

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ELEVATOR SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, April 16, 2019

BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Safety Advisory Committee TAC Meeting was held at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, April 16, 2019, at the Ramada Inn, 15901 West Valley Highway, Tukwila, Washington.

Committee members present were: Rich Metcalfe, Mike Wilson, Scott Cleary, Bob Oury, Ross Baldwin, Dermott Murphy, Wade Friesen, Robert McNeill, Jan Gould, Ricky Henderson, Charles Potts, Jack Runyan, Dylan Turner, Dave Messina, Eldon Nickens, Bob McLaughlin, Scott Clement, and Kevin Brinkman (appearing telephonically). The Department of Labor & Industries was represented by Dotty Stanlaske, Chief Elevator Inspector, and Candace Lau who chaired the meeting.

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were held, to wit:

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

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

A G E N D A

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

April 16, 2019 - Tukwila

Page No.

Welcome, Safety Topic	3
Introductions	4
Review of Proposals	7
Break	54
Review of Proposals	54
Recap and Adjournment	74

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

Welcome, Safety Topic

4

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So good morning, everybody.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Good morning.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So as usual, before every

8 meeting we have evacuation procedures. So if there should

9 be an alarm or a fire, head right out this door (pointing)

10 into the parking lot, and we'll convene. Go away from the

11 building as far as you can, and we'll convene there and

12 make sure we're all accountable -- or accounted for.

13 Sorry; not accountable. And then if there should be an

14 issue here, go out this door (pointing) and go into the

15 lobby, take a right, and there's an exit there as well

16 and go into the parking lot; we'll convene there.

17 Restrooms are out the double doors. Take a right,

18 take another right, head towards the lounge, and they're

19 on your left.

20 The safety topic for today is: The sun the out.

21 Make sure you protect your eyes and wear sunglasses to

22 shield your eyes from the glare. Also if you're going to

23 be doing any yard work, make sure you use body spray as

24 well as sunscreen to protect your skin.

25 ///

1 Introductions

2

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And with that, we'll go around
4 and do introductions again.

5 I'm Dotty Stanlaske. I'm the Chief Elevator
6 Inspector.

7 MS. LAU: Candace Lau. I'm the elevator technical
8 specialist for the Department of Labor and Industries, and
9 I'm chairing this meeting today.

10 MR. OURY: Bob Oury, Pace Material Handling.

11 MR. MURPHY: Dermott Murphy, City of Spokane.

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Bob McLaughlin. Homeowner.

13 MR. NICKENS: Eldon Nickens, International Union of
14 Elevator Constructors.

15 MR. FRIESEN: Wade Friesen, Vertical Options
16 Elevator.

17 MR. METCALFE: Rich Metcalfe, L & I elevator program
18 supervisor.

19 MR. HENDERSON: Ricky Henderson, ThyssenKrupp
20 Elevator.

21 MR. CLEMENT: Scott Clement, state elevator
22 inspector.

23 MR. RUNYAN: Jack Runyan, building owner.

24 MR. MESSINA: Dave Messina, Otis Elevator Company.

25 MR. POTTS: Charles Potts, building owner.

1 MR. McNEILL: Rob McNeill, ESAC committee,
2 non-voting.

3 MR. BALDWIN: Ross Baldwin, Elite Elevator.

4 MR. CLEARY: Scott Cleary, ESAC member.

5 MR. WILSON: Mike Wilson, Mobility Concepts, the
6 grain industry.

7 MR. TURNER: Dylan Turner, Greenbusch.

8 MS. NESBITT: Jane Nesbitt, -- (inaudible)

9 MS. CURRY: Alicia Curry, Department of Labor and
10 Industries.

11 MR. MOLESWORTH: Wayne Molesworth, elevator program
12 operations manager.

13 MS. LAU: And Kevin is with us. Kevin?

14 MR. McNEILL: Kevin says (via text message) he can't
15 hear us.

16 (Off the record to deal with
17 phone issues.)

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So I'd like to remind everybody
19 today to when you speak, raise your hands, wait till
20 you're recognized, and then if you would announce your
21 name for the court reporter, and speak loudly and clearly
22 because this -- we may have some difficulties because of
23 the setup of the room. I know it's a little tight, and I
24 apologize for that. But Jane had to work her magic to get
25 us a room for today so we could get started early rather

1 than wait till noon, so I'm sure you can all appreciate
2 that and that you'll all bear with it.

3 So with that said, as Candace mentioned, Candace will
4 be running this meeting. And Candace is the Chair.

5 Do you need something, Jane?

6 MS. NESBITT: No. I was just trying to --
7 (inaudible)

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Please silence your cell
9 phones.

10 And when we take a vote today, please make sure that
11 you hold your hands up and keep them up until the final
12 tally is announced. I would prefer not to do double and
13 triple counting again today. It will make things go so
14 much more smoothly.

15 MS. NESBITT: Kevin, can you hear?

16 MR. McNEILL: I think we'll just have to speak up.
17 He said he can -- it's still - it's hard to make out.

18 MS. NESBITT: The most important part is for him to
19 hear the --

20 MR. McNEILL: He said he can hear now. He thinks
21 it'll work.

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Can you hear us, Kevin?

23 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes, Dotty, I can hear you. I really
24 haven't heard anybody else, so I'm not sure everybody else
25 has been speaking or not. But it's gotten better.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay, great. That's what we
2 want.

3 All right.

4 So Kevin, I trust that you have mapped out your exits
5 in case of an emergency at home or where you're working.

6 MR. BRINKMAN: Ha, ha. Yeah, I know the way out.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay, good. And I trust that
8 you know where your restrooms are?

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes, I do.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay, good. All right.

11 And Candace will be chairing this meeting, Kevin.

12 So without further adieu ...

13

14 Review of Proposals

15

16 MS. LAU: Okay. So we're going to start where we
17 left off yesterday. I believe we're on 23605. These are
18 all retroactive codes. And the next sets will pertain to
19 electric manlifts as we call them, but they're grain
20 elevators. Correct, Mike?

21 MR. WILSON: Yes.

22 MS. LAU: Okay. So -- and these are -- this one is
23 like -- how many pages is this -- four pages long. And
24 basically the part that's underlined is -- you know, the
25 deal. The ones that are crossed out is proposed to be

1 crossed out. The stuff that's underlined is in addition.

2 I don't know if you guys want me to read it. But
3 there's like four pages of it. Would you like me to go
4 over that?

5 MR. CLEMENT: No, I don't think so.

6 MS. LAU: So the proposal is to add and strike some
7 of these items in these next four pages. So take some
8 time to look at it. And if somebody wants to make a
9 motion or discussion ...

10 Scott.

11 MR. CLEMENT: Mike, you're the author of this. Why
12 are -- my only question is: Why are you getting rid of
13 some of the means to prevent unexpected movement,
14 operating structures, egress, re-entry, stuff that's
15 common?

16 MR. WILSON: The basis for this is for the grain
17 industry and for special purpose elevators. We don't have
18 any of those requirements.

19 MR. CLEMENT: Okay. Thank you.

20 MR. WILSON: And this was to --

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Excuse us.

22 Gentlemen, we can only have one conversation going on
23 at a time, particularly with Kevin; he's having difficulty
24 listening -- or hearing.

25 MR. WILSON: So I guess to clear up a little

1 understanding of this, so what this list is is this list
2 is for people that are exempt from licensing that fall
3 under the RCW 270 exemptions.

4 And we do a lot of consulting with the grain
5 industry, and this is just for their records of how to do
6 examination along with the regular maintenance.

7 MS. LAU: Scott.

8 MR. CLEARY: The thing too with this is under the 270
9 statute, they're allowed to do a lot of things and not be
10 licensed. So we got to make sure that it's really well
11 defined.

12 Also, a lot of stuff -- this -- we brought this into
13 Part D because there's no other way of regulating in 17.3.
14 And by having a lot of stuff in here that's not
15 applicable, it just doesn't make any sense.

16 So this is just to clean up really what's in the
17 field. And so a lot of stuff that isn't -- (inaudible) --
18 or pre-1982 electric manlifts, and there's not -- there's
19 no other kind of -- (inaudible). It's a pretty simplistic
20 piece of equipment. They're still traction elevators, but
21 we're just trying to clean it up and make it easier so the
22 270 statute crowd knows how to be able to do the
23 maintenance and do the other things. So ...

24 MR. CLEMENT: My -- the reason I ask the question is
25 I don't know much about them.

1 And then the other question that's foremost to me is
2 are we being safe with everything. That was where I --
3 (inaudible)

4 MS. LAU: Any other questions or comments?

5 Is there a motion?

6 MR. POTTS: I move to adopt.

7 MS. LAU: Excuse me?

8 MR. POTTS: I move to adopt the motion.

9 MS. LAU: Is there a second?

10 MR. CLEMENT: I'll second.

11 MS. LAU: Okay. So there's a motion to approve as
12 written, the proposal. All in favor, please raise your
13 hand. Nine. Kevin?

14 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

15 MS. LAU: Ten including Kevin.

16 All opposed? One.

17 Abstentions? Two? Wait. Hang on.

18 Two oppose.

19 Abstentions? Three. So this one is approved.

20 Okay. So the next one is 23605, Examination of
21 standard application material lifts, special purpose
22 elevators, electric manlifts, and hand-powered manlifts.
23 So this is to add a couple words in there that's
24 underlined. The word "elevators" after "special purpose,"
25 and the words "powered manlifts" after "hand."

1 Any comments? Scott.

2 MR. CLEARY: The reason for that is there's no
3 definition of "special purpose lifts," so special -- SPE's
4 is what we're talking about which is 5.7.

5 And the nomenclature, we want to be consistent, is
6 these are hand-powered manlifts; they're not hand
7 elevators. So it's just to clean it up. Be consistent
8 with the historical way they've been regulated in the
9 historical nomenclature.

10 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Mike.

11 MR. WILSON: Just for clarity, this is an edit to the
12 Table of Contents. This page here is. That was in the
13 notes.

14 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Questions? Motion?

15 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
16 this proposal.

17 MS. LAU: Any second?

18 MR. WILSON: Second.

19 MS. LAU: Okay, let's take a vote. All approve of
20 this change in the Table of Contents? Kevin?

21 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

22 MS. LAU: Let -- keep your hands raised please.

23 Fifteen. That's fifteen. I'm missing Jan. So that was
24 approved.

25 Okay, the next one, 237XX. Again, this one is three

1 pages long. This has to do with additional required
2 onsite documentation for ASME A18.1.

3 Again, everything is new here. So take a moment to
4 read through these few pages. And we'll open it up for
5 discussion.

6 Mike.

7 MR. WILSON: So to explain what this is, that is a
8 new requirement in A18.1 to actually have a maintenance
9 section in there. They're requiring maintenance programs.
10 But what is lacking in the 18.1 code book was like 17.1
11 has an 8.6 maintenance section. They give you a list of
12 items that you should be working on. That list does not
13 exist in 18.1. So I compiled this list to be applicable
14 and separate what is required on stair chairs, vertical
15 platform lifts and inclined platform lists. And this was
16 just to make it so it's a level playing field for all
17 service providers to have a maintenance program that lists
18 the same items so we don't have one company from having a
19 couple things, another company have a couple things, but
20 nobody's consistent. And this is all about making it
21 level and even and a consistent playing field for all.

22 MS. LAU: Dave.

23 MR. MESSINA: A question for that. Where are you
24 basing that off of? Is that off of the --

25 MR. WILSON: 18.1 code book.

1 MR. MESSINA: Okay, thank you.

2 MS. LAU: Scott.

3 MR. CLEARY: Kevin, I know you've been part of that
4 committee. Section 11 in 18.1 are new and they -- and
5 those are our first attempt on maintenance, so it left out
6 a lot of content. We thought by putting this in here, it
7 puts it more harmonizing more with 8.6. And 17.1 I think
8 we want to harmonize things as much as possible. So we're
9 putting it in here, as Mike said, to make sure that
10 there's consistency with the service providers.

11 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Questions?

12 MR. METCALFE: A question. So you have here that
13 removes the requirement that maintenance -- or that
14 "mechanics procedural manual be left onsite." Is there a
15 -- what's the reason for that?

16 MR. WILSON: That's the maintenance -- the mechanics
17 manual?

18 MR. METCALFE: Right.

19 MR. WILSON: Because it's -- being that we're in a
20 license state, only licensed people should have access to
21 written procedures.

22 MR. METCALFE: So if another elevator company comes
23 in to take over the maintenance, there's no procedure
24 manual left for them there?

25 MR. WILSON: There would be only for unique devices,

1 unique purpose thing. But other than that, no. It's a
2 generic -- it's pretty generic. It would be no different
3 than the -- just like on elevator equipment where the
4 companies aren't required to put their procedures on
5 because they're written to their companies.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So are you saying that the
7 wiring diagrams will be removed?

8 MR. WILSON: No. Wiring diagrams -- it just says
9 that wiring diagrams -- (inaudible).

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: But that would remain --

11 MR. WILSON: Wiring -- the only thing that would not
12 be on-site would be the written procedures to do these
13 tasks.

14 MS. LAU: Dave.

15 MR. MESSINA: And so to kind of help clarify that as
16 well, so you would still have this list as what we need to
17 do on-site for the maintenance? The actual procedures of
18 how my mechanic is going to do that or perform it is -- we
19 would consider that task as belongs to Otis because we
20 have a unique way of doing it safely. That's what we
21 train our guys on. That's what I think you're referring
22 to as not being left there. Because that is with the
23 mechanics -- (inaudible)

24 MS. LAU: Jack, did you have a question?

25 MR. RUNYAN: I don't know if I got a unique situation

1 or not. I'm in a building that's two stories. We have a
2 electric manlift. When we put it in, they said that --
3 the guy that put it in said there is no inspection or
4 maintenance needed on that chairlift. They've been out of
5 business now for five years. In fact, they're not even
6 manufacturing chairlifts; it's access chairlift.

7 I called several different outfits. I called Acorn
8 in Seattle trying to get somebody to do maintenance. They
9 don't do anything except on Acorn chairlifts. They don't
10 do any commercial. Our building is commercial, but the
11 problem with that is we rented it out three times this
12 last year. There's three organizations within the
13 building. We meet five times a month. There's only one
14 lady that I know of that uses the chairlift. So to get
15 anybody there that they talk about, I've called Boise,
16 Idaho. They're supposed to have a guy in Tri Cities.
17 They're two hours from us. I called them. They haven't
18 returned my calls or my e-mail. I called an outfit in
19 Portland, Oregon. They don't have anybody that comes to
20 Goldendale. They do all their business in Oregon. I
21 called an outfit in Sunnyside who says -- they're
22 handicapped lift chairs. Their telephone number is
23 disconnected.

24 Acorn told me that they're not doing any maintenance
25 because of the requirements by Labor and Industries. And

1 he said, "I wish you luck trying to find somebody that
2 will do that."

3 So now I'm coming up on a five weight lift. The
4 chair's used about ten times a year. In fact, from
5 January last year to December of this last year, probably
6 five times. I'm not sure what the weight check does to a
7 chairlift. And so we're looking at cost effectiveness for
8 our chairlift. Just doing the L & I inspection, it costs
9 us about \$6 per use. If we can't find somebody that does
10 commercial chairlifts, we're looking at probably \$45 per
11 use over ten uses over a year. And figured out if you
12 were in a commercial building and it was used 365 days a
13 year, I won't have to worry about a five year weight lift
14 for 18 years because I only use it ten times a year.

15 So I'm not sure where to go. I can't find anybody.

16 So Dotty and I have e-mailed back and forth.

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We have talked about this. And
18 I'm not sure how to solve the dilemma unfortunately.
19 There are certain maintenance requirements that are
20 mandated.

21 MR. McNEILL: I think we can help him find some
22 potential licensed contractors. I'll check with the
23 licensed contractors I represent to see if they can do it.

24 MS. LAU: Okay. So getting back to this proposal --
25 Scott.

1 MR. CLEARY: Yeah, section 11, like I said before, is
2 new. So the 18.1 committee's trying to get into
3 maintenance and making sure that there's requirements --
4 there's a couple things there that -- (inaudible) -- that
5 is the requirements on a weekly basis by the owners that
6 may require license. So we're just trying to clean it up
7 and making sure that just because it's in the "regs," that
8 they're not doing stuff that you have to be a licensed
9 mechanic to do in the state. So ...

10 MS. LAU: Wade.

11 MR. FRIESEN: This doesn't address in any way any
12 sort of exemption for residential equipment which A18
13 covers a lot of. So this could be deferred by somebody
14 looking at this that's unfamiliar with documentation that
15 all these requirements would apply to residential units
16 which currently the State's not inspecting.

17 MS. LAU: Scott.

18 MR. CLEARY: The code does not differentiate between
19 commercial and residential. You basically you have to
20 require on residential to do this stuff here. It's not
21 enforced, but you have that obligation per the code. It
22 doesn't differentiate.

23 MS. LAU: Mike.

24 MR. WILSON: Dotty, you might be able to chime in on
25 this.

1 I believe the RCW says that all equipment shall be
2 maintained. It doesn't say private residence or
3 commercial.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

5 MR. WILSON: So that is why there is no
6 differentiation because the way the law's written.

7 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Dylan.

8 MR. TURNER: The only question I have is this is in
9 the retroactive section. So let's say you have a ten-year
10 old lift that you don't have this information for. What
11 then?

12 MS. LAU: Mike.

13 MR. WILSON: So you apply the items that are
14 applicable to the lift. So if the item isn't on there,
15 you don't apply it. But if this -- this even goes as far
16 as an elevator that was installed in the '30s, commercial
17 elevator-wise, you're under the same -- kind of the same
18 premise.

19 MR. TURNER: Oh, I guess -- I mean, how do you
20 produce wire with variances that don't exist? How do you
21 have that on sight? I mean, if it's a company that's gone
22 out of business or something. I'm just -- I'm not opposed
23 to this. I'm just -- that's the only thing I'm wondering.

24 MS. LAU: Scott.

25 MR. CLEARY: This is the same that we ran through

1 last with the grain industry on doing stuff in the MCP's.
2 If it's not there, you can't find it, you're going to have
3 to generate it.

4 So the wiring diagram is there for worker safety.
5 These are not cumbersome. And everything that's in the
6 field that I know about stair chairs and this kind of
7 chair lifts, it exists somewhere right down to this --
8 (inaudible). You know, the problem is everything is
9 younger than 85. So there's not a whole lot of -- there's
10 resources to find this stuff. So it's going to be
11 incumbent upon the owners to be able to generate this
12 thing. But it takes some time and effort.

13 MS. LAU: Anybody else?

14 Is there a motion?

15 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
16 this proposal.

17 MR. MESSINA: I second.

18 MS. LAU: Okay. So all approved -- all that want
19 to -- in favor of this proposal, raise your hands please.
20 Eleven.

21 Kevin?

22 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I'm having a real hard time
23 hearing anybody except you, Dotty. So I'm going to
24 abstain on this one just because I didn't hear all the
25 conversation.

1 MS. LAU: Okay. So that's eleven in favor.

2 Opposed? Zero.

3 Abstention? That's five.

4 (Note: Jan Gould joined the proceedings at some
5 point during this last discussion.)

6 MS. LAU: So this one passed.

7 Okay. The next one, 296-96-2374. Okay. So this
8 is --

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Kevin, we're on
10 2019-296-96-2374. That number -- last number may have to
11 be changed. But we will use that for reference during our
12 discussion.

13 MR. BRINKMAN: Okay.

14 MS. LAU: Okay. So this is in regards to the actual
15 WAC code 296-96-23701. And it used to be "Period
16 examinations," but that is proposed to be crossed out and
17 add "Maintenance" -- the word "Maintenance" ... and tests
18 on commercial accessibility lifts.

19 Number (1) adding "One- and five-year inspection and
20 tests" to the rest of the sentence.

21 And then on number (2) adding -- crossing out "10.2"
22 and adding "11 and with this subpart."

23 Any comments? Questions?

24 Is there a motion?

25 MR. WILSON: Motion to move forward with this

1 proposal.

2 MS. LAU: Is there a second?

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Could I just remind everybody
4 to speak up so Kevin can hear.

5 MS. LAU: Is there a second?

6 MR. POTTS: I'll second it.

7 MS. LAU: Okay. So all in favor of this proposal,
8 please raise your hand. Thirteen.

9 Kevin?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

11 MS. LAU: Fourteen.

12 All opposed? Two.

13 Okay. So this passed.

14 Okay. The next one, 2019-Part D Material Lifts.
15 It's two pages long. These are -- again, it's mainly
16 crossing out "Standard Application" and adding "WAC
17 Material Lifts." And then there's a whole list of new
18 items being added. You want to look through that and open
19 it up for discussion.

20 Bob Oury.

21 MR. OURY: Yeah, I'd like to make a couple of
22 comments. First of all, obviously we have to make a
23 friendly revision to go back to standard application.

24 The main reason for this, though, is to add 8.6 and
25 8.11 of ASME into maintaining all existing material lifts.

1 They inadvertently got dropped. So it's just really
2 bringing forward from the standard WAC for material lifts
3 to Part D so that we do have some requirements for keeping
4 with MCP's which I'm sure everybody wants to do.

5 So do I make a friendly to change? Or do we need to
6 worry about that, Dotty?

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I wouldn't say so because we
8 did that previously.

9 MR. OURY: Right. Okay, okay.

10 MS. LAU: Any other comments?

11 Is there a motion? Is there a motion on the table?

12 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
13 this proposal.

14 MR. WILSON: Second.

15 MS. LAU: All right. So let's take a vote on this
16 proposal. All in favor, please raise your hands.

17 Kevin?

18 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

19 MS. LAU: Fifteen.

20 All opposed? Zero.

21 Abstention? One.

22 This one passed.

23 Okay. The next one is -- is that a typo in here --
24 20119-24000. And this is also just a name change. Is
25 that right, Bob?

1 MR. OURY: Right. So I'll withdraw it. We've
2 already discussed this yesterday.

3 MS. LAU: This one's withdrawn.

4 The next one, 2019-24401. This is crossing out some
5 things and adding "Existing belted manlifts must comply
6 with the current adopted ASME A90.1 standard and this
7 section" has been added.

8 And then some things were removed.

9 And then number (2), just changing the numbering
10 there.

11 Any comments? Scott Clement.

12 MR. CLEMENT: Actually it's for you, Scott. I
13 remember in our meeting when you were going over some of
14 this, you had mentioned -- and forgive me; I don't
15 remember exactly -- but there's no grandfathering of them.

16 So an elevator installed in '85 is inspected to the
17 '85 code. It doesn't happen with beltlift?

18 MR. CLEARY: No. Section 1.3 (c) talks about the
19 year after the latest standard is adopted, all portions of
20 that standard become applicable.

21 I sit on that ASME committee. The reason for that is
22 that most of these run 24/7. Most of them are very old.
23 So you want to keep your eyes on the latest safety
24 standards every time that you do it. And if you look at
25 it, there's been a lot of ambiguity about how you test

1 them. Everything -- and we'll talk about it later on
2 testing. The section is very clear that they want the
3 latest standards to apply. So if you look at it, there is
4 no grandfathering; there never has been.

5 So they want you to keep these standards current.
6 And so that's -- there is no grandfathering.

7 MR. CLEMENT: Thank you.

8 MR. CLEARY: But I could -- I was dispatched to New
9 Orleans, and we talked about that. It's very clear with
10 historical things that they run all the time, they're old,
11 we want them to the latest safety standards. Let them
12 brought up and tested to the latest standards.

13 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Is there a motion?

14 MR. WILSON: Make a motion to move forward with this
15 proposal.

16 MS. LAU: Is there a second?

17 MR. CLEMENT: I'll second.

18 MS. LAU: Okay. So all in favor of moving this
19 proposal forward, please raise your hands.

20 Kevin?

21 MR. BRINKMAN: (Unintelligible.)

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I think he said --

23 MS. LAU: Sixteen. Unanimous. This one passed.

24 Okay. The next one is 2019-24416. And this was in
25 reference to manlifts, to strike this whole thing I guess.

1 And the rationale is to repeal this as it was found
2 in A90.1. So this is for belt manlifts?

3 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

4 MS. LAU: Discussion? Anybody? Scott Cleary.

5 MR. CLEARY: We adopted the latest standard of A90,
6 so we just want to be consistent with that document and
7 not have any other superfluous things to look at. So
8 we're just trying to clean it up and go to the national
9 code. We adopted and taken out sections in 675 to A90.1,
10 so I just want to make sure that there's no ambiguity in
11 this -- (inaudible) -- go back to the adopted code.

12 MS. LAU: Jan.

13 MS. GOULD: And then the items struck are in the A90?

14 MR. CLEARY: Yes.

15 MS. GOULD: Thank you.

16 MS. LAU: Charles.

17 MR. POTTS: This just seems to be editorial. I make
18 a motion that we adopt it.

19 MR. MESSINA: I second.

20 MS. LAU: Any more discussion?

21 Okay. So let's take a vote. All in favor, please
22 raise your hand.

23 Kevin?

24 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

25 MS. LAU: Sixteen. This one passed.

1 Okay. The next one, 2019-24419, same as before.
2 This is one that's being repealed as this is found in
3 A90.1.

4 Any discussion or motion?

5 MR. RUNYAN: I motion to move this forward.

6 MR. WILSON: Second.

7 MS. LAU: Okay. So the motion is to move this
8 forward. Okay. All in favor?

9 Kevin?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

11 MS. LAU: Sixteen in favor. This one passed.

12 Next one is 24422. Same thing; repealed. A90.1 --
13 it's already covered in A90.1.

14 Jan.

15 MS. GOULD: I make a motion to pass this as written.

16 MR. TURNER: Second.

17 MS. LAU: Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor?

18 Kevin?

19 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

20 MS. LAU: Sixteen. This one passed.

21 Okay. Next one, 24425. More of the same. A90.1 --
22 repealed as this is found in A90.1.

23 Charles.

24 MR. POTTS: A question. This one and the subsequent
25 one up through 454 are all identical repeals because

1 they're found in -- up to A90.1. Is it appropriate to
2 combine these and have one vote since they're identical in
3 intent?

4 MS. LAU: Yes.

5 MR. POTTS: I'd like to make such a motion.

6 MS. LAU: Up to which one?

7 MR. POTTS: Up to 454. There's a half dozen, maybe
8 more.

9 MS. LAU: Okay, so there's a motion on the floor to
10 treat the next few from 24425 to 24457.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 24445.

12 MS. LAU: To 24455 -- or I'm sorry -- to 24454.

13 So there's a motion to treat all of these the same
14 since all of them are proposed to be repealed because it's
15 also found in A90.1.

16 Is there a second?

17 MR. HENDERSON: Second.

18 MS. LAU: Okay, so let's take a vote on that.

19 MR. NICKENS: Can I have a comment on this?

20 MS. LAU: Yes.

21 MR. NICKENS: I'd like to go on record being I'm
22 opposing that we do group voting on any proposals here. I
23 think every one should have its individual attention.

24 MS. LAU: So are you -- would you like to take a vote
25 to --

1 MR. NICKENS: I just commented after the vote --

2 (inaudible)

3 MS. LAU: Bob McLaughlin.

4 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I would like to make a suggestion
5 that maybe we amend the motion to move forward, to ask the
6 body to review those documents for a few minutes and see
7 whether they would take any portion of 425 through 454 and
8 address those.

9 MS. LAU: Okay. So we can take a moment to review.
10 Is that what you're asking for? To review to make sure --

11 MR. McLAUGHLIN: To review the block and identify
12 those that would be objectionable or that would be
13 questions about if this continues, and then go back and --
14 (inaudible) -- is my reasoning.

15 MS. LAU: Oh, Scott.

16 MR. CLEARY: Being the co-authors of these, I agree
17 with Eldon that I think we should -- each one should stand
18 alone in case there's something that we missed or
19 something that was obviously something that we -- we
20 looked at these pretty quick, but I think we shouldn't
21 block them. I think they all deserve individual ...

22 MS. LAU: Okay. So is there maybe --

23 Charles.

24 MR. POTTS: Well, I -- since I made the suggestion
25 and the motion, I read these things before I got here.

1 It's not new to me. This is not news.

2 I thought we were supposed to be up to speed when we
3 got to the meeting. They're identical in intent.

4 So I don't see any point in voting on them one at a
5 time line by line as if we had the rest of our lives in
6 which to do it.

7 MS. LAU: Any other comment?

8 Bob McLaughlin.

9 MR. McLAUGHLIN: If this appeals to the group, then I
10 would extend that to pass 457 to pick up items 460 through
11 478 which are also similarly phrased.

12 MS. LAU: Okay. So right now what's on the floor
13 with the motion is to treat all of these from 24425 to
14 24454 in the same -- as a group -- as a bundled group to
15 be voted on. So that's what -- unless somebody wants to
16 withdraw that and --

17 MR. POTTS: That's the motion on the floor or --

18 MS. LAU: That was the motion.

19 MR. POTTS: I don't want to withdraw.

20 MS. LAU: Okay, so that's the motion on the floor.

21 Scott Clement.

22 MR. CLEMENT: I agree with Charles. We were supposed
23 to be prepared, having read through these things. I did
24 it over the weekend. So hopefully everybody else was
25 doing their part. And I agree with Charles.

1 MS. LAU: Okay. So that's the motion on the floor.

2 And so let's move forward on the vote.

3 Oh, Scott.

4 MR. CLEARY: Just to be clear, there's nothing snuck
5 in there. It's just -- it's just moving everything to the
6 basic codes. So there's nothing that was added to any of
7 it. So ...

8 MR. HENDERSON: It's adopting a national standard
9 code which is ...

10 MR. CLEARY: Which we've already adopted.

11 MR. HENDERSON: Yeah.

12 MS. LAU: Okay. So any other comments?

13 Okay. So let's take a vote on -- again, this is
14 adopting these proposals which means we're repealing all
15 these proposals from 24425 to 24454 in a group to repeal
16 this. Okay, all in favor, raise your hand. Fourteen.

17 Kevin?

18 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

19 MS. LAU: Fifteen.

20 And all opposed?

21 Abstention? One.

22 So this one passed as a group.

23 MR. NICKENS: Could I get those group numbers again
24 please.

25 MS. LAU: 24425, 24428, 24431, 24434, 24437, 24440,

1 24445, 24448, 24451 and 24454.

2 MR. MESSINA: A question. Was that -- did we vote to
3 just group them together? Or was -- do we still have to
4 vote to approve it as written?

5 MR. TURNER: I think that was just the motion to vote
6 on them as a group.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No. I think that was -- I
8 thought that was a motion.

9 MR. MESSINA: I thought it was the motion to group
10 them together for a vote. I didn't know it was -- my vote
11 is going to be the same regardless. I'm just making sure
12 we did it correctly.

13 MS. LAU: Okay. So that is -- okay, so let's take
14 another count then for the whole group to be passed
15 together -- I mean, to be passed, this whole group that I
16 just read off.

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: To be considered.

18 MS. LAU: To be considered to be approved as written.

19 Okay, let's do that. All in favor?

20 Kevin?

21 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

22 MS. LAU: Fourteen.

23 All opposed? Zero.

24 Abstentions? One.

25 Not voting? One.

1 This one passed. This group passed.

2 So let's move on to the next one. Okay. So the next
3 one is 2019-24457, belt manlifts, A90.1 again.
4 296-96-24457. This is on number (4), we added "Stop
5 devices shall comply with the requirements found in the
6 current adopted ASME A90.1."

7 And then after that, everything is stricken.

8 And then there's also a change on (1) -- sorry;
9 excuse me -- changing from "stop" to "step" roller.

10 Discussion? Scott Cleary.

11 MR. CLEARY: The reason why we're not going
12 completely back to the A90 standard for the upper landings
13 is in the past the state WAC has allowed belted manlifts
14 to have only two safety devices at the upper limit. And
15 some of the ones that are old, they can't be retrofitted.
16 A90 requires three, one being on each side of the rails --
17 split rail switches that activate with 50 pounds pressure
18 no more than 24 inches from the top landing and having a
19 panic bar that's at the top -- (inaudible). The WAC has
20 allowed just two in the past. So if they've been in
21 operations for many, many years with two safeties, and
22 that's why there's -- we're keeping with -- the WAC has
23 allowed, but anything new would have to go -- (inaudible).
24 That's why there's the difference in safety switches.

25 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Scott Clement.

1 MR. CLEMENT: It says in your comments -- and I
2 actually wrote a question mark on this when I was reading
3 over it. Is there just not enough room for the three
4 switches on the older ones that they can't be put in?
5 It's just physically impossible? Or what limits that?

6 MR. CLEARY: A lot of it is how they're designed and
7 how they're put together. So putting other split rails in
8 would become probably very problematic in some of the
9 older designs currently.

10 MR. CLEMENT: Thank you.

11 MS. LAU: Any other questions?

12 Is there a motion?

13 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
14 this proposal.

15 MS. LAU: Is there a second?

16 MR. WILSON: Second.

17 MS. LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote. All in favor
18 of this proposal moving forward, raise your hand. Eleven.
19 Kevin?

20 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

21 MS. LAU: Twelve in favor.

22 All opposed? One.

23 Abstentions? Two. We're missing one.

24 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I did not vote.

25 MR. LAU: Oh, you're not voting?

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: No. I was looking at the way the
2 retained paragraphs were -- I was catching up on my
3 homework. But it won't affect the outcome.

4 So that's why I didn't vote because I was still doing
5 the homework.

6 MS. LAU: Oh, okay. So one non-voting.

7 So this one passed. Thank you. I didn't want to
8 have to vote again.

9 The next one is 24460. This one is being repealed --
10 is proposed to be revealed because it's covered in A90.1.
11 These are the belt manlifts again.

12 MR. MESSINA: There's another group of those.

13 MR. CLEARY: There's another four.

14 MR. POTTS: There's four more -- 460, 466, 470 and
15 478 are intended to be repealed because they're covered in
16 A90.1.

17 I think it's commendable that Mike and Scott have
18 done this work, and that we could honor the work that
19 they've done and not try to do it over for them.

20 And I believe Scott when he says that nothing is
21 being snuck in here; it's just like what it says it is.

22 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Are you making a
23 motion, Charles? Anybody -- does anyone want to make a
24 motion?

25 MR. MESSINA: I'll make a motion that we group these

1 four for purposes of --

2 MR. OURY: I'll second it.

3 MS. LAU: Okay. So there's a motion on the floor.

4 Any comments? There's a motion on the floor to group the
5 next four together to be voted together. That 24460,
6 24466, 24470 and 24478 to be grouped together.

7 So that's the vote -- what we're voting for right
8 now, to group these four together. All in favor?

9 Kevin?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

11 MS. LAU: Fifteen.

12 And all opposed? One.

13 So we're going to -- so the ayes have it. We're
14 going to group the next four together.

15 MR. MESSINA: I'd like to make a motion that we
16 approve it as written.

17 MR. METCALFE: I second.

18 MS. LAU: So now we're going to take a vote on moving
19 these proposals forward as a group. We're going to move
20 all four of these for approval. Proposal to move forward.
21 These proposals -- I don't know how to say it. All four
22 of these -- in favor of all four of these moving forward,
23 raise your hand.

24 Kevin?

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

1 MS. LAU: Fifteen.

2 All opposed? Zero.

3 Abstentions? One.

4 This one -- these four passed.

5 So the next one is 24480. 296-96-24480. This is
6 also on belted manlifts.

7 Some verbiage has changed. "Five year test
8 requirements" is struck -- is stricken. And added to it
9 is "Additional annual testing requirements."

10 And then the next line is stricken. "A five year
11 test of belt manlifts shall be conducted, and the test
12 shall be administered under the following conditions."
13 That part of it is stricken.

14 And number (2) and number (3) and part of number (4)
15 is stricken.

16 Any comments? Do you want to take a moment to
17 review?

18 Scott Cleary.

19 MR. CLEARY: The reason why we did this is that A90
20 has never had category test for Category 1 or Category 5.
21 There's always been acceptance tests. There's always been
22 annuals. And that's been kind of misunderstood when the
23 WAC changed it years ago. So if you don't -- if you just
24 do on a five-year test, what do you do in the interim?
25 Right? There's no guidance in A90. So it's always been

1 annual test. So you got to load test every year. And
2 that's why it's always been belted manlifts. Especially
3 with the ones that are getting older, they're run almost
4 24/7. So we need to get our eyes on them. They should be
5 pursuant to A90, section 8.1, and that is annual test.
6 And so that's why we want to make it very clear. It's
7 been misunderstand and I think misapplied for years. And
8 this will take care of that. It's a safety -- a user-
9 safety and worker-safety issue.

10 And also, there is no test tag requirements in A90 as
11 of now. So that's why we want test tags so the inspector
12 knows what's been done.

13 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Is there a motion?

14 MR. WILSON: Motion to move this proposal forward.

15 MS. LAU: Is there a second? Our.

16 MR. OURY: Second.

17 MS. LAU: Okay. So the proposal is to approve this
18 as written. All in favor, raise your hand.

19 Kevin?

20 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

21 MS. LAU: Fourteen.

22 All opposed? One.

23 Abstention? One.

24 This one passed.

25 The next one is 24500. And it's to strike "special

1 purpose personnel elevators" and replace it with "electric
2 manlifts," the verbiage. And add "requirements for a
3 special purpose elevator found in ... 5.3."

4 Any comments? Mike Wilson.

5 MR. WILSON: I make a motion to amend.

6 MS. LAU: Oh, okay. A friendly amendment?

7 MR. WILSON: A friendly amendment, yes.

8 MS. LAU: Is there a second?

9 MR. MESSINA: Second.

10 MR. WILSON: The amendment in here is on number (2).
11 After "special purpose" to insert "personnel" and to
12 change the reference of ASME A17.1-5.3 to 5.7.

13 MS. LAU: Is that it?

14 MR. WILSON: Yes, that is it.

15 MS. LAU: So the word that is stricken right now, the
16 word "personnel," you want to add that back in?

17 MR. WILSON: Ah, let's see ...

18 MS. LAU: Which word did you want to -- where did you
19 want to add the "personnel"?

20 MR. WILSON: Yes, to reinsert it.

21 MS. LAU: To reinsert that. So right now it's
22 crossed off.

23 MR. WILSON: Yes.

24 MS. LAU: Okay. So what you want number (2) to say
25 is "Where a special purpose personnel elevator was

1 installed after January 1, 1999, the conveyance shall
2 comply with the requirements for a special purpose
3 elevator found in the edition of ASME A17.1-5.7 or
4 A17.1/B44 that was in effect at the time." Is that
5 correct, Mike?

6 MR. WILSON: Yes.

7 MR. BRINKMAN: Candace?

8 MS. LAU: Yes, Kevin.

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I -- there might be one
10 additional change needed that kind of goes with that. In
11 the underlined portion of number (2) where it says
12 "requirements for special purpose elevator ...," if we're
13 going to add "personnel" back in the other one, we should
14 also say "special purpose personnel elevator" in that spot
15 as well.

16 MS. LAU: Any other comments?

17 MR. METCALFE: So I thought that you said number (2)
18 was where you were going to add "personnel." And so my
19 question is: "So electric manlifts cannot be renamed as a
20 special purpose" -- and you're going to insert "personnel"
21 there? We're -- I'm talking about number 2, right?

22 MR. WILSON: Number 2 ...

23 MR. LAU: Scott Cleary.

24 MR. CLEARY: We had some feedback from other people
25 that were involved. I would say that we need to leave

1 "special purpose elevators" and not insert "personnel" to
2 be consistent with the rest of the document. And then
3 make sure we change 5.3 to 5.7. So I think we leave the
4 underlined portion alone. And then that would be
5 consistent with the rest of the documents that we done
6 earlier on.

7 MS. LAU: So you want to keep -- keep what I just
8 read?

9 MR. CLEARY: Keep what's underlined in the proposal
10 other than changing -- change 5.3 to 5.7.

11 MS. LAU: What about the insertion of "personnel"
12 back in?

13 MR. CLEARY: I don't think -- it should be removed to
14 be consistent with the --

15 MS. LAU: Okay. So then now are you -- so the
16 friendly amendment was -- did you want to change the
17 friendly amendment, Mike?

18 MR. WILSON: Yes.

19 MS. LAU: So you want to keep that "personnel"
20 crossed off. So what your new friendly -- your friendly
21 is going to be number "(2) Where a special purpose
22 elevator was installed after January 1, 1999, the
23 conveyance shall comply with the requirements for a
24 special purpose elevator found in the edition of ASME
25 A17.1-5.7 or A17.1/B44 that was in effect at the time"?

1 MR. WILSON: Yes.

2 MS. LAU: That's what you want?

3 MR. WILSON: That would be correct.

4 MS. LAU: Just -- the only change then is the 5.3 to
5 5.7.

6 MR. WILSON: Yes. Sorry for the confusion.

7 MS. LAU: So that's the friendly on the table. Any
8 -- Dylan.

9 MR. TURNER: Just to clarify. Are (1) and (2)
10 referring to the same equipment?

11 MR. WILSON: No.

12 MR. TURNER: Okay. I just want to make sure of that
13 because I was -- if it's specifically referring to two
14 different things -- (inaudible). One is before 1999 and
15 one is after 1999. I was wondering if it was supposed to
16 be clarification on the same or different. So I just
17 wanted to make sure.

18 MS. LAU: Scott.

19 MR. CLEARY: Yes. The State has regulated -- before
20 5.7 became part of 17.1, the -- (inaudible) -- were only
21 regulated under the WAC under the -- (inaudible) --
22 section of the WAC. So now these are two separates.

23 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Questions?

24 Okay. So this is for the friendly -- this motion is
25 to just change from 5.3 to 5.7. We're going to take a

1 vote on that. All in favor?

2 MR. BRINKMAN: Candace?

3 MS. LAU: Yes. Yes, Kevin.

4 MR. BRINKMAN: I'm sorry. I have a little trouble
5 hearing. I'd like to -- and either Candace or Dotty --
6 please repeat why we're not going to add "personnel" back
7 in. Because in category -- in A17.1 there's special
8 purpose personnel elevators. So I'm just curious why we
9 don't want to add that back. Because we've --
10 (unintelligible).

11 MS. LAU: Okay. Scott Cleary.

12 MR. CLEARY: I agree that's how 5.7 is. So if we're
13 going to do it here, we need to add it clerical to the
14 rest of the document. So as long as we're consistent, I
15 don't -- it doesn't matter to me. As long as we refer to
16 5.7.

17 MR. BRINKMAN: I couldn't understand what he said --
18 what you said. So I still want to try to understand why
19 we're not keeping that "personnel" in there.

20 MR. CLEARY: Kevin, this is Scott. Can you hear me?

21 MR. BRINKMAN: I can now.

22 MR. CLEARY: All right. So basically the
23 nomenclature, we can leave it the way it is or we can
24 change it. We can have it reflect what 5.7 says as long
25 as we're consistent through the whole document.

1 So I agree with you that that's how 5.7 reads now.

2 So if you want to -- if you're opposed to that, we keep it
3 "personnel," that's fine. What I'm saying is there needs
4 to reflect an administrative change through the whole WAC.
5 I just want consistency.

6 MR. BRINKMAN: Okay. But if we adopt A17.1-2016,
7 aren't we already picking up the personnel? Because that
8 was the title used in A17.1. So for the document to be
9 consistent -- I understand this is the existing elevator
10 part of -- to be consistent, would we have to put it in --
11 already make a change administratively to -- and maybe
12 that's something that can be dealt with outside of this
13 vote. And I'm okay with that if the staff wants to do it
14 separately. But I'm just saying that I think it would be
15 good to match up with what A17 since we adopted that
16 standard.

17 MS. LAU: Scott.

18 MR. CLEARY: I agree. As long as we can do it
19 administratively. We just want to be consistent with the
20 national code and the WAC.

21 MR. BRINKMAN: I'm okay with -- (unintelligible) --
22 with letting the L & I staff decide on how to proceed with
23 that.

24 MS. LAU: Okay. So did you want to change it here or
25 not? That's the --

1 MR. CLEARY: (Shaking negatively.)

2 MS. LAU: Okay. So we're going to keep it the way it
3 is written. Let me read it one more time so that we're
4 clear on what you're asking for this friendly is -- your
5 friendly is still to just change the 5.3 to 5.7, correct?

6 MR. WILSON: That is correct

7 MS. LAU: Okay. So that's what we're voting on right
8 now.

9 Yes, Bob.

10 MR. OURY: It's also to add back in the "personnel,"
11 correct?

12 MS. LAU: No.

13 MR. OURY: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

14 MS. LAU: No.

15 MR. OURY: Got'cha.

16 MS. LAU: Is that correct, Mike?

17 MR. WILSON: Correct. I agree with what Kevin is
18 saying. Administratively if we can do this, it's good.

19 I just want to stay consistent with what the national
20 standard is.

21 MS. LAU: Correct. But right now, the friendly is
22 to only change the 5.3 to 5.7.

23 MR. WILSON: Correct.

24 MS. LAU: Correct?

25 MR. WILSON: Correct.

1 MS. LAU: That's what we're voting on right now.

2 Okay. So all in favor of changing it from 5.3 to
3 5.7, raise your hand.

4 Kevin?

5 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

6 MS. LAU: Fifteen.

7 All opposed?

8 Abstentions? One.

9 So the friendly is passed. So five point -- so any
10 comments on the rest of it? Any motion?

11 MR. POTTS: I move to adopt.

12 MR. CLEMENT: I second.

13 MS. LAU: So now the motion on the table is to move
14 forward with this proposal with the change -- the friendly
15 change to the 5.7. All in favor? Thirteen.

16 Kevin?

17 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

18 MS. LAU: Fourteen.

19 All opposed? One.

20 Abstentions? One.

21 This proposal passed.

22 Okay. The next one is 24516. And this, on number
23 (2)(a) "Elevators and" is stricken. And "Their" is added.

24 (c) "examinations" is stricken. And the word "are
25 to" is added.

1 "Applicable" is stricken. And addition of
2 "requirements found in ASME A17.1 Section 8.6 as
3 applicable to the."

4 Any comments? Mike.

5 MR. WILSON: I just want to -- so everybody realizes
6 that this is referring to hand-powered elevators.

7 MS. LAU: Okay. Any other comments? Questions?
8 Charles.

9 MR. POTTS: This seems to be editorial also and
10 should be obvious. It's just editorial.

11 MS. LAU: Is there a motion?

12 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
13 this proposal.

14 MS. LAU: Second? Any --

15 MR. OURY: Second.

16 MS. LAU: Okay. So the proposal on the table is to
17 move forward with this proposal -- approve this proposal.
18 All in favor, raise your hand. Thirteen.

19 Kevin?

20 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

21 MS. LAU: Fourteen.

22 Opposed? Two.

23 This proposal passed.

24 Okay. So the next one is 24528. This is to cross
25 out "elevators" and add "electric manlifts."

1 And then add a "(c)" to it. And that says "All car
2 doors or gates shall be equipped with an electric
3 contact."

4 And then (c)(i), "An electrical and mechanical
5 interlock must be provided when a safe means of
6 self-evacuation, a ladder, is not provided."

7 And then number (2) is crossed off.

8 Any comments? Eldon.

9 MR. NICKENS: Could you -- Mike, could you explain
10 (i) to me?

11 MR. WILSON: So what this is, this is on an electric
12 manlift on a grain and silo, which to be clear, a lot are
13 on the outside and sometimes they're inside. But you can
14 have -- it could be fully unenclosed hoistways, and some
15 will be -- (inaudible) -- closed. But what we're asking
16 here is that if you don't have a ladder for a means of
17 self-evacuation, then you have to have basically the car
18 door restrictor. That's what the mechanical lock is for
19 the car door. So that way they're -- in an unenclosed
20 hoistway, they cannot get out of the elevator because they
21 do not have a means of self-evacuation for safety.

22 MS. LAU: Scott.

23 MR. CLEARY: There's a lot of them in the industry.
24 And DOSH has allowed them to have -- to be able to --
25 (inaudible) -- any path of travel as long as you have a

1 safe means of exit. And that means three points of
2 contact on that ladder, right? So a lot of them don't
3 because the ladder may be in a place that doesn't make any
4 sense. So what they're trying to do is making sure that
5 if you have a safe means of a backup egress, you must meet
6 the 4917 required of three points of contact. If you
7 don't, then you got to have door restrictors. Right now
8 that requirement doesn't exist.

9 We think it's another layer of safety and will
10 enforce and allow the inspectors to say that ladder
11 doesn't meet the 4917 definition of three points of
12 contact. Either fix the ladder or put door restrictors on
13 so you can only get out at the landing. That's the logic
14 behind this.

15 MS. LAU: Jan.

16 MS. GOULD: This is a retro -- (inaudible).

17 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

18 MS. GOULD: So how many units are we talking about
19 having to add?

20 MS. LAU: Speak up please. Speak louder.

21 MS. GOULD: Oh, I'm sorry. How many units are we
22 talking about having to add a door restrictor to in the
23 state?

24 MR. CLEARY: There's 450 lifts in the grain industry
25 that fall under either the -- under this requirement. Of

1 those, probably maybe 100 may have questionable means of
2 three points of contact. So probably maybe 100 lifts that
3 have to be looked at.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So if they had to provide --
5 would you have any idea of the cost associated with this?

6 And there's a reason why I'm doing this. I believe
7 this was proposed last year, and it didn't go forward. Or
8 something similar. And the reason why it didn't go
9 forward was we didn't have enough information to do a
10 cost-benefit analysis. So I'm trying to pick your brains
11 here.

12 MS. LAU: Scott Clement.

13 MR. CLEMENT: Cost is important. But the safety of
14 that worker is more important. You can't put a cost on
15 anybody's life. Fix the elevator; keep your people safe.

16 MS. LAU: Dotty.

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, Scott had his hand up
18 first.

19 MS. LAU: Scott.

20 MR. CLEARY: I absolutely -- my comment: I don't
21 know how you put a price on that stuff on safety. Some of
22 them, you can't get to the ladders, right? So if you get
23 to the ladder, often you can't have safe means. And this
24 -- I don't think it's been really looked at in the past.
25 But we've done a lot of -- we spend a lot of time in the

1 field looking at these things, and it all comes down to
2 user safety.

3 So I think a lot of them could be modified quite
4 easily and cheap. And I have not done a full analysis on
5 it. But the bottom line is is that if you can get out
6 safely, then you should be able to get out.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And I appreciate what you're
8 saying. But it will not go forward without a cost-benefit
9 analysis. So I just want to make you aware of that.

10 So if you could -- if you would research that and
11 give me some ballpark figures so if this does move
12 forward, we can give that information to the proper
13 folks.

14 MS. LAU: Bob.

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Speaking as one unfamiliar with
16 grain elevators, I just have a question. From what you
17 describe, the only safe means of self-evacuation is a
18 ladder. Why don't you just -- I'm asking about the
19 language. Why don't you say "Safe means of
20 self-evacuation such as a ladder is not provided." If
21 there -- if someone looks at this and says, "Well, wait a
22 minute; I have another means of self-evacuation," wouldn't
23 that be considered? It's just as a matter of the way that
24 it reads: "Self-evacuation comma a ladder comma." Are
25 you saying that a ladder is the only means? Why not just

1 say "a ladder for self-evacuation"?

2 MS. LAU: Scott Cleary.

3 MR. CLEARY: Because if you don't -- ladder defined
4 by, my understanding, defined by DOSH in 4917 is that you
5 must be able to maintain three points of contact on that
6 ladder. So someone may have ladders, but your lift is
7 right here (pointing); the ladder's over here (pointing).
8 Or the ladder's right here (pointing). So despite --
9 we're just covering the basic definition of three points
10 of contact.

11 So that's kind of the thing about it.

12 Also, the question I have too is: These things
13 during annuals, when you're doing annual inspections, need
14 to be looked at too by the inspectors. Because that's one
15 of the requirements to have -- (inaudible) -- you must
16 have safe means of evacuation, and that should be looked
17 at during inspections.

18 MS. LAU: Any other -- oh, Ricky.

19 MR. HENDERSON: Just sort of clarification, Scott.

20 I was looking at the existing language in the 24528.
21 And the lines struck is very, very similar. The only
22 difference in the language is if it's unenclosed hoistway.

23 So I guess two questions I have on that one is: How
24 many of the products out there would be in an enclosed
25 hoistway? How many of them are unenclosed? Just sort of

1 an idea of.

2 And the second one is: Did this language just get
3 changed in the last WAC requiring this? Or has it been an
4 existing requirement?

5 MS. LAU: Scott Cleary.

6 MR. CLEARY: It's been in the WAC. And all the
7 electric manlifts that are non-SPE's are unenclosed.
8 They're put in -- you have grain silos that are either
9 wood or concrete. They're packed in, some of them. And
10 so anywhere that they have a unobstructed vertical --
11 (inaudible) -- as to where these are going to be, and
12 there's comingled everything in there, part of a --
13 different things. So every one of the non-SPE's that are
14 considered electric GPS's or electric are an unenclosed.
15 And some of them have easy means of getting out of it.
16 Some of them don't. And some of them could be 190, 200
17 feet tall where you're just -- you're in the middle of
18 nowhere, right? So there's no other safe landings,
19 anything else like that. There's no other really safe
20 means. You can't rappel. You can't -- so a ladder is
21 the only means to get out. And we're just trying to make
22 sure that everybody understands the definition of a safe
23 ladder.

24 And see, a lot of these were built by Uncle Louie
25 after World War II, and, you know, there was really no

1 guidance back then. So that ladder might have been used
2 for something else, climbing up that interstitial area or
3 not. And so we just want to make sure it's clear to
4 everybody that if you want to have a door that opens up in
5 mid flight, it might be 140 feet in the air, you got to
6 have a ladder that meets the definition of three points
7 of contact so you can have safe means of getting out. So
8 that -- it's always been kind of not very clear, and it's
9 not really been looked at like this. But we're just
10 trying to clear it up.

11 So none of them have hoistways. In a typical
12 definition that we're used to involve hoistway.

13 MS. LAU: Any other comments? Questions? Motion?
14 Is there a motion?

15 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
16 this proposal.

17 MS. LAU: Is there a second?

18 MR. OURY: Second.

19 MS. LAU: Okay. So there's a motion on the floor to
20 adopt -- or for this proposal to move forward. All in
21 favor, raise your hand. Nine.

22 Kevin?

23 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

24 MS. LAU: Ten.

25 All opposed? One.

1 Abstentions? Five.

2 So this proposal passed.

3 And then we're going to take a break -- a quick
4 break.

5 But Scott Cleary, did you have something to say?

6 MR. CLEARY: This doesn't change the requirements
7 that are already in effect. So this would not have a --
8 it should not have a impact because this has always been
9 caught on annuals. But this is not changing the
10 requirement. It's just enforcing what's been on the books
11 that hasn't been enforced in the past. This requirement
12 already exists, safe means in the WAC, so it's not adding
13 anything new.

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I'll research that. We'll talk
15 about it.

16 MS. LAU: Okay, let's take a 15-minute break.

17

18 (Recess taken.)

19

20 MS. LAU: Okay, let's start the meeting.

21 Kevin, are you still there?

22 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes.

23 MS. LAU: Okay, we're to start the meeting. I think
24 everyone's here.

25 Okay, so let's move on to the next one. We're on

1 24537. This is in regards to electric manlifts again.
2 This is to add number "(4) Long enough" -- number (4)
3 says, "Long enough so the car platform will be no more
4 than 6 (inches) above the top landing when the
5 counterweight buffer is fully compressed, and at least 6
6 (inches) from the deflector sheave when the car buffer is
7 fully compressed."

8 And this is because number (4) was left off on the
9 last code-adoption cycle.

10 Any comments? Any motion?

11 MR. WILSON: Motion to move forward with this
12 proposal.

13 MR. POTTS: Second.

14 MS. LAU: So we have a motion on the table to move
15 this proposal forward. All in favor, raise your hands.
16 Scott, is yours up?

17 MR. CLEMENT: Sorry.

18 MS. LAU: Was yours up, Rob?

19 I'm going to redo it because there's issues.

20 Kevin?

21 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

22 MS. LAU: Fifteen.

23 All opposed?

24 Abstentions? One.

25 So this passed.

1 Okay. Let's move on to the next one. 24543. The
2 same thing as on electric manlifts. And this is to strike
3 out -- on number (3) strike out "special purpose
4 elevators" and add the word "electric manlifts."

5 And then number (5) is stricken from -- the verbiage.
6 "Separate safety tags shall be used to distinguish the no
7 load annual safety test and the five year full load test."

8 And number (3) is Remove the reference to special
9 purpose. And number (5), Remove this as it does not
10 belong in this requirement.

11 Any comments on this? Rob.

12 MR. McNEILL: I'll defer to Scott for now.

13 MS. LAU: Okay, Scott Cleary.

14 MR. CLEARY: The reason why we want to make sure
15 we're consistent with electric manlifts is for the
16 nomenclature going forward with consistency with the past,
17 and also for inspectors, that they go out and try to find
18 -- they go to 5.7 for anything, they won't find everything
19 that electric manlift does. It's a WAC -- it's always
20 been a WAC requirement, and so we just want -- that's why
21 we're changing the nomenclature. Because it's not a 5.7
22 piece of equipment.

23 MS. LAU: Rob McNeill.

24 MR. McNEILL: I have one question. And I noticed
25 this in the one we just passed too and made a comment on

1 it.

2 When we look at any of the areas as we did yesterday,
3 we talked about --

4 MS. LAU: Rob, can you speak up.

5 MR. McNEILL: They discuss a safety factor for
6 suspension means. And in here, it says a good grade of
7 elevator traction rope. That kind of concerns me what
8 that means. Is there anything that we could add to that?
9 Maybe we could think about that before the ESAC, if that
10 question comes up so we can make sure that we're
11 maintaining an acceptable degree of safety, a factor of
12 safety.

13 MS. LAU: Mike.

14 MR. WILSON: I agree with you, Rob. We did not
15 create that verbiage, by the way. That is from the --
16 that's always been the language in the WAC. And we do
17 agree that it's either make a friendly amendment here or
18 we move it on to the --

19 MR. McNEILL: Probably need to research it a little
20 bit more.

21 MS. LAU: Scott.

22 MR. CLEARY: I think we really don't need to research,
23 but I think we need the safety standards for all traction
24 elevators in section (2). We should take that
25 nomenclature out of that and put it in here. I agree that

1 it would make sense if there's some ambiguity.

2 MR. McNEILL: Thanks.

3 MR. CLEARY: A point of clarification. Now, it
4 wasn't really clear to me, and maybe I just missed it
5 yesterday. So when this goes to the ESAC, is it going to
6 be pass or no pass? Are we going to have time to do some
7 massaging on some of the stuff that come out of this? I
8 think you answered it yesterday. I just want to make sure
9 I'm clear.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, I originally said that --
11 we want to do as much work here as possible. However,
12 with that said, if -- and I believe we did this last year.
13 If it comes up that something needs to be tweaked a
14 little, the ESAC would have that.

15 MR. McNEILL: I retract that. I had my hand over the
16 factor of safety, and it was passed. So the path was
17 there.

18 MR. CLEARY: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

19 So anyway, yeah, I would like to make sure that we
20 have some ability that -- and we're going through a lot of
21 things quick. So when it gets up to the ESAC that there
22 is a little bit of time. So I'm happy to hear that if
23 there's something that really needs to be changed, we can
24 do it.

25 So thank you.

1 MS. LAU: Eldon.

2 MR. NICKENS: Rob, I -- for some reason I don't see
3 the language that you're referring to.

4 MR. McNEILL: It was on the one we just passed on
5 24537. And number (2) had a safety factor of 5. I had my
6 pencil over that when I was looking at it. So I
7 apologize.

8 MS. LAU: Any other comments?

9 That was on the previous one, right? Is that right?

10 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, it was. It was on the previous
11 one.

12 MS. LAU: It was on the previous on.

13 Okay. So any comments on 24543? Scott Clement.

14 MR. CLEMENT: Why are we taking out "(5) Separate
15 safety tags ... to distinguish ..."? Do they have safety
16 tags?

17 MS. LAU: Mike Wilson.

18 MR. WILSON: It is located on a different
19 requirement. It's just that it didn't fit in this
20 requirement. So when we had rewritten this last year,
21 that had gotten moved into its correct spot. It was left
22 in here as well. So it was just taking it out of here.
23 They're still requiring the tags.

24 MR. CLEMENT: Okay.

25 MS. LAU: Scott Cleary.

1 MR. CLEARY: Yeah, it's redundant. So we just didn't
2 want to have it in different area. It's administrative.

3 MS. LAU: Any other comments?

4 MR. POTTS: I make a motion to adopt.

5 MR. MESSINA: Second.

6 MR. RUNYAN: Second.

7 MS. LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote to move this
8 proposal this forward. All in favor? Thirteen.

9 Kevin?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

11 MS. LAU: Fourteen in favor.

12 All opposed? Zero.

13 Abstentions? Two.

14 So this proposal passed.

15 Okay. The next one is 24553. This is also electric
16 manlifts. So on number (1), to strike "Elevator machines"
17 and add "Electric manlifts."

18 Number (2), strike out "elevator" and add "drive."

19 Number (7), strike out "elevator" and put in
20 "manlift." Strike out "provided" and replace it with
21 "located near the driving machine or the machinery space."

22 Number (8), strike out "elevator" and insert
23 "manlift."

24 Any comments? Questions? Any motion? Oh, Ricky.

25 MR. HENDERSON: A question. Where you were talking

1 about the changing the language for the lockout/tagout to
2 be in the driving machine or machinery space rather than a
3 control space, does this equipment not have a control
4 space?

5 MS. LAU: Mike.

6 MR. WILSON: This equipment, the controller is
7 literally could be a 6x6 box which is -- (inaudible).
8 This isn't addressing the -- they're not talking about the
9 main-line disconnect. That is already required to have a
10 locking means. It's just that this equipment, the machine
11 typically is located at the top of the hoistway, and the
12 controller may be located at the bottom. And what they're
13 -- we are saying is that by rule you need to have a means
14 to lock out the driving machine motor if you're up in the
15 space -- the machinery space working up there, which
16 currently there isn't -- it just doesn't exist.

17 MS. LAU: Rob.

18 MR. McNEILL: Is this different than NFPA 70? With
19 NFPA 70 you have to have a disconnect within sight of the
20 motion controller, and you just have to have a switch next
21 to the machine in a machine space.

22 MR. WILSON: We are going -- we're going a little bit
23 above what NEC -- you still have to have the disconnect
24 located within sight of the controller -- that's not
25 changing -- and the disconnecting means for that. We're

1 just saying that when you have the machine upstairs, we
2 want them to be able to lock -- actually lock physically
3 to be able to lock it out.

4 MR. LAW: Scott.

5 MR. CLEARY: And this is probably in 99 percent of
6 what's out there right now has that lockable switch at the
7 motor disconnect. It's a worker safety issue. And I
8 think the industry is moving forward thinking of taking
9 care of that. And so that's what we're -- (inaudible).
10 These are very atypical.

11 MR. METCALFE: So on number (7), so you strike out
12 the word "provided," yet you're saying that you want
13 "provided." Is there any reason why we couldn't leave
14 "provided" in there and just put the word "and located"?

15 MR. WILSON: That would be -- if you want to make a
16 friendly amendment, it could be added.

17 MS. LAU: So you want to make that friendly amendment
18 you said? Is that what you said?

19 MR. WILSON: That would be if Rich wants to.

20 MR. METCALFE: Yes, I'd like to propose to make a
21 friendly amendment to leave the word "provided." Number
22 (7) "shall be provided and located near the driving
23 machine or the machinery space."

24 MS. LAU: Is there a second?

25 MR. MESSINA: Second.

1 MS. LAU: Okay. So the friendly is to reinsert the
2 word "provided" on number (7); is that right?

3 MR. METCALFE: Yes.

4 MS. LAU: So it would read -- number (7) would read:
5 "A means to lockout/tagout the manlift equipment shall be
6 provided located near the driving machine or the machinery
7 space." Is that --

8 Oh, Ricky. Hang on. Is that correct so far?

9 MR. METCALFE: "Provided and" -- after "located"
10 "and" -- excuse me -- after "provided" "and located."

11 MS. LAU: So you want to add the word "and" because
12 there's not no word there.

13 MR. METCALFE: Right.

14 MS. LAU: So you want to reinsert "provided" and add
15 the word "and."

16 MR. METCALFE: Yes.

17 MS. LAU: Okay. Ricky.

18 MR. HENDERSON: Just reading that as it was
19 originally written, this appears to be a requirement for a
20 lockout/tagout disconnect by the controller. And my
21 concern is by rewording it the way we have, are we
22 eliminating that requirement and putting it at the machine
23 only?

24 MS. LAU: Eldon.

25 MR. NICKENS: I have concerns about the conflict with

1 the NEC as well. And I'd also like to see measurements
2 and location data related to that switch or to that
3 lockout. "Near" to me could mean something completely
4 different to you.

5 MS. LAU: Any other comments?

6 Okay. So right now what's on the table is a friendly
7 amendment to reinsert "provided" and add the word "and."
8 So it's going to read like this on number (7). "A means
9 to lockout/tagout the manlift equipment shall be provided
10 and located near the driving machine or the machinery
11 space."

12 So this is just the wording of this proposal; that's
13 what we're going for now. All in favor of making those
14 changes? Twelve.

15 Kevin?

16 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

17 MS. LAU: Thirteen.

18 All opposed? Zero.

19 Abstentions. Three.

20 So the friendly passed.

21 Any other comments? Motion?

22 MR. WILSON: Motion to move the proposal forward.

23 MR. RUNYAN: Second.

24 MS. LAU: Okay. So the motion on the table now is to
25 move forward with the proposal with the friendly amendment

1 added. All in favor?

2 Oh, what was that, Kevin?

3 MR. BRINKMAN: Sorry. Just coughing.

4 MS. LAU: Okay. So all in favor, raise your hand.

5 Eight.

6 Kevin?

7 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye. Nine,

8 MS. LAU: Nine including Kevin.

9 All opposed? Three.

10 Abstentions? Four.

11 Okay. So this proposal passed with the friendly.

12 Okay. The next one is 24560. So this is -- again,
13 this is electric manlifts or -- and this is to add a
14 number (1), just renumbering. Number (2), adding a number
15 (2) "Alternations must conform with the applicable
16 requirements of WAC 296-96-24519 - WAC 296-96-24557." And
17 to add number (3) "Electric manlift controls and
18 disconnects must be accessible and labeled."

19 Any comments? Questions? Motion?

20 MR. OURY: I motion that we move forward with this.

21 MR. CLEMENT: I second.

22 MS. LAU: Okay. So the proposal is to move forward
23 with this proposal. All in favor? Twelve.

24 Kevin?

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

1 MS. LAU: Thirteen.

2 All opposed? One.

3 Abstentions? Two.

4 This proposal passed.

5 Okay. The next one is 24600, hand-powered manlifts.

6 So this is for the scope. And the word "elevators" is

7 crossed out and replaced with "hand-powered manlifts."

8 Any comments? Motions?

9 MR. METCALFE: I motion to move forward with this
10 proposal.

11 MS. LAU: Any second?

12 MR. WILSON: Second.

13 MS. LAU: Okay. So let's move forward on this
14 proposal. All in favor? Eleven.

15 Kevin?

16 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

17 MS. LAU: Twelve.

18 All opposed? Zero.

19 Abstentions? Did you vote, Jan?

20 MS. GOULD: Yes, yes.

21 MS. LAU: Okay, I'm -- we're going to have to redo
22 it. I only have fifteen.

23 So all in favor? Thirteen including Kevin.

24 Correct, Kevin?

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes.

1 MS. LAU: Opposed? Zero.

2 And abstentions? Three.

3 So that one passed.

4 Okay. The next one is 24611, Maintenance and test
5 requirements. (b) "Hand elevators" is stricken and
6 replaced with "Manlifts." And add the word "safety" and
7 add "there is not a full load testing requirement."

8 Any comments? Questions? Motions?

9 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
10 this proposal.

11 MR. POTTS: Second.

12 MS. LAU: Okay. So all in favor of moving this
13 proposal forward, raise your hand.

14 Kevin?

15 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

16 MS. LAU: Okay, fourteen including Kevin. Correct?

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: (Nodding affirmatively.)

18 MS. LAU: All opposed? Zero.

19 Abstentions. One.

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's not enough.

21 MS. LAU: Okay, so that's not enough. Let's do it
22 again. All in favor? Fifteen.

23 All opposed? Zero.

24 Abstentions? One.

25 This proposal passed.

1 The next one, 24630, Habitable space beneath the car
2 and counterweight. A bunch of stuff is stricken, and
3 added in place of that is: "There shall not be habitable
4 space below an elevator hoistway or counterweight shaft
5 unless the floor above the space can withstand an impact
6 of 125 percent greater than the impact generated by a free
7 falling car with rated load or counterweight falling from
8 the full height of the hoistway."

9 The reasoning behind it is that this language came
10 from the electric manlift section and makes better sense,
11 consistency.

12 Any comments? Questions? Motion?

13 MR. WILSON: Motion that we move forward with this
14 proposal.

15 MR. RUNYAN: Second.

16 MS. LAU: Okay. So all in favor of moving this
17 proposal forward, raise your hands. Twelve.

18 Kevin?

19 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

20 MS. LAU: Thirteen.

21 All opposed? Zero.

22 Abstentions. Three.

23 This proposal passed.

24 Next one -- the last one is 24670, Hoistway
25 requirements. This is to add a number (4) "Adequate

1 lighting must be installed and operating. NOTE: for the
2 purpose of this section adequate lighting is 5 (foot
3 candles)."

4 Any comments? Motions?

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I have a comment.

6 MS. LAU: Oh. Dotty.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So where must the adequate
8 lighting be installed?

9 MR. WILSON: This is under hoistway requirements so
10 it would be for the hoistway.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Throughout the entire hoistway?

12 MR. CLEAR: Path of travel.

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Pardon?

14 MR. CLEAR: Path of travel.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Does it say "path of travel"
16 for this somewhere and I'm missing it?

17 MR. WILSON: We'll have to make a friendly amendment.
18 Motion to make a friendly amendment.

19 MS. LAU: What would your motion exactly --

20 MR. WILSON: So on -- we will add to number (4).
21 "Adequate lighting must be installed and operating in the
22 path of travel."

23 MS. LAU: In the path of travel?

24 MR. WILSON: Yes.

25 MS. LAU: Rob.

1 MR. McNEILL: Would you consider having that lighting
2 with 5 foot candles at the ladder? Because if we use the
3 path of travel, there are going to be areas in that
4 hoistway that do not -- (inaudible) -- 5 foot candles;
5 behind rails and such.

6 MS. LAU: Scot Cleary.

7 MR. CLEARY: Most of these are in like old wood
8 cribs. So there's a lot of shadows and that stuff. Most
9 of them would be open -- in the path of travel you got
10 three points of contact; your ladder should be
11 illuminated. Just like your path should be. So I think
12 by having path of travel, if you have a correct ladder
13 setup, that should be lighted too. Sometimes it's just
14 really hard to get there in these old cribs.

15 MS. LAU: Jan.

16 MS. GOULD: Even commercial elevators, only fire
17 service access elevators have to have the hoistway lit up,
18 and that's under a phase 1 condition or an alarm goes off.
19 And that's only 1 foot candle. And that's when an
20 emergency path of travel is needed in stairways and
21 exiting and egressing in a building under an emergency
22 condition. So ...

23 MS. LAU: Scott Cleary.

24 MR. CLEARY: The reason for this is that 1 foot
25 candle is pretty dim. And they have the ability to exit

1 that elevator cab at any point of travel in that hoistway.
2 So we just feel that most of them are meeting it now
3 anyways. And to make sure that it's defined as 5 foot
4 candles like it is for the electricians just makes sense
5 because they can do self-extrication anywhere within that.
6 That's the only reason.

7 MS. LAU: Eldon.

8 MR. NICKENS: Scott, is that -- is that lighting for
9 the ladder documented?

10 MR. CLEARY: No. With the ladder -- by definition,
11 if you got three points of contacts from your cab, you're
12 within that far (gesturing). So anything that illuminates
13 that cab or that path of travel should illuminate that
14 ladder. But there is no definition on what that ladder
15 illumination should be per each one of the rungs.

16 MR. NICKENS: My concern would be the illumination of
17 that ladder and the use of that ladder in a darkened
18 environment. You may have access to that ladder with the
19 cab lighting, but once you remove yourself from that
20 particular area, you're no longer in a lit environment.

21 MR. CLEARY: There is no cab lighting. These are
22 hand pulls. So you're --

23 MR. NICKENS: Oh. I stand corrected.

24 MR. CLEARY: You're on a crate, and you're pulling up
25 with a rope, and there's nothing around you except

1 whatever is illuminating that path of travel. And so it
2 can be pretty dark. There's no lighting requirements
3 inside that -- there's no -- it's hand pull. There's no
4 electric devices.

5 MR. NICKENS: So that would even make it more
6 critical to have that ladder illuminated.

7 MR. CLEARY: And that's why we feel it's more
8 critical to have 5 foot candles.

9 MR. NICKENS: I don't disagree with that. But I'd
10 like to see the lighting location identified.

11 MR. CLEARY: Then that would be a friendly amendment
12 then.

13 MS. LAU: Wayne.

14 MR. MOLESWORTH: Could I just make a quick
15 suggestion. DOSH has a standard for permanently affixed
16 ladders to a structure, and it has a lighting requirement.
17 You might look at that and combine the two so that you've
18 got the standard from DOSH in yours as well.

19 MS. LAU: Scott.

20 MR. CLEARY: And I don't disagree with that. Because
21 remember that these are in grain terminal silos and they'd
22 be very dusty, and not being able to see how slick -- dust
23 are on those rungs. And I agree with that. I didn't know
24 if you wanted to push in that direction. But as a safety
25 issue, that makes sense.

1 MS. LAU: Any other comments?

2 So like right now there is a proposal for a friendly
3 amendment to add the verbiage at the end of number (4).
4 So it would read -- Number (4) "Adequate lighting must be
5 installed and operating in the path of travel." Is that
6 correct, Mike?

7 MR. WILSON: Yes.

8 MS. LAU: Okay. Is there a second on that friendly?

9 MR. CLEMENT: I'll second.

10 MS. LAU: Okay. So all in favor of adding that
11 verbiage on number (4), raise your hands. Fourteen.
12 Kevin?

13 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

14 MS. LAU: Fifteen.

15 All opposed? One.

16 The friendly passed. So we're going to add that to
17 the end on it.

18 Any comments or motion on the original proposal with
19 the friendly? Charles.

20 MR. POTTS: I move to adopt the proposal.

21 MR. RUNYAN: Second.

22 MS. LAU: Okay. So the proposal -- or the motion on
23 the table is to move this forward with the friendly added
24 to it. All in favor, raise your hands. Fourteen.

25 Kevin?

1 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

2 MS. LAU: Fifteen.

3 And all opposed? One.

4 This passed.

5 So that comes to the end of our -- Dotty.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Just a point of clarification.

7 On that last one, we're going to have to review that and
8 make sure it's not in conflict with DOSH. So there is the
9 potential that we may come back to the ESAC with amended
10 language so that everybody's aware of that.

11 MR. CLEARY: And that would be appreciated.

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And I think the same with the
13 one previously that had to do with the location of the
14 disconnect. We'll have to check that and make sure that's
15 not in conflict with the NEC to ensure the safety. Okay?

16

17 Recap and Adjournment

18

19 MS. LAU: Okay. So this part is concluded. Did you
20 want to say anything else?

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I did actually want to discuss
22 a few things.

23 So for those folks that are on the ESAC, we are
24 working on determining a date. I would expect that we
25 would be meeting one day most likely to go through all the

1 proposals. And so we are looking at hopefully doing that
2 prior to the next ESAC meeting, just to let you know that.

3 And we do have some dates for public hearings. So
4 once this goes through the ESAC meeting, we will have --
5 the CR102 will be filed on 7/23. And then public hearings
6 will be held on or after 8/27. There will be three of
7 them. And that will give everyone an opportunity to
8 provide their comments during that period. And written
9 comments will be taken at that time. We will have -- the
10 program will have --

11 MS. CURRY: It will just be the CR103. They don't
12 care about the other stuff.

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, the program will have
14 approximately a week and a half to respond to all the
15 comments from the public hearings. And then the CR103
16 will be filed on 10/22, and the rules will be effective on
17 12/1/19 if all goes according to plan.

18 So that's these changes that we just spoke about.

19 All right. 17.3 is for those of you that are
20 familiar that we have another rulemaking process going at
21 the same time for 17.3 -- A17.3, and the CR102 is being
22 filed today. And the public hearings will be held the
23 week of 5/27 to 5/31 because they have to be on or after
24 5/21. And we have those dates confirmed for 5/30 and
25 5/31. And the CR103 will be filed on 7/23. And those

1 rules concerning ASME A17.3 will become effective on 9/1.

2 So we have a couple of different effective dates just
3 to let you know.

4 I also wanted to make everybody aware that the
5 elevator bill passed. And what that means is the
6 temporary mechanics licenses will be extended for 12
7 months. It is our anticipation that we will treat those
8 just as we do with full mechanics licenses. So if an
9 individual becomes sick or is laid off or whatever reason
10 can't work, they can put their license in abeyance for
11 that period, and it will start -- the clock will start
12 kicking again -- kicking in again when they tell us that
13 they are able to go back to work. And the reason for the
14 12 months is that individuals who apply for temporary
15 mechanic licenses are required to have 75 percent of their
16 continuing education and their experience completed. So
17 during that one year they should be able to complete their
18 remainder of their education and experience. If they
19 don't, well, obviously that's up to them.

20 MR. FRIESEN: When does that go into effect?

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That goes into effect -- when
22 does that go into effect, Alicia? Is that a 90 day?

23 MS. CURRY: I'm sorry, for what?

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: When does that go into effect,
25 the temporary -- the operating -- the temporary mechanics

1 license?

2 MS. CURRY: I thought it was like 30 days after the
3 Governor signs.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Is it 30 days?

5 MS. CURRY: It's 30 or 60.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I'm not sure.

7 MS. CURRY: I think it's either 30 or 60 days after
8 the Governor signs.

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we'll verify that for you.
10 That was one portion of the bill.

11 The second portion of the bill was to allow
12 homeowners to remove stairway stairlifts and wheelchair
13 lifts. This is homeowners only for residential to allow
14 those folks to remove those units themselves or to hire a
15 general contractor -- a licensed general contractor to
16 remove them. It is not -- so it eliminates the need for
17 them to hire a licensed elevator contractor who hires a
18 licensed mechanic.

19 The reason why we did that is because we know that
20 people are doing that anyway. We get the phone calls,
21 "What do I have to do?" We tell them what they have to
22 do. They call an elevator contractor, and the elevator
23 contractor quotes them like \$4- or \$6- or even \$800 an
24 hour. And that's the last we ever hear from the
25 homeowners.

1 So what we're hoping to do is we are hoping that by
2 saying to them you're not going to face a penalty if this
3 happens -- because it is a misdemeanor -- you're not going
4 to face a penalty if this happens, but we want you to
5 report to us that those units have been removed. So
6 that's what our hope is anyway.

7 And lastly is the expansion of the ESAC. And ESAC is
8 Elevator Safety Advisory Committee. And to allow for two
9 more positions on that. Specifically we are hoping to
10 have the City of Spokane be represented at the table for
11 those meetings. And that way all of the authorities
12 having jurisdiction will have a seat at the table when
13 decisions are made. And there will be an extra seat as
14 well. Hopefully that will help us with some of our
15 attendance issues we've been having. And we will have
16 more voices at the table making decisions.

17 So that was excellent news to hear that that passed.

18 I've also been told that the budget for the elevator
19 program's requests were passed. And that budget includes
20 money for the development of a new computer program system
21 for elevators. Our current system has been patched by so
22 many different people and has so many different computer
23 languages involved, that it is pretty well obsolete. And
24 hopefully what I've heard is true. And we did get the
25 budget; we did get the monies.

1 And what that means to folks is once that's
2 developed, you should be able to pay for your permits
3 on-line instead of sending in a check or bringing it into
4 a local office. You should be able to pay for that
5 on-line. You should be able to file your permit
6 application and your plans right on-line. And you'll
7 input the information that is associated with the
8 conveyances that you're installing. And hopefully that
9 will mean that we'll have less errors in our system as far
10 as the data that we have. Because the way it works now is
11 the check goes either to a front counter or service
12 location or it goes down to the mail room. When the data
13 gets input, it may get input wrong because people aren't
14 familiar with the terminology that we use. So I have
15 great expectations for the new system that we will be
16 developing, and I'm very excited about it.

17 Lastly but not least, I would like to specifically
18 thank Candace for chairing this meeting. I think she did
19 an excellent job.

20 (Clapping.)

21 And I would like to thank all of you for taking time
22 out of your busy schedules and being here and helping us
23 clean up our WAC rules once again.

24 And I don't want anybody to feel that this is the
25 last go-around as far as rules and code-making goes.

1 Because -- or adoption of the code process because the
2 2019 code is next on our list to review and bring a group
3 together and hopefully adopt.

4 So with that said, thank you again everybody.

5 Does anyone have anything to add? Rob.

6 MR. McNEILL: One question. When do you -- I know
7 you said yesterday, and I didn't write it down. When do
8 you think that the review of the 2019 code will start?

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Probably later -- probably --
10 now, maybe Kevin or Rob, you can answer this, or even
11 Ricky.

12 Has that been published yet?

13 MR. HENDERSON: I'm not sure. I know there's been --
14 it's finalized, but I don't know if it's actually
15 available to the public yet.

16 MS. GOULD: I don't think so, Dotty. It's really
17 close.

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay. So typically it's -- we
19 would look to be adopting that six months after it's
20 published.

21 So whenever it's published, I would think we'll start
22 those discussions later this year. And -- poor Alicia is
23 looking like "not again." But I would think we'll start
24 having those discussions later this year. But it should
25 be I would hope a fairly smooth process because we're not

1 going to be trying to catch up for six years as we did
2 last time and clean our WAC rules up.

3 Any other questions?

4 MR. RUNYAN: I would like to make some comments.

5 I volunteered for this kind of finding out what this
6 was all about and hopefully help my situation. I really
7 like the comments and the additions and how this was run.
8 I congratulate you on doing that.

9 There are several things that looking from the
10 outside looking in on handicapped chairlifts. Maybe we
11 need to install a counter. Rather than go for a five-year
12 weight check -- I'm not sure what drives a five-year
13 weight check. Why put 300 pounds on a chairlift at five
14 years? I'm not sure what that proves, except it's broke.
15 I'm not sure in elevators what happens if you go into a
16 elevator building and you got four elevators, and they
17 pull a weight check on the first one and it breaks, now
18 what are you going to do with the other three? That would
19 be my concern.

20 I think that you need to go and push the OEI
21 certification for the state.

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: OEI.

23 MR. RUNYAN: I'm not sure what the insurance
24 companies would look at if you don't have them OEI
25 certified.

1 I don't think temporary licenses. I've done lots of
2 things in the military where we've tried to do something
3 on a temporary basis, and we usually ended up with
4 injuries of individuals.

5 And I think we need to look at chairlift removal.
6 Disconnect the electric, now you've got a -- you just got
7 a dead machine. And I don't think in a commercial
8 situation such as I that I should be requested to have a
9 licensed mechanic come in and remove it.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Thank you for those comments.
11 Anything else?

12 MS. LAU: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

13 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to adjourn this
14 meeting.

15 MR. MESSINA: Second.

16 MS. LAU: Okay this meeting is adjourned.

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Thank you, everyone.

18 (Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m.,
19 proceedings adjourned.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
) ss.
County of Pierce)

I, the undersigned, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify:

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand on this 30th day of April , 2019, at Tacoma, Washington.

H. Milton Vance, CCR, CSR
Excel Court Reporting

(CCR License #2219)