ORIGINAL

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

STATE OF WASHINGTON

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

of

ELEVATOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Date and Location

August 21, 2012 Tuesday, 9:00 a.m.	L&I Tukwila Training Room 12806 Gateway Drive Tukwila, Washington

---

BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Advisory Committee Meeting was held on the date and location as set forth above. Those committee members present were: Scott Cleary; David Gault; Robert McNeill; Bill Watson; Keith Becker; Charlie Val. The Department of Labor and Industries was represented by Becky Ernstes, Elevator Technical Specialist; and 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

TM

1 I N D E X

2

3 August 21, 2012 Page No.

4 Introductions/Purpose 3

5 Comments Regarding February Minutes 4

6 Chief's Report 5

7 Old Business 9

8 New Business 35

9 Future Business 71

10 Conclusion 79

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

Introductions/Purpose

MR. CLEARY: Let's get going. We want to start off with introductions, again, and talk about purposes, then we'll move into any questions we have about the last meeting's minutes.

I'm Scott Cleary with Mobility Concepts. I'm the chair.

MR. McNEILL: Rob McNeill. I represent the elevator contractors.

MR. WATSON: Bill Watson, ad hoc member representing the City of Seattle.

MR. VAL: Charlie Val representing the IUEC.

MR. DAY: Jack Day, State of Washington.

MR. GAULT: Dave Gault, Paramount Olympic Hotel representing owners.

MR. BECKER: Keith Becker representing operators exempt from licensing.

MR. CLEARY: I want to reiterate a little bit about the purpose of this committee. We are here to be a funnel to help get things to the State for changes and adoptions but we have not been getting a lot of feedback and information and requests to get things on the agenda from

everybody that's sitting here. So I really recommend that if you have things that you really want to get on the agenda and get talked about, get ahold of me or any of the committee members so we can get it on the agenda and get things discussed. Because this is the forum to do it. Everybody shows up and we have not been getting a lot of requests for anything. So please feel free to send anything to me or anybody else out here and we'll work what we can to get it on the agenda.

One other topic we need to talk about. This is Bill Watson. He'll be retiring by the time that we have our next meeting, so this will be his last meeting here. I personally would like to thank him for all his help and support. And any difficult questions you have today should all be directed towards him. And after this before our stakeholders meeting, we're going to have a little cake for him and some water. So I'd just like to say thanks.

Comments Regarding February Minutes

MR. CLEARY: And with that, any comments about last meeting's minutes? I motion to accept them. Any second?

MR. VAL: Second.

MR. CLEARY: They'll be put in the record and

accepted.

Chief's Report

MR. CLEARY: Next I'd like to have Jack Day talk about the chief's report.

Does everybody have an agenda? Okay.

MR. DAY: Has everybody received this colored graph? Do you have that? That was part of the handouts.

What I tried to do is change it up a little bit so it doesn't look just full of numbers. If anybody is interested in the actual numbers, send me an e-mail or go to L&I's Web page and type in "score card." There you'll see all the physical numbers of the different regions.

What I decided to do this time is put it in a graph representation. This gives you an easier look at how we finished 2012. Remember, this is fiscal year. So this is how we finished 2012 in our annual inspections and other inspections that we performed.

The blue is the annuals due for that particular month. The red are the actuals that are completed. The green are other inspections that we performed that month. This would include technical, supplementals, temporaries, new and durations.

And then if you turn the page, this is going to be

our running for this year following up as I will keep track of it in a better way for the group.

I'd like to hear from the group. Would you rather see it in this graph representation? We'll continue with this graph.

Again, what I've shown you, the first one is where we ended in 2012. And FY13 is the month of July thus far.

If you turn the page again, you see permits, new. On here are graphical representations of permits approved. And it shows from 2009 through 2012. This is based on a calendar year.

Are there any questions on this particular one?

MR. GAULT: What was the jump in June?

MR. DAY: The jump in June of 2012. Becky, can you speak to the jump in June in 2012?

MS. ERNSTES: Basically, I was on vacation in May and very few permits got done. So I came back in June. I did the permits.

MR. GAULT: The order of magnitude, it's just showing a huge -- did we have an interest in more buildings and renovations? I'm just curious whether -- it always gives us an economic climate for how the elevators go up. So do economic indicators. I just was curious if you knew what you were approving when you came back.

MS. ERNSTES: Well, I mean --

MR. DAY: These are new.

MS. ERNSTES: Yeah. The residential -- actually, the July jump is a company that took out approximately 60 permits for residential incline chairs that were previously installed and not inspected.

MR. CLEARY: So that's going to be an artificial spike.

MS. ERNSTES: Yes. So it's an anomaly. Plus, I wasn't here in May.

MR. CLEARY: So that's the main jump.

MS. ERNSTES: Yeah. That's the main jump.

MR. GAULT: You take that out, and everything else is within norm.

MR. CLEARY: Correct.

MS. ERNSTES: The main jump was incline -- or residential incline chairs.

MR. DAY: Any other questions on new? Okay.

Let's turn the page to alterations. And here, again, is a representation of alteration permits approved. And the different years and the spike is an anomaly. It was a rather large campus that bought two-way communication devices for most of the campus. That's what that spike is.

MS. ERNSTES: That was in 2010.

MR. DAY: So a two-way is an alteration.

1 Any other questions on alterations? A lot of people
2 have noticed the alteration permits have been going up in
3 a steady pace, so that's an indicator there.
4 The next two pages are an account of the accidents in
5 the State of Washington which we performed an
6 investigation upon. And I chose to give you both numbers
7 and the graph. Last time, if you remember, I showed you
8 the graph, and a lot of people had difficulty because of
9 the way it's laid out. It's really snug and close
10 together. One of the things we're going to do for next
11 time is drop off the 2007 numbers. But before we did
12 that, I want to let everybody have a chance to look at
13 this.
14 There was also some confusion, fault and no-fault.
15 Fault is when we found direct cause that it was the
16 conveyance that caused the accident. No-fault is we could
17 not find the cause.
18 Any questions on accidents? Any questions about,
19 wow, look at how far -- how many have occurred in the last
20 year and a half?
21 MR. GAULT: More being reported?
22 MR. DAY: Could be. You think more being reported?
23 MR. GAULT: There wasn't a change in regulation, was
24 there?
25 MR. DAY: No.

MR. GAULT: Sometimes that's the spike.

MR. DAY: I would conclude that there may be some more that's reported, but knowing where these occur, it's actually more accidents are happening. And that's really the driving factor of that. People are more in a hurry, obviously, but most of this is SeaTac where these non -- not at fault. It's people falling over -- taking luggage. And this is truly the driving factor of this.

UNIDENTIFIED: Is there any special purpose accidents (inaudible) -- special-purpose elevators?

MR. DAY: In this entire group? Yes, there are. There are. And it was an at-fault accident. Because this goes back to 2007. That happened in December 2010.

Any other questions? Any questions whatsoever? That concludes my report.

Old Business

MR. CLEARY: Now we're going to switch on to old business. MCP record series enforcement due date, and that's going to be by Jack.

MR. DAY: Basically, this was put in here, old business, as a reminder. Enforcement of the MCP record series that's on the Web page will be upon the code adoption date. And if anybody's read further down this,

1 and we'll be talking about it here later in the meeting,
2 that will probably be somewhere around March.
3 MR. CLEARY: Any questions at all on that? Is that
4 it, Jack?
5 MR. DAY: That's it for that one.
6 MR. CLEARY: Now we're going to move on to fire
7 initiation testing devices, FAID, with Rob and Dave.
8 MR. McNEILL: We're still trying to get together with
9 the State. Fortunately, we've finally been able to talk
10 to the fire marshal, and he's willing to meet with us to
11 discuss responsibility for testing in the items that are
12 listed in your agenda here in blue.
13 Also, as a handout, Mike Wilson, state inspector for
14 elevators, put together a really nice excellently done
15 overview of the issues with the FAID testing. So I urge
16 you to go ahead and take a quick read at that when you
17 have any time, and please come back with some comments for
18 us. We're finally at the point where we're going to be
19 able to get all the information. And we met with the fire
20 inspector in Bellevue, and things should be moving on
21 fairly rapidly now.
22 MR. CLEARY: Do you have an idea of the schedule?
23 MR. McNEILL: I don't. It's really contingent on our
24 ability to meet with the state fire marshal, discuss all
25 of the issues, determine who should do the testing and to

make sure that we -- and keep the elevators and the code requirements up to date and keep the units safe for the public and owners.

MR. PRINSEN: It was a recent announcement that the State of Washington will be adopting the IFC code, so moving away from NFPA. So that's similar to what Bellevue did several years ago. And so there's some conflicting writings in the IFC compared to what we see in the ASME code. So is this committee going to address those concerns in how those will be determined?

Also, the State also announced that they're going to be adopting the most current IBC which now includes armored elevator concerns. So how is the State and how is this committee going to deal with those concerns as well?

MR. CLEARY: This is the first that I've heard that they're going to this adoption. So that's got to be looked at. I agree. Can you talk a little bit about who is working on what?

MR. McNEILL: Dave and I are working together, and, really, we've just been in the information gathering point. It's been difficult to get the other agencies to find the time to spend with us.

MR. CLEARY: We've been working on this for a while so we need to find a way to somehow get it wrapped up and get some information back.

1 MR. GAULT: I would say if you know differences --
2 reading code and comparing code is like watching paint
3 dry. So if you know of a difference, please feel free to
4 communicate that difference you see between the NFPA and
5 the IFC.
6 MR. CLEARY: And this is what it comes back to I
7 talked about in the beginning. We need your help and
8 support. You know things. There's a lot more eyes and
9 ears out there. Get it to us so we can integrate it and
10 get it through and understand. So we're looking for
11 everybody's help. So anything you guys can do for Rob and
12 that stuff would really be helpful.
13 MR. WATSON: Max, when you're talking about an
14 armored elevator, are you talking about a fire service
15 access elevator as well as occupant evacuation operation?
16 MR. PRINSEN: We have a lot of architects that are
17 starting to call and inquire about the operation, and it's
18 not really fully vetted through ASME. It has been
19 specified by IBC. And so now that the State's going to be
20 adopting that most recent version, that's going to push
21 this body and the elevator industry into some requirements
22 that really haven't been vetted through any other
23 inspection or code authorities. So I think we're going to
24 have to, as a body, think about how we're going to deal
25 with this, you know, within -- I mean, obviously, it's

1 going to affect probably Seattle more than anything. But
2 it affects the State as a whole, so we have to look at
3 that.
4 MR. WATSON: Well, in Seattle we've had it in rule
5 since 2009.
6 MR. CLEARY: Can I just ask one more time, when we
7 talk, we introduce ourselves, please, for the record.
8 MR. WATSON: In our Seattle version of the IBC, we've
9 had it in there since 2009 to have requirements for the
10 fire service access elevator and OEO, occupant evacuation.
11 So we're still trying to work our way through how to do
12 that since there is no clear standard set forth by ASME as
13 to how to do this stuff. Currently, we're having the
14 lobby floor slope away from the hoistway if it's a fire
15 service access elevator, trying to put a larger drain, a
16 required drain in the pit that will drain 10,000 gallons
17 per hour, and still working on how do you make elevator
18 equipment less susceptible to both fire and water damage.
19 MR. PRINSEN: Yeah. And those are good starting
20 places. They are trying to meet the intent of what the
21 goal is of the new code. But there's some very specific
22 items. I mean, even signaling the fire command centers
23 and a lot of different things that are specifically
24 different that we've not addressed within local code
25 adoption. And, again, primarily because it's not really

1 vetted through the ASME code yet.
2 MR. WATSON: That's exactly right. In particular,
3 there's no real standard to look at as to how this
4 equipment should -- I mean, there are some parameters as
5 to what we want it to do, but nothing that's prescriptive
6 in any measure at this point in time. And that's the
7 problem with IBC and ASME not getting together and putting
8 rules together that mesh at the time of adoption of those
9 codes. Hopefully, ASME has -- I know the amendments have
10 been voted on a couple of times. I'm not sure where they
11 stand right now. But the hope is that it will still get
12 in the 2013 code. I'm not sure if that will happen.
13 Ricky, do you know for a fact?
14 MR. HENDERSON: I've talked to some of the committee
15 members on that committee, and I understand it's more than
16 likely going to make it in the 2013 version of A17.1.
17 MR. WATSON: So even if we haven't adopted 2013, we
18 kind of -- if we know something's in a code and been
19 approved that's a future code, oftentimes we use that
20 language as a policy or a way to get to the problem or the
21 issue before it comes in code. So hopefully, we'll do the
22 same here.
23 MR. PRINSEN: I think we're probably going to be
24 faced later this year and definitely early in 2013 with a
25 lot of inquiries and challenges through the architects who

1 feel that this is mandated now through the IBC, and it's
2 going to pose some real challenges not only for us to
3 specify what that actually means, but it's also going to
4 be a challenge for inspections and a variety of other
5 things.
6 MR. WATSON: I agree. We've had architects in
7 Seattle who have come to us and wanted exemptions from any
8 of this stating it will cost at least $200,000 extra per
9 car to install this kind of stuff, which we didn't quite
10 agree with. It will also be a big impact on the elevator
11 inspectors to get them up to speed as well as plan
12 reviewers as well as consultants and elevator companies.
13 So it's a big challenge. It will be.
14 For all of you folks that aren't aware, in the IBC
15 now, if you have a building that's over 120 feet in rise,
16 there's a requirement for something we call a fire service
17 access elevator. That's an elevator that has to hit all
18 those floors and is designed in some manner to be more
19 reliable than a regular elevator. And one of the concerns
20 is keeping water out of the hoistway because that's what
21 -- we've done a pretty good job with fire protection over
22 the years, but not such a good job with water damage,
23 putting the elevator out of service when that's the
24 elevator that the fire service and first responders would
25 like to be using to fight a fire and respond to any kind

of emergency.

There's also something called "occupant evacuation operation." That's for really tall buildings, 400 feet and higher, I believe. And that's where elevators, unless they're commandeered by fire service, could help with evacuation of buildings. If you have elevators that have this kind of operation, you do not have to put in a third egress stairwell in the building. So I'm pretty sure most architects will opt for this kind of operation to save the cost of a third exit stairwell in a tall building. But those are the issues we're working through right now.

MR. CLEARY: Becky.

MS. ERNSTES: Well, there's also the IBC is pretty soon to be open for public comment because all their adoption is going on right now. So you have the ability to do public comment to the IBC rules that they're adopting through the State.

MR. CLEARY: Jack, as we're going right now right in the middle of trying to adopt new codes and stuff, has this been integrated into that process too?

MR. DAY: A piece of it. Design of the elevator has not as far as (inaudible) 17.1. But through the draft rules, what has been implemented or suggested in those is the drain or the sump pump. As people are aware, we don't mandate drain or sump pump in the State of Washington, but

it was felt under these situations that it's necessary. So this really affects 125 feet of rise or more. So a lot -- this conversation, we want to stay in tune with the City of Seattle since they're the ones that will have the bulk of this.

MR. CLEARY: Any more questions? Any questions on this? That's good information. Thanks.

Next on the agenda is penalties. That's Jack Day.

MR. DAY: Penalties, this is also a place marker as well.

In the past we had not been issuing 90 days or this series of penalties. This is an additional reminder for folks that as of July, that will be initiated. So the 90-day penalties for not completing the work by the due date is going to be in effect in the beginning of October. That will be that 90 days thereafter. So if a customer has a correction, as the law requires the correction to be done in 90 days or they face a civil penalty, this action will begin in October. So just send that -- I'm making sure all the elevator companies are aware of that, that if you see this, you don't want to put those corrections off for your customer. You want to take care of them.

Any questions about the civil penalties?

MR. GAULT: The penalties are going to end up going to the owner.

1 MR. DAY: That's correct. The penalties will go to
2 the owner. That's right. The State does not regulate any
3 kind of contractual agreement with anybody. It
4 automatically holds the owner culpable. They have the
5 responsibility of ensuring those corrections are done.
6 MR. CLEARY: Any questions on that?
7 We're going to move on next to code adoption updates
8 on the ASME 17.1 and 18.1. Jack, you're up again.
9 MR. DAY: So at this present time, we're fairly close
10 with our draft. I'm so confident in how close we are that
11 I'll be releasing the draft by the end of the week. I
12 would encourage everybody that is not signed up for our
13 listserv to please be signed up at our listserv site. Is
14 everybody aware of where that's at? On L&I's Elevator
15 home page -- everybody familiar with our homepage? Up in
16 the upper right-hand corner, join e-mail service, click on
17 that. And it will have you fill out who you are and
18 submit and then you're a part of it. I'll be sending
19 these out via that avenue.
20 And below on the bullets here in black, you see this
21 is our -- at this point in time, our timeline for code
22 adoption. So they'll be sent out here by the end of this
23 week. So at that time, you're going to have the
24 opportunity from that point to start your comment phase.
25 In the comment phase, I'm asking -- there will be a

1 cover letter with this. I'm asking that you submit any of
2 your comments directly to me, that you include your
3 subject, it must be in writing, include the WAC 296-96
4 reference, and be specific about the section you agree
5 with or disagree with. And finally, don't just shoot me
6 something that you disagree with and not say why. And it
7 would be an opportune time for you to submit your own
8 language as well or what you believe will be correct or
9 would take care of the situation. So what I would hate to
10 see is: John Doe, no. No, what? No, why?
11 Here's what we reviewed by myself and the pertinent
12 whoever it would be person at the Advisory or depends on
13 if it's administration, who would be reviewing those. I
14 do plan to share each and every comment.
15 So what I'm going to try to do is hook up a Web page
16 to put all these comments on. I'm not promising I can do
17 that, but we have limited Web space. But if I can, that's
18 what I'll do. If I can't, I'll probably just be sending
19 them out through the listserv to everybody that's on
20 there.
21 Below in red -- I won't go through all these, but
22 there has been some -- one change specifically which is
23 edits include but are not limited to. And the third from
24 the last you see a strike through "and suspension rope
25 diameter." If you don't have that stricken, you can

1 strike "suspension rope diameter." It was felt there was
2 no need to limit that to any more than what A17.1 -- A17.6
3 has done.
4 And through this we're also seeking comments
5 regarding MRL. And I think, as Becky put it last time at
6 our last meeting, overhead clearances, we're concerned
7 with this overhead clearance space. Right now we have, as
8 most of you are familiar with the draft, it says 6'6".
9 And I'm curious if that will meet everybody's intent as
10 MRL's get faster and in higher-rise situations. 6.6, or
11 is there something else we need to do to facilitate access
12 from the car top to this machine equipment located at the
13 top of the shaft? Is everybody familiar with what I'm
14 talking about here?
15 MR. SPAFFORD: Would that be the refuge space or is
16 that, you know, when they're maxed out?
17 MR. DAY: Well, what it is about is an elevator is to
18 get locked off for it to be considered a work platform.
19 Now, at the top of the shaft is the machine and governor.
20 And now to provide for maintenance and inspection and
21 service, when it gets further than 6'6" reach, that's
22 going to be the problem. When you've got a faster
23 elevator, there's more runby and there's more overhead
24 clearance necessary for that because you've got your
25 buffer, stroke and everything coming into play. So we're

concerned that 6'6" may be an issue, and we would like to hear about the issue sooner than when it happens.

MR. GAULT: Is it too big or is it too small?

MR. DAY: The equipment will be higher than 6'6", and somebody may have to put a ladder on top of the car to reach the equipment up there. That's what the concern is. Is it a real concern? Is that really going to happen? I'd like to hear from the elevator manufacturing industry about that very subject.

MR. PRINSEN: We've had this topic of discussion in previous occasion a couple years back, and looking at special inspection operations, just making sure there's not an entrapment situation for the personnel on top of the car so that there is still availability to go through the escape hatch and out the front door. So is that still a consideration at this point?

MR. DAY: I'd like to hear more about it, for sure. If it comes to that you need more room, is that the method? Then I want to know that everybody agrees to that method. Will that work for other elevator companies? Are they going to have to come up with a unique something else that we don't know about at this time? The reason I'm speaking of it is I'd rather this was in the code that we adopt so that it isn't a variance or some other issue down the road, so it's addressed in writing.

1 MR. PRINSEN: My other question would be is I would
2 have to go back and look. I can't answer this now, but
3 maybe you can. What would we be adopting that would be
4 different than what ASME has?
5 MR. CLEARY: Becky.
6 MS. ERNSTES: Well, currently, we have a rule in WAC
7 rule that's in Part D, Existing Elevators, which we apply
8 to all elevators that you cannot use a ladder to access
9 overhead equipment. So if your equipment is over 6'6",
10 then you're going to have to put in some kind of permanent
11 work platform to get to that equipment. That's what we've
12 done in the past is you put in either a ladder access to
13 the work platform that then has rails, and we have those
14 throughout the state.
15 MR. DAY: Max, we've run into this issue where people
16 aren't quite ready on their installation, and then at the
17 time of the installation, they have this issue and they
18 want to put a ladder in on top of the car. Chain it in a
19 closet or control room or somewhere, and here's our ladder
20 to put on top of the car because they're not thinking
21 about this particular issue. It goes right past them.
22 They're not coordinating this with architects. Architects
23 don't have the code, and here it becomes an end-of-project
24 issue. And we'd like it to be very clean up front.
25 So ASME working platforms is where it will talk about

it. Are you aware? Will that meet every given situation that you, as manufacturers, have? Will it meet that situation? Because that will talk about -- ASME talks about working platforms.

The other issue that we've had with this is elevator companies saying, "Oh, this is not a maintenance item so you don't need to go up there." Which I'm not sure that's an accurate statement. So those things are maintenance and inspection items, so you will need to up there at some time or another.

MR. CLEARY: Any other questions on that? Jack, is that all you have?

MR. DAY: That's all I have on this at this present time.

Are there any questions about the two code adoptions here that we have listed, A17.1-2010 and A18.1?

MR. WATSON: Jack, I saw in here where we were talking about A17.6, the suspension means standard and removing the section on aramid fiber. Would that be a code that we would adopt statewide then?

MR. DAY: A17.6?

MR. WATSON: A17.6. Because we just didn't talk about it in here very clearly.

MR. DAY: Yes. Well, there's two codes that are interactive with A17.1 code adoption. They are A17.6,

which is the suspension standard. Very new standard. And A17.7, new technologies. So both of these we have plans to adopt. There are some edits to both, but we do plan on adopting both of them.

MR. CLEARY: Can you talk a little bit about the harmonization with the City of Seattle and City of Spokane? We talk a lot with City of Seattle, but where is the City of Spokane in with all of this?

MR. DAY: The City of Spokane has also been involved with the development rule draft development process.

So there's a few differences that the City of Spokane is going to do as with the City of Seattle as well. So what we've tried to do in writing the draft was incorporate those differences. For example, the City of Seattle has a difference with sprinklers. So we have a clause in there dealing with that. Both cities have a difference with the supplied key box, and so I tried to incorporate the differences in that. So as there were differences recognized, we tried to incorporate them in draft -- in this draft format. Other things are agreed upon by both.

MR. CLEARY: Any questions on harmonization at all?

MR. DAY: We're really trying to make sure we're all on the same page as much as we can be with the difference in -- in the different cities and the way they do business

1 as well.
2 MR. CLEARY: I think it would be beneficial for
3 myself and other people that work in the Spokane area to
4 have some representation from them to talk about where
5 they're at and what varies in their city code, municipal
6 codes. I think that would be beneficial.
7 MR. DAY: I think the key to that is going to be
8 asking their upper-level management. And if that's a
9 desire, that's probably the way the Committee may want to
10 go.
11 MR. CLEARY: Anybody else think that would be
12 helpful?
13 MR. PRINSEN: So I believe -- I'm not sure, but I
14 believe the notification that I read about IFC and the IBC
15 code was potential adoption this year by the State of
16 Washington. I believe that we, under the subtext of the
17 elevator code through WAC, adopt those codes as part of it
18 moving forward. So I think we want to make sure that we
19 look at those two integrations pretty carefully to make
20 sure that we're addressing what the issues are in IFC and
21 the IBC.
22 MS. ERNSTES: The State Building Code Council has
23 been doing code review. They cannot adopt rules until it
24 goes through -- sits through one legislative session. So
25 their rules will not be in effect that they're doing

1 public comments on until after the session where they get
2 to do comments or change by legislative law. So they
3 won't be adopted this year. They will be adopted after
4 the session, and then it's usually July before the
5 adoption date because they have to sit through a session.
6 MR. PRINSEN: So either if it comes before or after,
7 I still think that we need to be looking at how the code
8 adoption that we're creating integrates with that code
9 adoption because we have more voice and ability to make
10 changes of what we're doing. We don't have as much
11 ability to make changes in what IFC or what IBC is going
12 to be doing or how the State is adopting that code unless
13 the Code Authority -- you know, so the State Code
14 Authority goes back to that group and says, "We think
15 there's some issues here that need to be mitigated." So
16 have you guys participated in that conversation with those
17 groups?
18 MS. ERNSTES: Well, we're waiting until the final
19 came out. And I haven't seen the final yet that they --
20 because they have done changes. And yes. We have talked
21 with Tim Logler [phonetic], and we were also involved with
22 some of the fire guys when they're talking about the
23 fireboxes and evacuation elevators. We have not received
24 any comment from stakeholders about that at all. We've
25 been putting out there that we're doing rules now, and all

1 the comments that we got back we've addressed in rule. We
2 have official forms that people can submit comments on,
3 and we've been talking about that for many months now and
4 we haven't gotten any feedback.
5 So I do know what the IBC says. I've read the new
6 stuff. Some of it's a change from the 2009, but the fire
7 evacuation and the occupant elevators were in the 2009
8 code. Some of the things are more explicit. What they
9 have, those say to elevators that were in 2009.
10 MR. DAY: Max, is that what you were referring to,
11 the occupant evacuation and those -- that specifically in
12 hardened elevators?
13 MR. PRINSEN: Not only specifically that, but IFC
14 also has some retrofit and code items that have not been
15 in the NFPA, for example. So there's actually mandated
16 language in there that certain things will occur to all
17 elevator systems. That's not been the practice
18 necessarily with what we do through ASME and through the
19 WAC codes. So if IFC is adopted, then we're looking at
20 some of those things. I think Bellevue has taken an
21 approach that's looked at a couple of those items and has
22 gone back and tried to implement some of those things, but
23 at the same time, on a statewide basis, that's a pretty
24 big implication.
25 MR. DAY: Are you referring to A17.3 then, where NFPA

1 references A17.3?
2 MR. PRINSEN: Yes.
3 MR. DAY: The State has addressed that a few years
4 back in regards to upgrading the elevator fireman's
5 service and leaves that to the local jurisdiction to do,
6 to enforce.
7 MR. PRINSEN: But we previously were under the NFPA.
8 Now we're adopting IFC which puts a new rule into place.
9 MR. DAY: No. We were under IFC then as well. This
10 isn't the first time for IFC.
11 MS. ERNSTES: The IFC was adopted at the last --
12 actually, the IFC was adopted two code cycles ago by the
13 State Building Code Council. And we chose to not enforce
14 the -- the IFC says that all elevators will be provided
15 with fire services to a certain year code, don't know it
16 off the top of my head, in A17.3. We don't adopt A17.3,
17 and we have notified the State Building Code Council that
18 if a jurisdiction was to adopt that, when they pull an
19 alteration, we won't recognize the A17.3. They will have
20 to bring it up to our current adopted code.
21 The City of Spokane has adopted that as a city, and
22 they are giving people as of last year three years to
23 bring their elevators up. The City of Bellevue has been
24 targeting high rises. The fire marshals have been talking
25 about whether certain jurisdictions are going to adopt

that. We're taking a hands-off approach and letting the fire jurisdictions decide which elevators they want under fire service. And if permits get pulled, they will be installed to the current adopted code by the State for ASME of how they operate, not to the A17.3 which we don't adopt. And that happened even the last code cycle that we talked about that.

MR. CLEARY: Does that help, Max?

MR. PRINSEN: Partially.

MR. CLEARY: Partially.

Bill, how are you guys looking at it and reviewing at the City of Seattle?

MR. WATSON: Well, we've had a rule in place for 20 years or more that made high-rise elevators have at least Phase 1. And over the years we've had a lot of modernizations. And every time we have a modernization, the owner is required to bring their own elevator up to current standards if they're making those changes.

Now, we clearly have a lot of elevators under seven stories in existence today that do not have fire service of any kind. But that's where we have not required them to be brought up to an IFC or an NFPA standard. But when the elevator is modernized, it's brought up to the current ASME standard which requires full Phase 1 and Phase 2. So that's how we've been dealing with it. There's still a

1 few out there that -- quite a few, actually, that don't
2 have fire service.
3 But in general terms, our fire service has told our
4 fire service agencies -- the City of Seattle has fire
5 departments and has told us that they don't usually use an
6 elevator for emergency purposes if it's six stories or
7 less. They generally run the stairs. Because their
8 standard is to only go within two floors of a fire. So if
9 the fire was even on the roof or the highest level, they
10 would only go up to the fourth floor. That's why they
11 haven't felt it was that big of an issue at this point in
12 time.
13 MR. DAY: The State of Washington is very similar to
14 what Bill has said. And it's that jurisdiction -- I think
15 that's exactly where we went. It's that jurisdiction's
16 determination how will they use that elevator in an
17 emergency. What do they need? So whether they wish to
18 enforce the NFPA, their NFPA code on that becomes the
19 dominant decision. But then, again, as Becky said, once
20 that decision is made, then it's updated to the current
21 ASME standard for fireman service.
22 MR. CLEARY: Any other questions?
23 One thing we haven't really heard from is we haven't
24 heard from a fire representative in a long time. It would
25 be good to have somebody in here to give us what they're

1 thinking and what they're strategizing, what they want to
2 implement. So is that something that you could help with,
3 Jack or Bill?
4 MR. DAY: Uh-huh.
5 MR. CLEARY: It would be good to get a presentation
6 from them.
7 Any other questions?
8 MR. DAY: Rob, is there any way when you meet with
9 the fire jurisdiction that you could ask them that
10 question?
11 MR. McNEILL: Sure. It's been very difficult for the
12 State to respond, and that's why it's taken so long with
13 the FAID. But the City of Bellevue has been very
14 receptive. That would be easy, I'm sure, to get them to
15 come down and talk to us and explain what they're doing
16 and how they see things.
17 MR. CLEARY: That would be very helpful.
18 Max.
19 MR. PRINSEN: We're starting to see an increase from
20 cities like Auburn, Kent and all who have their own fire
21 departments who are reading these codes now and coming up
22 with their own interpretations, that's what they mean.
23 And I think that's why, as a body, if we have
24 clarification, because I mean -- I mean, from what I just
25 heard, it's like, well, the fire marshal determines here

what he wants and that's what it's going to be there. And so that means we could end up with, you know, in King County alone 37 different cities within King County that could have their own impression of what this means. It gets pretty complicated. So I think we're going to have to figure out how we can kind of get a handle on this.

MR. CLEARY: Jack, is there a governing body that helps to integrate and coordinate with all the different municipalities and fire departments to try to get some commonality through this?

MR. DAY: There are a couple of them, yes. So we may look them up and get them involved.

MR. CLEARY: That would be very helpful.

Any other questions?

We're going to move on to Keith Becker talking about existing machine room space and enclosures.

MR. BECKER: We've been working the last couple of months just looking through some language that is describing platforms, access to our machine rooms and our equipment in the grain industry. Over time, we've had some issues in establishing a safe way to access this equipment. We've had some new installations on -- and there's been some discussions arose on the machine rooms and it started some more discussions as to looking at some of the WAC's.

1 Right now we're not doing anything that is going to
2 go forward in this current WAC review. But we ran into
3 some discrepancies. Our work platforms, in one case,
4 296-96 is talking about 30"x30" platforms. Our ASME code
5 is looking at 24 inch plus door swing.
6 We also have some issues that we're kind of looking
7 at. The general-duty clause requires employees [sic] to
8 furnish a workplace free of recognized hazards. We're
9 looking -- if we need to add any language, we're hoping it
10 will be very general. It could be something that could be
11 across the board. It's not going to be specific to grain
12 handling operations. Right now it directs us to RCW
13 49.17. When I read an RCW, it doesn't tell me much. I
14 don't get a lot from an RCW.
15 We're trying to evaluate the situation to see if we
16 can add some language that will direct us into a WAC code
17 that would perhaps deal with platforms, ladders. In the
18 grain industry, we have a grain standard, which those
19 rules prevail. They don't -- we're evaluating to see if
20 there's any conflicts, I mean, anything else we would want
21 to put into a code. I don't think there's going to be.
22 We also have 296-307 deals with agricultural
23 operations and some exemptions that are allowed in that
24 industry. I guess my personal opinion is the agricultural
25 industry needs to step up. I mean, it has to be safe. It

1 can't be -- maybe when some of these codes were made there
2 was a reason for leaving agriculture behind a couple of
3 steps. I'm not sure that that exists anymore. We need to
4 be up to speed. We're dealing with people's lives.
5 There's no difference whether it's a passenger elevator,
6 an escalator or a manlift and a grain elevator.
7 So we're just going through these codes trying to
8 evaluate what we have. And if we can put in something
9 that would be very uncomplicated, get a little direction
10 in something that could be an industrywide -- some
11 language that would just fit everybody, just direct us to
12 a couple of real simple WAC's that just describe these
13 accesses.
14 So we've had one phone conference. We've had -- Jack
15 and I have had a couple of discussions. We'll meet again
16 later this week on the phone to hopefully make a little
17 bit of progress on this thing. Nothing's going on real
18 fast.
19 MR. CLEARY: You make a good point. RCW's are the
20 law, but sometimes they're kind of convoluted and hard to
21 read. It's the WAC that tells you how to do it and make
22 it easy. So that's the important part. So getting some
23 language written in there so it's understandable and gives
24 good guidelines is very important. So thanks for your
25 time on that.

1 Any questions on that at all?
2
3 New Business
4
5 MR. CLEARY: With that, we're going to move on to new
6 business. And Jack's going to talk a little bit about the
7 new -- the agency proposed bill, RCW 70.87.200, which
8 talks about exemptions for temporary lifts and hoists.
9 MR. DAY: Does everybody have a copy of that on
10 page 4? That's where we're at.
11 So this RCW was looked at in regards to temporary
12 construction hoist, and the effect is fairly simple when
13 you read this. What we're trying to do is address the
14 temporary construction personnel and material hoists that
15 are utilized to move personnel and material into and out
16 of a building. So that's the main focus of this.
17 The lifts that are used to construct facades where
18 workers would actually perform work from the lift is what
19 we're putting in here to be exempt. So that's kind of the
20 clarification to this language. If you're performing work
21 off of it such as a bricklayer on one of their lifts, or
22 somebody constructing a scaffold on the exterior, or
23 somebody cleaning the windows on the exterior, these
24 things are not regulated by the Elevator Inspection
25 Department. These things are regulated, but they're

1 regulated under the DOSH rules.
2 So this is what this language is intended to do,
3 clarify that particular realm of the industry, and also to
4 clarify that we do not do portable lifts -- construction
5 lifts. So somebody picking up a pallet of drywall on
6 their fork truck, we're not regulating those things. So
7 we're trying to make that very clear. Portable lifts are
8 not regulated.
9 Another issue that we've been having that is right
10 down this same line is who is supposed to dismantle an
11 elevator. And as you read this particular RCW, we're
12 trying to make it clear or clearer that the elevator
13 mechanic who works for a licensed elevator company is the
14 person responsible for dismantling or removing an elevator
15 from -- you know, just tearing it down whenever two --
16 unless two things are happening. And we spelled out the
17 footprint of the building, the foundational footprint of
18 the building. If it's being -- that's our parameter. And
19 in that, are they gutting the building? If they're
20 gutting the entire building, then that's somebody -- that
21 will be somebody else. If they're tearing the building
22 down to its foundation, that's somebody else. But if that
23 isn't happening, then that work is supposed to be done by
24 the mechanic. And a lot of people think that that's okay
25 to be supervised by the mechanic, and that's not what this

is talking about. It's supposed to be done by. So the intent was to clarify this.

Now, I also state that people are also looking at this to make sure that we can do it in rule. So this RCW may die on the vine because we also have others looking can we do this in WAC 296-96. So we may see this particular RCW go away and not go through the legislative process.

MR. WATSON: If that happens, will there be an intent to put it in WAC rule?

MR. DAY: Yes. It must, yes. That's the percent that still needs to be worked on before the end of the week. So we'll know this before the end of the week.

MS. ERNSTES: We've already written the language in WAC.

MR. DAY: Yes. It's written there, but we've got to wait to make sure that's approved.

So that's -- you may see that -- this very language in WAC 296-96 draft to cover these two issues.

Any other questions?

MR. CLEARY: Okay. Move on to routine inspections under Section 10.2 in 18.1. What we're trying to do here is standardize between 17.1 and 18.1 on who does the inspections.

Basically, it states in 10.1.2.1 that periodic

1 inspections will be done by the AHJ or its representative.
2 And it also says that for incline IPL's, VPL's and stair
3 chairs, commercially, that they need to be looked at every
4 six months. And we're trying to harmonize and standardize
5 between what we're trying to do in 17.1 and get the
6 inspectors out of doing the routine tests and put it back
7 into the licensed mechanic and companies that are trained
8 on that piece of equipment. So that's what this is about.
9 The language is somewhat the same in the two, and we want
10 to get it changed to reflect that it needs to be done by a
11 licensed mechanic.
12 MR. DAY: Put in one insert to your comment, and to
13 be clearer, these have been redirected as examinations,
14 not inspections. So you'll see this in the draft as well
15 for this and for the A17.1 8.11 as called examinations.
16 It should not be construed in any way that the inspection
17 will not happen. It will.
18 MR. CLEARY: Correct.
19 Any questions on that whatsoever at all?
20 We're going to then talk about 8.6 with Jack and
21 we'll finish up with myself talking a little about LULA
22 applications. Jack.
23 MR. DAY: 8.6 is a pilot that began mid-June. The
24 pilot began as a mechanism to be efficient and effective
25 in evaluating the ASME 8.6 section of the code. This is

1 the preventive maintenance tasks that are in there.
2 The intention was to send out a few elevator
3 inspectors to learn and be able to transfer what is and
4 isn't today -- existing today on the MCP, and they've been
5 evaluating several MCP's to see what 8.6 task is not
6 there. And also, they evaluate it as each of you have a
7 different interval mechanism, the elevator companies have
8 a different mechanism for recognizing when that task is
9 due, evaluating that to see if that task has been
10 performed. Their goal is to create an effective efficient
11 way to pass this along to other inspectors so that we can
12 effectively go through and evaluate the 8.6 section of the
13 code during our annual inspection.
14 This has reached its second phase, the second phase
15 of the pilot which it's been handed off to other
16 inspectors to see the viability of what the initial group
17 created. So it has reached its second phase. And those
18 inspectors are putting into practice and will bring back
19 evaluations of that and if things need to be changed to
20 correct them to make them efficient for the next group.
21 The intention is by mid next month that we start
22 another group, either the end of this month or mid next
23 month we start another group of inspectors on the pilot to
24 see how well that evaluation process goes. So basically,
25 what we're trying to do is combat the issue of all the

1 different MCP documentations out there, evaluate them and
2 put them into a mechanism to be efficient for the elevator
3 inspection staff and to be standardized across the board.
4 The real intent of standardization is so that we properly
5 evaluate these 8.6 tasks everywhere we go.
6 The goal is to have this delivered across the state
7 by the end of the year. So as you're going to see this
8 continue to grow, you'll see where we've come in and
9 evaluated 8.6 maintenance control program that you have
10 existing today based off the 2005 code. If the task is
11 not there, your customer will receive a correction. If
12 the interval has been exceeded, your customer will receive
13 a correction. So this is a key process here.
14 And, again, what I'm saying is it's 8.6. It's not
15 8.11. 8.11 is for the next code. 8.6 is now.
16 And those of you that want to see or hear more about
17 the specific to a particular company, I would ask that you
18 come by and make a visit with me and we can show you.
19 I'll show you your company, not somebody else's.
20 Are there any questions?
21 MR. HENDERSON: A clarification. Did I understand
22 that the 8.6 MCP, this is going to be -- at the end of
23 this review, there's going to be one MCP for all vendors?
24 Or is each elevator company still going to be able to
25 create their own 8.6 MCP?

1 MR. DAY: At the end of the code adoption for MCP for
2 the 2010 code cycle, do you mean? Or do you mean
3 particularly right now?
4 MR. HENDERSON: The 8.6 pilot that you have talking
5 about right here.
6 MR. DAY: It's your existing MCP. And if it's
7 missing something, then it will be recognized at that
8 point for 8.6, 8.6 item.
9 MR. HENDERSON: To rephrase, you mentioned there's
10 going to be an efficiency for testing and the inspectors
11 to be examining, making sure everything was completed. I
12 took that to mean that there was going to be one form for
13 everybody. Is that true?
14 MR. DAY: One inspection form that the inspectors
15 would use?
16 MR. HENDERSON: No. The 8.6 MCP check chart or check
17 items that we have out there right now.
18 MR. DAY: That we, meaning the elevator companies --
19 MR. HENDERSON: Yes.
20 MR. DAY: -- have out there right now?
21 MR. HENDERSON: If I understood you correctly, the
22 8.6 pilot program you have right now, as you're evaluating
23 each one of those individual, you're seeing what's
24 lacking. And the efficiency of -- for the inspectors to
25 inspect the MCP's is going to lead toward a one common MCP

1 8.6 chart for everybody. Or are you still creating --
2 individual companies are creating their own?
3 MR. DAY: Well, where individual companies are, and
4 that's the particular issue at this time is individual
5 companies, which it's okay, have created their own, but
6 they're missing 8.6 items. So I'm not fully understanding
7 your question.
8 MR. CLEARY: The question that I think that you're
9 asking is there's going to be one that's common that looks
10 the same, or are there going to be parameters that you set
11 which each company will fill in themselves at a minimum
12 level and have everything included. You'll still be
13 developing your own. It will have to include everything
14 -- it will have to meet everything on a checklist, but
15 you, the companies, will be developing them themselves as
16 long as they include everything that's put in a minimum
17 standard. There won't be one common that everybody pulls
18 off and does the same.
19 MR. DAY: I have a sample. I have this sample, but
20 many companies have their own unique method for putting
21 that together. What we're looking for is do you have --
22 are all these items in there.
23 MR. HENDERSON: So at the end of this pilot program,
24 individual companies can still create their own 8.6 MCP
25 charts, but they may have some corrections on items that

1 may be missed out of this pilot.
2 MR. CLEARY: There may be some things they need to
3 include they haven't included.
4 MR. HENDERSON: And other items for efficiency's sake
5 for the inspectors that -- because that was one of the
6 items you were mentioning is the inspectors right now
7 having issues with everybody's different check chart.
8 MR. DAY: Well, the issues that the inspectors have
9 with the logs, not the check chart, with the logs is that
10 elevator companies did not use reference numbers. So
11 what's contained within their manual, you have to go
12 search inside the manual. And what do they talk about
13 when they talk about brake maintenance, for an example?
14 So when many companies talk about brake maintenance, and
15 as we all put that together as a PM cycle, it refers to
16 outside of MRL tearing the brake down and cleaning it,
17 that kind of thing. But other companies have in there
18 that they check the brakes, see if it's hot. And that is
19 not a preventative maintenance task per the A17.1 code.
20 That is an examination outlined by 8.11, truly so. But
21 not a preventative maintenance task.
22 So as each company has done that differently, and
23 that's hard to find, the elevator pilot group went in and
24 pulled that out. Oh, yes, it's here, and this is what it
25 says in their manual for doing this task so that we don't

1 improperly write something up that is contained within
2 their manual. It just isn't specific on their log.
3 MR. CLEARY: We're trying to standardize output.
4 Your input will be different for each company, but the
5 output needs to be standardized so it can be gleaned
6 readily in the field by the inspectors, I think is what
7 we're trying to do.
8 MR. DAY: It's most important that we become as
9 standard as possible with this log section because we do
10 want standardized evaluation. We don't want to
11 misevaluate something because somebody wants to be -- or a
12 company is so detrimentally different than the rest of the
13 group. It's keen to know that the closer you can follow
14 the sample, the easier it will be across the board for
15 evaluation. The further you differ, you run the risk of
16 -- you know, everybody runs the risk of somebody writing
17 it up incorrectly or a mechanic not understanding what
18 they're supposed to do.
19 UNIDENTIFIED: I guess the keyword is -- you hit the
20 keyword that I was looking for, how standardized do all
21 these forms need to be between everybody. And that's --
22 and I guess that's the final question.
23 MR. DAY: Well, in the draft -- now you're referring
24 to -- so you're talking about two different things in my
25 mind. A17.10 adoption standardized form, that's the form

1 when everybody -- that's the time you need to become
2 fairly standardized with your product. We'll say -- we'll
3 have in the draft the expectation is you follow the sample
4 to a certain level. Deviations, you're going to need to
5 send through the Department so we all understand what they
6 are. But the expectation is, follow the sample as much as
7 you can, knowing that there are a few idiosyncrasies
8 that's going to have to take place. We all understand
9 that. But we're looking for the tasks, all the tasks to
10 be there going all the way back to 2007.
11 So this particular pilot program isn't news to you
12 guys. You were supposed to have all the 8.6 tasks on the
13 MCP by now, long before now. If you don't have them, you
14 need to get them.
15 MR. TAPLIN: You also indicated that one of the
16 things that you're looking at in this pilot was to have
17 subject to review your intervals; is that true?
18 MR. DAY: Have subject?
19 MR. TAPLIN: Well, you were reviewing the MCP's to
20 make sure the intervals were done properly.
21 MR. DAY: The intervals were done as indicated.
22 MR. TAPLIN: As indicated, not --
23 MR. DAY: On the MCP.
24 MR. TAPLIN: But not how the State says how many
25 times you should be doing this.

MR. DAY: As far as -- the State --

MR. TAPLIN: Frequencies.

MR. DAY: The frequencies, age, use, environmental, condition, inherent design quality. That's kind of how that's set up, right? The only frequency that we have set up at this present moment is the Category 1, 3 and 5 safety tests. So it's been in draft, and it's also been stated through this committee a few years ago that the frequency for 8.11 check items has to be at least once a year, more often as based off of age, use, environmental, condition, inherent design quality. So in the future, that's how 8.11 comes into play.

MR. VAL: And manufacturer recommendations.

MR. DAY: Yes. And manufacturer recommendations.

MR. CLEARY: Max.

MR. PRINSEN: Jack, you made a reference to the code number being part of the procedure.

MR. DAY: The reference number.

MR. PRINSEN: The reference number. And I think the reason that that was kind of avoided is because we continue to change the reference number as they change periodically from code version to code version. It seems like we replicate the work quite often. And also, it sounds like in this pilot process, we're actually going to move to a final process through the 2010. Does it behoove

1 us to look at what is our goal at the final processes
2 instead of doing all these intermediate steps?
3 MR. DAY: What is our goal in the final process.
4 MR. PRINSEN: Right. Well, I mean, new adoption of
5 the new code. So, I mean, should we just be focused on
6 trying to get to the end game instead of doing these
7 intermediate steps to that end game?
8 MR. DAY: We're focusing on both, Max, not just one.
9 We are focusing on both objects. But the objects today is
10 maintenance as maintenance has been put in place by the
11 owner and the elevator company, is it being done,
12 evaluate, meaning that log, and giving a direct report to
13 the owner as we have the code today to do that. So in the
14 future, which is also being done, is streamlining the
15 future process.
16 There are a few basic differences in 8.6 between the
17 2005-8.6 and the 2010 which we plan to adopt. Those basic
18 differences are they moved the categories. All category
19 tests in 2010 have been -- actually have them in '08 --
20 have been moved to 8.6. They're referenced in 8.11 so
21 there's still that reference from 8.11 back to 8.6 for
22 this.
23 And a couple other additions in 2010. What are they?
24 I forget what they are. I think one of them is safety
25 test for the overspeed valve, the five-year safety test.

1 There isn't very much difference for the 8.6 as far as
2 that goes except for the category tests. That's the main
3 focus. So if you're set up there, you're not going to see
4 much print difference as far as that goes between the two
5 codes for that particular 8.6 section. So that means if
6 an elevator company has devised an 8.6 to the 2010 code,
7 it should be fine if it has been devised to the 2010.
8 MR. GAULT: And also, just as a comment, owners are
9 not in this every day. We're going to look to the State,
10 what the State has. So if the elevator company is not
11 mirroring what the State wants, we're not going to be able
12 to know what your nuances are with that. So it's just as
13 easy to have the codes listed so that we can see that
14 those are in compliance because we're the ones held
15 accountable that you're doing it so that we're not talking
16 different languages between, "Oh, that's done here," and
17 the inspector comes and says, "No, it's not done. You
18 didn't have this, XYZ."
19 MR. DAY: To clarify, when the inspector finds a
20 correction, the inspectors will be using and have been
21 using the code reference number. And that's exactly what
22 gets delivered to an owner, 8.6.4 point blank point blank.
23 Then if you're going to force your owners to go through
24 the manual to find out, you're going to confuse your
25 owners.

1 So it's really important that everybody -- all of us
2 get on the same page with these reference numbers. It
3 will be great that if I use a reference number, Ricky will
4 know exactly what John was referring to and can explain it
5 to the owner without a loss of interpretation, without a
6 loss of misunderstanding. When we're talking about a
7 brake preventive maintenance task, we want to know that
8 we're talking about the brake preventative maintenance
9 task, not the brake examination, not the brake one-year
10 safety test, not the brake five-year safety test. All
11 different reference numbers. Let's get on the same page
12 with this. Let's be on the same page with this. This
13 benefits everyone. Everyone.
14 MS. GILLESPIE: I have a question on so when an
15 inspector comes out and inspects, looks at an MCP, maybe
16 they write up something that we missed or the building
17 owner, is there a way to standardize the reports that come
18 in from the city and the State as far as numbering the
19 items? You have the code like you just said next to it,
20 but it would be nice on the reports coming back like
21 Item 1 written up, Item 2, then the code. Because then
22 it's easier for us to communicate with the building
23 owners. Also, if we call up an inspector, we can say,
24 "Hey, Item No. 1 that you wrote up on this report . . ."
25 That's just a suggestion. I don't know if anyone's ever

1 talked about that before.
2 MR. DAY: As a reference number being an item number?
3 MS. GILLESPIE: Yeah, yes. On the reports.
4 MR. DAY: That's been talked about a lot. And we
5 would like it that the State was standardized in that
6 process. We have a piece of that put together. What we
7 utilized in order to accomplish that was the inspection
8 item numbers out of 8.11 or the maintenance item --
9 preventive maintenance item numbers out of 8.6. And so
10 the parts we don't have done relate to the elevator pit,
11 fireman's service and outside hoistway. So those three
12 items have not been completed, but we have created -- all
13 we've done is created some common generic.
14 MS. GILLESPIE: Like it will say "additional item."
15 MR. DAY: Right. Not everything in the code. We'd
16 be here --
17 MS. GILLESPIE: But sometimes even under the
18 additional items, we're talking about several different
19 additional items. It just gets confusing. So even if
20 just on the inspection reports themselves you have the
21 numbers of what's written up. Maybe it's just like 1
22 through 20, then the code. It's just a suggestion. I
23 don't know if anyone else --
24 MR. DAY: I agree. Maybe you can see some of the
25 things we've done. Either get with me, Becky or a local

1 inspector and we can easily show you and get your input.
2 Hey, you like this or not.
3 MS. GILLESPIE: Thanks.
4 MR. WATSON: Dee, you see the City of Seattle
5 reports. Are you kind of envisioning a section where we
6 talk about MCP issues and having an item number and a code
7 behind it like we view on all of our --
8 MS. GILLESPIE: Yes. That would be great. Or even
9 just on the report itself listing each item as a number on
10 the report, I mean, just to reference on the report
11 itself.
12 So say I'm looking at an inspection report that the
13 inspector has written up, maybe an MCP item, maybe
14 something in the machine room. Then if you just have a
15 number for those items on the report, this may be even
16 standard between the city and the State as far as just 1
17 through 20 items or 1 through 5 items, it helps us. And
18 then the code that's referencing or the MCP, you know, the
19 8.6, whatever it would be, then it's just easier for us to
20 communicate between the building owner. I don't know if
21 the building owners would have any input on that. But
22 it's just we're talking about the code with them too. But
23 sometimes it's just easier to go, "Hey, Item No. 1 on your
24 2012 inspection report," you know, it's car top handrails,
25 whatever, then it's just easier communication. Because

1 we're looking at several pages sometimes. Sometimes we're
2 looking at a previous report if the owner hasn't taken
3 care of something. Then it just gets easier. I don't
4 know.
5 MR. WATSON: Well, we try to break our reports in
6 items that refer to all the conveyances at a jobsite, all
7 elevators or something, and list all the things that
8 pertain to all the equipment and then go through
9 individually and speak to individual conveyances. But I
10 think maybe we'll look at something else in the future.
11 We'll at least talk about it. Maybe we could get some
12 help from you too as far MCP type issues or something like
13 that. That might be helpful.
14 MS. ERNSTES: Are you talking about like when we do a
15 code reference and then we have like a specific thing
16 about that code that you want a number by it?
17 MS. GILLESPIE: Yeah. Even just on the report
18 itself, the inspection report that we get either from the
19 State of Washington or whatever city it's coming -- you
20 know, city. Then it just seems like it's confusing to the
21 customer, especially as far as when we're referencing or
22 talking even between ourselves as far as even talking with
23 the mechanic or technician out in the field. It's like if
24 they've got a copy of the inspection report, we've got a
25 copy, they're going, "Hey, have you taken care of this

1 item?" It's just -- especially the building owners, I
2 think it would be nice just to have a number, have the
3 reports numbered or standardized so that we're kind of
4 looking at the same format.
5 MS. ERNSTES: You're saying so if you're doing like
6 ASME 2.10.1 and we say what the code says and they say,
7 "Fix Hall Door No. 6," you want that as Item 1.
8 MS. GILLESPIE: Yeah. Or something to that effect.
9 MS. ERNSTES: But what we have done is when we get
10 our next drop or probably by the end of the year, instead
11 of just having this little line beside each thing, now
12 there will be two boxes that you fixed it, it was
13 corrected or it's not.
14 And after -- the other thing that's going to happen
15 with our next drop is that everybody will be able to see
16 the last three years of reports on the computer by putting
17 in the conveyance number. And you can look up three years
18 of history, and that check mark will say whether that item
19 was recorded as corrected or not. That's coming soon. So
20 you'll have each -- we don't have numbers for every
21 write-up, but we do have a clear this item was corrected.
22 Not just a line anymore. A box that says, "Yes, it's
23 corrected," or "No, it wasn't."
24 MS. GILLESPIE: That's great. That will help a lot.
25 MR. CLEARY: Any other comments?

1 We're going to move on to LULA application. The
2 Committee is seeking feedback and advice on I've been
3 getting a lot of requests, can we expect the application
4 or the use of LULA's, which are limited use, limited
5 access elevators, in certain buildings other than what is
6 specified in the WAC. The WAC 296-05-590 states --
7 there's two sections, sections 1 and 2. And what we're
8 looking for is guidance and some feedback on section 2.
9 But section 1 states, "LULA's may be permitted in
10 churches, private clubs and buildings listed on the
11 historical register that are not required to comply with
12 accessibility requirements." And that can do with less
13 than 3,000 square feet or other issues.
14 Section 2 is what we're looking for guidance on is,
15 "Installation of LULA's in existing buildings that are not
16 required to comply with accessibility requirements and
17 will be considered on a case-by-case basis by the
18 Department."
19 So what we're looking for is does it make sense to
20 expand the application of LULA's, and if so, what
21 shouldn't we expand them to? So it's something that we've
22 been kind of struggling with for years, and so I think
23 it's time that we try to see if we -- the equipment itself
24 is, you know, you can get them with Phase 1, Phase 2,
25 fire, and the equipment has gotten to be a very good piece

of equipment from a lot of different manufacturers. So limiting it in these economic times to just fraternal organizations, churches and private clubs, I think, should be able to be expanded.

So we're looking for feedback from everybody on what -- if they are to be expended in use, what are the limitations, what are the heights and what kind of structures shall be able to be permitted. And so that's kind of -- Max.

MR. PRINSEN: I think part of the reason that, I think -- like you said, Scott, we've had these conversations many times in the past. And part of the reason for looking at it on a case-by-case basis is because the other types of applications, churches, private clubs and private residences and historical buildings, those are pretty much set. The uses of those buildings very rarely ever change, whereas in commercial applications, the use is changed considerably over a period of years. And so it really -- it really would put a -- you know, what made sense at the moment that the LULA was requested for for a building application, they go renovate the building and change the use of the building and suddenly that LULA is not a good fit anymore, but yet here the building has been designed without a commercial-sized hoistway or something like that. So

1 those are some of the considerations I know that we
2 thought about in the past.
3 MR. CLEARY: That makes a lot of sense. That's what
4 we're looking for advice and guidance on. Because there's
5 a lot of buildings that were permitted, small doctor's
6 office buildings and that stuff that were allowed to be
7 built before the regulations were in place. Now that they
8 want to get a new tenant upstairs for another doctor, they
9 have no way of meeting the codes without financially or
10 even structurally meeting those. So that's one of those
11 things where making it a case-by-case, it would be nice to
12 have a certain -- some parameters set so you can at least
13 discuss what can be considered on a case-by-case. Now
14 it's really kind of a black area.
15 The equipment, I think, is not intended to be used as
16 a main passenger elevator, nor should it ever be approved
17 as that. But there are some applications where you just
18 can't get a 2,500 pound elevator. You just can't do it.
19 And then what do you do? We allow VPL's to penetrate a
20 floor. So do you put an elevator that's got fireman
21 service that's a very good piece of equipment up to 1,400
22 pounds where you can't put it in but you can put in a 750
23 or 1,000 pound VPL which, to me, is not a good
24 application? And so we've got to look at that ambiguity
25 and see what makes sense.

1 So we're looking for feedback from people that are
2 interested in any of these applications or not. But we
3 need to get some facts and data together. So that's what
4 we're looking for.
5 Any other -- basically, that's it in kind of a
6 nutshell.
7 MR. DAY: I just really want to reiterate, when the
8 State looks at these, somebody may have already purchased
9 the thing, and they didn't think about this criteria
10 that's listed here as others as approved. We had a new
11 building newly designed, and it's an office building, and
12 the architect built the hoistway for a LULA. They already
13 ordered it. And here it is, and here's my justification.
14 This is how I built my building with this in mind, and I
15 already bought the LULA. It's sitting 100 feet from me
16 over here waiting to be permitted and installed.
17 And I really think if we're going to -- as I was
18 talking to Scott about this, if we're going to venture out
19 and approve something, a LULA, we should define the
20 criteria around what we will approve and not have it so
21 open-ended. Open-ended leaves people to believe if they
22 can go ahead and do it, get it all set up and the State
23 will cave in and give it to them. And in the past, that's
24 not worked very well.
25 MR. CLEARY: Charlie.

1 MR. VAL: Those definitions that you talk about are
2 already in place. We already have a place for LULA's, we
3 already have a reason for LULA's, and so expanding those
4 is what you're trying -- is what your goal is, correct?
5 MR. CLEARY: It's not really a goal. But if you read
6 portions, they will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
7 We want to get rid of that case-by-case and define what
8 that case-by-case is. So not just to expand it, but to
9 make sure that whatever is done is defined for the
10 architects, for the companies and for the end-users and
11 have that really defined. Because that leaves it really
12 open-ended. The way it's written now, it's really
13 open-ended. And depending upon who is doing the review of
14 case-by-case can be way, way different. So we're trying
15 to get that more well defined.
16 And it's also for allowing certain building owners
17 and that stuff to be able to provide access in areas where
18 they right now are not able to. So I don't know if it's
19 just to generate -- it's to make it more well defined.
20 It's pretty ambiguous now, at least in my eyes.
21 MR. SPAFFORD: So are you suggesting that we just
22 remove line 2?
23 MR. CLEARY: No. I think we need to have it.
24 MR. SPAFFORD: That would be my suggestion.
25 MR. CLEARY: And maybe make line 1 bigger, more

1 inclusive.
2 We're looking for everybody's input on this. I have
3 not set -- I've been getting input from different entities
4 wanting that more defined. Who makes that case-by-case
5 decision? Is it different from one person making it one
6 day from a person who might make it two months from now?
7 So we're just trying to maybe get rid of 2, but find a way
8 of defining that a little bit.
9 MR. DAY: But if we're going to keep 2, what are the
10 parameters around it?
11 MR. CLEARY: Correct.
12 MR. DAY: What would be the considered parameters
13 around it?
14 MR. CLEARY: Becky.
15 MS. ERNSTES: Well, when you see the rules that we
16 have put out there for review, we have gotten rid of
17 line 2. And our rationale is until we can describe the
18 parameters better, we'd like to get rid of that too and
19 work on defining parameters. But for now, in the new
20 adoption, we suggest we get rid of line 2.
21 MR. CLEARY: That hasn't been through public comment.
22 MS. ERNSTES: No, it hasn't. But it is a proposal.
23 MR. CLEARY: So I just think for the companies that
24 are in that market, it would be nice to put this to bed
25 and have a set of parameters put on them. You're right.

1 We've been talking about it, Max, for a long time.
2 MR. OURY: This isn't an area that I'm involved in at
3 all, but do you ever define a section by what would not be
4 included? Would that maybe be helpful to -- Max made some
5 good points about a building being designed one day where
6 you might approve one and then altered another day where
7 it's not approved. And there were some other good
8 comments on where you would not want one. So could you
9 define it by saying like -- like somebody buying a lift
10 because they think it's included. You could easily say,
11 "If this happens, this is not a reason for us to" -- I
12 don't know. Maybe that way you could leave it in there
13 but you define what really wouldn't be included.
14 MR. CLEARY: In my eyes it's still ambiguous because
15 you allow churches, private clubs --
16 MR. OURY: Those are already included.
17 MR. CLEARY: I know. I'm saying that they are. But
18 they can change service too. I mean, churches are shut
19 down and private clubs change all the time. So you allow
20 some organizations that had the same flexibility and the
21 same possibility of being --
22 MR. OURY: But if a church closes down, it's no
23 longer a church. If it's modified to be something else,
24 and that does happen, it's no longer a church.
25 MR. CLEARY: But a private club can change to all

1 kinds of different private clubs.
2 MR. OURY: That's true. Just an idea.
3 MR. CLEARY: That's why defining this makes --
4 MR. OURY: I'm just trying to help you keep it not go
5 away.
6 MR. CLEARY: That's the kind of input we want.
7 MR. DAY: That's a good suggestion.
8 MR. CLEARY: Yes. Very good.
9 MR. WATSON: This is one of those things like Max was
10 talking about earlier where you have NFPA or IFC and ASME
11 requirements. We have a code, the A117 accessibility code
12 that talks about car sizes and allowing LULA's in
13 different installations, and we have a WAC code that says
14 if the installation is required to be barrier-free
15 accessible, then you have to have a certain size car in
16 there. And those two do not meet the same standards. So
17 we always struggle with that, and have for years and years
18 and years.
19 At least in Seattle we have plan review that's
20 required ahead of time. So somebody in our department is
21 looking at the building plan and trying to make sense out
22 of what's being installed. Is that going to meet the
23 codes when it's developed instead of having to wait until
24 the elevator inspector gets out there and says, "You know,
25 you've got a 3x4 hoistway. You need a 6x8 hoistway"? So

1 deal with it. So at least we have somebody who deals with
2 accessibility issues.
3 It's not in the elevator section, but every building
4 plan that comes through that has any kind of conveyance in
5 it, we get a chance to look at it and make our comments on
6 it. So hopefully we resolve most of those issues up
7 front. Sometimes an architect will tell us, "Well, a
8 company told us they could put a LULA in. Another company
9 told us they couldn't. So we're trying to get your
10 input." And we go back and review it and try to make
11 sense out of it.
12 MR. CLEARY: I find some ambiguity too between you've
13 got to have a building official sign off on it, right?
14 They may sign off on it and say it's okay to put in, but
15 it doesn't mean it's permittable by the State or the city.
16 So educating the local building officials on what the
17 parameters are for this type of equipment, I think, is
18 really important too. Just because you get a sign-off
19 sheet from a building official doesn't mean you can put it
20 in.
21 MS. ERNSTES: That's right.
22 MR. GAULT: I remember from my federal days, do you
23 have back when this was written there's typically notes
24 about why things were done that would help educate why
25 this was put it in this way? That would shed some light

1 on the case-by-case. Because I'm getting the feeling that
2 they thought that the case-by-case was limited to these
3 types of operations and not to open it to a variety of new
4 changes, whatnot. So I don't know if you can go back and
5 research the notes when it was created why this was put in
6 this way. That would probably shed more light, but also
7 get the feedback, but shed some light on why it was put in
8 this way. Rather than just try and change it or modify
9 it, shed some light on why it was put in the way it was.
10 MR. DAY: So I've attempted to do that because I was
11 very curious, you know, what happened.
12 MR. GAULT: And there are no notes.
13 MR. DAY: Hu-uh. But what I did was go around and
14 asked folks that were around back in the '90s. Bill
15 Watson was one of them. Max, I'm pretty sure I asked you.
16 And Max is right on target. That was one of the things.
17 You have no control of what happens to this building five
18 years from now. Five years from now, do we walk and say,
19 "You're not a church anymore. Get it out. Shut it off"?
20 Is that what we say? Well, in all aspects, it's probably
21 what we ought to be saying, right? So we're trying to
22 avoid that particular situation. We really kind of limit
23 it.
24 The other thing that was part of the issue was that
25 it was quality, and it was quality of the unit. And can

1 you have this unit causing issues, scaring people? And at
2 that time, a lot of people were not very familiar with,
3 and those that were familiar with some of the different
4 vendors saw there was a significant difference between
5 this manufacturer and that one. Well, how do you regulate
6 quality? We've had that discussion numerous times. That
7 is a harder bill to sell.
8 So that was back then. Has it changed? Listening to
9 Scott, quality has changed.
10 So one of the issues that's still dominant is exactly
11 what Max brought up: What's that building going to be
12 five years from now? Today it's a church where they use
13 it to get parishioners upstairs. Five years from now,
14 it's a day care. That's just how those things happen.
15 MR. CLEARY: But it's even more gray than that.
16 Because Part 1 says you can put it in churches and
17 fraternal organizations, but the State, and help me
18 clarify this, isn't allowing it in new churches. Only
19 existing churches.
20 MS. ERNSTES: No. That's not true. The State is
21 allowing it in new churches when they didn't have to meet
22 the accessibility requirements. I was actually on the IBC
23 tag committee for quite a few years, and we discussed
24 LULA's and the 117 code in depth. And Washington has
25 always been ahead of the curve in providing accessibility

1 and having those accessibility codes. They're one of the
2 few states who decided that a person in a wheelchair
3 needed to have enough room to roll in there, turn around
4 and exit front. The community back then, and I don't know
5 that today -- decided that they didn't want to have to
6 back in -- you know, roll in, back out. They wanted a
7 conveyance big enough to have that turning radius which is
8 what the minimum cab sizes are. And that's why we're not
9 in conjunction with 117 because they don't give you those
10 size elevators to complete that maneuver.
11 And I did -- the tag committee included people who
12 were in wheelchairs, and we had the VA come in and talk to
13 us about accessibility. And that's why we kind of went
14 along with this is the minimum cab size when you have to
15 provide accessibility, and that's why Part 1 is written
16 like that.
17 We will allow LULA's in new churches as long as the
18 building official says, "Okay. You don't have to meet all
19 the accessibility guidelines." Because they could provide
20 all those services on Floor 1. And then you could have a
21 LULA.
22 MR. CLEARY: Have you approved any outside section 1
23 on a case-by-case in the State of Washington?
24 MS. ERNSTES: Only when we got forced into a couple
25 of times because people already had it sold and sitting

there. And I think there were two cases like that.

MR. CLEARY: So that sets precedence or no?

MR. DAY: No. It does not. That's a variance. It does not set precedence.

MS. ERNSTES: Variances are very specific that it doesn't set precedence.

MR. DAY: But Scott brings a very good point. Here it is, and we want to be consistent. If we're going to do it, let's get it written. If we're not going to do it, let's get it stricken, one or the other. Don't be wishy-washy about it. That's kind of the point with this No. 2. Where would we allow it? Where could we allow it? And are there any criteria around it? So I think that's really the focus. And he wants to hear from you.

MR. CLEARY: We need input.

MR. DAY: Input.

MR. CLEARY: I feel that we -- the LULA's have come a long way in quality and how they work. I think if a person is stuck and cannot put a commercial size elevator in, is it better to put a fully enclosed LULA in with automatic controls? Because we will allow a VPL to penetrate a floor with constant pressure. So is it really meeting the intent of giving that person the ability to get up and down floors easily? You have somebody that's a modified quad that can't keep that finger pressure on

there. It's not that easy to do.

MR. VAL: I think that we're running a risk of lowering the bar. And that's what we're always trying to do. We're always trying to lower the bar and lower the bar and lower the bar. So now the next time when we can't get a LULA in, well, let's just put a catapult and we can flip them into the backyard from the front yard because there's not enough room to put in a LULA. So we've got to be careful on lowering these standards. Those standards are there for a reason.

MR. CLEARY: Catapults aren't permitted under 17.1 or 18.1, but VPL's are. So I think if you look at it, I don't think anybody wants to put in something that doesn't work well, that's dangerous. I don't want to lower the bar. I don't think I ever said that I want to lower the bar. There are some applications --

MR. VAL: The purpose is for everybody. So you may not want to lower the bar, that may not be your expectation, but that's what's going to happen.

MR. CLEARY: Well, I guess, and that's why we need to have some parameters set in there that make sense.

MR. WATSON: I understand what you're saying, and I'll answer a question that you asked Becky. Have we ever allowed LULA's in other than those situations you were talking about? And, yes, we have in new construction.

1 One example I can give you is there was some kind of
2 HUD money or something. I don't think it was HUD. But
3 there was money to go around and build some new firehouses
4 and modernize firehouses and such. So some of these
5 firehouses had wanted to put in handicap lifts to move
6 firemen from level to level in the house where they had
7 sleeping quarters. And we kind of looked at that and
8 said, "Are you really putting handicapped firemen on the
9 job? Is that what you're trying to do here? Or what is
10 the issue?"
11 So the issue was they wanted access to different
12 floors but they were not required to have an accessible
13 elevator. They could put in a handicap lift, but it
14 didn't seem like there was a real need for a handicap lift
15 because, generally speaking, we're not employing
16 handicapped firefighters.
17 So what could we use? Could we use a LULA because it
18 was a small firehouse and it met the requirements of
19 people being able to move from floor to floor? And it was
20 not the general public that was getting in there. And we
21 also had the requirements on a LULA for there to be
22 Phase 1 but not Phase 2, right?
23 MR. CLEARY: You can have Phase 2.
24 MR. WATSON: You can have Phase 2 now? I don't know
25 that that's true. But as of right now in the code you

1 don't actually -- but so we looked at it and approved the
2 use of LULA's in those instances as being better than a
3 VPL or something because it was fully enclosed and it
4 could go 25 feet instead of 12 feet -- or 14 feet. So it
5 made sense, but it's kind of a gray area and it is kind of
6 on a case-by-case basis. Now, would we allow that for a
7 condo? Probably not.
8 MR. CLEARY: Max.
9 MR. PRINSEN: So I work with a variety of other state
10 agencies on different issues. And as owners and property
11 owners and so on and so forth, we make choices, and those
12 choices sometimes have consequences. So sometimes the way
13 that you deal with these issues is by informing owners
14 that if you make this choice, there is a consequence that
15 this benefit is only received at this particular
16 condition. And if that condition changes, that benefit
17 goes away.
18 So we have a lot of rules in the State of Washington
19 and actually operate under those types of things. So
20 maybe this is a type of situation where you look at the
21 benefit is extended to this very specific use, if you
22 change the use, the benefit goes away, and you take the
23 risk of the cost of losing that benefit. And that's a way
24 to approach it.
25 MR. DAY: Max, that's a really good point. And

that's for our variance -- at least one of them that I'm aware of when we issued the LULA is it's used like this. If the owner -- if this changes, this variance no longer is valid. So we try to be very specific when we do that.

MR. CLEARY: A couple things. One is if anybody thinks the quality is cheap and not very good, I have a fully operational one in my showroom which you can come and look at to see what they're made of now. They're not made of rubber bands and bamboo.

Also, it's just something -- this is why it's really important that we do get everybody's feedback because there's a lot of very good issues on both sides of this. That's why I think we need to define it. I think we owe it to the end-users and the companies that are out there to help define it and kind of put this to rest. It's not for every application. I agree. It's not for massive use, but there are some applications I think that would be beneficial. So please, give feedback.

Any more questions?

With that, everybody have a piece of cake and say goodbye to Bill.

MR. PRINSEN: Future business topics?

///

///

///

1 Future Business

2

3 MR. CLEARY: Sorry. Future business.

4 MR. PRINSEN: I'd like, because we're seeing an
5 increase in construction and it looks like maybe the
6 economy is recovering a little bit, I think we should
7 review the topic of temporary elevators and usage of what
8 permitting will be allowed because I think we went through
9 some things several years ago about what happens when the
10 manlift goes away and we get temporary elevators. It
11 would be good for this body to be fully aware of those
12 rules because it's going to come up again as a topic.

13 MR. CLEARY: Very good point.

14 MR. DAY: Max, do you have any indication or any
15 information that would supply us with when the suspected
16 next boom may be? Any crystal ball?

17 MR. PRINSEN: Well, I mean, we're seeing more
18 requests for proposals and stuff like that. I mean, that
19 should indicate that things are picking up a little bit.
20 So there's always that opportunity. And because things
21 are changing so rapidly, I think we just need to be kind
22 of ahead of it.

23 MR. DAY: Proactive?

24 MR. PRINSEN: Yeah.

25 MR. CLEARY: Charlie.

1 MR. VAL: Also future business, I'd kind of like to
2 have the Committee be able to receive correspondence that
3 comes in to the State in between meetings, you know,
4 things that are going to be topics that we're going to be
5 talking about and things that we're going to need to know
6 about so that we don't walk into a buzz saw or we don't
7 walk into some things that we don't know are going on. I
8 think that a lot of the communication that goes to the
9 State, you know, we're going to be asked to give an
10 opinion on, and we're not going to have the (inaudible).
11 So I'd like to come up with a way to get some of those
12 communications.
13 MR. DAY: Okay.
14 MR. McBRIDE: My name is Tom McBride, and I represent
15 the National Elevator Trade Association on legislative and
16 regulatory matters. And you may know about the trade
17 association. It represents the manufacturers, installers,
18 maintenance companies related to elevators and other
19 conveyances.
20 Some of its members have been involved for years and
21 years, and you know them. But the association wants to
22 take a more active role in Washington State on regulatory
23 and legislative matters. And one of the things, you all
24 know better than I do the complexity of the issues and how
25 it's changed over time. And you've asked for feedback on

1 a number of issues, the importance of that. One of the
2 things that comes to mind of the association as it wants
3 to engage more actively is perhaps there would be value in
4 forming some sort of subcommittee to this Elevator
5 Advisory Committee. You can call it a Technical Advisory
6 Committee, if you like. Whatever you want to call it.
7 But an additional forum where the stakeholders -- and I'm
8 not talking just industry. I'm talking everyone,
9 stakeholders across the board could come together to look
10 at some of these complex issues that we've talked about
11 today, whether it's machineless rooms or self-inspection
12 or some of the things we talked about today, like the new
13 elevator code.
14 But there would be value, I think -- we think, in
15 having a dialogue that would allow for a little more
16 discussion. Because I know this Elevator Advisory
17 Committee is terrific, but it's limited in time. I know
18 there's limited resources with the State. If there were
19 an additional forum where people could sit down and have a
20 more lengthy discussion about some of these complex
21 issues, there might be some value in that. And the
22 association would be interested in helping to facilitate
23 that if there's interest.
24 I think it also might be a benefit to both
25 governments and State because it might even synthesize

1 some of the comments, create greater consistency and maybe
2 reduce comments so that you get feedback that's more
3 consistent.
4 MR. CLEARY: Bill.
5 MR. WATSON: One question. Something you said kind
6 of interested me. Are you suggesting that NEII may be
7 willing to fund such an operation?
8 MR. McBRIDE: That's a good question. I can't answer
9 that question, but I know that NEII would be interested in
10 helping facilitate it in some way.
11 MR. WATSON: I mean, one of the things you said was
12 you recognize that we don't have the time or the resources
13 to deal with so many large issues in depth, so I think
14 everybody is interested in meeting the needs of the
15 citizens of the State. How we go about it is another
16 issue. And what's been in place here since the State
17 started developing rules and legislation and regulation
18 has been this committee.
19 So I think we would certainly welcome your input at
20 this level at this point in time, and maybe as that input
21 -- as we see how that involvement goes, we can look at
22 other things as well. But I think we might be getting the
23 cart a little ahead of the horse by trying to develop
24 something else before we see how this interaction works
25 out. Because as you know, the only way NEII has been

1 involved in the past has been by a code committee where
2 different major companies have had a person in their local
3 jurisdiction be a part of a code adoption process.
4 I guess that didn't work out to their requirements. So
5 that was changed at this point.
6 MR. CLEARY: I agree with that too. But we, over the
7 last -- I've been affiliated with this organization, this
8 committee for five years now, and it always sounds good in
9 this meeting. But getting other than a small group of
10 people to participate in these subcommittees, it usually
11 -- we can't pull enough people together consistently to
12 make it happen. And so I agree, and I think it needs to
13 be done. But in my experience, there's only been a few
14 groups of people that really will put the time in on a
15 subcommittee. So if you can make that happen, that would
16 be fantastic.
17 MR. PRINSEN: I think no different than your comment,
18 you know, that home elevators are no longer made out of
19 bamboo and rubber bands, the industry technology is
20 evolving rapidly, and new code is allowing new code
21 acceptance of evolving technologies. And so the
22 challenges that we've had in the past in trying to meet
23 those challenges, they're not going to happen once every
24 three years. They're going to happen every few months.
25 And so this type of committee or group would help

1 facilitate that a little bit and bring those
2 communications forward.
3 And also, as Tom mentioned, there's no particular
4 format set up. But if this body were to accept that type
5 of proposal, I think that NEII would be willing to look at
6 how to formulate that and structure that. At the same
7 time, the traditional NEII roles are changing all
8 throughout the country, and so this is a role that NEII is
9 playing in a variety of other states as well. So this is
10 not something that's new just for Washington. It's just
11 one of Washington -- Washington is one of the areas
12 they've decided to become more engaged.
13 MR. CLEARY: Thank you. Bill.
14 MR. MORRELL: To me, it's always been a bit vague if
15 a particular manufacturer wants to come to the State of
16 Washington and present their product to find out if it's
17 permittable in the State of Washington. This process is
18 something that before we go out and sell to a customer, to
19 a homeowner a particular lift, I've been asking whether or
20 not it's ever been permitted. And if it hasn't been
21 permitted, it goes back to the manufacturer to submit
22 paperwork to get it permitted. And I won't sell something
23 unless I get some feedback that it would be permittable.
24 This particular committee may be an avenue to look at
25 new technology and to say, "Well, it should be permitted."

1 And I think the State would welcome a body like that to
2 look at new technology and find out if it could be
3 permitted or what the problems would be, what would the
4 obstacles be.
5 MR. CLEARY: And I think that's a timely discussion
6 because we have had discussions amongst ourselves that
7 maybe we do need to find a way, a forum to get
8 manufacturers in the industry to give more presentations
9 and help educate. I think that's really critical because
10 a lot of times, we don't have all the facts and data that
11 are really necessary to make a really substantial decision
12 on things. So I think it's a great idea. We just need to
13 be able to do it and do it expeditiously and have the
14 enthusiasm that we see sometimes in these meetings carry
15 on to when no one else is around and have things that are
16 really -- we don't have a lot of time so it would be
17 really important to do that.
18 So if you guys come with some proposals or some
19 outlines or how you'd like to do it, we'd put it on the
20 agenda for next time and let's work on something. I think
21 it would be very beneficial. That's what this is for.
22 MR. McNEILL: I'm all for it. The toughest challenge
23 I've had with some of the code issues that we discussed
24 over the last year and a half or so is getting my
25 constituents together. Because I may have one company who

1 has a representative in New Jersey, one in Texas. And
2 then when I e-mail my constituents, I don't get any
3 response, or it's, "I'm not doing that anymore. You need
4 to talk to this guy."
5 So I'm all for each one of us that represent a
6 different segment of the population to have the
7 subcommittees so we can get good input from our
8 constituents that we're representing and then bring it to
9 this level. Obviously, it would be open to everybody so
10 I'm not limiting it just to my elevator contractors that
11 are licensed. Anybody could be there. But that way we
12 could really define some future questions, be proactive,
13 not reactive, and provide much better public safety.
14 MR. CLEARY: And I think that's good. I think we
15 want to stay -- and then, Jack, you can address this after
16 I'm finished, if you like. Kind of stay away from calling
17 it a subcommittee, because with a subcommittee, we can't
18 really meet without public notice and outside of certain
19 meeting areas. So being able to come together and put
20 information together and put it in a form which can then
21 be presented at these meetings, I think, would be very
22 beneficial.
23 Anything you want to add to that, Jack?
24 MR. DAY: Probably just really quickly. We've hit
25 our limit here. Sorry.

1 I'm encouraged by individuals and entities wanting to
2 get involved, and what I would like to see is that they
3 really -- you know, if they could really be motivated and
4 really get involved, that would be outstanding. Mirror
5 what you've heard. Been involved before, and nothing
6 happened. We wait around for nothing. So there is a
7 problem with progression. Bill wants his piece of
8 equipment approved. Do we wait through the subcommittee
9 to get it done or do we do it? So in the past, we've just
10 done it. You can't wait for the subcommittee. They don't
11 get together to actually do it. So think about that with
12 your proposal.
13 And I'd also like to know where this has achieved
14 success, where in the United States. Can you direct us or
15 a letter from states where this has succeeded, this
16 process? Because I would hate to start another process
17 when there is no track record and bogs us down even more.
18 Other than that, I don't have anything else.
19 MR. McBRIDE: Thank you for the feedback. We'll talk
20 to Jack and the chair and others and see if we can get
21 some more detail for us. Thank you.
22
23 Conclusion
24
25 MR. CLEARY: With that, I'd like to motion for

1 adjournment of our August 21st Advisory Board.
2 MR. WATSON: I'll motion.
3 MR. CLEARY: It's approved, it's adjourned.
4 (Whereupon, proceedings adjourned at 11:00 a.m.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2

3 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
4 County of Pierce)

5

6 I, Cheryl A. Smith, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify:

7 That the foregoing transcript of proceedings was
8 taken before me and transcribed under my direction; that the transcript is an accurate transcript of the
9 proceedings insofar as proceedings were audible, clear and intelligible; that the proceedings and resultant foregoing
10 transcript were done and completed to the best of my abilities for the conditions present at the time of the
11 proceedings;

12 That I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any party in this matter, and that I am not
13 financially interested in said matter or the outcome thereof;

14

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand on this 13th day of September, 2012, at Auburn, Washington.

16

17

18 Cheryl A. Smith, CCR, CVR
Excel Court Reporting
19 16022-17th Avenue Court East
Tacoma, WA 98445

20

(CCR License #3017)

21

22

23

24

25

Au ıst 21, 201

Elevator Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-in

Last Name	First Name	Contact Number	Email Address
DAY	JACK	360 902 6128	DAYL235@LNI.WA.G
GAULT	DAVID	206 793 1535	david.gault@fain
VAL	Charles	206 282 4885	CVAL@IUEC19.ORG
CLEARY	SCOTT	253-896-0970	Scott@mikelfy Conceptsinc-
MCNEILL	ROB	425-269-3302	ROBERT.MCNEILL@KONE.COM
Ernstes	Becky	360-902-6456	ernb235@LNI.WA.GO
MCBRIDE	John	425-864-0060	JMCBRIDE@ELTEC.CC
GILLESPIE	DEE	425-864-0131	DGILLESPIE@ELTEC.CC
TAPLIN	DAN	425-864-0558	dtaplin@eltec.cc
SPRAGUE	SCOTT	360 779 7795	[illegible]
McLAUGHLIN	BOB	206 246 3062	tideline@mindspring
Whited	Jerrel	509 520 4550	JWhited@NWIA.G
MATHEWS	STUART	206-787-5604	MATHEWS.S@PORTSEATTLE
Pazaruski	Ryan	(206-787-7590	pazaruski.r@portseattle.org
SPAFFORD	DAVID	206 255 2266	DAVID.SPAFFORD@SEATTLE.GO
Gould	JAN	206-684-8106	JAN.GOULD@SEATTLE.GOV
Moser	Jeff	206-465-6312	Jmoser@knoxbox.com
FRINSEN	MAX	206-730-2001	MAX.Frinsen@ohs.com
~~Steve~~ Jones	Steve	360-239-1695	JSTE235@LNI.WA.GOV

Please Note: This sign-in sheet is a public record, and the information provided is open to public disclosure under the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

Au st 21, 201

Elevator Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-in

Last Name	First Name	Contact Number	Email Address
Henderson	Ricky	425-864-3584	ricky.henderson@ThyssenKrupp.com
Mike Cook	Mike	801-718-5287	Mike.Cook@ThyssenKrupp.com
McBride	Tom	360-481-1824	tom@mcbridepa.com
Klein	Jymm	206-248-6416	jymm.Klein@otis.com
Cote	John	360 415 4037	cote@LNI.wa.gov
Tomasino	Tony	509-735-0136	TOMA235@LNI.wa.gov
Metcalfe	Rich	425-990-1461	metR235@LNI.wa.gov
Oury	Bob	253-872-9006	bob.oury@pmhinc.com
Morrell	Bill	206 762 1969	medsurgsys@aol.com
Fillips	Diana	425 277-1011	info@jfillips.com
Fillips	Judith	425 277-1011	judy@jfillips.com
Becker	Keith	509-397-4381	keithe@pnw.coop

Please Note: This sign-in sheet is a public record, and the information provided is open to public disclosure under the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).