staff is short. So as we
6 can get them in place and get them trained, we expect this
7 to move closer to a 75 to 80 percent margin for next year.

8 However, as we all know, when we put on elevators
9 each and every year, most of my audience is part of that
10 participation of adding annual inspections to our
11 repertoire. So in the future, we'll be needing more
12 inspectors to keep up with that. However, we don't count
13 on that alone. We are also engaged in some technology to
14 promote more efficient inspections. I'm talking about
15 digital technology where we're using -- where we're
16 piloting this technology now, and we're hoping that that's
17 going to increase our percent as well.

18 The next thing to go to on the next page is
19 accidents. And what this is easier to see is by the
20 graph.

21 2014, the last one in there, 2014, the second
22 quarter, we don't have all the data in. That's why it's
23 short like that. This is based on a calendar year, so
24 it's just begun for us. It's about halfway through. I
25 usually don't have these reports entered for at least a

1 month and sometimes a bit longer after the accident
2 happened, so don't focus too much on that last one right
3 there.

4 But look at the other ones. And I'm pointing to the
5 graph again. What I'm showing you guys here, if you look
6 backwards in time, you see that in 2011 and not until 2012
7 fourth quarter did we start to see a bit of a decline in
8 accidents on escalators. And then you can really see it
9 really quite well in 2013 where you have a high degree of
10 accidents and then they go down.

11 So what I expect at this current time is this is a
12 pattern, but it's a pattern based on the time of year.
13 After this next quarter is finished and we have all the
14 results, that will probably give us more of a trend of
15 what's going on today. Some of the places have put
16 additional signs up to help a person -- to redirect them
17 to the elevators instead of the escalators. We're waiting
18 to see if that has helped or not.

19 Everybody, I left a pamphlet here on the desk. And
20 the majority of our escalator accidents have everything to
21 do with holding the handrail. And I'm looking and I'm
22 seeking for ways to get this information out to our riding
23 public. Because, again, the majority of these things have
24 to do with the handrail. What do we do? Do we legislate
25 this thing into existence for making people ride [sic] the

1 handrail? Or how can we get communication out? I'm
2 looking for ideas from the group and from your group.
3 What would be most efficient? Anybody have a thought? I
4 want you guys to know that I have literally thousands of
5 these pamphlets.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Update the photos.

7 MR. DAY: That costs the State money. But if that
8 would help, I would gladly do it.

9 Is there a place we can recommend? Can we hand some
10 of these out to some of the elevator companies' personnel?
11 Can they deliver some of them to your escalator customers?
12 Is there some method that we can pull together and think
13 about to get the message out?

14 MS. FILLIPS: Certified Folders has a distribution
15 program for stocking rack brochures.

16 MR. DAY: What's the name of it?

17 MS. FILLIPS: Certified Folders.

18 MR. DAY: Is that a company?

19 MS. FILLIPS: It's a company.

20 MR. DAY: So they go around and put pamphlets in --

21 MS. FILLIPS: Yeah. You buy it by the month, however
22 many months (inaudible).

23 MR. DAY: It would need to be very strategic of where
24 they're placed. That would be the important thing. I can
25 call them and see the results of that.

1 MS. FILLIPS: Also you can hire a writer to develop a
2 feature along the lines that you have in mind and get it
3 placed.

4 MR. DAY: Can you repeat that, Judy?

5 MS. FILLIPS: Yes. You can hire a writer to develop
6 a feature along the lines of what you want it written like
7 and have it placed.

8 MR. WHEELER: Jack, could you get this in electronic
9 and e-mail it out to your distribution list that you send
10 the minutes out to and maybe any known owners of
11 escalators and just from the State's position encourage
12 them to notify their people?

13 MR. DAY: I can.

14 MR. WHEELER: It seems like a simple low-cost
15 alternative.

16 MS. HOLCOMB: Just kind of a quick point. I'm a
17 prior property manager, so I'm just saying all, probably
18 90 percent of this stuff it's going to be transients and
19 pedestrians, unless you're planning on educating the
20 common people. Property owners aren't going to hand these
21 out to everybody that walks in their building. And it's
22 not very likely that a standard customer coming in is
23 going to read it. Just to be realistic.

24 MR. DAY: With that known, other ideas?

25 MR. WHITED: How about if you have service companies

1 just drop them off like at the airport or wherever you're
2 going to have them and just put them in a plastic box? It
3 doesn't seem like that would be too hard. People would
4 come by and take them out if they wanted to read them.

5 MR. DAY: Okay. What do you think, Keith, building
6 owners would say if we asked them to put a plastic box at
7 the entrance to their buildings in their foyer or
8 something and have them in there?

9 MR. GAULT: You said Keith, but did you mean me?

10 MR. DAY: Dave. Sorry.

11 MR. GAULT: It was going through my mind as you're
12 asking the question what would we do. Well, we wouldn't
13 put the literature out because it's not in -- I mean, it
14 just wouldn't -- as one person pointed out, it's transient
15 people that are coming and going. You know, you don't
16 have any residents. It's good for places that have
17 residents that would become aware of that are part owners
18 in the building. But for the transient people, I think it
19 is a public news -- a public flash, just, "Are you aware
20 of?" you know, those sorts of things that would get out to
21 the public to educate them more about don't stick your
22 hands between two moving doors, hold onto the handrail.

23 The ones that are the top problems, put out public
24 service announcements. I mean, there's all kinds of
25 public service announcements. I realize people don't

1 listen to them, but it's a difference. I've never heard
2 an escalator public service announcement. They may
3 actually listen. People turn off what they know; what
4 they don't know, they listen.

5 MR. DAY: Okay. I'd like to investigate that one.

6 MR. HENDERSON: I don't know if this has been talked
7 about before. Has anything been talked about like the
8 school programs since children are one of the highest at
9 risk on these? We do fire safety and all other kinds of
10 programs for the children at schools. Something like that
11 would, I think, target it.

12 MR. DAY: That's been talked about in the past for
13 sure.

14 MS. FILLIPS: Along the same line, you might work
15 with the Parent Teacher Student Associations to hand them
16 out to parents. This education has to start with the
17 parents. I don't think you can teach the kids to do
18 something that doesn't include --

19 MR. DUIN: That kids program for schools already
20 exists. All you have to do is contact the Elevator
21 Escalator Safety Foundation and they'll send a packet out
22 that tells you how to give the presentation. We did it
23 last week. It resonates with the kids. They think the
24 cat is kind of creepy because it's still from the 1980s,
25 but the video still holds their attention. And then they

1 take that information home to their parents and friends
2 and educate them. It's a very effective program, and it's
3 very easy to do.

4 MR. CLEARY: I agree. I think programs like that
5 like public service announcements are the best way because
6 most of these would be picked up and thrown on the floor.
7 I think it's a waste of resources to try to place those.

8 Any other comments on that? Bill?

9 MR. WATSON: I think the State usually has an
10 elevator safety month in November or something the
11 Governor signs off on and says a few words. Maybe at that
12 time the State could get one of the news agencies, one of
13 the TV stations to run a bleep on it on the nightly news
14 about safety on elevators and escalators.

15 MR. DAY: That's a good idea.

16 MR. WATSON: That's pretty inexpensive and it gets
17 out to a lot of people.

18 MR. CLEARY: While he's riding an escalator.

19 MR. DAY: Maybe we can talk the head official in the
20 State to -- we'll see.

21 MR. WATSON: Who's that?

22 MR. DAY: Yeah. I'm not saying here.

23 MR. CLEARY: All right. Let's move on. Jack?

24 MR. DAY: Well, there's a lot of good ideas for that,
25 and we do have to move on. But I think the public service

1 announcement and the schools are going to be probably our
2 best bet moving forward without having to come up with a
3 brand-new rule about how to get on and how to get off
4 escalators. I wanted to bring that up at my accidents.

5 What else do I have? That's all I have for the
6 scorecard.

7 MR. CLEARY: We can move on to the maintenance
8 control program. Jack Day.

9 MR. DAY: Just really quick, as you see on page 2 of
10 the handout, a Web link to a list of companies with
11 code-compliant MCP's. That's where you'll find that.
12 Just turn the page to the backside. It's Web address is
13 right there.

14 MR. CLEARY: Is it completely up to date?

15 MR. DAY: I believe so.

16 MR. CLEARY: Any other questions or feedback on the
17 listings for the MCP authorized companies and the Web
18 site? None? Okay.

19 Let's move on to legislative activities. That's
20 Attachment C.

21 MR. DAY: Has everybody had a chance to review
22 Attachment C? Have you guys? Attachment C, it's
23 Substitute House Bill 2146. This was passed the last leg.
24 session. It becomes effective July 1st of next year, so
25 there's a year's grace in this taking effect.

1 But what this effectively does is it reduces the
2 appeal from \$200 to \$100. And there isn't a need to do
3 WAC 296-96 changes because it has language in it in
4 regards to administration of it, but not how much it is,
5 the actual language, how much appeal dollars are in the
6 RCW. And specifically it's RCW 70.87.170.

7 We will have to go through an effort of changing a
8 few of our letters that go out, our letters being customer
9 corrections that have the appeal language on it. So that
10 should be incidental in its effect.

11 Are there any questions on this bill that is now law
12 in the State of Washington effective July 1, 2015?

13 MR. CLEARY: All right. With that, we'll move on to
14 draft WAC 296-96. Jack?

15 MR. DAY: Thank you. There is no attachment for
16 this.

17 I explained a little bit of it a while ago. With the
18 analysis form, there is a draft WAC, and that's what it's
19 called: draft future WAC code. You'll find it on the
20 same Web page as you find the Elevator Advisory
21 information. That's where -- and it's there now.

22 And the intent of that is once changes have been
23 decided is that they go into that draft WAC. If there was
24 an attachment, which there more than likely will be with
25 the analysis form, it will go in the margins.

1 So this section will contain what the verbiage will
2 look like as the Department goes through the process of
3 adopting those new rules so they're there for everybody to
4 see all along the way between the time that the decision
5 was made to change the language and what to change it to.
6 The supporting documentation, this is where it's going to
7 be put. And it's called "draft future WAC." And again,
8 it's found on the same Web page as the Elevator Advisory
9 Committee agenda and meetings.

10 Any questions? Thank you.

11

12 Old Business

13

14 MR. CLEARY: Okay. We're going to move on now to old
15 business, and we're going to talk about fire alarm
16 initiation devices. There's been a subcommittee that's
17 been working for quite a while, and we want to kind of
18 wrap it up. So David?

19 MR. GAULT: I thought we had wrapped it up when we
20 presented -- when Bob presented it, it was wrapped up.
21 But now we have to fill out the analysis form, so we will
22 reconvene to do the analysis form and put it in
23 documentation.

24 MR. DAY: So can you briefly, Dave, let us know the
25 decision and why?

1 MR. GAULT: Okay. I'll have to go through it and
2 redo it as a subcommittee. I don't have the notes here
3 with me.

4 MR. WHEELER: Rob gave me the same analysis that he
5 thought that it was done, and recommendation was not to
6 move forward with it and that he owed a letter that he was
7 drafting to you. And he didn't know what that letter was,
8 but maybe that was this Attachment B document that you
9 talked about.

10 MR. CLEARY: What we're trying to come up with is the
11 rationale, how the subcommittee came up with that.

12 MR. WHEELER: I didn't get any of that information.

13 MR. DAY: Getting back to the analysis form, you see
14 why we need it? Okay.

15 MR. CLEARY: Is there anybody in the audience that
16 was on the subcommittee that could help? Any questions?
17 No.

18 MR. DAY: So as of now, the FAID committee remains
19 open because we need to have some kind of analysis and a
20 rationale of why the decision was made to do that.

21 MR. CLEARY: Okay. And we'll have something for the
22 next meeting.

23 Okay. Let's move on to existing machine room space
24 enclosures and access to machine room subcommittee. Keith
25 Becker?

1 MR. BECKER: The means of access subcommittee has
2 been working actually on this a long time. We've been
3 trying to finish it up, too. It's in Attachment D in the
4 handouts.

5 This is meant to develop a means of access for all
6 existing elevators, so this is going to affect anything
7 that's out there in the elevator world. It started out
8 with the grain industry and issues that we had there.
9 We're trying to make this fit everybody.

10 We will -- I will take this, the subcommittee will
11 take this and we'll get it into that format that Jack
12 presented earlier. And I'm not going to read through the
13 document. It's all there. We reviewed it. This is
14 basically what we're proposing. We're looking for
15 comments, outside comments.

16 One of the things, the effects of the impacts to the
17 real world that it's going to have, we can deal somewhat
18 with our own industry, and I'm not positive on impacts, if
19 there will be fiscal impacts to the rest of the elevator
20 world on creating these means of accesses. We are hoping
21 to develop means of access for repair, maintenance,
22 inspection, and it will become noncombustible permanent
23 ladders, stairs, platforms, guards, everything that
24 follows ASME codes, WAC codes.

25 And we are trying to include some language in there

1 that existing means of access, if it's, say, wood ladders,
2 wooden stairways, wooden platforms that are structurally
3 sound that are not needing any more than a repaired kick
4 board or a toe board or something like that, repairs like
5 for like we're hoping to continue to leave in there, not
6 require changes to these things. If, in fact, the
7 existing structure becomes structurally inadequate, then
8 it will have to be brought up to code, and the wooden
9 access, the wooden stairways would have to go away. So if
10 you're having to replace a structural member, that's going
11 to be an alteration. That's going to require taking it
12 out, replace it with noncombustible permanent access.

13 These are types of things that I'm hoping now to --
14 with what's in here that it will be looked at in different
15 areas of the industry and we'll see some comments back if
16 there's some issues. But like I said, we tried to allow
17 some language in there or leave that language in there
18 that allows existing if it's structurally sound.

19 So that's where we're at. We will now put this in --
20 go back and try to get this into the format into Jack's
21 proposal, get it through that, include all our notes and
22 where we're at. But we have taken an ASME code dealing
23 with new installations and adapted that. And I think
24 that's -- all of the -- everything is included in this
25 attachment that kind of leads you through where we went

1 with this thing. So we tried to take out what we didn't
2 feel was necessary and add something that was going to
3 represent what we felt needed to be done. So that's where
4 we're at with this thing.

5 We're looking for some comments. Right now if you
6 don't have contacts for me, we'll have to go through Jack
7 and maybe you can pass it on if you have e-mails or
8 something that you want to address. But we will have
9 recommendations.

10 MR. CLEARY: Keith, this could have a substantial
11 impact on some in the industry. Have you gotten any
12 feedback from the stakeholders?

13 MR. BECKER: I have not, but this is really the first
14 time it's being presented as an attachment for somebody to
15 look at and read. So that's where I'm at right now. If
16 it's going to be a huge impact that we need to go a
17 different direction, is it in a specific area, is it in
18 dumbwaiters, is it an elevator -- certain elevators, old
19 structures, what -- where are the impacts at.

20 MR. CLEARY: When have you seen impacts for your
21 industry or potential impacts?

22 MR. BECKER: You know, we've got time and materials.
23 Were not looking at significant -- so far we've done this
24 in our operations. We haven't seen significant expenses.
25 It somewhat adds to the pile of a list of things to do,

1 and while it's monumental sometimes on everything that has
2 to be done, but safe access.

3 One of the areas we're still -- in our industry we're
4 still looking for some direction is on a hand pull -- we
5 have hand pull conveyances, hand pull elevators inside of
6 our grain facilities. And at the top there's nothing more
7 than an overhead shiv. It's not defined in the WAC as
8 what that area is, if it's the top of a hoistway, is it
9 top of a car, is it machine space. Defining that area and
10 then determine -- and I believe we're leaning towards
11 defining that as machine space, and it will be dealt with
12 that -- those are typically wood structures -- or quite
13 often are wood structures in wood structure -- you know,
14 in a wood facility, and there is no access. We're leaning
15 a ladder up on top of that and climbing the ladder and
16 doing maintenance and repairs and inspections. We believe
17 that that is an area we probably should look at, something
18 permanent and with a platform, ladder, stairway, however
19 you're going to get to it, and it will follow the code.

20 So far it has not been extremely expensive.
21 Sometimes we will need variances because we'll run into
22 height restrictions when we get on top of this, some
23 places where we don't have a seven-foot clearance. And so
24 if this goes into effect, then we'll have to ask for a
25 variance.

1 MR. CLEARY: Jack?

2 MR. DAY: As we move forward, and what we hope folks
3 will see with the analysis is there's going to need to be
4 some input from building owners, property managers and
5 other folks. So I would like to make sure that those
6 folks sooner or later are engaged fully and understand
7 there is an impact. Some of the newer -- most are newer
8 buildings, and there's probably not going to be. But when
9 we get into older buildings prior to 1960, there's
10 probably going to be an impact.

11 MS. HOLCOMB: It seems that a lot of the new changes
12 to the machine rooms and the pits and all these inspection
13 items that are coming up, the building owners are not
14 being made aware of this. So these are huge cost impacts
15 to them that I understand are safety issues. But what's
16 your guys' decision on notifying the people that have to
17 pay for this? I mean, is there any process in place for
18 you guys to notify, hey, we're changing how your building
19 was built, how your machine room was built and now you're
20 going to have to change all these changes? Well, people
21 aren't aware of that. So we're having to do that. But as
22 a committee, shouldn't that be something that you're
23 having to notify building owners when you're making
24 changes to the structure of their building?

25 MR. DAY: Yes.

1 MS. HOLCOMB: So is that something that can be --

2 MR. DAY: When we went through the analysis, one of
3 the things was physical impact. That was one of the
4 things to fill out. Is there a physical impact? How much
5 is it? And nobody's going to, as a general rule for
6 something like this, be right on the money. Somebody may
7 need to have to change a wooden ladder to a metal ladder.
8 That may be a cost of \$1,000. Others, that may be
9 significant and be a \$20,000 bill.

10 MS. HOLCOMB: Well, we're seeing a lot of
11 significance, and they just think there's no communication
12 to the buildings. So I was wondering the process for
13 that.

14 MR. CLEARY: How would you like to see it
15 communicated?

16 MS. HOLCOMB: Well, they're not -- I'm just saying
17 because they're not hearing anything from L&I, so to them
18 it's a surprise. So if you're a building owner and you're
19 saying, "Okay, this has changed, this has changed, this
20 has changed," do you have the time to go look and read
21 through an RCW and the whole protocol? It would just be
22 nice if they had something, okay, we're changing these new
23 requirements. Your building owner's going to see some
24 changes, some more costs. This is stuff they don't have
25 budgeted.

1 So yeah, you're guys are coming up with safety
2 issues, but the buildings aren't aware and the owners
3 aren't aware that now all of a sudden if they have
4 20 elevators, they're looking at \$50,000. So that's
5 something that I think just kind of being on this side of
6 it when you're making all these things that are cost
7 impacts to the building owners, that there's no
8 communication.

9 MR. CLEARY: Getting the word out is always difficult
10 and it's very important, so we need to figure out a way to
11 help communicate better. There's no doubt.

12 MR. DAY: Help communicate differently. Because the
13 pamphlet that went out to all the owners didn't get read.
14 It's not that they weren't communicated with. They didn't
15 read it.

16 MS. HOLCOMB: Were they notified that now you're
17 going to have to change your pit lighting and your machine
18 room lighting and your doors and all these things that are
19 now new codes and then now I'm hearing ladders and
20 anything that's wood and all this other stuff? Well, how
21 is that being communicated to the building owners? I
22 mean, it's just, I think, maybe the big cost items that
23 are going to be more substantial, especially when you're
24 changing codes for something that's been in place for
25 20 years. They're not expecting that.

1 MR. CLEARY: I think it's incumbent upon them, too,
2 to have good dialogue with their service providers and
3 also do some due diligence.

4 MS. HOLCOMB: So now you're putting it back on us.

5 MR. CLEARY: No, no, no. I'm putting it back on
6 them. They need to do some due diligence, too. And if
7 they only have elevators that -- well, they have to be
8 participating in these types of meetings and also spend
9 some time getting on the L&I Web site, which there's --
10 everything's on there. It may not always be easy to find
11 it, but you can find it or you can ask questions. I mean,
12 you can call into a tech specialist. They have to be
13 engaged, too. It can't always be the service providers or
14 everybody has to --

15 MS. HOLCOMB: Well, I mean, because I was a property
16 manager. That's why I'm saying this. I've been in the
17 industry a long time. So you have all of a sudden 20 new
18 codes, you don't have the time to go -- I mean, you're
19 dealing with 40 other vendors and God knows how many
20 tenants. So that's -- you're not going to sit there and
21 think, Okay, it's January 1st. I need to go read the
22 RCW's to see what's changed.

23 MR. CLEARY: Then they're going to have to depend
24 probably on their service providers then.

25 MS. HOLCOMB: Well, I just think if there's something

1 and you're changing codes and you're changing inspection
2 processes, the building owners, I mean, they're getting
3 pissed off because they're not knowing what's going on.

4 MR. CLEARY: Dave, do you want to talk to that?

5 MR. GAULT: Having been a building owner for almost
6 20 years now and only been on the Committee for a couple
7 years, I can tell you that my education level has
8 increased. Before, I relied on the elevator company
9 through the service agreements that one of the lines in
10 the service agreement stated that you are to maintain the
11 elevators in accordance to code. So when code changes,
12 it's incumbent upon you to make the presentation to bring
13 it up to code or what the code requirement is. And, you
14 know, it's not that the owner doesn't have the wherewithal
15 to go search code, which, as you said, you have multiple
16 tenants. We have multiple codes. There's a lot more
17 going on in buildings than just elevators. So because of
18 that, it is incumbent upon the elevator service provider
19 to help bring those codes to the owners when they become
20 aware of them and make the presentation.

21 And then we get this friendly visit once a year that
22 also further educates us when we have -- and with that,
23 it's not we have been given, it's just that we have
24 negotiated with -- that because of funding mechanisms
25 coming from large amounts comes from different means and

1 we have to seek that and we just can't immediately fund
2 that. And so changes do come forth.

3 So I can say that I've been more educated about
4 elevators and escalators, but most building owners are
5 not.

6 MS. HOLCOMB: Well, I mean, it's just kind of -- if,
7 say, you're a building owner and you have 25 elevators and
8 all of a sudden we decided pit lighting and machine room
9 lighting and all these things that you are now responsible
10 for financially, how big of a cost is that going to be for
11 you? And you're not giving any variances and we're just
12 starting to pass out fines because this is a new code.
13 It's been three months, you haven't changed your pit
14 lighting and now all of a sudden -- you know what I mean?
15 Because that's a big cost to people, especially when it's
16 not just in relation to the elevator. It's the building.
17 But if there's no lenience on it, I mean, I just don't
18 know. Because I'm just speaking all the frustration of my
19 customers. Because it's kind of like, okay, now all of a
20 sudden I have to install this new lighting because your
21 guys are saying that's a new code. It's their expense.
22 It's a building issue. Does that make sense?

23 MR. DAY: It does. And I would love to talk to you
24 about that later, but I'll leave with there's -- for each
25 of you in this business today, there's a certain level of

1 responsibility each of you have and so do your employees.
2 And you turn it around, putting every emphasis back on the
3 State and saying, "It's just a new code that just came
4 in," and you didn't know? This is your own fault because
5 we do publish this well in advance.

6 MR. CLEARY: All right. Okay.

7 MR. WHITED: Our frustration is that we are told we
8 have to do this to comply and we have no direction of what
9 you actually want. That's a frustration with about
10 20 companies that I'm in contact with that handle grain.
11 They don't know what you want at the top of the head
12 pulleys on these outside manlifts. That's been a
13 frustration for 10 years now.

14 MR. CLEARY: And that's what that subcommittee is
15 working on.

16 MR. WHITED: That's what they're supposed to be
17 working on. So if we have a violation to have it
18 corrected in 90 days, how can we correct it if we don't
19 have the information to correct it? That's where we are.

20 MS. HOLCOMB: Then you get a time limit.

21 MR. WHITED: And the time limit.

22 MR. DAY: Keith, can you investigate what Jerry's
23 talking about?

24 MR. BECKER: It's part of what we're -- we will.
25 We'll continue to -- right now it's not addressed in WAC

1 at all, that area.

2 MR. WHITED: It's in our correction. We received the
3 correction for 90 days to have it done.

4 MR. DAY: What WAC code was it a violation of, Jerry?

5 MR. WHITED: Yep.

6 MR. DAY: What WAC code was it a violation of?

7 MR. WHITED: That was by your inspectors.

8 MR. DAY: You don't have that information? You can
9 bring that to me later then and I'll be glad to discuss it
10 with you so that you have complete and correct direction.

11 MR. BECKER: Now, with this particular document, and,
12 you know, we've got 30 some elevators and whatever, so we
13 have the same frustrations. And what I've got right now,
14 we finally got a document that we can hand out. And so,
15 okay, here's the proposal. We've spent two years saying,
16 "Okay. We're going this direction and we're going to
17 write it this way, we're going to write it this way. What
18 are we going to put?" Because nothing exists right now
19 for correction on just like what Jerry is talking about,
20 or a lot of existing means of access, there's nothing
21 there that's clear.

22 So the intent is to create something that's clear,
23 but soften the impact to deal with situations that are
24 safety issues. If there's no access, then it needs to be
25 put in in a certain way. If there is access and three of

1 the stair rungs are gone and the structure that holds them
2 up is cracked and it has to be corrected, where is the
3 direction?

4 There's an opportunity to soften this as best we can
5 and create something that gives direction. Right now
6 we're hoping this particular one, you know, that that's
7 been the comment of the subcommittee is how do we make it
8 workable for people and not make it a huge impact? So
9 input from anybody that's got concerns would be greatly
10 appreciated.

11 MR. CLEARY: I agree. And that's why we need to get
12 structure to our subcommittees so we can get things done
13 in a more expeditious manner. It would be nice to get --
14 we've been kicking the can down the road a lot, so we do
15 need to get some answers.

16 All right. We need to move on. The overview of the
17 point of sale, and that has to do with on residential
18 elevators and residential stair chairs, after they get
19 their acceptance testing, no one really knows what happens
20 to them. And so if things get jumped out or worked on by
21 Uncle Louie and, you know, the new owners really don't
22 know the history of what work has been done on that
23 elevator, what's been jumped out or done or not done.

24 So there's been a subcommittee in place to look at
25 getting these inspected at point of sale, and the subchair

1 is Swen. He's been working really diligently, putting a
2 lot of work into that. So he's going to give a little
3 overview of what's going on. So Swen?

4 MR. LARSON: First of all, I'd like to thank all of
5 you that served on the committee and gave up their time to
6 help with this.

7 Back in 2004 the then chief of the Elevator section
8 of L&I, Dottie Stanlaske, sent out a letter after a
9 fatality where a young boy was killed on a residential
10 elevator asking if we'd work on putting something into
11 place. So I was tasked with being the chair of this
12 committee. And I didn't have a lot of experience on the
13 residential elevators and the home lift stuff, but as I
14 got to research it, I can tell you that in my 30 years in
15 this trade, I see nothing that needs addressed more than
16 what I discovered since I started looking into this.

17 In the March edition of Elevator World it talks about
18 one of the things, there's swing doors on elevators, and
19 part of what I want to do is help educate. I think I
20 certainly didn't know it was this big of a problem, but it
21 says, "The number of children seriously injured or killed
22 will never be fully known due to protective orders and
23 destruction of documentation. However, one manufacturer
24 reported there were 34 children injured or killed from
25 1983 to 1993 in New Jersey, in southern New York State

1 alone." That's incredible. The age of the kids getting
2 killed are from 3 to 13 years of age.

3 And it goes on to say, "It may be an easy rebuttal to
4 claim parents have an obligation to watch their children
5 at all times. However, this fallacy is not persuasive
6 when the hazards are also not known by the general public.
7 Furthermore, children sometimes leave their parents'
8 observation with a playful or independent intent."

9 It goes on to say, "The first step in all risk
10 reduction methodologies is to eliminate the risk. There
11 is no amount of warning that will mitigate this risk, and
12 the solutions are easy, generally." And then he names the
13 three ways to implement. Manufacturers have to design
14 something that is safe, and then they talk about the
15 AHJ's. And I think this is where this group comes in.

16 In order for an AHJ to address a problem, they have
17 to have statutory authority to address the problem, and
18 that's what we're attempting to give them here. This is
19 not an overreaching bill. It just will require an
20 inspection of the home conveyance at the time of the sale.
21 It's not a lot of money.

22 And then the last thing they look at are the
23 maintainers. And they say they have the heaviest
24 responsibility to make sure that these things are safe for
25 the people using them. They're the ones that see them

1 most often. If they see a problem, they need to report it
2 and make sure to educate the people on the dangers of it.

3 In the conclusion, it says, "The clearance hazard has
4 been known since at least 1931, yet the distance increased
5 through the years and the introduction of the folding car
6 doors has created a new hazard. It is unacceptable that
7 these injuries and fatalities to children still occur from
8 well-known hazards. If the elevator industry fails to
9 take necessary actions, others, e.g. the US Consumer
10 Protection Product Safety Commission, may make them for
11 us." And then the article starts off by saying, "Inaction
12 is not an option. We have to choose to be a part of the
13 problem or a part of the solution." And this is the
14 vanilla sugarcoated version of this story.

15 There were some questions asked at the last meeting.
16 I've attempted to answer them, and I'm willing to try to
17 answer any questions that remain.

18 I think it's too late to get this on the legislative
19 agenda this year. This needs to be an ongoing part of
20 what this committee does. This is important legislation,
21 and I don't think -- hopefully it doesn't get dropped.

22 I'll answer any questions anybody has.

23 MR. CLEARY: So what kind of progress -- what have
24 you done on the subcommittee?

25 MR. LARSON: The subcommittee, we met with the

1 Realtors, talked with them. At this time they said they
2 could not support us.

3 MR. DAY: Did they say why?

4 MR. LARSON: Did they say why? No.

5 MR. DAY: Just no?

6 MR. LARSON: Yeah. They said, "At this time, we
7 cannot support your legislation."

8 MR. DAY: For you, is that acceptable?

9 MR. LARSON: I would have to say no. I think they
10 share some risk there. One of the things I'm going to do
11 is I'm going to provide all my documentation when I'm
12 finished with this project for two reasons: number one,
13 anybody moving forward with this will have starting
14 points, will have some facts and figures in place; and
15 number two, we're trying to get the word out to everybody.

16 MR. DAY: I would like it, if you could, Swen, is to
17 do the analysis and include your documentation in it as an
18 ongoing living document so we can publish it, because the
19 reasons why are important. If somebody says no, I'd like
20 -- we deserve to know the rationale of why it's no.

21 MR. LARSON: Well, they said that they would be
22 interested in further education on the subject. But my
23 response was, you know, if you're buying a house, you're
24 handed a handful of paperwork and you've got a little
25 pamphlet in there about elevator safety, what's the

1 chances that's ever going to get read by anybody? We have
2 to mitigate the risk.

3 MR. CLEARY: Charlie?

4 MR. VAL: I think part of our problem is education.
5 So we went down to testify and talked to the -- I guess it
6 would be the home inspectors. We had that meeting, we
7 told them what we thought the problem was, and there was a
8 bunch of mud thrown in the water. They wanted to know
9 what a -- they didn't understand what a conveyance was,
10 there was a bunch of old history that was brought up, and
11 there wasn't a chance to rebut anything. I think that
12 what we need to do as a Committee, on the Committee level,
13 we have to support the idea to run legislation and then
14 that becomes a document as well.

15 So at the meeting, we weren't able to tell the
16 inspectors that the Elevator Advisory Committee is in
17 favor of this because we didn't have that conversation.
18 So I think we need to start here and get support from the
19 Advisory Committee, then we go out to educate, speak to
20 the Elevator Advisory Committee suggested we do this, and
21 it just gives us a little more credibility.

22 MR. CLEARY: I'm pretty passionate about this. I
23 represent the residential market, and there are people in
24 here that understand that, you know, we get called in a
25 lot to look at things that have been --

1 (Interruption in meeting.)

2 MR. DAY: If the alarm goes off, we will go out this
3 door. And everybody drop everything and we go out this
4 door. We will walk, if it's safe, around to the other
5 side of the building to the sidewalk, okay?

6 MR. CLEARY: To kind of finish up, it doesn't make
7 any sense to me because right now there's no regulations
8 that precludes a homeowner or a representative from
9 working on a residential elevator or conveyance after it's
10 been through the initial acceptance. And we see a lot of
11 things where they don't want to spend money on interlocks,
12 so we see things jumped out. Bill, you've seen it, too.
13 A lot of things just gets worked on by somebody who
14 doesn't understand conveyances.

15 So to me, for them to not even want to listen or talk
16 makes no sense. You've got to have a roof inspection,
17 gutter inspection, all kinds of other things that you have
18 to have done. You've got something that can hurt and kill
19 people. It's documented. It's got to be maintained right
20 and looked at. So the new buyer has no idea of what the
21 history work record is on this piece of equipment. There
22 are not good records whatsoever. And so for them not to
23 even entertain it, I find it troubling.

24 So I appreciate what you're doing, Swen, but we've
25 got to press a little bit. And for them just to say "no,"

1 to me is unacceptable.

2 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'd like to amplify on a couple of
3 things here. First of all, it's been brought to my
4 attention that people like Charlie and Swen and Scott have
5 far more visibility on some of these issues, the effect
6 and the problem area than I do. And I owe an apology for
7 Charlie and Swen for not acknowledging the fact that they
8 are the boots on the ground, and also Scott for a lot of
9 what we see here.

10 The concern that we have as homeowners, as I
11 expressed to Jack and Scott in my memo, which is part of
12 the minutes here, is that you can explain this problem in
13 25 words or less and propose a solution, but it's the
14 implementation of how that actually comes together to
15 result in a good legislation as opposed to not well
16 thought through legislation is what our approach has been
17 and the efforts that we have made to try to look at all
18 aspects of this thing. And I'd like to talk to you a
19 little bit about that, and I'll try to be as brief as
20 possible.

21 One thing that I should mention is that Swen and
22 Charlie and also me were invited down to the steering
23 committee of the Washington Association of Realtors in
24 January. Our time was extremely limited. We were only
25 given just a few minutes to appear before the committee.

1 And at the end of those brief comments -- and as you know,
2 if you've ever been given a time limit of three or five
3 minutes to express your case, it's just insufficient. So
4 time was short for them, time was short for us. As I
5 recall, they announced later that they said that they
6 wouldn't support this legislation, but they are not
7 unaware of it.

8 And the thing that was gratifying to me is that for
9 the first time in the 10 or 15 years that we've been
10 dealing with this issue and talking about this issue,
11 there was dialogue between the real estate group and the
12 proponents of this legislation. That has never, to my
13 knowledge, occurred before.

14 The problem they had was a short legislative session,
15 a lot of things on their plate. And the agreements that I
16 saw go back and forth were rather than trying to deal with
17 this in a pressure-cooker atmosphere, to wait until the
18 legislative session was over and then revisit this. So no
19 doors have been closed. In fact, the last time I talked
20 to the Washington Association of Realtors, they said they
21 had not heard anything more from the proponents of the
22 legislation, so they were open but contact needs to be
23 reestablished. And we would certainly contribute in any
24 way we could to that process because just getting this up
25 to the point where those two groups are finally talking to

1 one another was exceptional.

2 That said, I'd like to review a couple things, which
3 I don't know the Board here is familiar with. And again,
4 I'm going to be as fast as I can. But for some reason --
5 I shouldn't say for some reason. But at the present time,
6 the residential community is faced with about six serious
7 issues, two of which directly affect our residential
8 inclines.

9 We have licensing of residential maintenance that's
10 coming up. You'll see that at the bottom of your agenda.
11 We have the MCP program, which is just getting started.
12 We have the ongoing issue of the recall that L&I initiated
13 18 months ago on certain residential incline elevators
14 that were declared insufficient in their braking capacity.
15 That is still a work in progress.

16 We have a new evolution to my experience of
17 residential inclines are now being subjected to
18 unannounced inspections. That's something that this Board
19 has mentioned for the last ten years off and on as to why
20 that wasn't occurring. It is occurring. I haven't had
21 much feedback on the results of it, and that's something
22 that Jack and I could probably talk about away from the
23 Committee when there is more time. I would like to do
24 that. So that's my invitation to you, Jack, because I
25 think the Board would benefit from being updated on that

1 next quarterly meeting.

2 We also have annual inspections coming up for
3 discussion and, of course, we have time of sale.

4 Now I'll summarize by saying that all of these issues
5 that I have mentioned and time of sale are interrelated.
6 You can't look at just one from our point of view without
7 considering all of these other factors. There's a lot
8 that's affecting us, there are a lot of things that are
9 being done. The Department is being proactive in making
10 inspections at least in our community. I don't want
11 anybody to go away from this meeting thinking that the
12 residential community is oblivious to items of maintenance
13 and safety. We are not. It's an ongoing issue. There
14 are a lot of different moving parts to it, and hopefully
15 we can pull all those together with the help of some of
16 these other organizations and have more progress to report
17 back in the future.

18 MR. CLEARY: Jack?

19 MR. DAY: Is one of the things I hope folks are
20 listening to -- the young lady in the red.

21 MS. HOLCOMB: Salinas.

22 MR. DAY: Salinas. What Salinas had said and what
23 Rob is saying and what I'm putting together with what we
24 put together with this analysis, the whole intent here is
25 to be better at informing you and the owner of what we're

1 doing and what's going on. The analysis, Swen has said
2 you're going to put that together. Charlie, you've asked
3 that the Committee -- it's not a Board -- that the
4 Committee be supportive. And me talking with other
5 Committee members, they want to see what it all is that
6 you're putting together so that they can make a decision
7 about supporting.

8 It isn't that -- I don't believe it's not the fact
9 that they don't support the idea behind it. It's
10 supporting what is that going to turn into, what does it
11 look like and how much is that candle foot power going to
12 be. So they want to know this, and I think they deserve
13 it. So let's get that information out here so that it can
14 be published, and then next time you can ask the question:
15 Does the Committee support?

16 MR. LARSON: Yeah, it was in 25 words or less. I
17 didn't want there to be any hidden agendas there, but I
18 thought it was as simple and straightforward as I could
19 make it. Obviously, we don't have enough time to flush
20 things out all the time, but like Bob said, we had three
21 minutes to talk. The real estate committee, we got five
22 minutes to talk here. And hopefully, if there's more
23 questions that needed answers, then what are the
24 questions? And get them to me and I'll do my best to
25 research and get an answer.

1 MR. DAY: Who's on your subcommittee with you?

2 MR. LARSON: Scott, Bob McLaughlin, Charlie, Carissa
3 [phonetic] Barrett, Mr. Maris here. Who else? Dave
4 Spafford and --

5 MR. DAY: Well, I would like you to add to it how
6 would we enforce it. How would we do it? Because that's
7 important for me. Because at the end of the day, I have
8 to have the manpower to do it, and the companies have to
9 realize what their role and responsibility is. So I think
10 more needs to be done, and I'm looking for this analysis
11 to start filling the gap.

12 MR. CLEARY: Are you going to stay for the
13 stakeholders' meeting so we can further discuss? We've
14 got to move on. We're getting really tight. So any
15 questions, at the stakeholders' we can do some more
16 discussion on this.

17 Next I want to move on to the subcommittee for Part B
18 permits, and Bryan Wheeler is the subchair.

19 MR. WHEELER: Just a brief overview of what this is
20 is we established a subcommittee several months ago now,
21 actually creeping up on a year ago, to review and look at
22 a program to implement a permit process for alterations on
23 some minor alterations as well as some installation of
24 vertical platform lifts and some residential products or
25 accessibility products and in modeling after a program

1 that Oregon has whereby a contractor in good standing can
2 have a book of permits, so to speak, and as they sign that
3 alteration, they notify the Department and they can do the
4 alteration, turn it over to the public, and at the
5 Department's discretion it would be inspected, whether
6 that's on an annual visit or a stop by rather than holding
7 the elevator up from being turned over to the building
8 owner, so to speak.

9 We've met a couple times on this committee. There
10 are a few that have discussed this. I am looking for more
11 stakeholder participation because as of this point, it's
12 mainly been industry. And so I really am looking for more
13 stakeholders. We do have a sign-in sheet here for
14 anybody. After this meeting, come up, sign up.

15 I'm looking to hold the next meeting in June and
16 would encourage anybody's participation. Because our goal
17 is to have something put together for the August meeting
18 of the Committee here so that we can introduce it to the
19 January legislation if it requires any code change. And
20 after today, I learned that we have an analysis form that
21 I need to fill out, and I'll get that to you.

22 Questions? Yes.

23 MR. DAY: I do want to make a point, Bryan. I
24 apologize you might not have gotten the word that L&I has
25 decided to work with stakeholder groups, and our meeting

1 is on June 11th for us to craft language to present to our
2 Director for this proposal.

3 MR. WHEELER: Great.

4 MR. DAY: So we're joining with you. We have a
5 sign-in sheet, and anybody that would like to be on that
6 committee, we would like you to sign up for it.

7 MR. WHEELER: Where is this meeting on June 11th?

8 MR. DAY: Sally? I'm sorry.

9 MS. ELLIOTT: Next door in this room right here.

10 MR. WHEELER: Here right next door. Okay. Great.

11 MS. ELLIOTT: 1:00 to 3:00.

12 MR. DAY: Okay. So our intent is to come up with
13 some language. It will require an RCW change, and it will
14 more than likely result in some WAC 296-96 additions on
15 how to administer it.

16 So we'll send this around. So if you're interested,
17 please sign up and put a mark on your calendar June 11th
18 and right next door. It will be in the afternoon. Read
19 the minutes.

20 Any other questions for that?

21

22 New Business

23

24 MR. CLEARY: Okay. We're going to move on. I'm
25 going to be really quick on the licensing criteria. I

1 contacted the members that would like to be on the
2 subcommittee. I'll get an analysis form put together and
3 get it sent out. I would like to have the first meeting
4 probably the first or second week in June. So everybody
5 that signed up for the subcommittee for licensing
6 criteria, I'll get that form to everybody and we'll get
7 that kicked off.

8 Kind of the goal and the purpose is to look at
9 streamlining the amount of licensing categories and see
10 what makes sense. Because we also have to find a way to
11 do training and licensing, so that's all going to be part
12 of this. So we talked about that before. But I'll get
13 things back out to everybody, and we'll have a full report
14 at the next Advisory.

15 Any questions on that?

16 MR. DAY: I do. One of the things that I'm
17 interested in as well, and I'm not sure if you guys are
18 covering it, is a consolidation of the testing and
19 qualification methods to move more towards a national
20 theme such as I know there's one which is NEIP, N-E-I-P,
21 but there's also a CAT and CET. And these are nationally
22 recognized organizations that have training material and
23 testing criteria already devised for several of these
24 categories. And in some of these, my interest is taking
25 the State out of that business as much as we can of

1 qualifications when there's a national organization that
2 does so.

3 MR. CLEARY: We plan on looking at that and making
4 some recommendations as part of that subcommittee.

5 With that, I'd like to move on to code adoption
6 subcommittee. And Jack is going to talk about that. And
7 we have -- I think Tom is one of the people that would
8 like to do some addressing on that, too. So go ahead,
9 Jack.

10 MR. DAY: I've just got my name in here for a
11 placeholder because at the time, I wasn't sure who was
12 going to speak. I have learned today that it's going to
13 be Mr. Wheeler.

14 MR. WHEELER: There will be some others, I'm sure.
15 But the, I guess, proposal here is that we'd like to
16 establish a subcommittee to review code changes,
17 recommendations, analysis. This committee here exists to
18 advise the Department on what adoption of rules and
19 enforcement and administration of those rules should be.
20 The challenge is that it meets four times a year, and as
21 we've seen today, we're very limited on what can be
22 discussed and what can be reviewed at this meeting in a
23 time frame.

24 The proposal for this committee would be -- of all
25 stakeholders interested and available would be to meet on

1 a monthly basis and review these action items, these
2 proposed changes, these issues that come up and have all
3 stakeholders input and actively participate. The goal is
4 to work fast and swift to review the issues, come up with
5 some solutions for recommendations and bring them to these
6 monthly meetings that would establish, I think, a better
7 flow of information in progress through these changes.

8 So with that, I'd like to seek the Committee's
9 approval to start that process. After today's education,
10 we do have an analysis that, I think, for this
11 subcommittee, it may not be an analysis that needs to be
12 filled out right now because this subcommittee doesn't
13 have an agenda of topics yet. One of the first functions
14 would be is to establish this committee and develop that
15 agenda of topics via the input of the stakeholders for a
16 regular routine meeting.

17 With that, I'll ask Tom if there was any other
18 discussion that you wanted to --

19 MR. CLEARY: What I need to get clarification on,
20 too, is we've had in the past a standing subcommittee.
21 Are you recommending something like that or something when
22 the need comes up as we start going through new code
23 review? So it's still not really clear in my mind what
24 and how this would be administered.

25 MR. WHEELER: I think it's definitely more of a

1 standard subcommittee that would -- I mean, the
2 stakeholders that are on this committee would be able to
3 continually bring about recommendations or thoughts that
4 are brought to us. We have the time in that monthly
5 meeting to actually open up a code book, do the research,
6 gather some history from the Department as to what brought
7 that code into place or that policy into place in the
8 past, and then be able to come to this table with some
9 recommendations and some thoughts. So yeah. It would be
10 more of a standing committee, is my understanding.

11 MR. CLEARY: Tom?

12 MR. McBRIDE: I think Bryan summarized it really
13 well. Some of the origins of this idea came up back when
14 the code adoption was under way. And as Bryan pointed
15 out, there is just so much to cover in the limited amount
16 of time that the EAC meets. And a number of the
17 stakeholders thought if there were a forum where we could
18 sit down and dive into these issues in greater detail,
19 debate them, get all the stakeholders in one room so
20 everyone's there to provide a recommendation to this
21 group, this committee, it might be really helpful. And it
22 would hopefully smooth out some of the code adoption
23 process because some of those debates and dialogues would
24 have already occurred. That was the idea behind this, and
25 I think Bryan described it well.

1 It's a forum that can take up a number of different
2 issues. For example, when the new code is adopted, we
3 don't always take the time to go through the old code, the
4 old RCW's, the old WAC's to eliminate the materials that
5 are out of date or they're inconsistent with the newly
6 adopted model code. So it's really an attempt to provide
7 some additional time and stakeholder input to advise the
8 Committee.

9 In terms of the time, Scott, that you asked, the
10 standing nature of the committee, I think Bryan is right
11 that the anticipation is it would be there to take a look
12 at issues as they arise. But we certainly would
13 acknowledge that if it serves its purpose and there's no
14 more reason to keep it in place, I would think that the
15 Committee could set aside the subcommittee. There
16 wouldn't be any need for it. That would be fine.

17 But we really do see this as a broad-based
18 opportunity to get all the stakeholders in one room and to
19 act fast to take off little pieces of a bigger project and
20 deliver product recommendations to the Committee so we can
21 see some immediate results. And sure appreciate the
22 support of the stakeholders in moving this process
23 forward.

24 MR. CLEARY: I think the Committee would appreciate
25 something where we didn't wait until the 11th hour on some

1 of these comments that we get back or things don't get
2 pushed through or becomes a fire. So getting some
3 feedback and getting part of that process up front I think
4 would be very helpful for us to be able to advise the
5 State on what we think needs to be modified or changed.
6 Because even through this last process, you know, there's
7 some things that now you sit back and look in hindsight
8 that if we had more time or spent more time, we probably
9 could have had some more things in the language. So I do
10 think that would be beneficial.

11 MR. DAY: Which codes are you suggesting?

12 MR. WHEELER: At this point, we're not suggesting any
13 agenda. The committee would review, I think -- you know,
14 there's obviously, like Tom brought up, if there's codes
15 that are in the WAC that may not apply -- and I don't have
16 specific examples of this right here, but if they don't
17 apply to today's after the new code has been adopted, we
18 need to get that cleaned up. If there's other items that
19 come up prior to your announcement of the Department
20 already moving forward with the Type B permits, I knew
21 that there's going to be some code language changes that
22 need to happen for the Type B permit. And I think that
23 this subcommittee would be a good forum to be able to get
24 all stakeholders involved to review just that code piece,
25 not to mention, you know, the Type B permit would look at

1 the administrative, all the full implications of it. This
2 would help with just that code piece.

3 So the agenda is wide open at this point. I don't
4 think anybody has any specific code to discuss right now.

5 MR. DAY: Wide-open agenda for a subcommittee with no
6 basis or scope? I'm lost.

7 MR. WHEELER: It's with code, in particular to how
8 the code is written and what changes we want to suggest.

9 MR. CLEARY: I think that's why it would be important
10 to see an analysis form put together with that.

11 I guess my one concern would be is if we have a
12 really good cross-section of all stakeholders. But having
13 just an open subcommittee kind of defeats the purpose of a
14 subcommittee, because we're supposed to have a beginning
15 and end point. So I think we need to define this a little
16 bit better.

17 MR. McBRIDE: If I may add just a bit to that. I
18 think Bryan described it well. The idea in the
19 description that you provided in the agenda, Chief Day, is
20 broad in scope by design. Because really, we didn't want
21 this idea to limit or to prescribe what that subcommittee
22 would do. That's really up to the stakeholders who are
23 involved. So to some extent, we thought it was
24 inappropriate to call out what that subcommittee would do.
25 That's something the stakeholders who are participating

1 should describe.

2 But I think you're right, Chief, that the idea is to
3 dig in deep on some of the broader issues that are
4 impacted by the adoption of the code or, as Bryan said,
5 other issues that come up along the way. I think the
6 subcommittee would be to communicate with the Committee,
7 the EAC committee, as to what its projects would be. And
8 there's got to be communication there. It's not intended
9 to ask for a free scope.

10 MR. CLEARY: So it's my understanding that each topic
11 that you would address, you'd fill out another form?

12 MR. WHEELER: Correct. We'd fill out that analysis
13 form for each topic. This committee is just -- it's more
14 of establishing a workgroup, if you will, in between all
15 of these meetings that after this board has approved that
16 analysis form, you know, between that meeting and the next
17 meeting, we actually now have a forum to discuss, debate
18 and to work with that idea to bring a proposal to the
19 table the next time.

20 MR. CLEARY: Charlie?

21 MR. VAL: I think that where you guys can start, if
22 you wanted to start somewhere, would be this Fire
23 Administrative Code. I heard today that they thought they
24 were finished with it, but that would be a good place for
25 you guys to put your input, take a look, you know, at the

1 questions that we have on here and bring those -- let us
2 know what your thoughts are on that. Because what's going
3 to happen is we're going to make a recommendation to the
4 Elevator Division on this FAID, and you guys are probably
5 going to have to be put on that. So that would be a
6 perfect spot for you to get together and talk about that.
7 We have subcommittees, and sometimes they're not active or
8 we don't think they're active. It can be, you know, Swen
9 and I on our committees also. So there's a lot of work
10 that could be done. We could use the help right now.

11 MR. MARTIN: One of the things you said earlier, and
12 I think it's Salinas that's sitting here, when she was
13 talking about stakeholder engagement, Jack, you said we
14 need to communicate differently, I think was your words.
15 You chose your words closely -- or very specifically.

16 MR. DAY: Carefully.

17 MR. MARTIN: Yeah. Carefully.

18 I think this is a great example of like exactly what
19 she was getting at, that it's a different way to
20 communicate. And you're going to get people that are
21 focused on -- you're going to get an elevator guy like
22 myself, if I'm on the subcommittee, that has all sorts of
23 resources. We're going to reach out and we're getting
24 building owners that can then engage with other people at
25 BOMA, or whatever the hospitality group that David is part

1 of, to get their opinion on certain things. And so this
2 would be the exact opportunity to do what we discussed
3 earlier, and that's to communicate differently.

4 MR. DAY: Before we make a decision, because I want
5 us to make a decision, one of the things -- I'm supportive
6 of this, but I'd like to see from the committee -- the
7 subcommittee, if you guys are agreeable to it, if you're
8 all agreeable, is a list of priorities or a list of items
9 that your intention is down the road to start addressing
10 like, as Charlie brought up, the FAID. Some other things
11 that come to mind really quickly is machine roomless,
12 control roomless conveyances. Here's some things that we
13 have some significant rules in regard to or FAID where we
14 have little in regards to how we're going to treat them
15 and do we need to create some more in-depth discussion,
16 debate and deliberation to ultimately bring back a
17 proposal about some of these rules.

18 So in the event of creating a subcommittee to look at
19 WAC for what's our priorities, and then maybe also to look
20 -- as you're looking at the 2013 code in and of itself.
21 So do those things, in it, do those address some of the
22 concerns or are there concerns in 2013, as you're looking
23 at it, for MRL. What about that level of subcommittee?

24 MR. WHEELER: I think with the approval of the
25 subcommittee, the intention and in the purpose and scope,

1 it actually states that -- in our first meeting is to
2 develop that list of targeted areas as a committee and
3 then bring that -- have that prepared and hopefully have
4 some background on each of those items or a significant
5 amount of those items for that August meeting. So with
6 the approval of the Board today of organizing this
7 committee, I think that by August we can come to the
8 meeting with a good list of items that we think we should
9 be addressing for your approval.

10 MR. CLEARY: After having the analysis form out there
11 and hearing that they'll do that for each one, I feel more
12 comfortable with it. Does the Committee want to vote on
13 authorizing or letting them set up this subcommittee? I
14 motion that we vote on it.

15 MR. VAL: Second.

16 MR. CLEARY: All in favor?

17 THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

18 MR. CLEARY: Again? All right. So you have the
19 opportunity to go ahead and do that. But it's really
20 important that we --

21 MR. DAY: Before we go, who is going to be chairing
22 this?

23 MR. CLEARY: Subchairing.

24 MR. DAY: Who's going to chair the subcommittee?

25 MR. WHEELER: So Rob and myself will take the lead on

1 that.

2 MR. DAY: I also would like to be present in all
3 this.

4 MR. WHEELER: I would appreciate your participation
5 in it.

6 MR. DAY: We need to get the dates out there, which I
7 think we have some preliminary dates, do we not, Tom?

8 MR. McBRIDE: That's correct.

9 MR. DAY: What were they; do you recall?

10 MR. McBRIDE: You know what I'll do is I'll send that
11 to you, Jack, and then maybe you can send it -- whoever
12 you want to send it out, send it to all the stakeholders.
13 We really do view this as a large group and see that
14 entire stakeholder group is helping to set the --

15 MR. DAY: Did I not put those dates in the --

16 MR. WATSON: The proposed meeting dates are
17 June 12th, 8:00 to noon, that's in Tukwila here; July 16th
18 8:00 to noon; and August 14th. Actually, August 14th is
19 set up as a whole day for right now.

20 MR. DAY: Okay. So we could go through some
21 priorities, per se, and then you're going to know do we --
22 owners, what subject, make sure they're there and that
23 kind of thing, okay? Make sure that we've got the right
24 people in the room, as Scott would say. We want to make
25 sure the building owners are there if they need to be

1 there, and the elevator companies are there as they need
2 to be there and so on and so forth.

3 MR. CLEARY: And I think that might address some of
4 your questions out there, how do we get it out to the
5 owners. They'll have participation and they'll know it's
6 coming, not just after it's already been adopted. I think
7 that's very important.

8 All right. We've got to move on. We're running out
9 of time.

10 MR. DAY: Bryan, you're going to take off with this?

11 MR. WHEELER: Yes.

12 MR. DAY: All right.

13 MR. CLEARY: Proposal for comb impact device.

14 MR. DAY: That would be me.

15 MR. CLEARY: That would be Jack.

16 MR. DAY: We're going to go through this again but a
17 little bit slower. This is our first attempt at the
18 analysis form, which was a good one. And I want us to go
19 through this a little bit slower with a brief summary of
20 what this proposal does and its purpose.

21 Escalator moving devices installed prior to 1993 were
22 not equipped with comb impact devices. The intent would
23 be to follow New York in requiring these devices which
24 will reduce the severity of injuries to the public that
25 become entrapped between the comb plate and the moving

1 step. What we want is a device that will shut the
2 escalator off if somebody gets themselves entrapped
3 instead of waiting for someone to push the stop switch
4 which allows the escalator to keep running and running and
5 running.

6 I'm going to take us down to No. 2. Of the -- this
7 is our count, 509. This does not include the City of
8 Seattle or Spokane. There may be as many as 226
9 escalators without the device. We do not really know as
10 some of the alterations may have included a comb impact
11 device, but we're not sure.

12 None of the devices are calibrated to 65 psi. What
13 New York City did was come in and require that the
14 vertical calibration be at 65, therefore it shuts the
15 escalator off, removing power from the motor and brake
16 much sooner than what the code -- I think the code's
17 150 --

18 MR. VAL: 15 -- 1.5

19 MR. DAY: So this is a lesser amount.

20 So what calibration will do is affect all of them,
21 not just the ones installed prior to 1993. And I say 1993
22 as in 1993 code which became effective in Washington in
23 1995.

24 Permitting inspection impact will be high, so it is
25 going to be an impact to the Department, to the owners and

1 to the elevator companies. So one of the things that we
2 may look at is a phase in of this criteria, and maybe
3 something that -- who is affected most, what locations are
4 affected most, and then call that as a high priority and
5 those get taken care of first and then move down the line.

6 Three, if enacted, what type of physical impact?

7 I'll be searching for some evaluations on the pricing from
8 different elevator companies. I do want to make note that
9 there is no way I can keep your information secret. So
10 once you tell me, it's open to the public. I won't put it
11 into this, but people will, if they ask, they'll know what
12 your pricing is. Anyway, it's something that after that,
13 that we will need to communicate to all the affected
14 owners and property managers up front so that they know
15 this is coming.

16 No. 6, it would require new rules to identify the
17 proposal. You see that I suggested it would go in WAC
18 Part D, Subpart 4, Section 3. And what it will read, "For
19 all existing and newly installed escalators, a device
20 shall be provided that will cause the opening of the power
21 circuit to the escalator driving machine motor and brake
22 where a resilient vertical force not greater than
23 60 pounds in the upward direction is applied at the center
24 of the front of the comb plate."

25 So what this affects, it affects all escalators, not

1 just the ones that were installed older than the 1993
2 code. And that's that 60 pounds of force.

3 Now, again, this is intended as a living document,
4 and I intend to put it on our Web page. But also, I
5 wanted to ask the group if they have so far supported
6 moving forward, knowing that this isn't finished in any
7 way, with analysis or information that needs to be
8 captured within. Does the group support moving forward
9 with this safety device? Yes? No? Skip? Charlie?

10 MR. VAL: You said this is going to affect all
11 escalators?

12 MR. DAY: Yes.

13 MR. VAL: So what we're talking about -- you're
14 talking about this started off with 509, so now we're
15 looking at how many?

16 MR. DAY: Well, 509, we're looking at a total. But
17 200 and some odd do not have a comb impact device at all.

18 MR. WHEELER: Just in the state --

19 MR. DAY: Just in the state. I do not know the
20 numbers in Spokane or Seattle. We would like to get those
21 numbers as this document remains alive.

22 MR. VAL: So you're saying that we only have 509
23 escalators in Washington State? I thought it was much
24 higher than that.

25 MR. DAY: A lot of people thought so, but the city

1 has quite a few as well.

2 MR. MARTIN: An additional cost to be considered when
3 you look at fiscal impact is going to be the nuisance --
4 the billable nuisance calls when it comes to reducing the
5 sensitivity or, I guess, increasing the sensitivity of
6 that comb plate. So it's not just the up-front fixed cost
7 of the installation, but you're going to look at ongoing
8 cost for everyone.

9 MR. DAY: I'm going to reach out to the elevator
10 companies and have you supply me with documentation
11 indicating how many nuisance calls you get from any of the
12 escalators installed after 1993 code --

13 MR. GAULT: That have the device.

14 MR. DAY: -- which have the device. However, there's
15 another impact here as well because we're intending to
16 reduce it to 60. So that would be in other states where
17 maybe I ask the same thing is if you can get it from your
18 counterparts in New York City.

19 MR. HASTINGS: And that's cutting it in half of what
20 the code is now?

21 MR. DAY: Uh-huh.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What other jurisdictions other than
23 New York City have this in place?

24 MR. DAY: That's the only one I'm aware of. Anybody
25 aware of any others? I'm not aware of any others.

1 MR. GAULT: Jack, I have one question. The 121
2 accidents, are they limited to less than 10 percent of the
3 509 that you have reports on? Are they a specific type of
4 escalators? Since you're going out to all escalators, but
5 the 120 accidents are over specific escalators --

6 MR. DAY: You mean escalators that don't have the
7 impact device?

8 MR. GAULT: No. You say 121 escalator accidents.

9 MR. DAY: Okay. Hang on. Let me get to that.

10 MR. GAULT: What is the population of the escalators
11 that those accidents occur on? Are they less than
12 10 percent? less than 1 percent? I'm just trying to get a
13 feel for --

14 MR. DAY: I see what you mean.

15 MR. GAULT: Because there's not as many escalators as
16 elevators.

17 MR. DAY: Yeah. Hang on. I thought I put the total
18 of accidents over the last four years.

19 MR. GAULT: You did.

20 MR. CLEARY: 250 no fault.

21 MR. DAY: So that gives you that percent of the total
22 accidents, how many of them are caused by comb --
23 entrapments in the comb.

24 MR. GAULT: But they're the only ones that have the
25 comb device. Or are they limited to a certain number of

1 escalators, not just any? So could one escalator have
2 20 of the accidents? That's what I'm getting at. Is the
3 problem with a certain type of escalator? a certain moving
4 walkway?

5 MR. DAY: Certain vintage of them.

6 MR. GAULT: A certain vintage? You know, are we --

7 MR. DAY: I would have to study that. I don't know.

8 MR. GAULT: Are we affecting the whole body with a
9 regulatory requirement? Because I see going to the
10 60 pounds is what is going to be a nuisance call. Now the
11 owners have to foot the bill for every nuisance call
12 because it's only moving walkways that had all the
13 accidents and not escalators.

14 MR. DAY: Before we jump to nuisance calls, let's get
15 the data to support are there really nuisance calls and
16 why. Because the owners -- or because of something.
17 What's a nuisance call and why.

18 MR. GAULT: We have to look at the accident --
19 analyze the accidents. We just don't put it over the
20 whole -- everything.

21 MR. DAY: Sure. I wouldn't imagine that it's about a
22 specific type of escalator over another type.

23 MR. GAULT: You say I assume it's not over?

24 MR. DAY: I would not assume it's a specific type.

25 MR. VAL: I would suggest we would continue to

1 support investigating. That would be my recommendation.

2 MR. DAY: Okay.

3 David, I haven't captured all of your questions, but
4 I do want to get them so I can get them in this analysis.

5 Phil, I think I got all yours, so I appreciate your
6 comment.

7 MR. WHEELER: Jack, one quick question. Did I hear
8 you say that the 60 pounds would be 50 percent of what the
9 code currently requires, the national code?

10 MR. DAY: I acknowledge that's more than likely what
11 it is.

12 MR. WHEELER: So it's significantly less, though.

13 MR. DAY: Yeah.

14 MR. WHEELER: What's the motive to go that far -- is
15 the motive to get these devices added to the escalators in
16 general, or is it that 120 pounds is too much and we're
17 trying to lower it to 60?

18 MR. DAY: Yeah.

19 MR. WHEELER: Both of those?

20 MR. DAY: Yeah.

21 MR. WHEELER: As we go through this, I would just ask
22 that we consider taking one step forward at a time and
23 think about let's get the devices on and follow the
24 national code and then see what that does or if we need to
25 go further after that. But just take that into

1 consideration as we go through this.

2 MR. DAY: Maybe in phases.

3 MR. WHEELER: Possibly.

4 MR. DAY: I only have one phase. That's another.

5 MR. WHEELER: It might help with those trouble calls
6 that we're talking about.

7 MR. HASTINGS: It seems like the only way we could
8 get data right now on what the impact would be on nuisance
9 calls would be from New York because New York is the only
10 one that has experienced the 60 to 65 pounds of pressure.
11 All ours are set higher.

12 MR. DAY: I'll see if I can get some information from
13 them.

14 MS. HOLCOMB: And is it 121 escalators or is it
15 80 escalators and one of them has had 20 reports? I think
16 that's kind of what David was getting at. Is it one unit
17 that's having multiple reports are is it 121 all together?

18 MR. DAY: No.

19 MS. HOLCOMB: We know they're all different
20 conveyance numbers and it's not repetitive?

21 MR. DAY: It is not -- as a general rule, have I seen
22 that it's repetitive.

23 MS. HOLCOMB: So we don't know.

24 MR. DAY: No. It's not the fact that we don't know,
25 because we do. And I can supply that information to the

1 group. I could give conveyance numbers, building as well,
2 if you all want it.

3 MR. CLEARY: Any further questions on this?

4

5 Conclusion

6

7 MR. CLEARY: Okay. With that, I motion that we
8 close.

9 MR. WHEELER: Second.

10 MR. CLEARY: All in favor?

11 THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

12 MR. CLEARY: Against?

13 (Whereupon, proceedings
14 adjourned at 11:05 a.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Sign-in

Last Name	First Name	Contact Number	Email Address
GALT	David	206-793-1535	David.Gault@fairmont.com
Becker	Keith	509-595-8262	keith@paw.coop
Burdini	Skip	206-571-4997	skip.burdini@seattle.gov
Cherry	Scott	253-996-0970	Scott@MobilityException.com
Clark	Charles	253-254-8777	charles@iuec.org
Wheeler	Bryan	425-786-7113	Bryan.Wheeler@ThyssenKrupp.com
Filips	Diana	425-277-1011	DianaFilips@JFilips.com
Filips	Judy	425-277-1011	JudyFilips@JFilips.com
Lundberg	Dan	206-622-5565	dlundberg@fujitec.com
FERRARI	R.L.	206-622-5565	RFerrari@fujitec.com
WATSON	Rich	206-914-9326	Rich@NWHS.com
Sloboden	William	253-561-4103	Bill@SWS@GMAFL.com
Morrell	Bill	206-762-1969	Bill@AdaptiveInstallations.com
Crawford	Amy	206-762-1969	Amy@AdaptiveInstallations.com
RYAN	Andrew	253-653-3379	andrew.f.ryan@boeing.com
Baker	Todd	360-902-4334	bobt235@LNI.WA.GOV
Curry	Alicia	360-902-6244	Curry235@LNI.WA.GOV
Elliott	Sally	360-902-6411	you235@LNI.WA.GOV
ERLICH	MATTHEW	360-902-6508	Matthew.Erich@LNI.WA.GOV

Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Sign-in

Last Name	First Name	Contact Number	Email Address
Pazaruski	Ryan	206-887-7590	Pazaruski, R @ portseattle.org
WILSON	MIKE	253-377-5495	WILSON235@lni.wa.gov
COTE	Bill	360-340-0744	COTE235@lni.wa.gov
Metcalfe	Rich	425-990-1461	Met235@lni.wa.gov
Brewer	CHRISTINE	300-628-1698	CHRISTINE@nygov.com
Martin	Phil	425-891-3695	phil.martin@us.schindler.com
McBride	Tom	360-481-1824	tom@mcbridepa.com
Henderson	Ricky	425-864-3584	ricky.henderson@thyssonknipp.com
HERRING	ROD	425-247-5637	rod.herring@thyssonknipp.com
LARSON	SWEN	206-465-8072	SLarson@Teelec Inc 19, 04
POP	Marius	425-284-9653	pop@parmanriselevator.com
Holcomb	Salinas	425-664-1392	sholcomb@eltecce
Hartings	Mike	425-864-0500	mhartings@eltecce
Cham	Lee	206-954-1821	lcham@hkaconsulting.com
Klein	Jymn	206-248-6416	jymn.klein@otis.com
Watson	Bill	253-752-8127	billjamiewatson@gmail.com
SPRAGUE	SCOTT	300-779-7795	accumar@gmail.com
AMIS	JIM	206-909-5276	jim.amis@pmhinc.com
ROBIN	PAUL	503-255-5005	paul@innomobility.com

