

1 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

2 STATE OF WASHINGTON

3
4
5
6 ELEVATOR SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

7
8 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

9
10 Tuesday, February 17, 2015

11
12
13 BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Safety Advisory
14 Committee Meeting was held at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday,
15 February 17, 2015, at the Department of Labor &
Industries, 12806 Gateway Drive South, Tukwila,
Washington.

16 Committee members present were: Keith Becker, Swen
17 Larson, Robert McNeill, Skip Buntin, and David Gault. The
18 Department of Labor & Industries was represented by Jack
Day, Chief Elevator Inspector; and Becky Ernstes, Elevator
Technical Specialist.

19 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were held, to
20 wit:

21
22 Reported by:
H. Milton Vance, CCR, CSR
(License #2219)

23
24 EXCEL COURT REPORTING
16022-17th Avenue Court East
Tacoma, WA 98445-3310
25 (253) 536-5824

I N D E X

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

February 17, 2015 - Tukwila

Page No.

Introductions/Purpose	3
Chief's Report	4
Old Business	20
New Business	--

PROCEEDINGS

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

Introductions/Purpose

MR. BECKER: We need to get your attention. We need to get started with our meeting this morning.

We are the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee.

MR. DAY: Please take your seats. The meeting's about to start.

MR. BECKER: If you were here last time, I had a tough time trying to keep things going. So I'll see if I can do a little better job on this.

Introductions. I am Keith Becker. I represent owner-employed mechanics exempt from licensing.

And we'll start down here at the front.

MR. LARSON: Swen Larson. I represent the IEC licensed mechanics.

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

MR. DAY: Jack Day, Chief Elevator Inspector. I represent the Secretary position.

MR. BUNTIN: Skip Buntin, Chief Elevator Inspector for Seattle, representing the AHJ's.

MR. GAULT: David Gault, Fairmont Olympic Hotel, representing ownerships.

1 MR. BECKER: The minutes from the last meeting, are
2 there any comments? Can we approve those as published?

3 MR. McNEILL: So moved.

4 MR. DAY: I second.

5 MR. BECKER: All in favor?

6 THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

7 MR. BECKER: Approved.

8

9 Chief's Report

10

11 MR. BECKER: Moving on to the Chief's report.

12 MR. DAY: Chief's Report. Everybody, turn to page
13 number 5.

14 Page number 5, we'll be going through the inspection
15 scorecard at the top of the list on the statewide. You
16 can see down the columns, though, unit 1 and unit 2, unit
17 1 being King County and north, unit 2 being the rest of
18 the state. But as I said, we'll focus on statewide.

19 Statewide, the first quarter, we were able to achieve
20 46 percent of our annual inspections for that quarter.

21 Second quarter, 34, a downturn of more than ten
22 percent.

23 And so far January's numbers represent 26 percent.

24 What these numbers represent is the total of annual
25 inspections that were performed within that time period.

1 If you look at the notes below, I won't bore you with
2 reading them. But the notes below somewhat explain what's
3 going on.

4 Is there any questions in regards to our annual
5 inspections or our scorecard?

6 UNIDENTIFIED: Is that a percentage of what was
7 scheduled for each month, or is that for year?

8 MR. DAY: It is a percent of what is scheduled in
9 that month, what is scheduled to be performed, what is due
10 to be done.

11 UNIDENTIFIED: Wow.

12 MR. DAY: That's what that is.

13 Currently the agency has 27 FTE positions. And we
14 have 25 of them filled, about to go to 24. So we're up.

15 I don't want to make a plug for FTE's, but if anybody
16 knows of any, please have them give me a call. FTE's,
17 field technical employees.

18 If you turn the page, these are our accident counts.
19 And there was a couple of questions last time. One of the
20 questions was: Does this include City of Seattle and City
21 of Spokane? And the answer is: It does.

22 And the other one which was: Are these based on a
23 fiscal year? The first quarter starts in July. So the
24 answer to that question is: Yes, July first quarter. And
25 so on and so forth.

1 You can see the dominant thing in there which is the
2 escalators. And throughout the years it's always remained
3 the dominant thing. Escalators no fault, by the way. A
4 lot of this is rider error.

5 Any questions on accidents?

6 Keith, back to you.

7 MR. BECKER: Next on the agenda, a checklist for plan
8 review with Becky.

9 MS. ERNSTES: As of January last year we had new
10 requirements that were to be put on plan review. So we've
11 gone a whole year, and we're still missing items. I
12 continually send plans back for missing items.

13 So I developed an electric elevator checklist, a
14 hydraulic and a roped hydraulic for your use for your plan
15 people to check that these items are on the -- right now
16 we're going to try this as this is for your use to make
17 sure everything's on there. But if we continue to return
18 plans for missing items, we're going to require this be
19 sent in with every plan so that we know somebody looked at
20 them. I mean, we've been struggling with this, and it's
21 caused a lot of headaches. So we're going to try this
22 for your use. If it doesn't work, it will come with every
23 set of plans they come in that somebody has reviewed your
24 plans and made sure that these items are on there.

25 MR. DAY: Becky, can you take a few moments and just

1 go through these please. Just go through the electric
2 layout.

3 MS. ERNSTES: Okay. So basically the first one is
4 about machine room, identifying machine room disconnects.

5 I get plans that show disconnects clear across the
6 room. The WAC code says it's got to be within 24 inches
7 of the door. Location of the drive machine and motor
8 controller, outlets, light switches, and the swing of the
9 door. You don't necessarily have to put too exact where
10 the outlet's going to be or where the light's going to be,
11 but you have to put it on there so that it's on the plan
12 so that the electricians reviewing these plans also need
13 to know. We need a GFI outlet and we need a light switch
14 by the door.

15 Hoistway plans, one of the problems we have is all
16 the dimensions and clearances. So we need -- especially
17 showing cab dimensions, dimensions for overhead. We have
18 handrails on top of cars now, and I don't know that we
19 have the proper clearances because some of these plans
20 don't really show proper clearances or the proper height
21 from the horizontal plane of the car top to the motors in
22 the overhead. We have a 6'5 dimension as a maximum for
23 that. So I need to know what the car level and -- just
24 need more dimensions on there.

25 And we mention some top of car clearances and the

1 height from the horizontal plane to the car top.

2 Pit ladder details, that's one that gets wrong a lot.

3 The code kept switching back and forth, do we need

4 continuous rungs or we don't. So I see plans with no

5 continuous rungs, which is allowed, but the code still

6 requires a grab bar at the top of the ladder. You can't

7 use the sides. So the plans need to show grab bars.

8 The height of the ladder, the width of the ladder and

9 the -- from the wall.

10 And since we've had so much trouble with the pit stop

11 switches and pit lights being at wrong heights, you need

12 to show them where they are and the dimensions and where

13 they're located.

14 Location of rail brackets, machine beams, loads and

15 reactions. And one of the things that we haven't seen a

16 lot is seismic because a lot of these are generic plans.

17 So you need to indicate you have a seismic switch and this

18 is a seismic built.

19 And the other thing is I see lots of plans that

20 nobody has the name of what model number this is. If it's

21 a Synergy, blah, blah, blah, then we need that on there.

22 We need the model number of the elevator. Because people

23 change models and change plans without letting us know.

24 So we have a list of approved models, and we need to have

25 that on the plans.

1 Other things is, you know, power requirements.
2 There's a whole laundry list that is pretty typical of the
3 things we're seeing. I don't need to go through every
4 one. But these days we are required to finish floor. So
5 that needs to be on there. That's one thing that gets
6 missed a lot.

7 Who's your manufacturer of your equipment? We need
8 to know that.

9 MR. DAY: Thank you, Becky.

10 Ladies and gentlemen, I really want to encourage you
11 all to use -- whoever submits your drawings, whoever's
12 doing that for your company, they really need to start
13 utilizing this.

14 What's really become quite obvious is how many
15 drawings we send back. And when we send a drawing back,
16 that means we have to plan review again as well. Not only
17 do you, but so do we.

18 And we thought of this tool several months ago as a
19 way we're first going to use it to send the information
20 back to you. We'll check the box. We'll send it back.
21 Here's what's missing. But in turn, we would encourage
22 you to also use this same checklist. It's available on
23 our Web site, and it'll help your plans get through the
24 first time rather than the second or the third time.
25 There's quite a high degree of return of plans. And this

1 day and age, as busy as we're getting, if we can get this
2 done the first time, it's helpful for everybody. So
3 please, those of you that are doing electric or hydraulic,
4 take a look at these. Have your folks utilize them in
5 their review process.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. GAULT: Jack, this is for new construction and
8 existing, just for clarity, that it's not just for new
9 construction.

10 MR. DAY: Generally we see these drawings mostly
11 always on new construction. Always on new construction.
12 On major alterations, that's where we see these drawings
13 again. So major alterations where you're submitting
14 drawings and always, always, always new.

15 MR. BECKER: On major alterations, we're just dealing
16 with the area of the alteration? You're not looking for a
17 full schematic of the whole lift?

18 MR. DAY: Well, there's a defining term between major
19 and minor alterations, right?

20 A major alteration, you change a machine controller,
21 things like that. And usually when you're doing such an
22 activity, it involves the rest of the conveyance in some
23 degree. It usually comes into play.

24 So when it gets to that major involving most of the
25 rest of the conveyance, that's when we need it.

1 But if you can imagine, you're changing the machine
2 in the controller, and the disconnect needs to be reviewed
3 again by the electrical department. It probably needs to
4 be moved. Moved to where? The last thing any of us want
5 including your owner is somebody putting the disconnect in
6 the wrong place on a alteration.

7 So hopefully, that helps explain the difference when
8 we see plans come in for a major alteration. Try to make
9 sure the machine's where it's supposed to be rather than
10 have to move it after you spent a lot of time and energy
11 putting it in the wrong place.

12 Becky, do you have anything to add to alterations?

13 MS. ERNSTES: Well, we haven't had a very good
14 process for doing plan review or requesting plans on
15 alterations. And Mike and I are going to work on what we
16 need and when we need it because for a lot of the minor
17 alterations or if you're doing a tank, if you're not
18 moving it, we haven't requested any plans. If you're
19 moving equipment in the machine room, even a hydraulic, we
20 want a new plan review. And we're going to work on what
21 we need for traction elevators. Because some people send
22 plans, some people don't, and I have to request them. So
23 it depends on -- we're going to work on more criteria for
24 that.

25 MR. BECKER: Any questions?

1 The next item, we've got residential incline update.

2 MR. DAY: Turn to page 15. Yes, 15.

3 MS. ERNSTES: A lot of pages today.

4 This is a quick update. I keep a full spreadsheet,
5 and this is just a kind of analysis.

6 We have four -- three people that have filed appeals.
7 We have been through one full hearing with appeals and are
8 still waiting on the judge's orders.

9 One out of this group is willing to negotiate with
10 us. Three of these people on the left-hand side, two of
11 them never responded to the hearing. And the other people
12 are working on getting their permit. So they've basically
13 abated their hearing.

14 So we have some in voluntary red tag. We have some
15 that turned into material transporting persons material
16 lifts. We have two people who we have no contact with,
17 can't get ahold of them, left notices. We have a few
18 other people who are now under contract. And then we have
19 some people who were going to have a sit-down meeting with
20 attorneys to deal with people who just ignore us.

21 And as you can see at the bottom, we have 18 people
22 that have now had their Rehmke's. Or in the case of a
23 couple of these, they were drop hooks or they were
24 noncompliant. But most of this batch was Rehmke's or drop
25 hooks. We have 18 and 19 including Mr. McLaughlin who

1 have replaced theirs. So we've got quite a bit of
2 compliance, and we're continuing to work on the
3 noncompliant ones, whether they're in appeal or we're
4 going to take further actions for the people who ignore
5 us.

6 MR. DAY: Any questions?

7 Okay. Thanks, Becky.

8 MR. BECKER: Maintenance and testing. Jack.

9 MR. DAY: Maintenance and testing. As with last
10 November -- so this is really a continuation of our
11 concern, Skip and I's concern since last November's
12 advisory meeting.

13 We continue to see that maintenance is not taking
14 place. What we also see is safety tests when they are
15 performed, they're performed after we come into the
16 building and knock on the door. And our concern is quite
17 high.

18 We do -- Skip and I both believe the safety test is
19 the last line. That's the last line to know if a
20 conveyance is actually assured to be safe. Without the
21 safety test, we do have a significant risk out there of
22 incidences and accidents.

23 We've seen evidence of the lack of maintenance
24 causing accidents. And now triple this with no safety
25 test and a continuation of this fact.

1 The Department is very interested in comments from
2 the industry, so we will take comments from the industry
3 later on today -- this will be at 1:00 today -- in regards
4 to a plan. If the industry has a plan, what's the plan?

5 Skip, do you have any --

6 MR. BUNTIN: Just to add a few things to that.

7 We went on one job, and the annual test was overdue.
8 And the owner called the company up. And the response
9 from the superintendent of maintenance was, "Well, we
10 don't do the test until they write it up." And I hope
11 that we don't all follow that same standard. But that was
12 the superintendent's response to the owner. And the owner
13 wasn't very impressed with that response and neither were
14 we.

15 I would just encourage you to let your
16 superintendents know that even if you are behind, probably
17 the proper response is, "We overlooked it. Sorry. We're
18 going to get right on it." And it would have been more
19 appropriate probably.

20 But if that -- I'm sure that's not overwhelming with
21 all the companies. But I would just caution that, that
22 you instill a different attitude in the superintendents
23 that are working for you.

24 As well, the other issue that we've run into which is
25 a little disconcerting is we've tested fire service in

1 several cases where phase one elevators didn't respond to
2 the proper floors. And it was because either a processor
3 board was changed out or a new software program was put
4 in. And I think neither Jack or myself want to require
5 permits every time a software change is due. So I would
6 encourage all of you to talk with the folks that are
7 responsible for that kind of thing and get a procedure in
8 place to test once a processor board or software change is
9 made. Because I know I don't have the folks to go out and
10 test each time you guys change software in your units, nor
11 do I want to have to do that.

12 So just kind of police yourselves on that. We've
13 seen it on three different occasions now in our annual
14 testing.

15 I don't know if Jack has experienced that as well.

16 MR. DAY: (Nodding affirmatively.)

17 MR. BUNTIN: But it does concern us, and we'd like to
18 kind of get a handle on that.

19 MR. DAY: So I'll follow up with Skip. Software,
20 safety tests, all these things are outlined in what we
21 commonly call the maintenance control program. It's in
22 there. It's in there what you're supposed to do and when.

23 The importance -- I see several managers in the
24 audience. The importance of it is that you instill within
25 your folks to properly review. If you update software and

1 it affects the operational control, there needs a series
2 of events through the maintenance control procedures that
3 they check. These are common to us and common to you
4 guys. On the examination, does the thing still work the
5 way it's supposed to work?

6 And that really gets into the crux of the matter.
7 The crux of the matter is roles and responsibility.

8 Now, one of the places that we always tend to go is
9 the owner. Always, always, always it's after the owner.
10 And we have an owner sitting right to my left. However,
11 the elevator companies themselves have a role and
12 responsibility. You're not immune from it. You have a
13 higher charge. And what we're wanting to glean is that
14 the elevator companies actually take charge of this, take
15 charge of their own role and responsibility to have a
16 license in the state of Washington. These things are a
17 requirement.

18 If you change software, you should have your
19 employees doing a check of the software that was changed
20 to make sure it's still working correctly.

21 When your employees are there and notice the safety
22 test is past due, there's something that should be an
23 inherent charge that you do.

24 And what's -- I think for Skip and I, what's getting
25 disconcerting is that we're having to take this to such a

1 level in order to get this accomplished.

2 And I don't mean this to be a preaching session.

3 What we're asking is that role and responsibility to
4 come alive within your own companies. That's what we're
5 asking.

6 Any questions on that?

7 I do have at least one other item that I'd like to
8 address.

9 Right now we're working on creating a technical
10 bulletin. And what the technical bulletin is about -- and
11 we hope to have it done in a week or so. But things move
12 slow. But I did want to take this opportunity to talk to
13 people in the audience about it.

14 What we have is underrated shut-off valves. We're
15 starting to find underrated shut-off valves. Some of your
16 folks are finding it because it's in your MCP. Now, some
17 of the others may or may not be finding it. I don't know
18 if it's in your MCP, but it should be. It is a code
19 requirement that the shut-off valve be properly rated.

20 Anyway, what we're finding is underrated shut-off
21 valves. We're finding valves that are rated for 200 PSI
22 with a pressure relief above 400 PSI. So that's a
23 significant problem not only for your own workers' safety,
24 but also for the public's safety. Okay?

25 So I want to take this opportunity to kind of give

1 those that are in the room a little bit of a heads up and
2 also to let you know pretty soon we'll send out a
3 technical bulletin for this.

4 What we do expect elevator companies to do is to --
5 in the time between you recognize it and the time when it
6 actually gets fixed is come up with a method that reduces
7 the chances of an accident with it, something to mitigate
8 the circumstance. We ask that you do this in order to
9 lessen the possibilities of one of these valves coming
10 apart.

11 In the meantime, when the owner is coming up with the
12 monies or whatever they need to do in order to actually
13 fix this, that there's a short-term solution in place. So
14 we don't have to go in and just shut the escalator --
15 excuse me -- elevator off. Okay?

16 We also in roles and responsibilities -- I'll get
17 right back to that -- when you can't mitigate the
18 circumstance and when the owner refuses to mitigate it,
19 then it's time to get us involved with it.

20 This was formerly known as the tattletale law, but
21 there's a law out there, and you all are supposed to tell
22 us.

23 If you cannot get any farther, then we need to know
24 so that we can help fix this problem.

25 But again, we'll have a technical going out. Those

1 of you that have -- those of you that are involved with
2 the MCP, be sure that's part of your MCP for your
3 maintenance staff and your safety test staff to review so
4 when they're faced with that, they recognize they have a
5 potential dangerous situation on their hands. Okay?

6 Any questions in regards to that?

7 MR. LARSON: Have there been any failures --
8 catastrophic failures that you're aware of yet?

9 MR. DAY: Not in the state of Washington.

10 MR. LARSON: Okay.

11 MR. DAY: You may recall, there was a valve about
12 four years ago going across the country, and it was like a
13 gate valve where the -- it had a nut on the bottom. So a
14 lot of folks referred to it just as that valve. And it's
15 not just that valve; it's the situation itself. It's an
16 underrated shut-off valve.

17 So specifically about all those valves, no, I don't
18 know. But we do know there's been accidents across the
19 country regarding shut-off valves and their rating.

20 We just want to head this off before Washington gets
21 added to the list.

22 Was there another question?

23 MR. BECKER: Any other questions?

24 MR. DAY: You guys all know how to figure out if you
25 got a -- ask your engineers, whoever writes your

1 procedures for your company, how to figure that out.

2 That's the best way to do that. Okay?

3 You'll see more. We'll send a bulletin out.

4

5 Old Business

6

7 MR. BECKER: Okay. We'll move on to old business.

8 And the first item on there is means of access, and it

9 is ... it's the first proposal in the packet.

10 MR. GAULT: 17.

11 MR. BECKER: I heard 17. Yes, page 17.

12 The purpose of this proposal is to develop safe
13 machine room, machine space access requirements for
14 existing elevators in existing buildings or structures for
15 maintenance, repair and inspection. Provide instruction
16 and guidelines for proper installation, repair and
17 maintenance of access. Access should be considered fixed,
18 permanent, non-combustible, and to determine whether there
19 was any access that this was addressed already in existing
20 WAC's.

21 Now, this proposal if it actually, in fact, will
22 address all existing conveyances. In some cases there's
23 some unsafe accesses there. It's old. It's structurally
24 unsafe. And we're trying to figure out a way to address
25 it.

1 This proposal is pretty wordy. But it's meant to
2 provide direction and not leave a lot of windows for
3 variances and different things to have acceptable access.

4 Now, this particular one, the last time we met -- and
5 I'm not good enough on this to have the changes that I
6 made on the document. But at number 5 on this proposal I
7 was asked to check with the industry to see -- check on
8 fiscal impacts. I sent out e-mails to -- that's over a
9 couple of times over the last year. There's been no
10 response as to impact.

11 Our feeling is the impact is in most cases going to
12 be less than \$1,000 to the owners on a conveyance. In
13 some cases where there has to be large changes, of course,
14 it's going to be a larger impact.

15 That last e-mail was sent out on the 19th of January.
16 And like I say, there was no response.

17 On item 7, there was a change and there was reference
18 to belt manlifts, and that was taken out completely any
19 reference to belt manlifts. That probably would be for
20 another day. That's number 7 -- item number 7. That's on
21 the bottom of the first page. So that one was removed.

22 So the -- if revised or repealed, the proposal would
23 affect -- so the wording should be for electric manlifts,
24 we would put wording in this part of the code for
25 hand-pull manlifts.

1 On top of page 18, it would go -- it would be a new
2 WAC 14000 for electric elevators. There would be -- the
3 wording would be revised in 23121.

4 Moving down, the other change on the bottom of -- oh,
5 excuse me, am I on the right page? The bottom of the
6 second page, page 18, is on number 11 there's proposed
7 language added. The proposed language originally just
8 said: Proposed language (see below) has been formed from
9 modified language from ASME A17.1-2010 Section 2.7 and
10 2.10 to fit the needs of this proposal.

11 So we went into the ASME code in those sections and
12 cleaned that out. That was for new installations. We had
13 to deal with existing equipment. And so that's where the
14 language comes from. And as you go below, you can see
15 where the portions of the sections that we pulled out that
16 we're going to use.

17 And again, it's wordy, but it gives direction if
18 changes need to be made in the code. If you get in the
19 ASME code, you got a bunch of hyperlinks, and as you open
20 them up, these things all show up. And then -- and I
21 don't know if we can pare this thing down if it actually
22 goes into the code.

23 On the bottom of page 20 there's a Note #1. It just
24 emphasizes. It's not a change in what's been in this
25 proposal. It's any like-for-like repairs will be allowed

1 to combustible ladders, stairs or platforms. If
2 replacement is required due to inadequate structural
3 integrity, then all of 2.7.3.3 will be followed in its
4 entirety.

5 So if we can -- if we've got wood ladders, and it's
6 just a broken rung, we fix it. If it's a step and it's
7 got a broken tread, we can fix it. Or a rail. If the
8 rail -- if the side rails on the stairs are completely
9 broke, it's got to be taken out and replaced. Then that
10 portion of the code's got to be followed. So we would
11 have a non-combustible stairway, a platform and such that
12 has to be -- it's not supporting itself, is not safely
13 supporting. It needs then -- it's got to be replaced with
14 -- just like it says in here. And it essentially is not
15 any -- it's not anything different than on new platforms
16 that we've all been installing for years. Toe boards,
17 hand railings, spacing, size. It's not anything crazy.
18 So that is in there for like for like. We're going to --
19 it would be permitted.

20 On the top of the last page, again, there's Note #2.
21 These sections would not be required to be followed unless
22 -- this is concerning -- regarding the access doors. And
23 unless the doors -- the existing doors have to be
24 replaced, then the following steps would have to be
25 followed until that point.

1 So if what's there is structurally sound, doesn't
2 have any issues, there's no reason to change it. If it
3 has to be changed, then we follow the new code.

4 So that's where I'm at with this proposal.

5 I think we've addressed -- you don't see huge
6 impacts, financial impacts unless there's something that's
7 existing out there that is damaged, wore out, broken.
8 Then it's got to be brought up to code.

9 So that's -- so I'm not sure if there's any
10 questions.

11 MR. DAY: So the idea behind this is -- as far as the
12 cost -- and we get back to number 5 -- that if there is a
13 condition and it needs to be repaired, repairing it right
14 instead of repairing it to the way it was when the way it
15 was was not correct or not to the code that we adopt, that
16 it isn't going to cost a ton more money to repair it the
17 right way. Is that the gist --

18 MR. BECKER: That is the feeling of -- I got no
19 response back from the industry as to -- you know. And
20 like I say, I open an e-mail that's five or six pages
21 long, if you can't get it on a napkin, I don't read it.
22 So it's -- I don't know whether it's -- it's a fact
23 there's no -- there is no feeling -- or the feeling is
24 that there's a low impact or that we just haven't gotten
25 response that we need from the industry.

1 But changing these things -- the grain industry, it's
2 fairly -- it looks to be fairly low impact in most cases.
3 Occasionally we're going to run into something that's odd,
4 and there's -- it's going to have to be a little more
5 significantly addressed.

6 The elevator industry, I haven't gotten a response
7 back. And so I have to assume that we're -- nobody has
8 concerns of the impact or -- what I don't want to see is
9 see a proposal go through and fly all the way through the
10 whole process, become a law, and then all of a sudden we
11 go, "Whoa, what's this?" So that's -- but at this point
12 there was a feeling for -- that there was inadequate
13 access to machine space and machine rooms in some areas
14 for maintenance repairs, inspections, and there needs to
15 be a way to address it.

16 And we have not found adequate wording in existing
17 code.

18 MR. DAY: No comments?

19 MR. BECKER: So for --

20 MR. DAY: So what do you want us to do with it?

21 MR. BECKER: Well, I would like to refine it to or
22 get direction from the committee as to where it needs to
23 go to, you know -- I understand that the process is slow
24 for it to become code, but I'd like to move forward to
25 polishing it up.

1 MR. DAY: So would you like it to become part of the
2 review WAC? Let's put it into the review WAC on the
3 Department's Web page as the first proposal to meet it?

4 MR. BECKER: I would. I think at this point we're
5 ready to move that forward.

6 MR. DAY: I'd really like to know as we -- we're
7 going to put it there. But what I'd really like to know
8 is what the financial impact, if any, would be. So --

9 MR. McNEILL: Jack, could you put a note on that WAC
10 page asking for comments on cost?

11 MR. DAY: Probably an asterisk right beside number 5
12 with a note.

13 MR. McNEILL: So when people see it on the Web site,
14 they'll be more apt to communicate what they believe the
15 costs are going to be to them.

16 MR. BECKER: And we had a couple of comments -- a
17 question?

18 MR. WHEELER: Keith, you a couple times referred to
19 this industry needing some input. And I know Jack was
20 concerned about the cost there. What I think we need to
21 clarify is that I don't know that the elevator industry is
22 something that is going to be able to provide cost impact
23 on stair replacements and so forth. I think that when you
24 say industry, we may need to go out to the general
25 contractor community if you're looking for stakeholder

1 input on pricing. It really is outside the scope of what
2 I know the elevator industry to be a part of.

3 MR. MARTIN: By "industry" you meant grain growers,
4 didn't you? Or --

5 MR. BECKER: This is statewide, all conveyances, all
6 existing passenger elevators and the grain industry. This
7 is not a grain industry issue. It's not addressing
8 escalators. It's not addressing the residential lifts.
9 It's all conveyances. So we're looking at material lifts.
10 We're looking at passenger lifts.

11 MR. MARTIN: So I think the focus industry needs to
12 probably be defined as building owner or property owner.

13 MR. BECKER: That's the issue that I've got, not
14 getting a response, then I can -- we can address that way.
15 Maybe that -- because this would be -- we're looking --
16 you know, at this point, it's not -- I don't have wording
17 in material lifts. I have wording for existing passenger
18 elevators. So if it needs to be worded different to
19 address the industries, but we're looking for direction if
20 we've got what is unsafe access to machine spaces that --
21 and that can be anywhere in the -- like I say, in all
22 conveyances that it gets addressed. And in some cases an
23 inspector going out on a roof and upstairs to the window
24 and over the top of the equipment to access it, you know.
25 If it's all handrails and properly -- you know, I think we

1 get that there can be a challenge in accessing some of
2 these areas. But there should be no reason that there's
3 not adequate stairways or ladders or platforms or however
4 we're going to access it. It should be safe.

5 MR. GAULT: Jack, do you have a comparable peer in
6 this state that is involved in the building sections that
7 is the state building code that may reach out through
8 those conduits to get industry feedback? Because I think
9 you're trying to -- everyone -- as Phil pointed out, this
10 is more than an elevator; this is a building issue. And
11 so I'm wondering whether that should be vented out through
12 the building funnel to reach the industry that you're
13 looking for to get comment on on your safe access for
14 elevator.

15 MR. DAY: I'll try that. That's a good idea. I'll
16 try that.

17 MR. BECKER: Becky, do you have a question?

18 MS. ERNSTES: When we're trying to make safe access,
19 today's code is different than the codes that were in
20 effect a long time ago. And in a real-world situation, an
21 inspector came to me last week, and they showed me a
22 picture of a very tall ladder, probably 18 feet in the
23 air, high incline. It had handrails that were 32 inches
24 high on one side of the ladder. And when they got to the
25 top, they actually had to open the door, step back down on

1 the stairs to get the door to swing open. And because
2 that handrail was really short and the ladder was really
3 steep, coming back down that ladder was a hazard. Because
4 this -- you know.

5 So are we trying to address those things? And if we
6 are, do we have a minimum because I don't see a minimum in
7 here for that kind of situation.

8 Because the code today says that you have to have a
9 platform at the top of that that's big enough to open the
10 door and have space to stand which they dictate. I think
11 it's 24 by 24. And you have to have enough room to stand
12 to open the doors instead of stepping back down onto a
13 step.

14 And this person -- we both agree that in the current
15 code that's today, there is no language that addresses how
16 they should fix that. And I don't really see much of that
17 in here either of addressing unsafe conditions and what
18 that constitutes.

19 I mean, is it okay to still climb up 15 feet on a
20 wooden ladder through a hatch hole that you have to stand
21 and take two hands to move the hatch out of the way?
22 Because there -- I see a lot of unsafe things out there
23 that we don't address as unsafe.

24 So is that trying to address this? And if it is, how
25 do we really get there? Do we make them bring them up to

1 what the current says? And are we going to still allow
2 these straight-up ladders that are "X" height? Because
3 some of them are higher than DOSH would allow you today
4 without a stepoff and a rest area. And then when you get
5 there, you're still like -- you don't have three points of
6 contact. You can't move that hatch out of the way. I
7 still see those kind of things out there as unsafe. Are
8 we addressing those issues?

9 MR. BECKER: This one did not address those issues at
10 this point. I mean, I think we can look at the language
11 if -- you know, that obviously would be much more of an
12 owner impact. And if those -- you know, there's a lot of
13 things you can work with. You know, if it's a fixed
14 ladder, vertical ladder, we can go 24, 25 feet without a
15 cage or a platform. You know, we can go that way. We're
16 supposed to maintain three points of contact all the time.
17 There's some interesting design accesses that -- and those
18 are things I without industry -- in fact, we haven't run
19 into those issues. I don't know whether the City of
20 Seattle or City of Spokane, I don't know how they're
21 impacted or if they see that quite often or not. I mean,
22 those didn't come up. And so we -- they're not in the
23 proposal at this point in time. And if that's something
24 -- you know, if that would make sense to be addressed here
25 if -- but --

1 MR. DAY: Let's take a poll from the audience outside
2 the grain industry of how many ...

3 MR. BECKER: So how many people in here have places
4 they see or can think of that would become issues of these
5 type of --

6 (Some audience members raising hands.)

7 So 25 percent.

8 And those would be -- so an issue like that, is it
9 correctable? Is it that way because there just wasn't an
10 obvious alternative? What do we see?

11 MR. WANGERSKY: Anytime you have a large building
12 which doesn't have a parapet or railing and has rooftop
13 access to the machine room as described in 2.7.3.2.2,
14 you're going to have a significant cost of either putting
15 up railing or putting in a walkway with railing. And I
16 think you could see costs over \$50,000 for liabilities
17 because of that.

18 That being said, our buildings, we won't see that
19 because we recently upgraded our roofs to meet the minimum
20 requirements for travel rest and fall rest. So we don't
21 have that issue anymore. But three months ago we would
22 have.

23 So I think you'll see a lot of owners with a lot of
24 trouble with that particular paragraph.

25 MR. BECKER: So the existing access is unsafe and

1 acceptable?

2 MR. WANGERSKY: It's what's out there. It's what
3 you're going to see. You're going to see a lot of large
4 buildings with substantial roof areas, the edge of the
5 roof is 50, 60 feet away, and guess what, it has no
6 railing and no paramount. You'd really have to run a long
7 way to fall off that building on the way between the
8 stairwell and machinery.

9 MR. BECKER: Well, and I wouldn't want to -- I don't
10 think I would want to see -- 60 feet, you know, or a large
11 distance of that putting railings on the rooftop side.

12 MR. WANGERSKY: But that's exactly what we've done.

13 MR. BECKER: Jerre.

14 MR. WHITED: Our people in the grain industry, we
15 want things fixed so they're safe. What we don't want is
16 we go fix it, and then the State comes along and says,
17 "Well, you got to do it a different way now." So we want
18 to get it right right off the bat, and that's why we
19 started pushing this to get the code changed so that we
20 can have something to go by so we know it's right the
21 first time.

22 MR. DAY: That's -- Jerre, that's the difference
23 between having it fixed right away, or as this is put
24 together, when it needs to be -- when it's in such a
25 condition that it now needs to be replaced, now replace it

1 with the right thing or with -- as defined thing.

2 So the question on the table is: The hazardous
3 situations right now, what to do about them?

4 And Keith, you have any ideas on your proposal with
5 hazardous situations as it exists today where the
6 inspector would go out tomorrow and find it, or the
7 elevator employees go out and run across it, is there
8 something that can be put in place?

9 As a minimum, there must be these things. And I'm
10 thinking that an asterisk beside each one as a minimum it
11 must have. The whole thing when you replace it. But as a
12 minimum, it must have. There is a minimum. It would be
13 nice if we would lay it out in our WAC 296-96. It would
14 be easier for our population out there that's dealing with
15 the situation. But there is a minimum already. And that
16 minimum is in the DOSH regulatory environment. And that's
17 what could come in, and they could come in and take a
18 look, and they can have it fixed for us.

19 So what we would like to do is have something to
20 encourage an owner to do it. But we can't sit back if we
21 know of a situation and not involve somebody at a
22 different level to go in and take care of that straight up
23 the ladder where you don't have a platform to stand on and
24 you're not wearing fall hazard.

25 MR. HENDERSON: Just to make sure that I'm

1 understanding where we're going from here and where Becky
2 was coming from, what we're talking about here is existing
3 building that at the time of the installation everything
4 was compliant. But under today's standards it would not
5 be compliant if it was installed today. And by today's
6 safety standards, it doesn't meet today's safety
7 standards. Am I right there, Becky?

8 MS. ERNSTES: Yeah.

9 MR. HENDERSON: Because we see that all the time out
10 there.

11 MS. ERNSTES: Especially some of these straight-up
12 ladders where you get up there and you have nowhere to
13 stand except on a ladder -- wooden ladder rungs -- and
14 you're trying to get a hatch open. You have no fall
15 protection and --

16 MR. HENDERSON: Been there, done that.

17 MS. ERNSTES: Yeah. And there are many, many out
18 there, and they're really unsafe.

19 MR. HENDERSON: Yeah. And working with the guys for
20 -- through the MCP part of that, it's really easy to talk
21 about, you know, if it's not compliant today, they can do
22 -- I tell them what to do. But this scenario right here
23 is a tough one because at the time it was compliant, but
24 now it may be considered unsafe.

25 I just want to make sure that I had it right in my

1 head what was --

2 MS. ERNSTES: That's what I'm talking about, yes.

3 MR. BECKER: Well, just in the interest of time,
4 maybe we could talk about this again at the stakeholder
5 meeting a little bit and figure out where we -- we need to
6 move on.

7 MR. DAY: We do.

8 But before we do, here's -- this is the way I was
9 thinking.

10 There is a minimum standard for ladders. And it's
11 all existing ladders. It's out there spelled out in the
12 DOSH world. You can go on the DOSH Web site and you can
13 find it. As a minimum it really doesn't matter. All of
14 them have to meet that because it is a minimum.

15 So there already is a code in place, quote/unquote,
16 for these. It's not ours. It isn't 296-96, but it is a
17 safety code. It already is there. So I don't see
18 anything wrong with referencing that standard in our WAC
19 maybe. Maybe that's what it is. That standard references
20 in our WAC here's the minimum standard for existing
21 ladders and platforms.

22 Now, to go further, we could use this as when those
23 things have become derelict and need to be replaced,
24 replace it with this.

25 So we head off both. What do you think, Keith? We

1 head both situations off. We don't need to do a
2 cost-benefit analysis for the existing platforms and
3 ladders. It's already there. It's already in rule. It's
4 not ours, but it's an agency above ours. Not under us,
5 but over us.

6 What do you think?

7 MR. BECKER: It would be a good conversation to have
8 at this point. And we'll try to look at it, kind of think
9 through that, talk through that a little bit.

10 You know, if the elevator inspectors are going to
11 write corrections for DOSH issues, it kind of maybe gets
12 interesting. So we kind of have to talk through that a
13 little bit.

14 MR. DAY: Well, if it becomes unsafe for our
15 employees, it's definitely already unsafe for yours.

16 And in regards to that, I don't see that we have a
17 choice. Do you? I don't see that we have a choice.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: The scenario that Becky was
19 describing, that's unacceptable. It seems common sense.

20 MR. DAY: It does.

21 UNIDENTIFIED: And anytime you can streamline
22 government where you don't have to create redundant rules,
23 it's a no-brainer.

24 MR. DAY: I think the best for this proposal is to
25 add the, you know, minimum in this to the DOSH rules.

1 I think you have those, don't you? We started off
2 with those.

3 MR. BECKER: We looked at those at one time.

4 MR. DAY: Minimum to those DOSH rules. And that way,
5 everybody can steer their own folks to that. You as
6 managers of elevator companies can go there and see what
7 it says. Maybe we should start off with getting some kind
8 of link to our Web page to that Web page.

9 Because again, I don't know how we cannot write it
10 up. It's something that needs to be addressed when it's
11 our own employees being put at risk. Our own employees.
12 And we have to look -- both look out for yours too, so we
13 have to do something. It's a good discussion.

14 MR. GAULT: As an owner, when you extend your
15 jurisdiction beyond elevator and start writing it up, it
16 becomes contentious because you're stepping outside of
17 your realm. I think it's -- I always look at the
18 government as a entity by which they provide feedback with
19 other knowledge of other agencies that they may have and
20 say something to the order that a owner needs to develop a
21 short-term plan that addresses this issue and not a --
22 you're doing something in the regulatory of -- well, you
23 can't if you're -- safety procedure has to be done at a
24 minimum with fall restraint, whatever that is necessary,
25 and continue on. But I really think it's -- if you did a

1 year of education of these unsafe because -- you know,
2 this elevator inspector may have pointed out. The last
3 elevator inspector learned how to get around it and always
4 accomplish it and didn't see it as unsafe going through
5 it. But I see too many times even within our hotel
6 industry people say something's unsafe, they just throw
7 that "unsafe" up to get something done. It's been an
8 ongoing existing. And so if you did an educational that
9 when these things occur, they're pointed out when you
10 don't have the jurisdiction to actually do it. And I
11 mean, I think you'd have more compliance with the owners
12 if you worked as an education that they must develop a
13 one-year plan or a two-year plan to do something. Because
14 everything in the ownership realm is a funding mechanism.
15 It's just not immediate cash. Some owner out there has to
16 dish out these kind of funds for these even if it's
17 \$50,000. That's still a lot to an owner to dish out when
18 it's not on the front end making the revenue. You have to
19 do a lot of salesmanship to sell these circumstances.

20 MR. BECKER: We're going to have to move on. We'll
21 come back to this and work through it even if we've got to
22 come back to it at the next meeting. But that's kind of
23 where we're at right now.

24 Next item, we've got review of the progress on
25 point-of-sale inspections. Swen.

1 MR. LARSON: After a unanimous vote by the Elevator
2 Advisory Committee to seek legislation to require having
3 residential elevators inspected at point of sale, the
4 language was taken to a senator. And the language is in
5 here. This (indicating) is what I took to the senator.

6 Senate Bill 5156 was drafted and presented to the
7 Commerce and Labors Committee. It was going to be a tough
8 sell from the outstart because of resistance by the real
9 estate lobby. Further complicating the politics in
10 Washington is a lawsuit now called the McCleary Decision.
11 It was filed by school districts against the State of
12 Washington for not adequately funding public education.
13 The State lost the lawsuit, and the Washington State
14 Supreme Court upheld the decision and ruled that the
15 legislators violated the law by underfunding the mandate
16 and threatened to hold the legislature in contempt if they
17 didn't fix it this session. A state legislative aide told
18 me any legislation that had a fiscal note attached will
19 fail. The legislation proposed would have added some
20 inspectors and added administrative work. What the
21 senator decided on was to add the following language to
22 the seller discloser list.

23 And what it says, "If a residential elevator, incline
24 elevator, stairway chair lift, or wheelchair elevator lift
25 is included with the transfer."

1 And it asks four questions.

2 Does it have any defects? If yes, please explain.

3 Was a permit obtained at installation?

4 Did it pass inspection at installation?

5 If alterations were made, did it pass inspection
6 after those alterations?

7 And then there was three choices: yes, no, or don't
8 know.

9 This wouldn't have compelled an inspection. My hope
10 was that by including this list would at least bring some
11 attention to the possible dangers these units may pose. I
12 thought it might have some educational value.

13 What came out of the Commerce and Labor Committee at
14 the suggestion of the real estate lobbyist was to remove
15 the questions and to lump conveyances into a miscellaneous
16 category along with 23 other items. Unfortunately this
17 change will do nothing to prevent the next accident.
18 Residential elevators still pose a significant risk. This
19 is how it will appear if the disclosure is passed.

20 And I've got 32 copies up here if some of you would
21 like to see how the language looks. And I'll probably
22 have one further report once we find out more.

23 I want to thank everybody that helped me on this. A
24 lot of work went into it. And my apologies for not doing
25 a better job. That's it.

1 MR. BECKER: Any other?

2 MR. McLAUGHLIN: We're moving up on a landmark event
3 here, and I don't want to take up too much time. And we
4 can talk about this more in the stakeholder meeting.

5 The events that Swen was talking about I think show a
6 lot more progress than perhaps it appears at first glance.
7 There's obviously been a lot of work by Swen over many,
8 many years on this thing. And I have the links to -- if
9 you go to the bill site, it will take you to the videos of
10 the two hearings that were held. They're quite
11 interesting. They also indicate that Senator Keiser and
12 probably her staff have done a lot of work on this also.

13 Swen talks about the fact that the -- well, I'm going
14 to skip ahead here.

15 There was a lot of work. The real estate group came
16 into the first hearing. At that time their instructions
17 were to tell the senior legislative affairs officer to
18 oppose the bill which already had been modified quite a
19 bit from the material that Swen has presented in these
20 meetings. The real estate community saw an opportunity to
21 move the language that Swen just quoted into another
22 section and presented that as a suggestion to Senator
23 Keiser.

24 At the second hearing the suggestion had been -- had
25 already been written in. The question was presented to

1 Senator Keiser whether this met to the satisfaction of the
2 parties, and her reply was that everyone is comfortable
3 with the revised bill and it passed unanimously.

4 I see a tremendous amount of work and movement by
5 everybody involved in this. A lot of work by Swen. A lot
6 of work by Senator Keiser and her committee. And also
7 work by the real estate community to make a major shift in
8 their position over the years. And I think Swen is to be
9 commended for the amount of work that he's done to get
10 this thing to a point where a substitute bill could come
11 out of the committee with as I say Senator Keiser saying
12 everyone is comfortable with it and it was passed
13 unanimously.

14 I know that Swen's disappointed in this a lot. But I
15 would say, Swen, I think you've achieved a lot more than
16 maybe appear from this. From what I understand, there are
17 a lot of educational opportunities just in getting this
18 far. And I hope that we'll see that go forward.

19 MR. BECKER: Thank you.

20 Any other comments?

21 Okay. Moving on, the next item is updates from the
22 Code Adoption Subcommittee. And I'm going to turn this
23 over to Bryan Wheeler. He's got four proposals
24 tentatively on the table.

25 MR. WHEELER: Yeah. Thanks, Keith.

1 The Code Adoption Subcommittee at the last EAC
2 presented four proposed code revisions to the current WAC
3 located on page 31 through 47 of your packet.

4 There has been no meeting since that last EAC meeting
5 nor has there been any changes to this document since the
6 last EAC meeting.

7 During the meetings that we did have as a code
8 subcommittee, it was represented by -- every stakeholder
9 group was represented and had an opportunity to present at
10 the committee meetings. Before we moved any of the
11 proposals up to the EAC, there was a vote on each of these
12 to take and recommend these to the EAC.

13 I think it's the opinion of the subcommittee that the
14 committee has completed their analysis of these proposals,
15 presented them to the EAC. And at this point we feel that
16 the EAC, it's in their hands to either place this on the
17 proposed Web site for the new upcoming WAC draft or not.

18 And so I guess at this point we're not sure there's
19 any further discussion that needs to take place on these
20 four items unless there's questions I'm not aware of.

21 MR. BECKER: Are there any questions or comments for
22 Bryan?

23 MR. DAY: Bryan, are you going to go through these
24 one at a time? How do you want to do this?

25 MR. WHEELER: I hadn't planned to. We've done it at

1 the last two meetings. So unless there's reason to. I
2 hadn't planned to, but I can.

3 MR. DAY: So the end result of this today, you want
4 to know from the advisory committee if they are in
5 agreement with these and want to send them back for
6 further changes or disagreement with these?

7 MR. WHEELER: Well, I guess that's -- if the EAC is
8 prepared to make a judgement on those, that would be
9 great. But if you're not, I think that's conversations
10 that need to happen.

11 MR. LARSON: I've got a comment.

12 Bryan, just so I understand, what you're talking
13 about is completely writing the administrative code,
14 completely replacing the administrative code as it exists
15 now with ASME 17.1; is that correct?

16 MR. WHEELER: The -- on proposal 001-2014, the new
17 format for conveyance rules in the WAC, yes, the proposal
18 is to format the WAC in a similar format to what the ANSI
19 is and highlight the changes to the -- excuse me -- the
20 ASME, the A17, to format it like the ASME A17 code and
21 then highlight the changes to those codes that Washington
22 state has accepted or made.

23 In many places of the WAC today has language that is
24 in duplicate of the A17, and so it's there. It's the
25 exact same wording as A17, but then it goes on further to

1 in a second paragraph or another subheading to make a
2 change that Washington has.

3 So it was an effort to clean that up and to make it
4 clear what changes Washington has to the A17 code.

5 MR. LARSON: Okay. And I thought we talked about
6 this the last meeting, and I thought we voted on it. And
7 so we're bringing it back again, and we voted not to go
8 ahead with it.

9 I think as it exists now, the question and format
10 answer is clear for the building owners and for a large
11 amount of people that use the code that aren't immersed in
12 A17.1.

13 I think you're talking -- just from what I've seen on
14 the areas that -- we did change the small areas. It was a
15 ton of debate. It was a ton of questions. And the
16 language didn't come out clear.

17 And I thought we voted that we weren't going forward
18 with this.

19 MR. GAULT: I vaguely remember the same comments.

20 MR. BECKER: Yes, me too. We -- essentially we
21 weren't comfortable with that direction as it was going.
22 That's what I recall.

23 MR. WHEELER: So let's make closure in the meeting
24 notes that this is then closed, and the decision on
25 proposal 01 was not to move forward.

1 MR. LARSON: You know what? I agree with clarifying
2 and simplifying language, and I -- and there's some
3 instances where we do that. And I think that benefits
4 everybody. But to completely rewrite the whole code, I
5 ain't got enough years left in my life to do that.

6 MR. WHEELER: So that's then closed?

7 MR. DAY: We've got a discussion going.

8 Becky.

9 MS. ERNSTES: Well, what we have tried to do when we
10 started in the last WAC rule is when we have codes that
11 are different than the ASME, we're starting to write the
12 ASME rule and trying to make it clear that this is an
13 exception to this code. And we did some of that in the
14 last rule and will continue to do that going forward to
15 identify when we change it that this is the rule we're
16 changing. And I think that that will help in clarity.

17 MR. GAULT: My only question is that as we go through
18 this, and you're not always current with which year of the
19 ASME code. And so when you now have to get into ensuring
20 that you're adopting a certain year of the code because
21 you sometimes trail in your review of what the code is,
22 it'll cause confusion for ownership if as the ASME code
23 changes, Okay, which one are you going to be following?
24 The '10, the '11 or the '12? Or which one are you --
25 which one is?

1 So that's one reason why I'm not in favor is that we
2 want to know what Washington requires of the ASME code
3 that you're requiring, and as you review it and as you
4 change it, it gets changed and we know what it is.

5 MR. DAY: Okay. So you want to keep the language --

6 MR. GAULT: The language, yes. And not just refer to
7 code that -- you know, not only for ownership and not only
8 for technicians. It just -- there's not a lot of people
9 out there that can read code. And hopefully the WAC is
10 one that is less encumbered for the routine people to
11 read.

12 MR. DAY: Okay, this proposal has two sections to it.
13 There's two pieces in it. And I would ask that we look at
14 this as the two pieces that are in this particular
15 proposal.

16 One of the pieces is to reformat the WAC so it looks
17 similar to the layout of A17.1. Correct, Bryan? Is that
18 correct?

19 MR. WHEELER: Uh-huh, correct.

20 MR. DAY: That could be a benefit I think for
21 everybody.

22 Culling away some of the language becomes inherently
23 difficult because as this first one that is an example
24 that it got culled away is dealing with some licensing
25 things. And it's licensing for all. It just so happens

1 that it lives in A17.1. But there's nine categories in
2 Washington. Not everything revolves around A17.1 in these
3 rules.

4 And so a lot of times it's necessary to keep this
5 entire language because we are speaking to a building
6 owner who doesn't know anything about A17.1 or the
7 building industry who doesn't know anything about that.
8 But we're also speaking to the licensed elevator mechanic
9 on category number 2 and number 6 who doesn't know
10 anything about that either -- A17.1 either. They know
11 A18.1 but not A17.1. And that language doesn't exist in
12 A18.1.

13 So culling the language tends from our experience in
14 dealing with actually 13 national standards that we have
15 to -- that this WAC deals with, make sure that the
16 information gets to all parties that are associated with
17 it.

18 And this particular one on this example dealing with
19 license, elevator companies -- all elevator companies,
20 whether you're category 1 or category 8, no matter who you
21 are, know that the jumpers can affect your license. And
22 it doesn't matter who you are. Okay?

23 So it was necessary. The thought went into -- fewer
24 pages would be nice. And I think we should always keep
25 that in mind, if it is possible, the fewer pages.

1 So I don't want to lose the thought, but also for the
2 subcommittee to recognize how broad this is. It's broader
3 than A17.1 alone as a general rule.

4 MR. HENDERSON: I just want to make one comment here,
5 which I think you started on. And that is -- and sort of
6 expanding on what Dave was talking about. When you work
7 in the state of Washington on conveyances, you have to
8 know both A17-1 code as well as the WAC and RCW. The WAC
9 and RCW's are not all inclusive on the WAC rules -- on the
10 rules that you have to live by in the state of Washington.

11 I'd say -- Jack, you might help me on this one. I'd
12 say the WAC covers or modifies less than 10 percent of
13 A17.1 that is required for all of us.

14 So you can't just say that you -- I don't want to --
15 you know, that because we have the WAC, we don't need to
16 know how to read an A17.1 code book. We have to.

17 And that's where Jack was going. Making it the same
18 will help everybody.

19 And that is all I was wanting to say.

20 MR. GAULT: My comment was more that it's -- A17.1 is
21 a -- in the days of growing up in school a reference note.
22 It gives where the real meat and potatoes of this section
23 is from and helps the individual or point to go for
24 further if it needs clarity within the entity of the code.
25 I mean, it helps you -- it's not just -- without putting

1 A17.1 in this section, it doesn't help anyone if they
2 don't really understand what they're reading. A17.1
3 allows further clarity to what they're doing if they're
4 trying to read it in context. Because all code has to be
5 read in context. You can't just take a bullet point and
6 just read that. It's all part of the code. It's all part
7 of the entity, and it all fits together.

8 So by just putting the A17 -- just go to the
9 encyclopedia. It's not easier always just to go to that
10 area. So the WAC has pulled out what's important to them
11 and then references where it comes from is what I'm
12 getting at.

13 MR. McNEILL: I think the challenge for most of the
14 elevator companies and licensed contractors is that we
15 work in every state, and as we continue to have different
16 requirements in every state, it causes a lot of confusion
17 and also adds a lot of expense that gets passed onto the
18 owners. And if we can get as much of one code aligned
19 nationally, it benefits everybody. And I believe that was
20 the intent here to clean it up so it's not confusing, and
21 we have one point of reference.

22 And oftentimes I've made the mistake of looking at
23 the WAC code because it's very descriptive --
24 prescriptive, but descriptive, and I ignore the 17.1 where
25 I really need to look at all of the detail and not skip a

1 step that may cost us later.

2 MR. DAY: That's where, Bryan, I think -- what the
3 cap was on this particular proposal is formatting the WAC
4 so that it lines up with the national standards that we
5 adopt. That way when we're dealing with A17 part 1, part
6 2 or part 3, that the WAC is also just like that. It's
7 just like that.

8 We tried to do it by dividing it into sections
9 several years ago. And what I'm hearing is we need it
10 more de -- it needs to be better defined. As this --
11 here's part 1 for A17.1 stuff.

12 And I think, Bryan, as we go through it, it may
13 inherently -- if it's inherently dealing with A17.1 be
14 able to strip away some of the entire paragraphs that
15 we've ended up copying and pasting.

16 MR. WHEELER: So the intent of the subcommittee and
17 the proposal here that's in front was -- much of what has
18 been described here and getting a uniformity with the
19 other jurisdictions, the City of Seattle included, that
20 have a very minor change, they list out the changes to the
21 code that the city has adopted and clearly spells that
22 out. Many other jurisdictions are the same way.

23 But I think that the crux of a lot of the debate of
24 the subcommittee on this was the question-and-answer
25 format and getting rid of that question-and-answer format

1 to help pare that down. And then lump the codes into
2 sections that are mirroring the A17 or other A17 dot codes
3 that are out there. So again, organizing it so that we
4 don't see just, you know, have to go six different places
5 to find the real answer. It's the A17 with these changes.

6 And I guess that was the example on page 33 as an
7 example to what this may look like. The existing WAC
8 being highlighted, and then a suggested future WAC where
9 it identifies the A17 section and then what has changed.

10 MR. DAY: I think if it's pared correctly in the
11 right place in the WAC, that would be the answer right
12 there.

13 MR. WHEELER: Exactly.

14 And I want to be clear that I don't think anybody in
15 the subcommittee intended for that rewrite to be the
16 responsibility of that subcommittee. As Swen says, I
17 don't think I have enough years in my life to accomplish
18 that. I think that that rewrite, should it choose to be
19 done, needs to be part of a code-writing group from the
20 Department or from someplace that does that. Because that
21 is a massive undertaking.

22 MR. DAY: Okay. So at this point on this proposal,
23 do we -- is there any change in what the committee wants
24 to ask for? Or as is? We weren't comfortable with it
25 from the last meeting with the proposed change or the

1 discussed changes. You want to continue on or where do we
2 want to leave it?

3 MR. LARSON: I've got a question. Maybe you can
4 answer this.

5 We have three AHJ's in the state of Washington. Are
6 they all on the same code?

7 MR. DAY: I believe so.

8 MR. LARSON: Okay. And then what happens when you
9 adopt the next level of code? Then you got to go back and
10 rewrite the sections that are different?

11 MR. DAY: Correct.

12 MR. LARSON: And then you do that before the code's
13 accepted? I would assume you have that in place.

14 MR. DAY: Yes. And I would point to the Code
15 Adoption Subcommittee is that's where we would like them
16 to be is pointing to those codes.

17 What they're looking for -- and Bryan, please correct
18 me if I'm wrong here. What they're looking for is moving
19 forward with suggested ways to format it as they go
20 through the new code.

21 MR. WHEELER: For future, yes. But I think that the
22 intent was to -- the stuff that's there now, format to
23 remove the question-and-answer format.

24 MS. ERNSTES: Can the two be compatible that we
25 remove the question -- or we keep the question and answer

1 and we reference the ASME? I mean, I don't see that as
2 two separate things since we already started putting in
3 ASME codes and -- I don't see those as they can't be
4 accomplished.

5 MR. WHEELER: You know, in an effort of time, I think
6 there's as many different ways as there are people in this
7 room to do that. And that's why we as a subcommittee
8 determined this was a way to present.

9 It's clear that the EAC has concern over this. So I
10 think to move on from this proposal would be the right
11 thing to do at this point. And if the subcommittee
12 chooses to present a revised version of this at a future
13 meeting, we will do so.

14 MR. BECKER: Are we good with that?

15 MR. LARSON: I have another comment.

16 One of your proposals you brought forward is not in
17 here, the one by Amy, and I think it had to do with 18.1;
18 I don't remember. And that's really interjecting
19 something, and that's what I don't want to see. I don't
20 want to see a whole bunch of stuff, you know, written by
21 some code committee and get a document this thick
22 (gesturing), and you don't know what's in it. That's
23 what worries me about this.

24 To clean up the language, I'm for it. To make it
25 simpler, I'm for that. To get rid of the punctuation

1 marks and things like that, I'm for that. But to
2 wholesale change the code as it exists now, I'm not for
3 that.

4 MR. WHEELER: Okay. Do you want to move on to
5 proposal 2 or -- do you guys want to go through all of
6 them?

7 MR. DAY: Well, I feel the need to give direction as
8 we go. And I just want everybody -- are we on the same
9 page?

10 I'm going to take a stab at it.

11 Bryan, what I'd like the subcommittee to do is to
12 continue with the formatting, the thought, the idea that
13 we're going to -- the intent is to group these WAC codes
14 into segments that mirror the codes that we have adopted
15 in this state. If we're dealing with A18.1, then A18.1
16 has its own section. And as it does, again, inherently
17 we'll be able to cull some of the language.

18 So I like the proposal. And the part -- I've always
19 been interested in getting rid of the question and answer.
20 So as we go through, as the committee goes through, they
21 start culling those -- getting rid of those question-and-
22 answer format and deliver a more straightforward format.

23 So I don't want to throw this baby out because
24 there's good things in it. Do you see what I'm trying to
25 get at?

1 MR. WHEELER: Yeah, I do. And I guess along those
2 lines, I like the fact of the recommendation back from the
3 EAC so that we have some dialogue.

4 But I'm wondering is maybe this has become the policy
5 for all proposals that are submitted. But could the EAC
6 then provide written comment on proposals that get
7 presented so that we can take that written comment back to
8 our subcommittee and further analyze it there if there
9 needs to be further discussion rather than a discussion in
10 a meeting? If we had a formal response to the proposals I
11 think would help get us to the right direction faster.

12 MR. BECKER: You know, I'm the same way on the
13 proposal I presented. It's nice to have something -- you
14 know, we all live in a world if it's not written down, it
15 doesn't exist; it didn't happen. It's nice to have some
16 things, some direction that you can go back to.

17 MR. WHEELER: And many times the committee's meeting
18 a month after this meeting, and what all was said and
19 stuff -- I know that it's being documented, but not only
20 is it readily available for us at those meetings. So if
21 we had a response section to each of these proposals I
22 think would --

23 MR. DAY: That's what I'm trying to do right now, not
24 in writing, but verbally. And then we can make some
25 notes. Just stop with each one might be an issue.

1 So for 001-2014 is keep the format to the adopted
2 standards. That's the first thing I'd like to say in
3 direction to the subcommittee.

4 (Directed to committee members) You guys okay with
5 keeping the format to look and be like the national
6 standards that we adopted? Because that's part of this
7 proposal. You guys okay with that?

8 Okay, Bryan, all of us are okay with that.

9 The next thing is one of the pieces that everybody
10 would like to see go away is the question-and-answer
11 layout that's within.

12 And I also would encourage the Code Adoption
13 Subcommittee that that's part of this proposal. If we're
14 going to cull the language, leave that up to somebody
15 else. Give all the language and the language itself be up
16 to somebody else. I mean, to cull the entire A17.1
17 paragraph down to a sentence -- down to a sentence. I
18 want you -- I would like that the committee -- the
19 subcommittee not deal with that.

20 MR. WHEELER: Correct.

21 MR. DAY: Okay?

22 MR. McNEILL: I don't know if I agree that the
23 complete committee wants the question and answer gone. I
24 think David -- unless I didn't hear right -- David as an
25 owners rep wants that question and answer --

1 MR. GAULT: No.

2 MR. McNEILL: -- description --

3 MR. GAULT: From my prior experience having -- I
4 dealt with the code of federal regulations, and that was
5 never done in a question and answer. You had subject
6 matter, you had reference, and you found exactly what you
7 want. If you're talking about hatches on a barge, you
8 knew where to go to find that. Hatches on a barge had to
9 have, and it listed da-da-da-da-da, not a -- you know,
10 what does a hatch on a barge have to -- you didn't -- so
11 it was outlined like Jack said, like A17 in a manner where
12 it's a step 1, 2, 3, A, B, C, subparagraph 4, 5, 6,
13 whatever it might be. When you're used to dealing -- and
14 that's the way most, you know, as I said the federal codes
15 are written. And that's why when I go to look at the WAC
16 that's asking me questions, and I'm going, Okay, these are
17 the answers, where do all these answers come from? And
18 when you do more research, you have to then page your way
19 back through A17. But if it's in a very straightforward,
20 no question and answer -- because every time you ask a
21 question to answer all the -- the answers answer all the
22 questions.

23 MR. McNEILL: Oh, okay. I understand.

24 I just don't want the subcommittee to be in a
25 position where they have expended a tremendous amount of

1 effort and then we have enough -- we don't have enough of
2 the committee that is for it, and we just end up spinning
3 our wheels again and wasting the subcommittee's time. I
4 don't want that to happen.

5 MR. DAY: So deal with these three things then?

6 Oh, we had another one?

7 MS. ERNSTES: I think Swen had a comment.

8 MR. LARSON: Yeah. I for one would like to see the
9 questions and answers remain in some kind of format. I
10 think it's a fast way for people to find the answers that
11 they're looking for on some of the frequently asked
12 questions. To wade through books and books of code, I
13 mean, some people are really good at it; other people are
14 not so good at it. But I think that for the majority of
15 the population, question-and-answer format works very well
16 for the residential owner, for the building owner. I
17 think it works pretty good for them to find their answers.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: Swen, what works for your mechanic
19 stuff?

20 MR. LARSON: Probably the same thing.

21 UNIDENTIFIED: Okay. So that's my question for you,
22 if you feel that's consistent with your mechanic --

23 MR. LARSON: Yeah. I think at this juncture that the
24 question and answer probably saves them time. You know,
25 you should be able to ask your people that and see what

1 they think too. I think it's more user friendly. I think
2 it's simpler to find the answer to go wade through two or
3 three code books that are bouncing you all over the place.
4 You just want to find the answer. And sometimes the
5 questions and answers just say, Here's what the state of
6 Washington expects of us in this area.

7 MR. DAY: So I'd just like to maybe throw out an
8 example or two right off the cuff. Okay?

9 I just opened the WAC, and I'm going to read a couple
10 examples of the question. Okay? Everybody okay with
11 that?

12 All right. Here I'm in WAC 5020, and it's dealing
13 with material lifts. Okay? This is what it's dealing
14 with.

15 What requirements apply to construction and fire
16 safety of hoistway enclosures? So it's a question.

17 And then down below are five items. Instead of what
18 requirements apply -- so we're just really talking about
19 something very simple here. The requirements that apply
20 to the construction and fire safety of a material lift
21 hoistway. It's just removing the question-and-answer type
22 of format.

23 So this is what I thought. Bryan or somebody -- who
24 else is here from that subcommittee? What difference
25 would you say -- do you have a WAC with you? Okay. Can

1 you take a stab at what you think?

2 MR. WHEELER: I don't think we want to do that, to be
3 honest with you. I think that the format -- the kind of
4 example that we used was really all that we talked about.

5 On page 33 where it -- for example, in the WAC
6 96-02471 --

7 MR. DAY: I'm sorry, Bryan, I'm not with you. Where
8 at?

9 MR. WHEELER: 02471 is the example on page 33 of the
10 handout. It talks about key switches. And there's a
11 fairly lengthy description that reiterates exactly word
12 for word what the A17 states. And the suggested change
13 there would be just adding the note section for the WAC
14 because the note section is what changes it in the WAC.

15 MR. DAY: And you may see from that particular
16 example that we already removed the question. So the
17 existing WAC already has the question removed.

18 MR. WHEELER: Yeah. I'd have to look at the previous
19 -- if it's a part of a subsection or not. I don't have
20 that in front of me.

21 But I think that -- what the message I'm hearing back
22 is that if the subcommittee was to reconsider keeping the
23 format similar to the adopted standard, removing the Q & A
24 format was the majority okay with. There was some
25 opposition. But that you want us to relook at this

1 proposal and provide some additional samples of what that
2 language might look like, not redo the entire thing, but
3 -- that's for others to do, but to provide some samples of
4 what that would look like.

5 MR. DAY: Yes. I believe -- just a second. Swen's
6 got -- Swen.

7 MR. LARSON: To answer your question that you raised
8 about the construction of the hoistway lifts, the answer
9 would be to send them to that section in the code that
10 deals with that. I mean, instead of just saying whatever
11 it says. You answer -- you send them to that section in
12 the code. That way, somebody that's not real familiar
13 with the code goes there, they read the question, Okay,
14 here's where I go and look for it. You know, 17.1, 3.6.8,
15 whatever.

16 MR. WHEELER: And that's how the A17 is written,
17 hoistway construction, and it lists all the requirements
18 for that. And so that's the similar format we want to see
19 in the WAC.

20 MR. LARSON: But I think the question and answer
21 sends them to the right place in the code, and it keeps it
22 user friendly for people that are not speaking the code.
23 It gives them a place to go and look in the code rather
24 than wading through code and trying to find it. It
25 clarifies it.

1 MR. POP: Let me respond. The only concern I have
2 with the reference is is that the code changes every two
3 to three years. So now we're looking at 2013 code. And
4 we're going to have to go and rewrite the whole WAC again
5 because there's always new sections added. And then -- I
6 mean, just like Swen said, who has the time to do all that
7 every two to three years to redo the whole WAC.

8 MR. BECKER: But I don't see that the ASME code is
9 going to reference a date until there's a change on the
10 date that's --

11 MR. POP: At that --

12 MR. BECKER: At that point we revise --

13 MR. DAY: It's a cross-reference task. The ASME
14 would tell us by reference at the beginning which codes
15 were edited or modified. And so it's the look at the WAC
16 codes to see if we have one that was modified -- or that
17 we modified of those.

18 MR. POP: Well, the only thing is like, for example,
19 Bryan mentioned the, you know, you have key switches. You
20 have 2.27.2 through 2.27.5 and 2.27.11. So if there was a
21 2.12 in edit in the future, then everybody says, Well,
22 this one's excluded here. So that's kind of what I was --
23 if there's -- you know, among the sections added in the
24 future.

25 MR. BECKER: Becky.

1 MS. ERNSTES: To my knowledge we have never done WAC
2 rules when we did not adopt the new code. We don't do WAC
3 rules typically in the middle of code adoption. We take
4 -- we decide we're going to adopt a new code, and so we
5 have the WAC's that we reformat to reflect the new code.
6 So we'll be doing that task anyway. And so whatever WAC
7 is in effect today references the 2011 code. And the
8 WAC's before that went in conjunction with the other ASME.

9 So even though it sounds like it's a monumental --
10 you have to remember, we don't have more than 40 different
11 codes in the new and alt section that refer to the current
12 adopted ASME. We have lots of stuff in WAC that are for
13 manlifts, but those are not nationally adopted codes. So
14 we're talking about a narrow piece of the code. We're not
15 talking about rewriting unless we change the format the
16 whole WAC. We're talking about the new and altered
17 section only that refer to a newly adopted section of WAC.
18 So we're not talking about a monumental task to keep up
19 with changes. Because we'd be looking at that section
20 anyway that we're changing and say, Okay, that's that code
21 number. So I don't think it's something that's
22 unmanageable when we're only dealing with new and altered.

23 And one of the things we need to do is we need to
24 take new and altered and divide them into their own two
25 sections which would help a whole lot.

1 And if we put it in a format that looks like ASME and
2 say all the machine room stuff is in section blank that
3 matches section blank, we're not -- I don't think that's a
4 monumental task to be able to do and to keep the question
5 and answers. And --

6 MR. DAY: I think it will make it simpler.

7 MS. ERNSTES: Yeah. It will over the long run.
8 Because you still take WAC 296 version "X" with the 2010
9 code and WAC 296 version --

10 MR. DAY: Becky, we're kind of --

11 MR. BECKER: At this point for right now with your
12 proposal, Bryan, have we got a consensus? What I need to
13 do is move through, and if we've got time to come back, we
14 can have more discussions --

15 MR. DAY: Well, I think we need to answer it for them
16 because they need to start another meeting. So I want
17 them to start a meeting with some direction from us.

18 And Swen, I think that you and the folks that you
19 represent will like it better if we have it formatted and
20 where it belongs in A17, mirrored, right? I think you
21 will. And you won't need the question part of it. I
22 believe that is so.

23 So Swen is going to want to see proof in the pudding.

24 So Bryan, what I'd ask, let's continue with this
25 proposal. That's what I would want to say. And then

1 let's just hands up or hands down. Continue with the
2 proposal, keep the format, the idea of the format to
3 adopted standards. Remove the question and answer but
4 only do a strike-through so it remains there for folks to
5 see. That way, Bryan, that way we can maybe can get
6 others more comfortable with it. Okay?

7 MR. WHEELER: Okay.

8 MR. DAY: And if we got A17.1 language in there,
9 leave that up to somebody else to decide to cull it or to
10 expand upon it. So all agree?

11 MR. BECKER: So for the committee just, you know,
12 something to look at.

13 MR. LARSON: To get something to look at? Is that
14 what you're saying?

15 MR. DAY: Uh-huh.

16 MR. LARSON: Yeah, I'd like to see --

17 MR. BECKER: Just a little larger example of --

18 MR. LARSON: Yeah.

19 MR. DAY: And if we don't like it, it's just struck
20 through, and we can bring it back. But they need some
21 direction is what they need.

22 MR. BECKER: Just a little larger example and we'll
23 just see what the feeling is.

24 Now, the other three, do you want to continue on with
25 those, Bryan, or -- I really need to -- we're getting

1 tight here.

2 MR. WHEELER: That's fine. I'll table the rest of
3 these until another meeting, and you can go on with your
4 other business.

5 MR. BECKER: Okay. The next item is machine room
6 space. And I've just got just a short -- real, real short
7 on that.

8 We were asked to -- this is on page 49 -- I was asked
9 -- we presented this -- the grain industry, we've been
10 asked for a light switch at the -- a light at the top of
11 the machine space.

12 Typically these machine spaces in the grain industry
13 are part of the work area. So there's already lights up
14 there. There's just not switches up there.

15 This proposal just asks for there not to be a need
16 for that light switch. What we have added to the language
17 from the previous was one line at the end of the top of
18 the purpose -- the proposal and the purpose, and that was
19 to ensure the lighting would not be turned off while work
20 is being performed in machine space -- in the machine
21 space. A tag-out procedure would be implemented at that
22 existing switch. Just a tag system that somebody could
23 apply to the switch when it's in the on position that
24 indicates that there's work being performed. And other
25 than that, that was the only thing that was asked to be

1 added to this proposal from the last meeting. That's what
2 we proposed.

3 The light switch in that area could be turned on
4 downstairs. It doesn't seem to propose a -- or add any
5 safety features to working in that area. Like I say, it's
6 in a large work area in these facilities.

7 And so that's what that was about.

8 MR. DAY: So this is a proposal in lieu of having a
9 light switch by the machine.

10 MR. BECKER: It's regarding just a electric -- I
11 mean, it's not getting into any other conveyances.

12 MR. DAY: Rob, I think it was your concern, and
13 rightfully so? And does this satisfy your concern?

14 MR. McNEILL: I still like the lock-out, but yes, it
15 does. It satisfies it. I think it's a good compromise,
16 and it makes it much safer for the worker up above. I'm
17 happy. I think it's a good move.

18 MR. BECKER: So moving forward.

19 MR. LARSON: So are you talking about locking the
20 light switch off or locking it on?

21 MR. BECKER: I'm tagging it to indicate --

22 MR. LARSON: Okay. Tagging it on?

23 MR. BECKER: Tagging it in the on position.

24 MR. LARSON: Okay, okay.

25 MR. BECKER: So that way --

1 MR. LARSON: Rather than --

2 MR. BECKER: They're not typically a three-way
3 switch. They're just a one -- a single-position switch.
4 They're turned on -- or even if they are, a three-way
5 switch if that switch is turned on --

6 MR. LARSON: Just a tag to say, Don't turn this off.

7 MR. BECKER: Work being --

8 MR. GAULT: Or actually I think it would be better,
9 rather than the tag thing, it should be actually a
10 physical lock of the switch, which they have, that you can
11 lock the switch in the on position.

12 MR. BECKER: Some cases we have two switching and --
13 for our dust exposure situations, there's not necessarily
14 a clear method for locking those out at this point.

15 But they can be. I mean, we can go that route. I
16 mean, it's used -- typically it's a switch cover that
17 needs to be changed that allows to make that change.

18 MR. DAY: I think you'd have to basically deal with
19 that with this proposal, wouldn't you?

20 MR. BECKER: Well, it depends on how that tag-out --
21 if that tag-out system is going to be a lock or if it's
22 going to be a tag that can be hung on the switch. I mean,
23 however you felt it was --

24 MS. ERNSTES: You also control who comes into your
25 building. There are not -- the public doesn't work in

1 your building. Nobody goes and works on that conveyance
2 without being signed in, notified. We're talking about a
3 grain bin.

4 And I understand his concerns because these are
5 highly explosive switches. And to change out a switch
6 just because, you know, you need to notify a worker, I
7 think a tag would work because anybody coming behind that
8 worker would know that that person is already there
9 because they sign in. We're not talking about even ten
10 people on a job site at once. We're talking three or four
11 people.

12 And I think in his situation -- I've been to many of
13 them -- a tag would probably work with that lock-out just
14 to say workers in the area, switch needs to remain on.

15 And then that person has to be responsible for taking
16 the tag off. They could even sign their name, who's
17 there, you know.

18 MR. BECKER: You know, the tag can be attached so
19 it's not going to fall off. You know, we can attach it to
20 the conduit or we can attach it to the switch. We can --
21 everything's rigid conduit in these facilities. It can be
22 zip tied on there and it has to be taken off. Or it can
23 be locked -- I mean, it actually could be locked on in
24 place.

25 MR. DAY: Would you like this to be moved to proposed

1 status in WAC?

2 MR. BECKER: I would.

3 MR. DAY: Okay.

4 And just because it's moved to proposed status
5 doesn't mean we're -- anybody's done with it. It just
6 means hopefully it's open to a wider audience. Okay?

7 MR. BECKER: The last item is licensing criteria.
8 You want to touch on that real quick?

9 MR. DAY: I don't know if I can be really quick.

10 The last page. Who hasn't had the opportunity to
11 read the last two pages, 51 and 52? No hands, meaning
12 everybody's been able to read it?

13 Okay. Basically what this is is we've created a
14 policy that allows us to renew a temporary mechanic's
15 license for more than two consecutive months and more than
16 six times per year. It basically allows a temporary
17 mechanic to remain a temporary mechanic for the next 17
18 months is what it does. Okay?

19 There are criteria that must be met. And one of the
20 things I'll start off with is this still means that the
21 temporary is renewed once every 30 days.

22 So please, this does not mean you don't have to renew
23 their license every 30 days. You do. It just means you
24 get to renew their license. Okay?

25 And there's some criteria in there. I want you guys

1 to read that carefully. But the basic criteria for it is
2 your elevator company's primary point of contact --
3 everybody know who -- I don't -- I'm not trying to put
4 anybody on the spot. I'm just trying to realize, do you
5 all know that each elevator company has a primary point of
6 contact? That primary point of contact person is the one
7 responsible for signing the application for the temporary
8 mechanic. And we won't take copied over after copied over
9 signatures. We want your person to take responsibility
10 for it.

11 That person also must be able to demonstrate to us
12 that they actually truly meet this, that you've exhausted
13 your labor pool and the jobs that you have outstanding and
14 you show us that you can meet that.

15 Now, that became a little bit difficult, and we tried
16 to spell it out the best that we can here in dealing with
17 represented and not represented people. The represented
18 people, that's going to be fairly straightforward if
19 there's somebody on the bench or not. The non-represented
20 people, it's going to be a little bit different because
21 you don't have a bench.

22 So that particular subject, though, you and the
23 primary point of contact can be discussing that with the
24 Department and how you're going to prove that.

25 The other thing that's in here is we did not change

1 the documented experience. We cannot change the
2 documented experience. It is as it exists. 75 percent.
3 So that's the only people that we're going to allow to be
4 turned up and become a temporary mechanic.

5 Lastly, I want you guys on the last page, underlined
6 circle number 5, you got to keep your pass rate up to 70
7 percent. You have to. You need to anyway because we're
8 way too busy to be messing around with failed inspections.
9 You are and so are we. And to make this point very --
10 right to the nitty-gritty of it all, you're expected to if
11 you're going to retain a temporary mechanic for more than
12 two months. You're expected to.

13 If any of you don't know where you're at in your
14 pass/fail rate, you can see me after the stakeholders
15 meeting, and I will tell you in private. I will tell you
16 in private where you are.

17 If you want to know, please send me an e-mail as well
18 if you want to know. Okay? And I'll send you your copy
19 of your report.

20 Any questions on this primary point of contact?

21 MR. GAULT: Jack, I just have one question. Just
22 the way it's written, does category 9 mean temporary
23 elevator --

24 MR. DAY: It does, yes.

25 MR. GAULT: Or is category 9 one of the categories of

1 a mechanic's license as a temporary?

2 MR. DAY: Category 9 means that person is holding a
3 temporary mechanic's license.

4 MR. GAULT: Because when I first read it, I thought
5 it was reading category 9 and, oh, you're only affecting
6 category 9 --

7 MR. DAY: We are.

8 MR. GAULT: -- two different ways. I just read it in
9 another way. So category 1 temporary elevator license
10 would not apply?

11 MR. DAY: How it applies is that the person may hold
12 a temporary category 1 or a temporary category 2.

13 MR. GAULT: But by the word "temporary" means
14 category 9?

15 MR. DAY: Yeah.

16 MR. GAULT: Okay. Thanks.

17 MR. DAY: I'm sorry. I held you guys five minutes
18 over.

19 MR. BECKER: At this point we will finish up the
20 agenda on the meeting, and we will adjourn. We'll take
21 about a ten-minute break and come back for the stakeholder
22 meeting.

23 (Whereupon, at 11:05 a.m.,
24 proceedings adjourned.)

25

