

# Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Agenda

November 18, 2014 - 9 to 11 a.m.

Tukwila Service Location

Time	Topic	Facilitator	Comments
9 – 9:10 a.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions/Purpose</li> <li>• Comments regarding August minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keith Becker</li> <li>• Keith Becker</li> </ul>	
9:10 – 9:20 a.m.	<p><b><u>Chief’s Report</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scorecard/Accidents</li> <li>• 8.11 maintenance/examination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jack Day</li> <li>• Jack Day/Skip Button</li> </ul>	
9:20 – 9:30 a.m.	<p><b><u>Old Business:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing machine room enclosure and access to the machine room (See means of access Analysis 006)</li> <li>• Overview of progress on point of sale inspections of residential elevators. (Point of Sale Analysis 008)</li> <li>• Purpose and scope on Sub-committee for Class “A” Permits (re convene?) (see analysis 005)</li> <li>• Code Adoption Subcommittee and discussion of analysis presented (See analysis 001,002,003 and 004)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keith Becker</li> </ul>	
9:30 – 9:40 a.m.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swen Larson</li> </ul>	
9:40 – 9:50a.m.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jack Day</li> </ul>	
9:50 – 10:20 a.m.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bryan Wheeler</li> </ul>	
10:20 – 11:00 a.m.	<p><b><u>New Business:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MS lighting (see analysis 007)</li> <li>• Licensing Criteria (Temporary)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keith Becker</li> <li>• Jack Day</li> </ul>	
11:00 a.m. – Noon	<p><b><u>Stakeholder meeting:</u></b>            You are encouraged to stay for the meeting. It is an informal to touch base with the stakeholders.</p>		
Future agenda	<p><b><u>Future Business:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential Maintenance Licensing</li> <li>• Acceptable LULA applications (limits to install)</li> <li>• ANSi A10.4 Maintenance</li> <li>• FAID/ consider re-evaluation</li> <li>• Proposal for Comb Impact Device</li> </ul>		

**The purpose** of the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee is to advise the department on the adoption of regulations that apply to conveyances; methods of enforcing and administering the elevator law, chapter 70.87 RCW; and matters of concern to the conveyance industry and to the individual installers, owners and users of conveyances. If a member is unable to fulfill his or her obligations, a new member may be appointed. An advisory committee member may appoint an alternate to attend meetings in case of conflict or illness.

- 1) Limit meetings to no more than two hours.
- 2) Please choose an alternate and submit their names and contact information.
- 3) Nominees, merits of why, Vote for the chair position.
- 4) Each of you represent a unique part of the industry, therefore you must be available for concerns and discussion with your represented peers and if necessary bring items forward to the table to be discussed.
- 5) All items to be discussed at the advisory level shall be included within the agenda. You will ensure any item relevant to the committee, be sent to the chair for inclusion into the agenda. Items not on agenda may not be decided at the meeting. This is to ensure public participation of the forum.
- 6) Review RCW and WAC and adopted standards, if there happens to be matters of concern, it is your obligation to bring them forward. Within each and every case decisions must be based upon public, worker and building safety.
- 7) L&I may not be the entity changing Statutes; you may need to become involved with your legislative representative in order to affect change.
- 8) The department thanks you for stepping up and volunteering, with that said the department needs to be assured of your participation. Please keep the meeting dates updated within your calendars. Your input is very important, and the department is at a great loss without your attendance.

**Stakeholder meeting:** You are encouraged to stay for the meeting. It is an informal touch base with the stakeholders.

### **Chief's Report**

#### **Draft WAC 296-96 – Jack Day**

Located within the elevator advisory section is a copy of our rules in electronic form. Its intended use is to update these draft rules with changes as they are created. Also attachments defining the rational will be captured and posted as well. Strategically the analysis document will more than likely become the attachment. You can find the 296.96 WAC copy by using the following

link: <http://www.lni.wa.gov/TradesLicensing/Elevators/CalNews/AgendaMeeting/Default.asp>.

### **Old Business Notes:**

#### **Existing machine room access – Keith Becker to report**

**See Analysis**

**Overview of progress on point of sale inspections of residential elevators – Swen Larson**

Elevators, Platform lifts and Stairway Chairlifts located in a private residence, shall be inspected upon completion and at the transfer of title/deed to ensure code compliance.

- See Analysis (Complete analysis to include Addendum A, B and C to be located on the Elevator Program website in the very near future).

**Purpose and scope on subcommittee for Class A Permits – Jack Day**

Means to allow companies to participate in a program that allows block permits for minor alterations and selected new installation permits. L&I will work with stakeholders to draft language for the Directors consideration for possible Legislation. Please place your names and contact information on the signup sheet provided before leaving today. Language was not sufficient to allow introduction into 2015 legislation secession. Is there interest in starting up discussions?

- See Analysis

**Code Adoption Subcommittee and discussion of processes formed around subcommittee activities – Bryan Wheeler**

The Elevator Safety Advisory Committee (ESAC) is the statutorily-approved body used to advise the Department of Labor & Industries (L&I) on the adoption of rules, enforcement and administration of authorities and matters of concern to the manufacturers, installers, owners and users of the conveyances in Washington State.

For that reason, on the agenda for consideration at our May 20 ESAC meeting is a proposal to create an ESAC subcommittee (Subcommittee) that would review and advise on matters related to the national standards, Washington Codes, Washington Administrative Codes (WACs), Revised Code of Washington (RCWs) and other policies. For example, the Subcommittee could pick a WAC section to review, analyze and make recommendations about in order to clean up outdated, inconsistent and/or unnecessary rule language. All stakeholders will be encouraged to actively participate in the Subcommittee and it will include L&I involvement. The Subcommittee should meet monthly, work fast and present its first report to the ESAC at its fall meeting.

On behalf of L&I, I believe the proposed Subcommittee will provide to the ESAC needed additional resources and expertise to assist the ESAC's work with the department. Please be prepared to discuss this important matter and opportunity at our May 20 meeting. I encourage you to support this effort.

**New Business Notes:**

**MS lighting**

- See Analysis

**Licensing Criteria (Temporary Mechanic)**

- Please review WAC 296-96-00910 (9), WAC 296-96-00912(3) and [Policy 07-16-104](#)

### **Future Business Notes:**

#### **Licensing criteria**

Combining categories:

- Categories 02, 06, 07 combined and remove commercial dumbwaiters (cat 1)
- Combine categories 03 and 04 under industrial
- Combine category 08 with 01
- Incorporate only NEIP, CAT, CET for all categories except material lift
- Remove wording in WAC 296-96-00906:  
*The applicant must provide acceptable proof to the department that shows the necessary combination of documented experience and education credits in the applicable license category (see WAC 296-96-00910) of not less than three years' work experience in the elevator industry performing conveyance work as verified by current and previous employers licensed to do business in this state or as an employee of a public agency;*

#### **Proposal for Comb Impact Device – Jack Day**

- Not available.

#### **Residential Maintenance Licensing**

Only properly licensed individuals can perform maintenance and testing on residential installations.

#### **Acceptable LULA applications (limits to install)**

Permit-able applications: Need to define where they can be installed:

- WAC 296-96-02590: (1) LULAs may be permitted in churches, private clubs, and buildings listed on the historical register that are not required to comply with accessibility requirements. (2) Installation of LULAs in existing buildings that are not required to comply with accessibility requirements will be considered on a case-by-case basis by the department.
- The department is seeking advice and instruction of WAC 296-96-02590(2). We want to remove it, at the discretion of the department, and put in its place defined acceptable applications greater than those found in (1).
- Do we have any discussion regarding building occupancies, building type or use and rise limitations?

#### **ANSI A10.4 Maintenance**

- We need everyone to be on the same page with the maintenance items in A10.4 and mechanic licensing requirements.
-

# Elevator Advisory Analysis Form – 2014

PROPOSAL NUMBER:	006-2014	DATE:	June 12, 2014
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	Means of Access		
PREPARED BY:	Keith Becker		
PHONE NO. & EMAIL:	509-397-4381, keith@pnw.coop		
Brief Summary of what this proposal does and its purpose:			
<p>Develop safe Machine Room/Machine Space access requirements for existing elevators in existing buildings or structures for maintenance, repair, and inspection. Provide instruction and guidelines for proper installation, repair and maintenance of access. Access should be considered fixed, permanent, and non-combustible. Determine if this access is already covered in existing WAC's.</p>			
1. Does the proposal promote Public, Building or Worker Safety?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Worker			
2. The effect of this proposal would be:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> None			
If there is no effect or impact, should we continue to propose this change?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. If the proposal has an effect on the program (major, minor, uncertain) briefly describe effects below:			
<p>The expected impacts should be low to owners, but increase safety for workers and inspectors. Repairs and "like for like" changes will be allowed, any alterations will require rebuilding of accesses to follow new regulations.</p>			
4. If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or the agency?			
<p>Agency: Training for inspectors for determining allowable repairs or replacement.</p> <p>Owner: In most cases, cost impacts should low. No changes will required if access is currently safe and structurally sound.</p> <p>Elevator Companies: ?</p>			
5. If the proposal has a fiscal impact, how much?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> More than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> None			
Unknown. Will require further discussion with the industry.			
6. What other stakeholders would be impacted by this proposal? List (if any) and briefly summarize the impact for each affected group and their positions:			
<p>These areas have limited access (non-public/for maintenance, repair and inspection only). No other stakeholders should be affected.</p>			
7. If enacted, would this proposal require a new rule? Or revise an existing rule?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Rule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revise Existing Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Rule Change			
If revises or repeals an existing Rule/Statute, provide WAC/RCW number and title:			
For Belt Manlifts, WAC 296-96-11045 would be revised to included proposed wording. For Electric Manlifts,			

WAC 296-96-13167(5) would be revised to include proposed language. For Hand-Powered Manlifts, a new WAC in 296-96-14000 should added, which define the top sheave area as a machine space and add the proposed language. For Electric Elevators, WAC 296-96-23121 would revised to include the proposed language.

8. Does the rule impact permits, licenses and/or inspections ("licenses" includes both registration and certification)? Identify all that apply.

Permits  Licenses  Inspections  N/A

Comments: Only if alterations are required.

9. If the Rule impacts permits, licenses and/or inspections, could the Rule be amended to improve timeliness or simplify the application, approval or process?

Improve Timeliness  Simplify Process  Specify Your Own

Comments: unknown

10. Identify the purpose for the proposal based on need, clarity and consistency:

- Need: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is obsolete, duplicative or unnecessary to a degree that warrants repeal or revision?
- Clarity: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is written and/or organized in a manner that is not easily understood by those to whom it applies?
- Consistency: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because of any of the following:
- The Rule is inconsistent with the legislative intent of the authorizing statute?
  - There is more specific legislative authority needed in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of Washington State citizens?
  - Laws or other circumstances have changed which requires the Rule to be amended or repealed?

Comments or other issues (if any): This proposal is based on need and consistency. There needs to be a avenue by which there can be a consistent method of maintaining safe access in existing buildings to the machine room/space.

11. General comments on this proposal (please include any additional background that would be helpful or comments on any similar proposals that you are aware of):

The sub-committee was formed at the August, 2012 Elevator Safety Advisory Meeting to address concerns from inspectors about accessing some machine rooms/spaces in existing buildings through what was felt to be unsafe means. After looking through the WAC's it was felt that good direction regarding the construction, repairs and maintenance of safe means of access to these areas doesnot exist. The sub-committee met first on September 20, 2012 and the process has been a "work in progress" since that time.

Sub-committee consists of Keith Becker, Jack Day, David Spafford, Terry Rozell, Scott Cleary, Robert McNeill, Joseph McCann, Amber Quann.

Proposed language (see below)

2.7.3 Access to Machinery Spaces, Machine Rooms, Control Spaces, and Control Rooms

2.7.3.1 General Requirements

2.7.3.1.1 A permanent and unobstructed means of access shall be provided to

(a) machine rooms and control rooms

(b) machinery spaces and control spaces outside the hoistway

(c) machinery spaces and control spaces inside the hoistway that do not have a means of access to the space as specified in 2.7.3.1.2.

2.7.3.1.2 Access to machinery spaces and control spaces inside the hoistway

2.7.3.1.2(b) from the car top shall comply with 2.12.6 and 2.12.7

2.12.6 Hoistway Door Unlocking Devices

2.12.6.1 General. Except in jurisdictions that limit the use of hoistway door unlocking devices, they shall be provided for use by elevator and emergency personnel for each elevator at every landing where there is an entrance.

2.12.6.2 Location and Design. Hoistway door unlocking devices shall conform to 2.12.6.2.1 through 2.12.6.2.5.

2.12.6.2.1 The device shall unlock and permit the opening of a hoistway door from a landing irrespective of the position of the car.

2.12.6.2.2 The device shall be designed to prevent unlocking the door with common tools.

2.12.6.2.3 Where a hoistway unlocking device consists of an arrangement whereby a releasing chain, permanently attached to a door locking mechanism, is kept under a locked panel adjacent to the landing door, such a panel shall be self-closing and self-locking and shall not have identifying markings on its face.

2.12.6.2.4 The hoistway door unlocking device shall be Group 1 Security (see 8.1). The operating means shall also be made available to emergency personnel during an emergency.

2.12.6.2.5 The unlocking device keyway and locked panel (see 2.12.6.2.3), if provided, shall be located at a height not greater than 2100 mm (83 in.) above the landing.

2.7.3.2 Passage Across Roofs. The requirements of 2.7.3.2.1 and 2.7.3.2.2 shall be conformed to where passage over roofs is necessary to reach the means of access to machinery spaces, machine rooms, control spaces, and control rooms.

2.7.3.2.1 A stairway with a swinging door and platform at the top level, conforming to 2.7.3.3, shall be provided from the top floor of the building to the roof level. Hatch covers, as a means of access to roofs, shall not be permitted.

2.7.3.2.2 Where the passage is over a roof having a slope exceeding 15 deg from the horizontal, or over a roof where there is no parapet or guardrail at least 1070 mm (42 in.) high around the roof or passageway, a permanent, unobstructed and substantial walkway not less than 600 mm (24 in.) wide, equipped on the side sloping away from the walk with a railing conforming to 2.10.2.1, 2.10.2.2, and 2.10.2.3,

2.10.2 Standard Railing

2.10.2.1 Top Rail. The top rail shall have a smooth surface, and the upper surface shall be located at a vertical height of 1070 mm (42 in.) from the working surface.

2.10.2.2 Intermediate Rail, Member, or Panel. The intermediate rail or equivalent structural member or solid panel shall be located approximately centered between the top rail and the working surface.

2.10.2.3 Toe-Board. The toe-board shall be securely fastened and have a height not less than 100 mm (4 in.) above the working surface.

shall be provided from the building exit door at the roof level to the means of access.

2.7.3.3 Means of Access. The means of access to the following shall conform to 2.7.3.3.1 through 2.7.3.3.6:

(a) machine rooms, control rooms, and machinery spaces and control spaces outside the hoistway, and machinery spaces and control spaces inside the hoistway that do not have a means of access to the space as specified in 2.7.3.1.2

(b) between different floor levels in machine rooms, in control rooms, and in machinery spaces or control spaces outside the hoistway

(c) from within machine rooms or control rooms to machinery spaces and control spaces

2.7.3.3.1 A permanent, fixed, noncombustible ladder or stair shall be provided where the floor of the room or

the space above or below the floor or roof from which the means of access leads, or where the distance between floor levels in the room or space, is more than 200 mm (8 in.).

2.7.3.3.2 A permanent, noncombustible stair shall be provided where the floor of the room or the space above or below the floor or roof from which the means of access leads, or where the distance between floor levels in the room or space, is 900 mm (35 in.) or more. Vertical ladders with handgrips shall be permitted to be used in lieu of stairs for access to overhead machinery spaces, except those containing controllers and motor generators.

2.7.3.3.3 Permanent, fixed, noncombustible ladders shall conform to ANSI A14.3.

2.7.3.3.4 Permanent, noncombustible stairs shall have a maximum angle of 60 deg from the horizontal, and shall be equipped with a noncombustible railing conforming to 2.10.2.1, 2.10.2.2, and 2.10.2.3.

#### 2.10.2 Standard Railing

2.10.2.1 Top Rail. The top rail shall have a smooth surface, and the upper surface shall be located at a vertical height of 1 070 mm (42 in.) from the working surface.

#### 2.10.2.2 Intermediate Rail, Member, or Panel.

The intermediate rail or equivalent structural member or solid panel shall be located approximately centered between the top rail and the working surface.

#### 2.10.2.3 Toe-Board.

The toe-board shall be securely fastened and have a height not less than 100 mm (4 in.) above the working surface.

2.7.3.3.5 A permanent, noncombustible platform or floor shall be provided at the top of the stairs conforming with the following:

- (a) Railings conforming to 2.10.2 shall be provided on each open side.
- (b) The floor of the platform shall be at the level of not more than 200 mm (8 in.) below the level of the access-door sill.
- (c) The depth of the platform shall be not less than 750 mm (29.5 in.), and the width not less than the width of the door.
- (d) The size of the platform shall be sufficient to permit the full swing of the door plus 600 mm (24 in.) from the top riser to the swing line of the door.

2.7.3.3.6 Where a ladder is provided, a permanent, noncombustible platform or floor shall be provided at the top of the ladder, conforming with the following:

- (a) Railings conforming to 2.10.2 shall be provided on each open side.
- (b) The floor of the platform shall be located below the level of the access-door sill by a vertical distance of not more than 200 mm (8 in.) where full bodily entry is required, and by a vertical distance of not more than 900 mm (35 in.) where full bodily entry is not required.
- (c) The depth of the platform shall be not less than 915 mm (36 in.) and the width not less than the width of the door or a minimum of 915 mm (36 in.), whichever is greater.
- (d) The size of the platform shall be sufficient to permit the full swing of the door plus 600 mm (24 in.) from the standard railing to the swing line of the door.
- (e) The ladder or handgrips shall extend a minimum of 1 220 mm (48 in.) above the platform floor level and shall be located on the access door/panel strike jamb side of the platform.
- (f) The railing on the access side shall be provided with a hinged section not less than 600 mm (24 in.) wide with a latchable end adjacent to the ladder.

NOTE: Any like-for-like repairs will be allowed to combustible ladders, stairs or platforms. If replacement is required due to inadequate structural integrity, then 2.7.3.3 must be followed in its entirety.

2.7.3.4 Access Doors and Openings. If provided.

2.7.3.4.1 Access doors shall be

- (a) self-closing and self-locking
- (b) kept closed and locked

NOTE: 2.7.3.4.2 through 2.7.3.4.7 are not required to be followed unless existing doors are replaced, openings modified or new doors or openings added.

2.7.3.4.2 Access doors to machine rooms and control rooms shall be provided. They shall be of a minimum width of 750 mm (29.5 in.) and a minimum height of 2 030 mm (80 in.). Keys to unlock the access doors shall be Group 2 Security (see 8.1).

2.7.3.4.3 Access doors for spaces specified in 2.7.4.2, 2.7.4.3, and 2.7.4.4 other than those for machine rooms or control rooms shall be a minimum width and height of 750 mm (29.5 in.). Keys to unlock the access doors shall be Group 2 Security (see 8.1). 2.7.3.4.4 Access doors for control spaces outside the hoistway shall be a minimum width and height of 750 mm (29.5 in.). Keys to unlock the access doors shall be Group 2 Security (see 8.1).

2.7.3.4.5 Doors are not required at openings in machine room or control room floors for access to machinery spaces outside the hoistway, provided the access opening is provided on all four sides with a standard railing conforming to 2.10.2, one side of which is arranged to slide or swing to provide access to the ladder or stairs leading to the space. Trap doors, where provided, shall have a standard railing conforming to 2.10.2 or guard wings on all open non-access sides.

2.7.3.4.6 Access openings located in the machinery space floor, secondary level floor, machine room floor, control space floor, or control room floor for access into the hoistway shall be provided with doors that shall be kept closed and locked. Keys to unlock the access doors shall be of Group 1 Security (see 8.1).

2.7.3.4.7 Access openings in elevator hoistway enclosures where full bodily entry is not necessary for maintenance and inspection of components shall be

(a) located to permit the required maintenance and inspection

(b) of maximum width of 600 mm (24 in.) and a maximum height of 600 mm (24 in.). These dimensions shall be permitted to be increased, provided that any resultant opening through the access opening into the hoistway shall reject a 300 mm (12 in.) diameter ball.

(c) provided with doors that shall be kept closed and locked. Keys to unlock the access doors to the elevator hoistways shall be of Group 1 Security (see 8.1).

# Elevator Advisory Analysis Form – 2014

PROPOSAL NUMBER:	008-2014	DATE:	11/18/2014
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	Point of sale residential elevators		
PREPARED BY:	Swen Larson		
PHONE NO. & EMAIL:	206-465-8072		
Brief Summary of what this proposal does and its purpose:			
Would require a residential elevator located in a residence have an annual type inspection when residence is sold to new owner.			
1. Does the proposal promote Public, Building or Worker Safety?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Worker			
2. The effect of this proposal would be:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> None			
If there is no effect or impact, should we continue to propose this change?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. If the proposal has an effect on the program (major, minor, uncertain) briefly describe effects below:			
Number of known permitted residential elevators in the state is 2,678. Number of non permitted conveyances Unknown. It is the fast growing segment of the Elevator Industry. See addendum A for actual #s and locations.			
4. If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or the agency?			
1) Added personel to do inspections. AHJ's affected : Elevator Section of L&I, City of Seattle, City of Spokane. See addendum B.			
2) Owners: Home sellers will need to pay for an inspection and if repairs are made a second inspection. Some have not had a turnover inspection or have been altered after turnover. See addendum C for discussion of costs			
3) Residential Elevator companies: Moderate impact because of slow turnover rate of homes with conveyances in them.			
5. If the proposal has a fiscal impact, how much?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> More than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> None			
6. What other stakeholders would be impacted by this proposal? List (if any) and briefly summarize the impact for each affected group and their positions:			
A) Real Estate agencies The Realtors have said they would oppose the legislation because they are worried it could kill a sale or slow down the process.			
B) Insurance Companies			
7. If enacted, would this proposal require a new rule? Or revise an existing rule?			

New Rule  Revise Existing Rule  No Rule Change

If revises or repeals an existing Rule/Statute, provide WAC/RCW number and title:

RCW: 70.87.120(2) WAC:296-96-01045 WAC:408C-030(19) Add to WAC: 308-408C-190

8. Does the rule impact permits, licenses and/or inspections ("licenses" includes both registration and certification)? Identify all that apply.

Permits  Licenses  Inspections  N/A

Comments:

9. If the Rule impacts permits, licenses and/or inspections, could the Rule be amended to improve timeliness or simplify the application, approval or process?

Improve Timeliness  Simplify Process  Specify Your Own

Comments:

10. Identify the purpose for the proposal based on need, clarity and consistency:

- Need: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is obsolete, duplicative or unnecessary to a degree that warrants repeal or revision?
- Clarity: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is written and/or organized in a manner that is not easily understood by those to whom it applies?
- Consistency: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because of any of the following:
- The Rule is inconsistent with the legislative intent of the authorizing statute?
  - There is more specific legislative authority needed in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of Washington State citizens?
  - Laws or other circumstances have changed which requires the Rule to be amended or repealed?

Comments or other issues (if any):

11. General comments on this proposal (please include any additional background that would be helpful or comments on any similar proposals that you are aware of):

Impact on safety to a new homeowner and specifically the homeowners children is major. Fatalities and major injuries on these types of units are overwhelmingly to children ages 3 to 13. Direct quotes from March 2014 article in Elevator world speaking about one type of these residential elevators. Full article available.

"The number of children seriously injured or killed will never be fully known, due to protective orders and destruction of documentation. However, one manufacture reported there were 34 children injured or killed from 1983-1993 in New Jersey and southern New York State alone."

"The first step in all risk-reduction methodologies are to eliminate the risk. There is no amount of warning that will mitigate this risk and the solutions are easy to impliment."

## **Addendum A**

### **Residential Elevators count**

A total of 2,678 Residential Elevators are known to exist in the state. An explanation needs to be made at how these figures were arrived at for the three AHJs that were contacted to get the numbers. The Elevator Section of L&I reports they have 2,274 Residential Elevators. City of Seattle reports about 384 units from 7-19-2002 to January 14 2014. They are unable to find their records before the 2002 date. The City of Spokane reports a number of 20 Residential Elevators. This is a minimum number. No one knows at this time how many units of this nature have been installed without a permit. Residential Elevators are gaining widespread popularity and are a growing trend in high end housing.

## **Inspector manpower projection**

### **Addendum B**

This portion of the elevator industry is the most un-regulated segment. Internet sales skipped permitting and inspections and installation by untrained and often unqualified personnel add to the danger.

The inspection of the units will be done by Elevator Inspectors because of the complex nature of the units and the danger that can be incurred doing the inspections. Communication with the group that does home inspections bears this out and will be added as an attachment. (Attachment 1)

The formula to figure the impact will be the total number of homes in the State that have permitted residential elevators in them(2,678) divided by the average time a home is sold to a new owner(7 years) will give the percentage of inspections that will need to be done annually(382). Some years will be more and some years will be less. The unknown in the calculation is the number of residential elevators installed without a permit. Residential Elevators in this category have the greatest risk because they haven't had an acceptance inspection.

In the State of Washington this will affect three Authorities having Jurisdiction (AHJ). The Elevator Section of L&I will be impacted the most because it has the largest number of these types of conveyances. The numbers are sufficiently high (324 inspections a year) so an Inspector/ Inspectors will need to be added.

City of Seattle may also need to put on additional help,(about 50 inspections a year) with time split between the residential and commercial sector.

City of Spokane, with its low numbers of this type of unit, should be able to absorb a few more inspections a year with no increase in manpower.

There will also be some extra administrative work that will need to be done by each of the three AHJs. I will defer to them projected costs.

## **Addendum C**

### **Cost to Home seller**

Like other inspections now required by law, the seller will pay for the cost of an inspection. The buyer has a right to expect they are not being sold something that will endanger them or their families.

For Residential elevators permitted and installed, maintained and no alterations made should require a single inspection. Current rates charged by the State to do an inspection are billed at \$70.00 per hour and travel time. Typical estimates for the inspection times for residential elevators average 4 hours. They should be close to the same for all jurisdictions. For units installed and in good shape the cost should be under \$500.00.

A report will be issued listing code violations and will become part of the buyer's document. If a conveyance is deemed unsafe the unit will be red tagged and removed from service until repaired and re-inspected. The cost of the repair will be a negotiation between the buyer and the seller.

There is a cost associated with safety, but there is an even higher cost associated with preventable accidents. The buyer and seller both benefit from the inspection.

Addition to WAC 296-96-01045. New language in bold and underlined

**WAC 296-96-01045**

Agency filings affecting this section

**What are the inspection requirements and fees for conveyances in private residences?**

(1) Chapter 70.87 RCW requires the department to inspect all new, altered or relocated conveyances operated exclusively for single-family use in private residences. Prior to installation, a licensed elevator contractor must complete a permit application as described in WAC 296-96-01005 and pay the appropriate fee(s) listed in WAC 296-96-01010.

(2) Chapter 70.87 RCW allows the department to inspect conveyances operated exclusively for single-family use in private residences when the department is investigating an accident, **or an to investigate an** alleged or apparent violation of the statute or these rules. **Residential Elevators, will have an annual type inspection before transfer of title/deed, to insure safe operation.**

(3) No annual inspection and operating certificate is required for a private residence conveyance operated exclusively for single-family use unless the owner requests it. When an owner requests an inspection and an annual operating certificate, the following fee must be paid prior to an inspection:

TYPE OF CONVEYANCE	fee
Each inclined stairway chair lift in private residence. . . .	\$30.00
Each inclined wheel chair lift in a private residence. . . .	\$30.00
Each vertical wheel chair lift in a private residence. . . .	\$37.80
Each dumbwaiter in a private residence. . . .	\$30.00
Each inclined elevator at a private residence. . . .	\$107.30
Each private residence elevator. . . .	\$69.10
Duplication of a lost, damaged or stolen operating permit. . . .	\$12.60

Proposed RCW Change

Add the language in bold and underlined:

Subsection of RCW 70.87.120 (2)

(b)(i) Private residential elevators operated exclusively for single-family use shall be inspected and tested only when required under RCW 70.87.100 or as necessary for the purposes of subsection (4) of this section and shall be exempt from RCW 70.87.090 unless an annual inspection and operating permit are requested by the owner **or before the transfer of title/deed to a new owner, ensuring safe operation and compliance with this chapter. Fees for these inspections are outlined in (b)(ii).**

Proposed WAC Changes:

Change the language of WAC-408C-030 (19) to read as follows

Exclusions and limitations

(19) Inspect or comment on the condition or serviceability of elevators or related equipment.

**Exception: Residential elevators will be inspected according to WAC 308-408C-190.**

Add the following section as WAC 308-408C-190. New language in bold and underlined.

**Residential Elevators as listed in RCW 70.87 located in a private residence, shall be inspected, per Subsection of RCW 70.87.120 (2)(b)(i) by Elevator Inspectors, employed by the Authority Having Jurisdiction.**



## Elevator Advisory Analysis Form – 2014

<b>PROPOSAL NUMBER</b>	005-2014	<b>DATE:</b>	
<b>TITLE OF PROPOSAL:</b>	Class A permits (Statute)		
<b>PREPARED BY:</b>	Jack Day		
<b>PHONE NO. &amp; EMAIL:</b>	(360) 902-6128 / DAYL235@lni.wa.gov		
<b>Brief summary of what this proposal does and its purpose:</b>			
Sets a statute in place to allow minor conveyance alteration and installation work to be installed and place the conveyance back into operation without the work being inspected by a state or city inspector. Also, places restrictions on the elevator companies that would stipulate “in good standing” before being allowed to perform minor alteration and installation work.			
<b>1. Does the proposal promote Public, Building or Worker Safety?</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Worker Not in a direct sense, however companies striving to obtain and stay in good standing may perform much better through their regular business opportunities.			
<b>2. The effect of this proposal would be:</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> None <b>If there is no effect or impact, should we continue to propose this change?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
<b>3. If the proposal has an effect on the program, (major, minor, uncertain) briefly describe (effects) below.</b>			
This program has the capability of reducing our inspection workload by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Alteration per year. In 2014; 1359 alteration permits were issued. July= 116 vs 50, August = 129 vs 73, Sept=83 vs 32, Oct=115 vs 44, Nov=167 vs 64, Dec= 94 vs 41. This on average may give us a per month average value of 50 minor alterations per month. Divided by 10 elevator companies = 5, leaving a average of 5 minor alteration inspections per month, or reduction of 45 alteration inspections per month. A minor alteration may take 1 to two hours; let’s use 1.5 as an average. FTE time = 68 hours per month or 810 hours per year plus travel time.</li> <li>2) New installation per year. In 2014; 570 residential incline chars were permitted this theoretically has the ultimate possibility to reduce inspections to 57. 30 residential incline and vertical lifts were permitted this theoretically has the ultimate possibility to reduce inspections to 3. The department would not recommend any other type of residential equipment be considered for Class A permits. The FTE hours alone could save the department approximately 527 hours plus travel time a year.</li> <li>3) Elevator companies participating in this program would inherently perform to a higher standard in order to maintain their good standing status. Thereby we would be spending less time during an inspection waiting on items to be corrected or failing jobs and having to incur re-inspection costs.</li> <li>4) IS impact to develop a software package to:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Randomly selects a permit;</li> <li>• Creates the Class A permits for purchase;</li> <li>• Tracks companies for placement into good standing; and</li> <li>• Develop a report of companies position for good standing, available on the web page.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>			

**4. If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or agency?**

**Bill and Rob will get a statement, Robert statement below.**

---

Here is my view of the impact of the Type A permit process for elevator alterations and accessibility lift installation in the State of Washington.

Owners:

A favorable impact in tenant and customer satisfaction. Units will be up and running faster allowing greater access for customers and tenants. This will improve the productivity and Goodwill.

A favorable impact on owner or business revenue. Many businesses rely on the conveyance systems to get people into their stores or floors of their stores to purchase items. Each hour a unit is down unfavorably impacts the amount of revenue received by the business owner. This impact in department stores, convention centers, and Arenas can reach hundreds of thousands of dollars of lost revenue.

A favorable impact on tenant retention. Uptime on elevators is important in residential applications. Buildings with down elevators tend to have more turnover of tenants.

A favorable impact on safety and risk management. Improves the ability to move the accessibility challenged citizens. In cases where there is only one conveyance in a building the disabled population may be severely impacted for weeks. In transit buildings the permits will allow more uptime, safer, and more efficient traffic flow.

Elevator Contractors:

A favorable impact will be experienced by having more satisfied customers that do not have to wait the presently required time for minor inspections. This provides a high degree of goodwill and recognition of contractor expertise and responsibility.

Improved customer retention. Customers lose patience with the contractor while the unit is down for State inspection. The permit will allow a higher degree of customer goodwill.  
Reduced legal cost and risk. A reduction in lawsuits, threats, and general bad-will when the unit can be turn over quickly to the riding public.

Increased revenue will occur when owners understand they can have the minor alteration completed in a timely manner. The impact to the building owners operation is reduced by the fast turnaround time. An unfavorable outcome will occur if the elevator contractor does not comply with performing the work correctly the first time. There will be an incentive to perform the work correctly or lost revenue or contracts may occur.

The Agency:

A favorable impact on public perception of the State. This demonstrates the States willingness to streamline red tape and improve worker productivity.

A favorable impact on revenue for the state. More revenue will be spent in businesses with working

units.

A favorable impact on public safety. Minor safety alterations purchased by owners improve the safety of the conveyances for the riding public.

Rob McNeill  
KONE Inc.  
District Manager, Pacific Northwest  
425-269-3302

---

Q 4 If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or agency?

As an elevator contractor doing accessibility incline chair lifts

- Home owners would be able to acquire installed lifts in a much more timely fashion  
Thus return home from the hospital following surgery, sickness or injury without waiting for the  
permitting and/or inspection process.

The aging population, realizing the risk of falling down stairs, can use lifts without delay, thus helping  
to reduce the risk of life threatening falls.

- Maintaining pace of the increasing number of new installs, the agency can meet the assigned  
mandates in a more efficient cost effective manner without compromise to safety.

- Elevator companies will experience a significant cost savings in business practice and increased  
profits.

Installing companies, in good standing, will have a significant competitive advantage by being listed  
on the LNI agency web site, promotion and advertisement over companies not in good standing.

Companies in good standing can be much more responsive to customer needs.

Bill Morrell  
Med Surg Systems, Inc  
DBA Adaptive Installations

**5. If the proposal has fiscal impact, how much?**

Less than \$50,000  More than \$50,000  None

**6. What other stakeholders would be impacted by this proposal? List, if any, and briefly summarize the impact for each affected group and their positions:**

Owners/property managers

Elevator companies

**7. If enacted, would this proposal require a new rule or revise an existing rule?**

New rule  Revise existing rule  No rule change

**If revises or repeals an existing rule/Statute, provide WAC/RCW number and title:**

**RCW 70.87.100**

**Conveyance work to be performed by elevator contractors — Acceptance tests — Inspections.**

(1) All conveyance installations, relocations, or alterations must be performed by an elevator contractor employing an elevator mechanic.

(2) The elevator contractor employing an elevator mechanic performing such conveyance work shall notify the department before completion of the work, and shall subject the new, moved, or altered portions of the conveyance to the acceptance tests.

(3) All new, altered, or relocated conveyances for which a permit has been issued, shall be inspected for compliance with the requirements of this chapter by an authorized representative of the department. The authorized representative shall also witness the test specified.

**New Section:**

(4) The department has the authority to issue class A permits for minor alterations and new installations of accessibility equipment.

(a) All minor alterations and new installation conveyances for which a class A permit has been issued shall be randomly selected and inspected for compliance with the requirements of this chapter.

(b) The authorized representative shall also witness the test specified.

(c) The class A permits will be issued to licensed elevator contractors that demonstrate good standing with the department.

(d) A company failing good standing status shall not be allowed to use, install or purchase Class A permits until they demonstrate to the department capabilities to be reinstated.

New Section

The department of labor and industries may adopt rules to implement this act.

New Section

The department of labor and industries has the authority to set fees for class A permits.

New Section

This act will become effective January 1, 2016.

New Section

Definitions:

“Accessibility equipment” means for the purposes of Class A permitting, the equipment is limited to residential application for people with physical disabilities. Limited to incline chair, inclined platform lift and vertical platform lifts where no enclosure is supplied.

“Alteration Minor” means an alteration in which the duration and scope of the project is limited in time and difficulty. The installation must be simple with limited wiring and no design changes. A list

**Comment [jsd1]:** What does good standing mean. Will it be outlined in Rule? Yes Percent value (pass to fail ratio) Commercial conveyances New & Alteration. Residential New installation.

**Comment [jsd2]:** Must be outlined in rule. If a company falls from good standing, they will need to demonstrate a good standing effort for the next (single or double value of permit booklet? More discussions needed)

**Comment [ARC3]:** Do we want to use the word “simple” here. Some might consider a more difficult installation as simple.

of minor alterations will be published by the Department.

“Class A permit” means a permit issued by the department for minor alterations and new installations of accessibility equipment to allow the permit holder to install and place the conveyance into service with a randomly selected inspection.

“Good Standing” means an elevator company that has consistently demonstrated over time the capability and inherent proven desire to uphold the laws, rules and codes outlined by the department and this chapter.

**8. Does the rule impact permits, licenses, and/or inspections (the word “license” includes both registration and certification)? Identify all that apply.**

Permits  Licenses  Inspections  N/A

**Comments:**

**9. If the rule impacts permits, licenses, and/or inspections, could the rule be amended to improve timeliness or simplify the application, approval, or other process?**

Improve Timeliness  Simplify Process  Specify your own (explain)

**Comments:** Currently, the department is experiencing a backlog. Some of the conveyance work is considered minor in nature; however, this work is important and can affect public safety. We can improve the effectiveness of our workforce by focusing on the higher impacts to public safety, while ensuring through good standing efforts the minor work is being performed properly. Please review #3.

**10. Identify the purpose for the proposal, based on need, clarity and consistency:**

**Need:** Does the rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is obsolete, duplicative or unnecessary to a degree that warrants repeal or revision?

**Clarity:** Does the rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is written and/or organized in a manner that is not easily understood by those to whom it applies?

**Consistency:** Does the rule need to be amended or repealed because of any of the following:

- The rule is inconsistent with the legislative intent of the authorizing statute?
- There is more specific legislative authority needed in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of Washington’s citizens?
- Laws or other circumstances have changed which requires the rule to be amended or repealed?

**Comments/Other Issues (if any):**

No.

**11. General comments on this proposal (Please include any additional background that would be helpful or comments on any similar proposals that you are aware of):**

List to do:

In rule:

Fees, must be set in rule, the fees must consider the inspection and paperwork time associated with the Class A permit. Also fees for re-inspection if a conveyance fails the random inspection.

Separate book for the different installs and alteration, currently fees for permits are based upon the actual time and material costs, fees for types or accessibility equipment and alterations will be different. Rule shall define a book of 5, one for each for the two different types of residential installs “incline chair and vertical platform lifts”. There may be several books sold for the alterations, each having their own classification for the type of equipment they cover.

Re-inspection, outlined in rule, if one conveyance fails, a set of two additional randomly selected conveyances shall undergo inspection and they will be considered re-inspection as well.

Minor alt list, as the department expects this list to change over time, the list should be set in rule.

Timeframe, if a company fails “Good Standing”

Benchmarks, define in rule how to become and how to maintain good standing status. Also define how to be reinstated if a company loses the good standing status, “what will be the expectation for reinstatement”.

### **Elevator Proposed RCW Definitions**

“Accessibility equipment” for the purposes of Class A permitting means equipment that is limited to residential application for people with physical disabilities. Limited to incline chair, inclined platform lift and vertical platform lifts where no enclosure is supplied.

**Comment [ZAMR(4):** Can accessibility equipment used by people without physical disabilities? If it's possible, you may consider removing this language.

“Accessibility equipment” for the purposes of Class A permitting means equipment that is limited to residential application and is limited to incline chair, inclined platform lift and vertical platform lifts where no enclosure is supplied.

**Comment [ZAMR(5):** Offered for your consideration.

“Alteration Minor” means an alteration in which the duration and scope of the project is limited in time and difficulty. The installation must be simple with limited wiring and no design changes. A list of minor alterations will be published by the Department.

**Comment [ZAMR(6):** The terms “duration”, “scope of project”, “limited in time”, “difficulty”, “simple” and “limited wiring” are too broad and could be interpreted in too many ways to be enforceable. Instead, could you use definitive terms regarding specific overarching types of minor alterations that could be further defined in rule?

“Class A permit” means a permit issued by the department for minor alterations and new installations of accessibility equipment to allow the permit holder to install and place the conveyance into service with a randomly selected inspection.

“Good Standing” means an elevator company that has consistently demonstrated over time the capability and inherent proven desire to uphold the laws, rules and codes outlined by the department and this chapter.

**Comment [ZAMR(7):** Too esoteric. Needs to be quantified to eliminate the subjective element. Could you use response time to corrective notices, history of no corrective notices, etc.? The term “good standing” is too powerful and is imbued with too great a meaning to leave to a subjective evaluation of whether they have an inherent proven desire. Can you include achievable benchmarks that cannot be disputed?

# Elevator Advisory Analysis Form – 2014

PROPOSAL NUMBER:	001-2014	DATE:	8-15-14
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	New Format for Conveyance Rules in WAC		
PREPARED BY:	L&I Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Code Adoption Subcommittee		
PHONE NO. & EMAIL:	Tom McBride for NEII, 360-481-1824, tom@mcbridepa.com		
Brief Summary of what this proposal does and its purpose:			
The conveyance related rules in the Washington Administrative Code shall be written in a format and order consistent with the ASME 17.1 Code, with Washinton State changes and additions expressly identified.			
1. Does the proposal promote Public, Building or Worker Safety?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Worker			
2. The effect of this proposal would be:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> None			
If there is no effect or impact, should we continue to propose this change?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. If the proposal has an effect on the program (major, minor, uncertain) briefly describe effects below:			
The effect of the proposal is minor as it is a formatting change that is organizational as opposed to substantive. But it will have a positive impact on the stakeholders in terms of ease of use of the WACs.			
4. If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or the agency?			
Nominal			
5. If the proposal has a fiscal impact, how much?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> More than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> None			
6. What other stakeholders would be impacted by this proposal? List (if any) and briefly summarize the impact for each affected group and their positions:			
Any stakeholder that uses the ASME and WACs (all) will be positively impacted, but there should be minimal cost due to the need to purchase the ASME code.			
7. If enacted, would this proposal require a new rule? Or revise an existing rule?			
<input type="checkbox"/> New Rule <input type="checkbox"/> Revise Existing Rule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Rule Change			
If revises or repeals an existing Rule/Statute, provide WAC/RCW number and title:			
8. Does the rule impact permits, licenses and/or inspections (“licenses” includes both registration and certification)? Identify all that apply.			
<input type="checkbox"/> Permits <input type="checkbox"/> Licenses <input type="checkbox"/> Inspections <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A			
Comments: The proposal is not substantive in nature.			
9. If the Rule impacts permits, licenses and/or inspections, could the Rule be amended to improve timeliness or simplify the application, approval or process?			

Improve Timeliness    Simplify Process    Specify Your Own

**Comments:**

**10. Identify the purpose for the proposal based on need, clarity and consistency:**

- Need: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is obsolete, duplicative or unnecessary to a degree that warrants repeal or revision?
- Clarity: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is written and/or organized in a manner that is not easily understood by those to whom it applies?
- Consistency: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because of any of the following:
- The Rule is inconsistent with the legislative intent of the authorizing statute?
  - There is more specific legislative authority needed in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of Washington State citizens?
  - Laws or other circumstances have changed which requires the Rule to be amended or repealed?

**Comments or other issues (if any):** This proposal is one of format and is not substantive in nature. It should make the use of the WACs easier, more clear and more predictable to stakeholders and the department.

**11. General comments on this proposal (please include any additional background that would be helpful or comments on any similar proposals that you are aware of):**

This proposal was passed unanimously by the EAC Code Adoption Subcommittee. The subcommittee requests that the EAC undertake a motion to indicate its support of redrafting the WAC into format and order consistent with the ASME 17.1 Code, with Washington State changes and additions expressly identified.

## Examples of format change Proposal 001-2014

The below re-write would stay in Part "B" of WAC

### Existing WAC

#### **WAC 296-96-00907 (ASME A17.1-8.11.1.5) Making safety devices ineffective.**

No person shall at any time make any required safety device or electrical protective device ineffective, except where necessary during tests and inspections. Such devices must be restored to their normal operating condition in conformity with the applicable requirements prior to returning the equipment to service (see ASME A17.1-2.26.7). If a required safety device or electrical protective device is found ineffective during the course of normal operation the conveyance must be immediately taken out of service. If the authorized mechanic or elevator company is found responsible for disabling the device(s) and placing the conveyance back into service they may have their license suspended until they can demonstrate conformity to the chapter (examples include, but are not limited to: Safety circuit, door and gate, terminal slowdowns, door reopening devices, anti-egress devices, or over current protection devices).

### Future WAC

#### **WAC 296-96-00907 (ASME A17.1-8.11.1.5) Making safety devices ineffective.**

Note: For all conveyances types covered in this chapter see ASME A17.1-8.11.1.5 and 8.6.1.6.1.

The below re-write would be placed in a part (2) two of WAC

### Existing WAC

#### **WAC 296-96-02471 ASME A17.1-2.27.8 FEO-K1 Fire service keys.**

*The key switches required by ASME A17.1-2.27.2 through 2.27.5 for all new and altered elevators in a building shall be operable by the FEO-K1 key. The keys shall be Group 3 Security (see ASME A17.1-8.1). A separate key shall be provided for each switch. This key shall be of a tubular, 7 pin, style 137 construction and shall have a biting code of 6143521 starting at the tab sequences clockwise as viewed from the barrel end of the key. The key shall be coded "FEO-K1." The possession of the "FEO-K1" key shall be limited to elevator personnel, emergency personnel, elevator equipment manufacturers, and authorized personnel during checking of firefighters emergency operation.*

**NOTE:** (ASME A17.1-2.27.8) Local fire or building authorities may specify the requirements for a uniform keyed lock box and its location to contain the necessary keys. Where required, a lock box, including its lock and other components, shall conform to the requirements of UL1037 (see Part 9). These keys shall be kept on the premises in a location readily accessible to firefighters and emergency personnel, but not where they are available to the public.

### Future WAC

#### **WAC 296-96-02471 ASME A17.1-2.27.8 FEO-K1 Fire service keys.**

The key switches required by 2.27.2 through 2.27.5 and 2.27.11 for all new and controller altered elevators in a building shall be operable by the FEO-K1 key.

NOTE (2.27.8): Local authorities may specify additional requirements for a uniform keyed lock box and its location to contain the necessary keys. Local authorities mean the local building and fire marshal authorities.

**Comment [jsd1]:** ASME A17.1-2013 is edited to not require the FEO key switch on all elevators. Only new, not existing, unless a controller modification is applied. The remaining requirements are within ASME A17.1

**Formatted:** Font: 10 pt



# Elevator Advisory Analysis Form – 2014

PROPOSAL NUMBER:	002-2014	DATE:	August 15, 2014
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	QEI-1 requirement for Washington State Elevator Inspectors		
PREPARED BY:	L&I EAC Code Adoption Subcommittee		
PHONE NO. & EMAIL:	Amy Blankenbiller for NEII, 785.286.7599, ajblankenbiller@neii.org		
Brief Summary of what this proposal does and its purpose:			
<p>This proposal requires all conveyance inspectors working for Washington State to be certified to the QEI-1 Standard of ASME. Inspectors will hold an internationally recognized certification as a Qualified Elevator Inspector. This certificate requires knowledge of and training in the nationally and internationally recognized codes relating to the construction, maintenance and alteration of elevating conveyances. To maintain the certification, an inspector must pass continuing education requirements and adhere to accepted standards of professionalism set by the industry.</p>			
1. Does the proposal promote Public, Building or Worker Safety?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Worker			
2. The effect of this proposal would be:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major <input type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> None			
If there is no effect or impact, should we continue to propose this change?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. If the proposal has an effect on the program (major, minor, uncertain) briefly describe effects below:			
<p>The QEI-1 certification will ensure that conveyance inspectors are knowledgeable and professional in the performance of their trade and that L&amp;I employees inspectors that are trained and held to performance standards set by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME).</p>			
4. If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or the agency?			
Minimal			
5. If the proposal has a fiscal impact, how much?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> More than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> None			
6. What other stakeholders would be impacted by this proposal? List (if any) and briefly summarize the impact for each affected group and their positions:			
<p>This is a public safety issue. Passengers of elevating equipment (the riding public), building owners and managers, elevator contractors, elevator technicians are all positively impacted. All parties would benefit by the level of knowledge and professionalism acquired by State inspectors.</p>			
7. If enacted, would this proposal require a new rule? Or revise an existing rule?			
<input type="checkbox"/> New Rule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revise Existing Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Rule Change			
If revises or repeals an existing Rule/Statute, provide WAC/RCW number and title:			
<p>Chapter 296-96 WAC, Rule 00650(1). Exclude all references to QEI certification in ASME A17.1 from code adoption.</p>			
8. Does the rule impact permits, licenses and/or inspections (“licenses” includes both registration and certification)? Identify all that apply.			

Permits  Licenses  Inspections  N/A

Comments: Licenses and inspections would be impacted because conveyance inspectors would hold a Qualified Elevator Inspector certification.

9. If the Rule impacts permits, licenses and/or inspections, could the Rule be amended to improve timeliness or simplify the application, approval or process?

Improve Timeliness  Simplify Process  Specify Your Own

Comments: The performance of all duties of State elevator inspectors would be enhanced because the inspectors would be more knowledgeable and better trained.

10. Identify the purpose for the proposal based on need, clarity and consistency:

- Need: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is obsolete, duplicative or unnecessary to a degree that warrants repeal or revision?
- Clarity: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is written and/or organized in a manner that is not easily understood by those to whom it applies?
- Consistency: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because of any of the following:
- The Rule is inconsistent with the legislative intent of the authorizing statute?
  - There is more specific legislative authority needed in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of Washington State citizens?
  - Laws or other circumstances have changed which requires the Rule to be amended or repealed?

Comments or other issues (if any): Public safety increased.

11. Proposed language (please indicate if sample language is provided)

*Delete the following from WAC 296-96-00650(1):*

*Exclude all references to QEI certification in ASME A17.1 from code adoption.*

*Add the following language from ASME A17.1 2013 to WAC 296-96-00650:*

*8.10.1.1 Persons authorized to make acceptance tests.*

*8.10.1.3 An inspector shall meet the qualification requirements of ASME QEI-1. Inspectors and inspection supervisors shall be certified by an independent, accredited, certifying organization as specified in 8.10.1.2.*

*8.10.1.2 Accreditation of certifying organizations. All organizations that certify elevator inspectors and inspector supervisors shall be accredited by an accrediting body (see 1.3) in accordance with ANSI/ISO/IEC 17024, or equivalent, and ASME QEI-1.*

*8.11.1.1 Persons authorized to make periodic inspections and witness tests. The inspector shall meet the qualification requirements of ASME QEI-1. Inspectors and inspection supervisors shall be certified by an independent, accredited, certifying organization as specified in 8.10.1.2 (see 1.3).*

*1.3 Definitions*

***Accredited certifying organization: a certifying organization that holds valid Documentation of Accreditation issued by an independent internationally or nationally recognized accrediting organization that accredits personnel certification bodies.***

*Note: A Certificate of Accreditation is an example of such documentation.*

**Accrediting body:** an independent internationally or nationally recognized organization that accredits organizations concerned with personnel certification.

12. General comments on this proposal (please include any additional background that would be helpful or comments on any similar proposals that you are aware of):

ASME A17.1 Safety Code for Elevators and Escalators recommends, and many jurisdictions throughout North America require, QEI-1 certification. This change would put Washington State on par with most other AHJs in this regard.

The EAC Code Adoption Subcommittee voted unanimously to recommend that Chapter 296-96 WAC, Rule 00650(1) be amended to strike "Exclude all references to QEI certification in ASME A17.1 from code adoption."

**From:** [Bartholomew, Dan \(LNI\)](#)  
**To:** [Stamey, Corki \(LNI\)](#); [Day, Jack \(LNI\)](#); [Bartholomew, Dan \(LNI\)](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Upcoming Code Adoption Subcommittee Meeting  
**Date:** Thursday, October 16, 2014 8:00:36 AM

---

Dear Sirs:

I would like to respond to the proposal that all Washington State elevator inspectors be QEI certified. If it is possible, can this be entered into the subcommittee minutes as testimony?

As a Washington State elevator inspector I have reservations about adoption of this proposal. First and foremost, the State of Washington already has trouble recruiting and retaining elevator inspectors. With the adoption of this proposal, it will be even more difficult to hire and keep inspectors. The end result of adoption of this rule would be less inspectors with less time to do accurate and timely inspections. Becoming QEI certified would only make the safe operation, installation and maintenance of conveyances less efficient and timely. The second concern would be the compensation of inspectors for their time and expense of acquiring and maintaining this certification. This will be of considerable expense to the State of Washington. There is the time spent studying, preparing for the initial exam and annual class time and expense to maintain the QEI certification as well as extra compensation that would be expected if inspectors are to maintain this certification. More elevator inspectors would be needed to compensate for lost time preparing for and maintaining the QEI certification. Elevator inspectors in this state are already paid below every other elevator tradesperson/inspector in the state. What would be the reason to take a job working for the state? As it is, the main people who are interested in inspecting are those who retire from the elevator trade and take up inspecting as a small addition to their retirement. Thank you for your consideration.

Daniel Bartholomew  
Department of Labor and Industries  
Elevator Inspector Division

---

**From:** Elevator Program [mailto:stco235@LNI.WA.GOV]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 15, 2014 4:32 PM  
**To:** LNI-ELEVATOR-SECTION@LISTSERV.WA.GOV  
**Subject:** Upcoming Code Adoption Subcommittee Meeting

Good Afternoon: Attached please find the following documents for the upcoming Code Adoption Subcommittee Meeting scheduled for **Monday, October 27, 2014 from 1 - 4:00 pm** at the [Tukwila L&I Service Location](#):

- Agenda
- Meeting Minutes from the Code Adoption Subcommittee held on 9/25/14
- Analysis #001-2014 - Format Proposal
- Analysis #002-2014 - QEI Proposal
- Analysis #003-2014 - Technical Correction Proposal
- Analysis #004-2014 - Add ASME A17.7 Proposal

As always, we would like to encourage all stakeholders to actively participate in subcommittee meetings whenever possible.

Thank you.

# Elevator Advisory Analysis Form – 2014

PROPOSAL NUMBER:	003-2014	DATE:	8-15-14
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	technical correction to WAC 296-96-00500(4)		
PREPARED BY:	L& I Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Code Adoption Subcommittee		
PHONE NO. & EMAIL:	Amy Blankenbiller for NEII, 785-286-7599, ajblankenbiller@neii.org		
Brief Summary of what this proposal does and its purpose:			
Edits WAC text to correct refernce and provide clarity			
1. Does the proposal promote Public, Building or Worker Safety?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Worker			
2. The effect of this proposal would be:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> None			
If there is no effect or impact, should we continue to propose this change?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. If the proposal has an effect on the program (major, minor, uncertain) briefly describe effects below:			
The effect of the proposed technical correction is minor, but provides important clarification moving forward.			
4. If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or the agency?			
Nominal, if any			
5. If the proposal has a fiscal impact, how much?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> More than \$50,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None			
6. What other stakeholders would be impacted by this proposal? List (if any) and briefly summarize the impact for each affected group and their positions:			
7. If enacted, would this proposal require a new rule? Or revise an existing rule?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Rule <input type="checkbox"/> Revise Existing Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Rule Change			
If revises or repeals an existing Rule/Statute, provide WAC/RCW number and title:			
WAC 296-96-00500(4)			
8. Does the rule impact permits, licenses and/or inspections (“licenses” includes both registration and certification)? Identify all that apply.			
<input type="checkbox"/> Permits <input type="checkbox"/> Licenses <input type="checkbox"/> Inspections <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A			
Comments: Corrects the reference to which requirements superceed others, does not impact any specific requirement			
9. If the Rule impacts permits, licenses and/or inspections, could the Rule be amended to improve timeliness or simplify the application, approval or process?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Improve Timeliness <input type="checkbox"/> Simplify Process <input type="checkbox"/> Specify Your Own			

Comments:

10. Identify the purpose for the proposal based on need, clarity and consistency:

- Need: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is obsolete, duplicative or unnecessary to a degree that warrants repeal or revision?
- Clarity: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is written and/or organized in a manner that is not easily understood by those to whom it applies?
- Consistency: Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because of any of the following:
- The Rule is inconsistent with the legislative intent of the authorizing statute?
  - There is more specific legislative authority needed in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of Washington State citizens?
  - Laws or other circumstances have changed which requires the Rule to be amended or repealed?

Comments or other issues (if any):

11. Proposed language (please indicate if sample language is provided)

*Amend WAC 296-96-00500(4) to read:*

*In any case where the national standards codes adopted by reference in chapter 296-96 WAC conflict with the requirements of ~~national standards adopted~~ this chapter, this chapter supersedes.*

12. General comments on this proposal (please include any additional background that would be helpful or comments on any similar proposals that you are aware of):

This proposal was passed unanimously by the WA EAC Code Adoption Subcommittee. The Subcommittee strongly recommends that the EAC move forward with a proposed rule.

# Elevator Advisory Analysis Form – 2014

PROPOSAL NUMBER:	004-2014	DATE:	10/13/14
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	Clarify acceptance of A17.7.		
PREPARED BY:	L&I Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Code Adoption Subcommittee		
PHONE NO. & EMAIL:			
Brief Summary of what this proposal does and its purpose:			
The proposal adds ASME A17.7 to WAC 296-96-00650 as a National Elevator Code the department has adopted, and clarifies department requirements.			
1. Does the proposal promote Public, Building or Worker Safety?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Worker			
2. The effect of this proposal would be:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> None			
If there is no effect or impact, should we continue to propose this change?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. If the proposal has an effect on the program (major, minor, uncertain) briefly describe effects below:			
The proposal makes it clear that A17.7 is adopted in WA, and clarifies the documentation required by the department.			
4. If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or the agency?			
None			
5. If the proposal has a fiscal impact, how much?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Less than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> More than \$50,000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None			
6. What other stakeholders would be impacted by this proposal? List (if any) and briefly summarize the impact for each affected group and their positions:			
The rule revision clarifies requirements to building owners and managers, elevator contractors and elevator mechanics, as well as permit applicants and elevator inspectors.			
7. If enacted, would this proposal require a new rule? Or revise an existing rule?			
<input type="checkbox"/> New Rule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revise Existing Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Rule Change			
If revises or repeals an existing Rule/Statute, provide WAC/RCW number and title:			
WAC 296-96-00650, Table, (3)(b)(i),(ii),(iii),(iv) Which National Elevator Codes and Supplements has the department adopted?			
8. Does the rule impact permits, licenses and/or inspections (“licenses” includes both registration and certification)? Identify all that apply.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permits <input type="checkbox"/> Licenses <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inspections <input type="checkbox"/> N/A			
<b>Comments:</b> Applicants and inspectors know exactly what permit requirements are and what documents have been accepted by the department for the required inspections.			
9. If the Rule impacts permits, licenses and/or inspections, could the Rule be amended to improve timeliness or simplify the application, approval or process?			

Improve Timeliness    Simplify Process    Specify Your Own

**Comments:** Yes, the purpose of the proposal is to improve timeliness, and simplify the application, inspection and approval process.

**10. Identify the purpose for the proposal based on need, clarity and consistency:**

- Need:** Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is obsolete, duplicative or unnecessary to a degree that warrants repeal or revision?
- Clarity:** Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is written and/or organized in a manner that is not easily understood by those to whom it applies?
- Consistency:** Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because of any of the following:
- The Rule is inconsistent with the legislative intent of the authorizing statute?
  - There is more specific legislative authority needed in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of Washington State citizens?
  - Laws or other circumstances have changed which requires the Rule to be amended or repealed?

**Comments or other issues (if any):**

**11. Proposed language (please indicate if sample language is provided)**

*(3) ASME A17.1, SECTION 1.2 PURPOSE AND EXCEPTIONS amended as follows:*

*The purpose of this code is to provide for the safety of life and limb, and to promote the public welfare. Compliance with this code shall be achieved by:*

*(a) Conformance with the requirements in ASME A17.1/CSA B44 and chapter 296-96 WAC. Additions or modifications to ASME A17.1/CSA B44 and/or chapter 296-96 WAC shall require approval from the department; or*

*(b) Conformance with a combination of the requirements in ASME A17.1/CSA B44, chapter 296-96 WAC, and ASME A17.7/CSA B44.7 with the following ASME A17.7 inclusions:*

- (i) *All system or component certifications performed by an accredited elevator/escalator certification organization (AECO) under ASME A17.7/CSA B44.7, shall be approved by the department before any such system or component is allowed to be permitted or installed in the state of Washington. The applicant must submit all code documentation required by ASME A17.7/CSA B44.7 Section 2.10 and any other documentation as may be requested.*
- (ii) *Sections of chapter 296-96 WAC that have taken exception to, made additions to, or modifications to ASME A17.1/CSA B44, such exceptions, additions and modifications shall supersede corresponding requirements in ASME A17.7/CSA B44.7.*
- (iii) ***The department retains the authority to reject a technology under A17.7/CSA B44.7 even if it is accompanied by an AECO certificate. The department has the final authority regarding acceptance of any item in ASME A17.7. The department may remove approval if a design has changed or unforeseen or undisclosed information is obtained. Additionally, any change to a design or component covered by an AECO certificate negates said certificate, and acceptance of a design or component covered by the certificate does not extend to other designs or elements otherwise governed by the requirements of this chapter.***
- (iv) ***Once a technology is approved by the department under A17.7/CSA B44.7, the department will post the specific ASME A17.7 AECO certificate including exceptions agreed upon. At that time, the certificate and exceptions become the technology is considered to be part of the adopted rule in the state of Washington and not subject to a variance process or additional approval. The installer shall post the certificate and exceptions including all required information on each conveyance installed utilizing the ASME A17.7 method.***
- (v) *The department may charge an additional fee for each item in review based upon the variance fee table.*

12. General comments on this proposal (please include any additional background that would be helpful or comments on any similar proposals that you are aware of):

All other National Elevator Codes adopted by the department are included in the table in WAC 296-96-00650.

The language within the provision is being modified to clarify that WA State does accept A17.7, but it retains its authority to reject a technology even if it has an AECO certificate. In addition the state of WA wants to be clear that changes to a design or component negates the related AECO certificate, and that the certificate applies only to the component for which it was received and not the overall system.



# Elevator Advisory Analysis Form – 2014

PROPOSAL NUMBER:	007-2014	DATE:	July 1, 2014
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	Machine Space Lighting 10-30-2014		
PREPARED BY:	Keith Becker		
PHONE NO. & EMAIL:	509-397-4381 keith@pnw.coop		
Brief Summary of what this proposal does and its purpose:			
<p>Regarding Electric Manlifts. WAC 296-96-13167(6) Says; A light with a switch must be located near the elevator driving machine or machine space. I agree that there should be lighting in this area, but I question the need for a switch to located nearby. I would suggest that 80 to 90% of all the existing electric manlifts have a switch for the lighting in the machine space, but it is located downstairs. I do not see a valid reason for asking that the conveyance owners be required to absorb the expense of relocating these switches for no apparent safety benefit. So, I am asking for consideration regarding a Code Change or at the very least a variance for this regulation until a Code Change can be made.</p>			
1. Does the proposal promote Public, Building or Worker Safety?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> Building <input type="checkbox"/> Worker			
2. The effect of this proposal would be:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor <input type="checkbox"/> None			
If there is no effect or impact, should we continue to propose this change?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
3. If the proposal has an effect on the program (major, minor, uncertain) briefly describe effects below:			
<p>The regulation, as it stands, doesnot promote safety and the proposal will also have no detrimental effect on safety. There is no apparent reason to require for a switch being located nearby and will only require time and expense to the building owners to comply for unknown benefits.</p>			
4. If enacted, what type of fiscal impact would this proposal have on the owners, elevator companies or the agency?			
<p>This proposal could potentially, lessen the financial impact of the regulation to the Grain Industry building owners by \$1,000 or more.</p>			
5. If the proposal has a fiscal impact, how much?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> More than \$50,000 <input type="checkbox"/> None			
6. What other stakeholders would be impacted by this proposal? List (if any) and briefly summarize the impact for each affected group and their positions:			
<p>This particular proposal effects the Grain Industry and it is unknown at this time the effects on other Industries.</p>			
7. If enacted, would this proposal require a new rule? Or revise an existing rule?			
<input type="checkbox"/> New Rule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revise Existing Rule <input type="checkbox"/> No Rule Change			
If revises or repeals an existing Rule/Statute, provide WAC/RCW number and title:			
WAC 296-96-13167(6)			
8. Does the rule impact permits, licenses and/or inspections (“licenses” includes both registration and certification)? Identify all that apply.			

Permits  Licenses  Inspections  N/A

**Comments:**

9. If the Rule impacts permits, licenses and/or inspections, could the Rule be amended to improve timeliness or simplify the application, approval or process?

Improve Timeliness  Simplify Process  Specify Your Own

**Comments:** If accepted, the proposal would simplify compliance.

10. Identify the purpose for the proposal based on need, clarity and consistency:

- Need:** Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is obsolete, duplicative or unnecessary to a degree that warrants repeal or revision?
- Clarity:** Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because the rule is written and/or organized in a manner that is not easily understood by those to whom it applies?
- Consistency:** Does the Rule need to be amended or repealed because of any of the following:
- The Rule is inconsistent with the legislative intent of the authorizing statute?
  - There is more specific legislative authority needed in order to protect the health, safety and welfare of Washington State citizens?
  - Laws or other circumstances have changed which requires the Rule to be amended or repealed?

**Comments or other issues (if any):** A portion of the rule seems unnecessary and doesnot serve an apparent purpose in the Grain Industry.

11. General comments on this proposal (please include any additional background that would be helpful or comments on any similar proposals that you are aware of):

I believe that 80 to 90% of all the existing electric manlifts will require corrections to be made to comply with this regulation and without a known benefit other than possibly convenience, it seems to be unjustifiable.