

Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Agenda

November 17, 2015 - 9 to 11 a.m.

Tukwila Service Location

Time	Topic	Facilitator	Comments
9 – 9:10 a.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions/Purpose • Comments regarding August minutes • Nominate and vote for a Chairman • Nominate and vote for a Vice-Chairman 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jack Day • Jack Day • Jack Day • Chairman 	
9:10 – 9:20 a.m.	<p><u>Chief's Report:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scorecard/Accidents • Maintenance/Testing • Proposed supplemental budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jack Day • Jack Day • Todd Baker 	
9:20 – 9:30 a.m.	<p><u>Old Business:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing machine room enclosure and access to the machine room (See Means of Access Analysis 2014-006) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jack Day 	
9:30 – 9:40 a.m. 9:40 – 11:00 a.m.	<p><u>New Business:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type "A" permits and inspections (005-2014) • Determine the next steps from future agenda <p>Discuss the topics to further aid in understanding the problem and possible solutions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert McNeil • Chairman/Vice Chairman/ Jack Day 	
11:15 a.m. – Noon	<p><u>Stakeholder Meeting:</u> You are encouraged to stay for the meeting. It is an informal "touchbase" with stakeholders.</p>		
Future agenda	<p><u>Future Business:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The desire to adopt ASME A17.1-2013 code • MCP logs; update, edit by adding or removing items, mandatory layout. • Maintenance; a similar reset as safety test • Contracts, what is included in a full maintenance contract • Residential Maintenance Licensing • FAID: Consider re-evaluation • ANSI A10.4 Maintenance • Acceptable LULA applications (limits to install) • Proposal for Comb Impact Device 		

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

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

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

Chief's Report

FYI- not part of the reporting agenda, left in place for informational purposes:

Draft WAC 296-96 – Jack Day

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

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

Scorecard and Accidents – Jack Day- (see attached)

Maintenance/testing- Jack Day – recap of decision regarding overdue testing -

Old Business Notes:

Existing machine room access – Jack Day to report

See Analysis- any further questions? Concerns? Objections?

New Business Notes:

Type "A" permits and inspections

- Selected new and alterations allowed to be placed back into public use without an inspection
- One out of ten randomly selected for inspection, must pass or two more chosen for inspection
- A failure rate of ???, will remove a company's ability to use type "A" permits

Future Business Notes:

Adopt ASME A17.1-2013 code

MCP logs; update, edit by adding or removing items, mandatory layout.

- There is a need and desire to standardize the logs
- From the inspector, building owner and some elevator companies, yes.

Maintenance; a similar reset as safety tests

Maintenance is not being performed and it is representing a concern for the public's safety. We see effects of the lack of maintenance regularly in the news and via complaints from the public.

Contracts, what is included in a full maintenance contract

Owners are regularly stating they have, or asking what is, "a full maintenance contract". Many Owners are misled into a false sense of security, then it's too late, they have signed a legally binding agreement.

Licensing criteria

Combining categories:

- Categories 02, 06, 07 combined and remove commercial dumbwaiters (cat 1)
- Combine categories 03 and 04 under industrial
- Combine category 08 with 01
- Incorporate only NEIP, CAT, CET for all categories except material lift
- Remove wording in WAC 296-96-00906:

The applicant must provide acceptable proof to the department that shows the necessary combination of documented experience and education credits in the applicable license category (see WAC 296-96-00910) of not less than three years' work experience in the elevator industry performing conveyance work as verified by current and previous employers licensed to do business in this state or as an employee of a public agency;

Proposal for Comb Impact Device – Jack Day

- Not available.

Residential Maintenance Licensing

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

Acceptable LULA applications (limits to install)

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

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

ANSI A10.4 Maintenance

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

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, November 17, 2015

11

12
13 BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Safety Advisory
14 Committee Meeting was held at 9:10 a.m. on Tuesday,
15 November 17, 2015, at the Department of Labor &
Industries, 12806 Gateway Drive South, Tukwila,
Washington.

16 Committee members present were: Swen Larson, Bryan
17 Wheeler, Alan Sorensen, and Clyde Wright. The Department
of Labor & Industries was represented by Jack Day, Chief
18 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

A G E N D A

	Page No.
1	
2	
3	November 17, 2015 - Tukwila
4	
5	Introductions/Purpose 3
6	Comments Regarding August Minutes 7
7	Nominate and Vote for a Chairman 8
8	Nominate and Vote for a Vice-Chairman 9
9	Chief's Report 11
10	Scorecard/Accidents 11
11	Maintenance/Testing 12
12	Proposed Supplemental Budget 13
13	Old Business 15
14	Existing Machine Room Enclosure and Access
15	to the Machine Room 15
16	New Business 21
17	Type "A" Permits and Inspections 21
18	Determine the Next Steps from Future Agenda
19	Discuss the Topics to Further Aid in
20	Understanding the Problem and Possible
21	Solutions (Future Business from Agenda
22	was discussed/incorporated in here.) 31
23	Future Business (Other) 65
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

Introductions/Purpose

MR. DAY: Let's get started, everybody. Good morning. My name is Jack day, the Chief Elevator Inspector of the State of Washington. This is the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee. I serve as the Chairman of this committee.

I want to take a moment through the process of introduction and introduce the newest -- newer members of the committee.

The first member, in his absence, I'm going to read his name. His name is Robert McNeill. He is absent today. He apologizes that he cannot make it due to family emergencies. He has every intention of serving this committee. However, he wants everybody to know that it's out of his control today.

As I go to members that are here, if you would please raise your hand so they know who you are.

The next member, that's Swen Larson. Swen Larson was previously on the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee and has been appointed to this new term for the next four years. Swen, over here (indicating).

The next member is Mr. Clyde Wright. He's new to the

1 Elevator Advisory Committee. He sits over here to the
2 left of Al Sorensen. He's with Trammell Crow, and he's
3 been appointed to the position representing architects and
4 engineers on the Elevator Advisory Committee.

5 Welcome Clyde.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Thanks, Jack.

7 MR. DAY: Al Sorensen. Al sits right here
8 (indicating) immediately to my left. And Al is
9 representing the ad hoc position for authority having
10 jurisdiction in the state of Washington. This is Al's
11 first -- or excuse me -- did I say state of Washington?
12 City of Seattle. Excuse me.

13 I believe this is your first term --

14 MR. SORENSEN: Yes.

15 MR. DAY: -- ever of serving on the Elevator Safety
16 Advisory Committee. So this is new for you.

17 MR. SORENSEN: Yes, it is.

18 MR. DAY: Two members that are not here. One is
19 Mr. Rolf -- R-O-L-F. He's with Anderson Construction.
20 And he was appointed to the position representing the
21 registered general contractors. And he is not here, but
22 if he comes strolling in, we'll make him stand up. He is
23 also new. He's not served on the Elevator Safety Advisory
24 Committee before.

25 The last person is Mr. Phillip Scott. He's with

1 Kemper Development. He's new as well. And his position
2 represents the building owners and managers position for
3 the state of Washington.

4 So with two members missing, I certainly want to
5 welcome the members here today. It is considerable time
6 and energy that's invested in this in performing this.

7 These people are your representative for the
8 particular positions. Issues that you may have, I want
9 you to meet them and be comfortable discussing issues that
10 are going back and forth between the relative positions
11 they represent.

12 Today we also have two people that are signed up for
13 alternates. One of them is sitting to my immediate right.
14 This is Bryan Wheeler. He's with ThyssenKrupp. He is
15 Mr. McNeill's or will soon be appointed to Mr. McNeill's
16 alternate position as the -- as the -- representing the
17 elevator companies in the state of Washington.

18 And Mr. Woods, correct?

19 MR. WOOD: Wood. Wood, no "S."

20 MR. DAY: Wood? Mr. Steve Wood?

21 MR. WOOD: Steve Wood.

22 MR. DAY: Steve Wood. He is the alternate to Swen
23 Larson.

24 So these are folks that you can get in contact with
25 to assist or to discuss the purpose of the advisory, which

1 I'm about to get into.

2 To find their contact name and number, if you don't
3 have the opportunity today to shake their hand and trade
4 business cards, they will -- some of them already are, and
5 the alternates will be posted on our Web site under "News
6 Information." That's on the left-hand side. And Elevator
7 Advisory Committee members, that's where you'll find the
8 contact information for these folks that are sitting up
9 here and their alternates.

10 The purpose. I'm just going to go through this very
11 high level. But if you turn your page of your agenda, the
12 purpose in bold, "... the Elevator Safety Advisory
13 Committee is to advise the department on the adoption of
14 regulations that apply to conveyances; methods of
15 enforcing and administering the law" So I won't read
16 the rest.

17 But their primary job is to advise the Department.
18 Their role is to know and understand RCW 70.87. And to be
19 very frank, it is to ensure -- we all would know public
20 safety, but public safety is one arm of it. It's also
21 building safety, and it's worker safety.

22 So those are the main goals, to keep those in mind.
23 Public, building and worker safety.

24 I'll allow any -- I want to allow anybody that has
25 anything else to say during the introductions from the

1 group.

2 MR. LARSON: I got a safety tip I'd like to throw out
3 there following a near accident.

4 If you're using metric anchor bolts, make sure you
5 use a metric drill bit when you're using them. We've had
6 occasions where somebody mounted a drill stand, used the
7 next size larger SAE bit, and somebody stepped in and
8 stepped on the buffer, and the buffer -- the quick bolt
9 didn't hold. So make sure you use the right drill bit.

10 MR. DAY: Okay. Anyone else?

11 That's real -- that's real interesting to start our
12 safety -- Elevator Safety Advisory Committee with a safety
13 tip. It's something we might want to encourage from now
14 on.

15

16 Comments Regarding August Minutes

17

18 MR. DAY: Okay. Our comments -- next item, comments
19 regarding August meeting. Has everybody had a chance to
20 go through and read the August meeting minutes? Any
21 comments regarding them? Are you all -- everybody okay
22 with them? Okay. Hearing no dissension or no comments
23 regarding it, they will go in as approved.

24 ///

25 ///

1 Nominate and Vote for a Chairman

2

3 MR. DAY: Okay. The next thing we want to do is --
4 I'm going to want to hand this gavel off to somebody else
5 here. And so for the first order of business coming up is
6 to nominate and vote for a chairman position for the
7 Elevator Safety Advisory Committee.

8 I'm first going to set your attention to Mr. Wheeler
9 as he has something to read, and then we can go from there
10 for the chair.

11 MR. WHEELER: All right. In Rob's absence, asked us
12 to read this letter.

13 (As read) "Dear Jack, it is my intent -- this is my
14 letter of intent to be nominated to be the Chair of the
15 Elevator Advisory Committee for this term. Unfortunately,
16 a critical family illness will not let me attend the
17 November 15th meeting, but will not inhibit my ability to
18 attend future meetings of the committee.

19 "My experience over the last four years has allowed
20 me to gain a clear understanding of the various issues the
21 committee and subcommittees are diligently working on over
22 the last four years to improve the safety and reliability
23 of vertical transportation in the state of Washington.

24 "I am committed to spending the time and effort with
25 all committee members and stakeholders on current and

1 future refinement of codes, process and coordination
2 within the industry.

3 "Sincerely, Rob McNeill. I'd like to be nominated
4 for the Chair of this Advisory Committee."

5 MR. DAY: Thank you, Bryan.

6 Is there any other members that would like to
7 nominate another person for the Chairman position? Either
8 themselves or someone else.

9 Hearing none, this is pretty much straightforward
10 obviously. Mr. McNeill has been awarded the illustrious
11 position as Chairman.

12 Okay. As his alternate sitting beside me, I'm going
13 to pass the gavel over to Mr. Wheeler. Although, I will
14 help him with the rest of the meeting. I'm going to let
15 him be the banger of the thing.

16

17 Nominate and Vote for a Vice-Chairman

18

19 MR. DAY: Okay. Next is to nominate for the Vice
20 Chair position. The Vice Chair position assists the
21 Chairman. Sometimes there can be quite a bit of issues
22 to facilitate, and also in their absence that they take
23 over.

24 So it must be a member that's been appointed by the
25 Director. So you're staring at the folks up here. It

1 cannot be me. Some of you will thank the Lord. It can't
2 be me, but it can be any of the others including the two
3 folks that are not present. So --

4 MR. WRIGHT: That'll teach 'em.

5 MR. DAY: That'll teach 'em to not be here.

6 And so usually we would sit here and take
7 nominations. So that might be the way we start. Is there
8 anybody that wants to be nominated for that position?
9 Careful, I'll appoint you. Nobody?

10 Okay, I'm going to -- I'm going to need somebody.
11 I'll make it easy on you. Rob might not, but I will.

12 I'm looking at somebody that's been here the longest.
13 Swen, how do you feel?

14 MR. LARSON: I feel good.

15 MR. DAY: You feel good. I -- I vote to nominate --

16 MR. WRIGHT: Can I nominate Swen?

17 MR. DAY: Thank you very much. Mr. Wright has voted
18 to nominate Swen. Swen.

19 Is there anyone else that would like to be nominated?
20 Boy, don't you like democracy? This is democracy in
21 action.

22 Congratulations, Swen. I don't think we need to take
23 a vote since -- it's a good thing we don't know these
24 other two folks very well.

25 MR. WRIGHT: That's right.

1 MR. DAY: But for the immediate time, Swen will be --
2 somebody else may want to take his place.

3 You can -- in the future, if you need to, you can
4 definitely back out. But I -- thank you. Thank you for
5 not saying "no."

6 I don't think I gave him the chance, did I.

7

8 Chief's Report

9

10 MR. DAY: Okay, next order of business. Are we on
11 time? No, we're behind ten minutes. I'm going to catch
12 us up really quick. The Chief's Report.

13

14 Scorecard/Accidents

15

16 MR. DAY: Chief's Report, the first item on the
17 agenda is Scorecard and Accidents.

18 Well, first and foremost, the Scorecard has some
19 significant technical difficulties, so was unable to be --
20 the report was unable to be run. So we have no Scorecard
21 to show you all.

22 The Scorecard typically shows the number of annual
23 inspections that we perform, how many we have to do, and
24 where we're currently at with them.

25 It -- again, like I said, it won't run. So I

1 couldn't bring it with us today. And I couldn't even look
2 at the data to tell you what the data says today. So I
3 apologize for that. I don't have the Scorecard.

4 And the same obviously is true with the accidents.
5 It only shows -- this is the handout for the accident
6 (showing). I don't know if you all have that. If you
7 don't, there's copies over here (indicating).

8 It is actually showing 2016 first quarter, second
9 quarter. Okay? And we're showing Elevator No Fault, 1;
10 Escalator No Fault, 9 for the first quarter. And for the
11 second quarter, No Fault, 1. I do believe we're also
12 having trouble with this report as well. So I would
13 definitely show this as a report of error as well. So I
14 apologize for bringing you next to nothing for this
15 report, so please forgive me.

16

17 Maintenance/Testing

18

19 MR. DAY: Turning to the next item, maintenance and
20 testing.

21 This is really a recap of our decision regarding the
22 overdue testing and to incorporate a reset and to make
23 testing full -- the intent is for all testing to be fully
24 caught up by July 1, 2016. That was the intent of that
25 in that regards.

1 I've taken a few questions from folks. One of the
2 main -- the main question that I've had that I haven't
3 published yet is about the seismic valve and its process.
4 And it falls in the seismic -- my answer is it falls in
5 the same process as a five-year test. That's exactly what
6 it is, a five-year category 5 test. And if that seismic
7 is due in this period of time, then it may be moved but no
8 later than June 30, 2016. Again, it's those seismics that
9 are due in this period of time between July 1, 2015, and
10 July -- June 30, 2016. Okay?

11 And that's been the major question that I've received
12 from stakeholders in regards to this reset.

13 If there's any others, I would like it if you would
14 send it to me in writing. I'd like to keep track of these
15 so that if I get -- as I get original questions or
16 something that we hadn't thought of, we can have them
17 answered and answered in a public way. Okay?

18 Any questions regarding the reset of safety tests?

19 The sign-in sheet's coming around. Please sign it as
20 it comes in front of you and pass it to the side.

21

22 Proposed Supplemental Budget

23

24 MR. DAY: Okay, Bryan, I'm going to let you take it
25 from here and be in charge if you don't mind.

1 MR. WHEELER: Okay.

2 MR. DAY: Proposed Supplemental Budget -- sorry --
3 Mr. Baker. Then you (addressing Mr. Wheeler) got it.

4 MR. BAKER: Good morning. Todd Baker, Public Safety
5 Operations Manager for the Department. And Jack asked me
6 to speak to something we're doing.

7 As we've talked about at past advisories, the
8 Department is really struggling to hire and retain
9 inspection staff because the salary we offer is a lot less
10 than what they can get in other jurisdictions in the
11 private sector.

12 So there is a process for state government to go
13 through to see about raising salary levels for different
14 classifications. It involves developing a proposal,
15 submitting it to State Human Resources, it gets evaluated.
16 If it goes forward, it goes through collective bargaining,
17 then through the legislative process.

18 And so that's a two-year thing. If we started now,
19 that would if it worked out would take effect in July of
20 2017. But our need is urgent, so we've taken a somewhat
21 unusual step in proposing a budget package that would be
22 considered by the legislature in the next session starting
23 in January of 2016 where we're asking to raise the salary
24 levels for the positions in the elevator program.

25 So we're not sure if this will be successful.

1 There's a lot of hoops to go through. The first being the
2 Governor's office has to consider all sorts of budget
3 proposals that are being suggested by different agencies
4 and decide what he wants to include in his budget. And
5 then that would go forward to the legislature for
6 consideration where the House and Senate would both have
7 their budgets. So a lot of steps, but we're concerned
8 about being able to hire and retain folks. And so we're
9 doing everything we can to see if we can get the salary
10 raised.

11 So questions or anything I missed, Jack?

12 MR. DAY: Any questions?

13 Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Baker.

14
15 Old Business

16
17 Existing Machine Room Enclosure and Access to the
18 Machine Room

19
20 MR. WHEELER: All right. So old business. Existing
21 machine room enclosures and access to machine rooms.

22 Jack Day.

23 MS. BREWER: Jack, I have a question. Christine
24 Brewer with Schindler. I'm just wondering how many
25 vacancies you do have right now.

1 MR. DAY: I believe at this moment -- I can't see who
2 that is.

3 MR. METCALFE: Rich. Five.

4 MR. DAY: Five. Thanks, Rich.

5 MS. BREWER: And that's field staff?

6 MR. DAY: Five Elevator Inspector 1 positions.

7 MS. ERNSTES: And a tech.

8 MS. BREWER: Out of 26, 27?

9 MR. DAY: Christine, there's also a technical
10 specialist vacancy as well, which has the potential to
11 create six Elevator Inspector 1 vacancies.

12 MS. BREWER: Thank you.

13 MR. DAY: Any other questions in regards to our step
14 fee increase -- not fee increase -- salary increase?

15 MR. LARSON: When will the figures be available what
16 you're proposing?

17 MR. DAY: The figures?

18 MR. LARSON: When will the figures be available for
19 what you're proposing to raise it to?

20 MR. BAKER: I have a copy of the budget proposal
21 here. It's for -- for the elevator inspectors, it's a 28
22 percent salary increase. And if you want the specific
23 numbers, we can get that -- we can make that available.

24 MR. LARSON: Okay. I just -- I'll probably field two
25 questions about that. So --

1 MR. BAKER: Sure.

2 MR. LARSON: -- thank you.

3 MS. BREWER: I think it would be helpful if this does
4 move forward to at least reach out to those that are
5 working up on the hill during session. Because during
6 last session, Tammy Fallon, you know -- or I guess I'm
7 going to ask a second question. Are you planning to
8 introduce the bill, the dedicated fund? Is that moving
9 forward?

10 MR. BAKER: That's the intent is to bring that bill
11 forward again.

12 MS. BREWER: Okay, okay.

13 So I think it would just be great because Tammy in
14 the middle of session reached out to Tom McBride and
15 myself and Otis' lobbyists to try to help move these
16 along. And so I just think it would be great if these do
17 get approved that Tammy or Todd reach out to -- through
18 Tom to work with us to see if we can help, if that's
19 something that's needed. Or if that's something we
20 support, I guess -- (inaudible)

21 MR. DAY: Thank you.

22 MR. WHEELER: Any other questions on the proposed
23 budget supplement?

24 Okay. Let's move on to old business then.

25 Jack.

1 MR. DAY: Old business. Means of Access, it's
2 analysis 2014-006. You'll find it on page 15.

3 This was a means-of-access analysis being worked on
4 by Keith Becker and Keith Becker's committee group. And
5 the intent for it was to put in place a means of access
6 for existing situations, means of access to elevator
7 machine rooms for existing situations that are unsafe or
8 that have degraded to an unsafe condition.

9 And Keith's group actually worked with several codes.
10 The most effective code that they worked with was the DOSH
11 code for ladder safety and platform safety. And what they
12 did was they incorporated into proposed language. If you
13 look at page 16, under 11 -- item 11, and it'll follow
14 suit through page 17, 18 and 19. What their proposal is
15 is that this language be introduced into the next series
16 of WAC 296-96 so that you all and we have a method to
17 enforce safe access to machine rooms.

18 We've run across situations -- and I know your staff
19 has as well -- where the individuals are on a day like
20 today crawling across a 30-degree slope roof with no tar
21 pits and no safety. And where that may have been okay 50,
22 60 years ago, it's not okay today.

23 And we want to basically introduce a code into --
24 again, into the WAC 296-96 that we feel is a safer
25 alternative for all of us for access to these spaces and

1 is actually an effective code already in the state of
2 Washington under the DOSH rules. So on one hand you can
3 say they already exist. It's just they don't exist in our
4 code. Okay?

5 And this might be a softer, kinder, gentler way for
6 all of us to decipher the DOSH codes for access to these
7 spaces and have a means to safely promote moving forward
8 with safe access.

9 However, one of my concerns is that I'm not sure that
10 the question's been fully answered as to how much this
11 will cost.

12 And we have -- I know Keith has reached out a time or
13 two to find out costs. And he's determined costs in his
14 world. His world being the grain elevator industry. And
15 so he's determined that the cost is minimal for his
16 industry. However, that could be quite a bit different
17 for the rest of you.

18 And we do have an architect here, but I would also be
19 interested in one of the folks -- two of the folks that
20 are missing, the building owner representative and the
21 general contractor's point of view of this.

22 So the intent is to keep this in old business, but we
23 do need a better clarification of the costs that will be
24 imposed so that we can accurately answer those questions
25 or be in a more accurate position to answer the question

1 regarding costs.

2 So it's a delicate balance, but we do realize that
3 we're all faced -- your employees and mine are faced with
4 some challenging access situations. And if they are -- if
5 they are seriously unsafe, there absolutely is worker
6 safety codes currently in place to address it today.

7 So for those things, we all got to be aware of them
8 and contact me, and I will assist if you definitely have
9 something very serious going on.

10 Please take some time. Read this through. Get with
11 your representative on the committee and give your
12 comments to them. Because I would like this to move
13 forward in one way or another to address the situation.

14 MR. WRIGHT: So the purpose of this is to grandfather
15 this into the code so that existing buildings would have
16 some period of time to comply?

17 MR. DAY: That's one of the criteria in here that
18 once it's recognized to give a period to --

19 MR. WRIGHT: Because I know when I looked through it,
20 I didn't see anything in here that was --

21 MR. DAY: That was one of the things discussed.

22 MR. WRIGHT: -- not ordinarily required currently
23 under the current codes and current requirements. I
24 didn't see any surprises in here.

25 MR. DAY: No. Well, I was part of that committee.

1 basically the concept there is to provide a alternate
2 permitting process for minor alterations and code work in
3 the state of Washington that currently today require
4 inspections. But with this new permit type would be a
5 scenario where a elevator company could have a series of
6 coupons, if you will, or permits issued to them to do the
7 minor alterations, and they would be inspected on a normal
8 annual inspection, looked at at that point. So it helps
9 relieve some workload from the State as well as for the
10 owners and companies overall.

11 It's been on the table for a little while. You can
12 see the concept there in the documents starting on page 7.

13 I'm not sure if there's any further information you
14 have, Jack, or --

15 MR. DAY: I have a little bit of additional
16 information.

17 MR. WHEELER: Okay.

18 MR. DAY: Rob McNeill has proposed three dates for
19 the future. We had trouble with those three dates in
20 finding a place. So with his absence, it's been difficult
21 in the past couple weeks to find alternative dates.

22 So that's -- when he gets back, that's probably going
23 to be the first order of business, finding the dates and
24 making sure that those that are interested in know the
25 dates and show up for the date. That's actually multiple

1 dates that's being proposed.

2 But it's coming close to the start of the "leg." So
3 it's running rather difficult that that's going to happen
4 in November obviously and have a smaller chance in
5 December. And then when the "leg" starts -- well --

6 Tom.

7 MR. McBRIDE: I agree with you, Jack.

8 The timing gets to be difficult. And at first, I
9 know the agency has been receptive to some direction on
10 this. And we certainly on behalf of NEII -- Tom McBride
11 with NEII -- appreciate that.

12 And it's been difficult to get the right kind of
13 language to move forward. I think the hope was even if
14 the agency decided to request, we could get something out
15 there that might move forward in 2016. At this point it
16 doesn't appear very realistic. And it sounds like,
17 though, there's openmindedness from the agency to prepare
18 maybe -- I mean, possibly as agency request for '17, which
19 would be great.

20 All that, what I'm leading to, is in the interim
21 because with the shortage of inspectors and its difficulty
22 in getting quick action on projects, do you think -- and I
23 haven't teed this up with you in advance, so I'm kind of
24 putting you on the spot, Jack. But do you think there's a
25 chance to revisit maybe the question of interpretation,

1 not necessarily a rule change, but the possibility of a
2 different interpretation of the requirement that a permit
3 be issued in all these cases, for example, the like-for-
4 like opportunity, maybe take another look at a lower
5 threshold to get some of the more modest alterations
6 approved without the full-blown permit?

7 MR. DAY: That has actually been a direction that
8 I've given to our tech specialist in the midst of
9 everything else. That's rather difficult to get to with
10 us being in the building as well and being one tech
11 specialist short.

12 The concerns -- (to Mr. Wheeler) you can stop me if
13 we get behind.

14 MR. WHEELER: No, that's ...

15 MR. DAY: The concerns are this: The concerns are
16 the things that we would think about taking off the table
17 is alterations continue to raise their ugly head when
18 they're installed wrong. And unfortunately that continues
19 to happen.

20 And that's kind of the point of this process.
21 There's a problem when I -- our process doesn't
22 distinguish a different level of company to company -- I'm
23 trying to be very choice with my words -- skill and
24 ability. And my main interest is public safety. So I'd
25 love to take some things away. But I know certain

1 entities have a history of messing it up. And that
2 history is what involves in a significant public safety
3 problem. It may be something as simple as the door
4 reopening device, as simple as that. And the reason for
5 this permit type is to award the company that is doing
6 well, yes, and to prevent the company that's the problem
7 today -- that's causing the problem today is why we can't
8 do it overall.

9 So without going further into it, that is the
10 ultimate challenge right there, distinguishing "A" Company
11 from "B" Company. "'A,' you can." "'B,' there's no way.
12 It's not ever going to happen with you."

13 So advice? How to overcome that? That's what this
14 committee's about, and I'm all ears for that.

15 MR. McBRIDE: So if I understand correctly, this is
16 an ongoing effort. The agency's still open-minded to
17 finding a solution, but you've identified one of the
18 difficulties in getting there.

19 MR. DAY: That's the difficulty in getting there.
20 That is straight up and down the problem.

21 MR. McBRIDE: And this could be done short of a
22 formal rule. It sounds like it could be interpretational,
23 at least that's the hope of the agency if I'm
24 understanding you correctly, to provide some relief in the
25 short term through a new interpretation?

1 MR. DAY: No, I can't -- I can't do a new
2 interpretation of, for example, the door reopening device.
3 I use that as an example.

4 And it's not going to be allowed for me to do. I
5 guess that's probably a bad example. I think a door
6 reopening device has become an alteration in -- right? Am
7 I correct?

8 MS. ERNSTES: Uh-huh.

9 MR. DAY: So a door reopening device has become an
10 alteration in that now anyway.

11 So what's something that hasn't become an A17.1 that
12 we call an alteration?

13 Like-for-like drives. There's one. And -- but we
14 already have come out with it. If it's a like for like,
15 if it's the same, the same. If the drive -- the motion is
16 the same, then no, it's not an alteration. It's when the
17 motion is different that it's not. So we've already done
18 that. So that we're not doing all drives. We don't want
19 to do all drives. If it's like for like -- but that's in
20 that clarification document that was sent out the
21 beginning of this year or the very end of last year?

22 MS. ERNSTES: Maybe March.

23 MR. DAY: Is everybody familiar with that? It's on
24 our Web page. It outlines here's things that doesn't
25 require a permit. And some of those things can be turned

1 on with the permission of the inspector prior to an
2 inspection, so we do have a document that we've tried to
3 reach some of this with that.

4 MR. WHEELER: If the industry was to provide a list
5 of examples that the industry maybe sees as opportunity to
6 go to this, you know, not quite as extensive as the full
7 permit list that we've talked about in the past and so
8 forth, but if there were some quick wins that we could
9 provide you guys with a list for your review, are you
10 saying that there is an opportunity then to maybe issue
11 another letter similar to what you did in the drives as
12 these are not considered required for permit? Would that
13 help your process seeing as you guys are down a tech
14 specialist. And I know the workload is pretty heavy right
15 now. So maybe as an industry we can get together through
16 -- and provide a list?

17 MR. DAY: We can. And then justification for it and
18 why we would pull it away.

19 Another thing that we've done is phones. That's
20 another one. So we changed our process for phones.

21 And this is all like Bryan is saying has been from
22 input on the industry as well.

23 MR. WHEELER: Yeah. So the main thing with this
24 proposal, though, is that there's a lot of backup behind
25 all the different reasons that would be pretty detailed in

1 this proposal.

2 I think the immediate concern is with regard to time
3 line and workload, right? We've already recognized -- I
4 know we don't have a Scorecard here, but in the past
5 Scorecards have been pretty clear that annual inspections
6 we're behind on, right? because of lack of staff and
7 things of this nature.

8 So what we're saying by issuing these permits for
9 every one of these minor alterations, we're really in a
10 sense saying that that alteration is more important than
11 the annual inspection. Because that's got to get done
12 before the elevator can be turned back over to service and
13 so forth.

14 So I think the hope would be is that we can identify
15 some of these alterations that maybe aren't quite as
16 critical that we can get turned on. Yes, they need to be
17 done correctly. That's a given. But they need to be done
18 correctly. But in the sense, it would free up some
19 workload to get these annual inspections which are very
20 much more encompassing of the whole unit, not just that
21 alteration -- altered item. I think that's more important
22 is the overall system in a lot of cases.

23 So I guess that would be something that the industry
24 maybe can help with to get you guys a list of things that
25 we see as those possibilities and then provide some

1 feedback from there?

2 MR. DAY: It is. Get us a list -- a list is already
3 on our Web site. So there's your list. So that's the
4 things that we consider.

5 When whoever's working on it, I do want you to
6 realize what the law says. Whether how we feel, I will go
7 right back to what the RCW says about it.

8 MR. WHEELER: And that's where -- we understand. And
9 that's the -- the law is what this is hopeful to change
10 down the road. But that takes a much larger process.

11 I guess what Tom was asking and I think several of us
12 in the room are thinking is that, Is there an opportunity
13 between today and the end of that process that we could
14 just clarify a little better through that letter like you
15 did with the drives a few more items that may not need
16 that permit?

17 MR. DAY: Yes, you have caught me off guard.

18 And for this particular thing, I can definitely tell
19 you that we and others have poured over that list with
20 input already.

21 And if you have something new to bring to the table,
22 I certainly -- my ears are open for it. If it's the same
23 old discussion and justification, nothing new, then the
24 answer's no. So I do want to be very clear. New
25 information, yes.

1 And I'll leave this open-ended here with one thing:
2 The one thing that's really helped, especially the phones
3 and drives and other things, are the written procedures.
4 Those have really helped.

5 And that is part of why we've made these
6 justifications for the drive and the phones in the past
7 anyway. Because now the procedures say "do this." And
8 then if this is a procedure for a drive that must be done
9 on a category 1 safety test, as long as we're doing
10 category 1 safety tests timely, then it's going to catch
11 the fact that the timer is still installed -- the run
12 timer is still installed because you changed the drive
13 and --

14 And Becky and I were talking about this not too long
15 ago. The reason drive came into effect is drives were
16 being changed from Y delta to a soft start on certain
17 models and here's the run timer that's hooked up to the
18 delta relay. Here's a new soft starter, no place to put
19 the run timer. Let's tape those together and stick them
20 in the trough. That's what started this in the first
21 place.

22 So just to be very clear what our determination was,
23 the run timer's part of the category 1 safety test.
24 Somebody has to sign off that it works.

25 MR. WHEELER: Any other questions or comments on Type

1 "A" permit?

2

3 Determine the Next Steps From Future Agenda

4 Discuss the Topics to Further Aid in Understanding
5 the Problem and Possible Solutions

6

7 MR. WHEELER: Okay. Let's move on to determine the
8 next steps for future agenda, discuss the topics to
9 further aid in understanding the problem and possible
10 solutions.

11 Not knowing much about that topic, I will defer to
12 you, Jack.

13 MR. DAY: Okay. So what I tried to do -- and it's
14 down here actually in future business when we look at it
15 is I have some bullet points, and these bullet points were
16 things that were either already discussed at a previous
17 advisory committee but tabled for future. And I've tried
18 to put them all together, and if they had an analysis, I
19 put the analysis with it. And what this was was to give
20 us a starting -- to give the Advisory Committee a starting
21 place.

22 Now, we already know that Rob McNeill and the
23 elevator industry and the department of elevator
24 inspections for the state of Washington wants "A" permits.
25 So I went ahead and put that in new business. But what

1 else is wanted or needs to be worded? And so here's the
2 future business.

3 The first one, desire to adopt ASME A17.1-2013 code.
4 And that's a -- that can be controversial, but I want
5 folks to already realize that the City of Seattle is
6 already in that process. And I believe their process is
7 intended to be adopted by July 1, 2016? Am I correct? Is
8 that correct?

9 MR. SORENSEN: Somewhere near there.

10 MR. DAY: Somewhere near there, Al says.

11 So is there interest in the 2013 ASME and going
12 through that process?

13 We can keep this tabled or open later. I can discuss
14 with you that it is an extensive process. It's not a
15 simple one. Anytime you do new codes, it's not simple.

16 It's time to discuss it now. We can do it again.

17 MR. WHEELER: So let me make sure we're clear. You
18 want us as a group here today to decide which future items
19 need to be into new business?

20 MR. DAY: Yes.

21 MR. WHEELER: Okay. I don't know. Is there anybody
22 that has come prepared and reviewed this list to say we
23 want these in the new business or ...

24 MR. DAY: Those folks would have been you guys. So
25 we may be too new of a group to do it.

1 MR. WHEELER: I think that's what I was getting at is
2 that I think that this group is new enough to where maybe
3 we need to have these as future agenda items. I think
4 they're all valid items that we should consider.

5 MR. DAY: Let's go through them all --

6 MR. WHEELER: Do you want to go through it, just give
7 a summary and then --

8 MR. DAY: -- and maybe one will stand out.

9 MR. WHEELER: Okay.

10 MR. DAY: And we can -- you can ask questions along
11 the way.

12 MCP logs; update, edit by adding or removing items,
13 mandatory layout.

14 What this is is an interest -- and a few of the
15 people that aren't in the room that shared this interest.
16 But the MCP logs themselves, the owner -- BOMA owner who
17 is not here today had an interest of the elevator
18 inspectors and I and a few of the elevator companies have
19 an interest in the logs being the same, meaning no
20 deviation.

21 If it's a hydraulic elevator, then here's the
22 hydraulic elevator MCP log, line by line the same. Change
23 who's doing it at the top, but it's the same. If it's
24 attraction, it's the same, and so on and so forth. If
25 it's an escalator, it's the same. It's the same across

1 the board for the type of conveyance that it is.

2 And so that was one of the interests.

3 And another part of the interest was that some of the
4 items that are on today's log be made available by the
5 state and go back to like the state log that used to get
6 posted on the machine room wall.

7 The reason for that is that elevator companies don't
8 get the MCP log out on site January 1st of the year or
9 January 2nd or February. And sometimes March and into
10 April do they not get the log. Yet there's safety tests
11 and key switch logs -- fireman service key switch logs and
12 tests of that nature that are taking place, and they don't
13 have a log to document it on site because the MCP log is
14 where it's at today.

15 So there's been some interest in that as well.
16 Commonality of the type, common and then remove some of
17 the testing items that was done by others and have that as
18 a separate log posted on the wall.

19 Yet again, there's been other interests. And the
20 other interest has to deal with 8.11 tasks that are
21 similar in nature to 8.6 tasks.

22 For an example, this is the easiest one to talk
23 about: Cleaning the car top. There's a cleaning the car
24 top 8.6, and there's a cleaning the car top 8.11. There's
25 an examination and there's the maintenance task itself.

1 And so the interest has been to effectively coordinate the
2 examination task in with the 8.6 maintenance task itself
3 so they're not separate, they're one in the same.

4 And that's been a lot of discussion. The meeting
5 itself has been around the discussion, and I think that's
6 where folks have to agree on a philosophical what's this
7 mean.

8 And really what it means is you have to outline
9 what's dirty in your procedure, what means clean. I've
10 been through this discussion if not once, a hundred times.
11 What's clean in a hospital is different for what's clean
12 in an industrial site. But you got -- you have to outline
13 what's clean to instruct your mechanic on when to clean
14 it. But that's what would be needed to happen.

15 And so to work on these things, MCP log, update,
16 edit, add and remove items, mandatory layout, I have an
17 interest in doing it. I think most of the industry has an
18 interest in doing it.

19 And I would like to see this moved up to new business
20 and be gone as a means to change.

21 I have two questions -- Bob.

22 MR. OURY: Bob Oury with Pace Material Handling.

23 Our niche in this industry is material lifts, which
24 are governed by WAC part C, minimum standards for material
25 lifts. And we fall into ASME A17.1 only at 8.6 and 8.11

1 for MCP's. And then it refers back to WAC. And I would
2 be very concerned for owners of material lifts and for our
3 maintenance mechanics if there was any kind of standard
4 log because it would complicate our particular type of
5 equipment. And where other industries like electric
6 elevators may all be similar and use similar items in the
7 MCP, our industry, there are new two manufacturers that
8 make product that is similar. Some are winding drums.
9 Some of hydraulic. Some are mechanical. And when we were
10 tasked to create our own MCP and MCP logs, we looked at
11 trying to do something that would be one size fits all and
12 could not come up with it.

13 So I'd be very concerned that material lifts in any
14 way would be part of any standardized MCP log. It's a
15 very different piece of equipment than elevators and would
16 become -- the log itself would become far more
17 complicated.

18 MR. DAY: Interesting. Thank you.

19 Todd Baker, did you have a question?

20 MR. BAKER: No. I just wanted to make sure you saw
21 him.

22 MR. WHEELER: Any other questions or comments on the
23 MCP log?

24 So Jack, is it -- are you looking to just move this
25 to the new business item and then develop a review

1 committee? Or what are you thinking?

2 MR. DAY: That's exactly what I'm thinking is that
3 sometime on or before February I would have reached out to
4 stakeholders who want to participate: elevator companies,
5 building owners and the like that want to participate.
6 And we get started on one or more of these subject
7 headings here about the MCP log and begin a discussion to
8 first -- our first position or interest would be to have
9 something available for the 2017 calendar year, not
10 effective next year, but the year after. And the intent
11 would be -- the WAC code will state as per the sample.
12 WAC 296-96 steers us all to the sample on our -- on the
13 Web page.

14 And so the first order of business I would have with
15 the committee is to affect that sample on the Web page.

16 But to seek -- I don't want the Department to do it
17 itself.

18 MR. WHEELER: We had another question in the back?

19 MR. OURY: Jack, Bob Oury again with Pace Material
20 Handling.

21 Do you have in your mind an idea of what this log
22 would look like that you might be able to share with us
23 that would be a log for everything?

24 MR. DAY: Are we talking about material lifts or
25 generic?

1 MR. OURY: Yeah, generic or material lifts.

2 MR. DAY: Generic, I see it looking very similar to
3 what it does today. The reason I see it looking similar
4 to what it does today is that's the sample in the 2013
5 code. So I don't see that.

6 What I do see is the items contained within it being
7 mandatory placement. Door reopening device under car
8 heading number 1, the first one. So it's the same place
9 no matter what type of equipment that has a door reopening
10 -- material lift doesn't have a door reopening device.
11 But for those of you that would, and for that matter, all
12 lines, these things are located in the same place. This
13 is what the owners want.

14 So for me, similar to what we got. Some of the
15 things would likely be removed and put -- and then a state
16 log reinitiated that is printed and posted for things like
17 fireman service key switch log, for an example, and smoke
18 detector/heat detector log, that becomes its own thing.

19 So yeah, I do have somewhat of a vision.

20 The other thing is to work with companies in their
21 procedures, combining some of the examination items with
22 maintenance items, so we shorten the list in essence. But
23 that means you got to work on your procedures.

24 MR. WHEELER: Do you have a sign-up list for
25 stakeholders that are interested in this committee? Or

1 should they just contact their Advisory Board
2 representative to -- with the name and number and we get
3 that to you?

4 MR. DAY: So leading into that -- and I haven't
5 talked about it much here or at all -- we're actually
6 looking at outlining a format for how we do a rule in a --
7 if you can envision a Visio format; this is how we're
8 going to do it.

9 So it would be that I would seek folks who have
10 interest, and those folks get appointed to a subcommittee
11 that I would run.

12 So right now, it would be premature to take names.
13 It would be good to know who's interested in it today.
14 That would be nice to know.

15 (Various hands being raised.)

16 The next thing is make sure you're on our listserv
17 because I'll be asking for volunteers. And that's the
18 way I --

19 MR. WHEELER: That's the process. Perfect. Okay.

20 We want to -- any other comment on that?

21 We'll move on to the next item. Maintenance; a
22 similar reset as safety test. I assume -- go ahead.

23 MR. DAY: This was brought up by one of the elevator
24 companies was interested -- we did the -- the challenging
25 aspects of safety test but in a similar fashion,

1 maintenance and examination are not taken -- they do go
2 hand in hand.

3 And what will it take to get maintenance and
4 examination started? And I don't want to sit here and
5 preach the fact. But, you know, over the last little bit
6 I've been cleaning up my office and looking at old RCW's
7 and WAC. And, you know, back in 1963 folks at L & I and
8 folks at the "leg" had the insight to put maintenance and
9 examination and safety tests in those rules and laws way
10 back then.

11 And how we got here, I don't really want to discuss.
12 What I want to discuss is how we get back to maintenance,
13 examination.

14 We already got the safety test done. So I have an
15 interest in hearing from stakeholders, owners and elevator
16 companies, how to get maintenance back at the forefront of
17 what we do, not repair and call-back service, but
18 maintenance. How do we do that?

19 So that's what this is about. What do we do? What
20 needs to take place? What actions need to be engaged in
21 order to get that happening?

22 Because right now, the actions of giving civil
23 penalties is where we're at. You want to keep doing
24 that?

25 MR. WHEELER: Would that be something that maybe we

1 could discuss further at the stakeholder meeting after
2 this?

3 MR. DAY: We could discuss it further there. And it
4 may be something that as a new group may want to tackle in
5 February. But here to discuss and maybe somebody at the
6 group wants to say yep, we want to do that in February.

7 MR. LARSON: The safety test reset, what kind of
8 progress are we making on that? Are those safety tests
9 getting -- are we hitting the benchmarks?

10 MR. DAY: Not that I see overall. Spotty. There's
11 some.

12 Hopefully everybody's taking this very serious and
13 are actually doing it. I can assure you that the
14 Department will take this very serious July 1, 2016. So a
15 cavalier attitude today won't do you well come that time.

16 MS. ERNSTES: Swen, I don't think we're far enough
17 along to answer your question. Because we have a date in
18 December where people are supposed to mark when they're
19 going to do them in the next six months. And then if they
20 choose to buy into that program, they're going to have to
21 send reports to the Department. So we're not far enough
22 along yet.

23 MR. LARSON: So the benchmarks haven't started yet.
24 But we're seeing movement that way?

25 MR. DAY: We don't expect to see movement until March

1 as far as reporting goes. We do expect at the beginning
2 of the year for reports from inspectors to -- and our own
3 correction reports to start reversing the number of
4 corrections we're issuing before safety test -- category
5 1, 3 and 5 safety tests. That's what we expect.

6 But remember that the inspector will go out there,
7 and if the MCP has been edited by a highlight, they're not
8 going to write that up. Okay? They're not writing that
9 up if it's been edited.

10 So the real show and tell will start July 1st.
11 That's really when the rubber meets the road on the
12 situation.

13 MS. ERNSTES: I do know the elevator companies have
14 been talking to owners because I've gotten a few calls
15 from owners for clarification.

16 MS. WHEELER: All right. Any other questions on the
17 maintenance reset?

18 All right. Contracts, what is included in a full
19 maintenance contract. Do tell.

20 MR. DAY: That was a quick discussion with one of the
21 advisory members and one of the building owners is they're
22 continuously fielding the question "I thought I bought a,"
23 "Why do I have so many corrections? I thought I bought
24 a."

25 So the question came -- was posed to me at an

1 advisory level, do we want to put into some WAC or
2 statement this is what -- this is what a full maintenance
3 contract consists of or covers or something for the
4 building owner -- so the building owner now -- a lot you
5 may be shaking "no," but I'm really interested in what the
6 building owner says because that's who I want to hear
7 from. But the building owner needs to know what they're
8 supposed to have done.

9 And when folks are less than that, and they sometimes
10 may not be forthright in saying that they're less than
11 that. That's the reason the owners think they bought a
12 full maintenance, and they're asking me and others about
13 that.

14 And so do we want to outline it? Do we want to say
15 what it is?

16 Melissa.

17 MS. CLEARY: Melissa Cleary with Mobility Concepts.
18 (Inaudible) --

19 MS. DAY: Melissa, I can't hear you.

20 MS. CLEARY: It seems like a lot of the problems now
21 are because a lot of our customers have had years and
22 years with everything perfect. Now -- (inaudible)

23 MS. DAY: I can't hear you. Could you come up a
24 little bit, please. I'm sorry.

25 MS. CLEARY: A lot of our clients are -- (inaudible)

1 -- four years have nothing wrong with their equipment.

2 And so now they're having a different inspector, and
3 they're seeing different stuff that nobody ever looked at
4 wrong. So now for these building owners it seems to be a
5 concern because they are being asked if this fixed item
6 from ten years ago that they've been paying for an annual
7 operating permit and having inspections and nothing's been
8 found. Well, now, of course, the owners are upset. So I
9 don't think it's any of us. I can't speak for them. But
10 we all want to install the proper equipment and sure
11 stuff's done to code. But it's never been inspected. So
12 now you're asking the owners after years and years to pay
13 up for all this stuff that was never handled to begin
14 with. It's a big monetary thing you're asking a lot of
15 business owners to suddenly handle when they've never had
16 an inspection.

17 And maybe I'm the only one seeing that. But that's
18 what I'm hearing from clients.

19 MR. DAY: So does Mr. and Ms. Owner deserve to know
20 what it is that is full maintenance? You're --

21 MS. CLEARY: A company can provide that, should be
22 able to provide that, not the State. The State shouldn't
23 tell me how to do a maintenance contract. They can go out
24 and do the annual, but as a company, we should be
25 providing contracts that cover that. I don't think the

1 State needs to regulate that.

2 MR. DAY: I agree -- I -- you know, part of me
3 believes that to be so, Melissa. But most of me knows
4 that that isn't what happens. I wish it was. But then
5 you wouldn't need me here, quite frankly.

6 MR. WHEELER: Is there another question on the topic
7 or comment? Okay.

8 Again, I think this is one of those topics that you
9 would look for people interested in being on a committee
10 to discuss and then bring a proposal to the stakeholder
11 meeting for a suggested change.

12 MR. DAY: You know, and it might not need to be that
13 kind of level.

14 MR. WHEELER: Okay.

15 MR. DAY: You know, frankly put, it could mean here's
16 the standard MCP log and buyer beware. As with you going
17 and buying a refrigerator today. Buyer beware. And that
18 may be our position.

19 But again, this is something I'm bringing forward
20 from a stakeholder who wanted it heard under future
21 business.

22 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, it's -- as a building owner too,
23 we're not buying a refrigerator because refrigerators
24 aren't subjected to, you know, annual inspections and
25 everything else.

1 MR. DAY: That's a great insight.

2 MR. WRIGHT: But the problem is every time I review a
3 maintenance or, you know, try to seek competitive
4 proposals on maintenance agreements, they're all over the
5 place. And the definition of "maintenance" versus "wear
6 and tear" versus "replacement" is always up to somebody's
7 interpretation who's writing the agreement. So part of
8 the problem is, you know, it's never comparing apples to
9 apples. It's, you know, you're dealing with a lot of
10 things, even proprietary equipment and information. So it
11 makes it very difficult on an owner's part to be able to
12 review a maintenance proposal or seek competitive
13 proposals and to be able to evaluate them to make a
14 decision. And let alone the issues in the field when
15 maintenance contracts and maintenance work is being done.
16 You know, what was somebody's maintenance on a previous
17 agreement is now a replacement under somebody else's. So,
18 you know, the --

19 MR. DAY: Or obsolete.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Or obsolete. So you see a lot of
21 additional costs and you wonder, Well, what am I paying
22 for? What is the difference between maintenance and wear
23 and tear?

24 Just for an owner to understand those sometimes gets
25 very complicated. And certainly as the equipment becomes

1 more complicated and more proprietary. I mean ...

2 MR. DAY: So there's some -- there is some interest.
3 But it probably needs to be headed more by the folks that
4 are interested in doing it.

5 Bob.

6 MR. OURY: Bob, Pace Material Handling again.

7 You know, this is a -- this -- I work in both the
8 elevator industry and also in industrial equipment. We
9 supply a lot of equipment that goes into warehouses --
10 material handling equipment. And for 30 years, I've been
11 providing service and maintenance agreements to owners, to
12 property managers. And this has been a difficult subject
13 for the whole 30 years I've been doing it because one
14 company, mine, may provide travel, may provide parts, may
15 provide certain services, and my competitor may provide
16 something else. And in none of those industries that I
17 work in is there a state authority or any kind of national
18 authority that defines what those things are. And we are
19 always constantly as a company that does provide a high
20 level of service always fighting the for lack of a better
21 term smoke and mirrors of other companies trying to not
22 show what they provide in their maintenance agreement.
23 And so I don't know that it's any different in this
24 industry other than we do have MCP's that do give us some
25 standards not unlike the auto industry that has standards.

1 And I was recently looking for a new car, and one
2 company provides maintenance for the first I forget how
3 many miles, and another company doesn't. You have to --
4 you know, including oil changes, and the other company
5 doesn't.

6 So this is a problem in a lot of industries. I don't
7 know that the State is going to be able to really resolve
8 that or mandate that my competitors are going to have to
9 step up to the level or I'm going to have to step down to
10 the level that the State requires. I think the fact that
11 we have MCP's gives it a fairly high standard to at least
12 start with.

13 MR. WHEELER: Becky.

14 MS. ERNSTES: Well, when the owners call me, the
15 first thing I ask them is: Do you know what a MCP is?
16 And a lot of them don't have a clue. And what that means
17 is the salesmen aren't talking to them about MCP's. They
18 don't know what they're supposed to buy as a minimum which
19 is my main question I get from owners. "What's the
20 minimum I have to have for my elevator?" And I think that
21 it shouldn't necessarily be coming from the State, but we
22 already have that minimum. The sales people need to be
23 cognizant of what are the State's minimums, and that's
24 what they need to convey to their customers. I mean, what
25 do you provide for what Bob was talking about as far as,

1 Oh, well, we provide -- we don't charge you for every time
2 or we don't charge you mileage or we charge you one way or
3 we put you in with a group when we're going to Port
4 Angeles. I don't think that that's the kind of level
5 we're talking about. I think we are talking about the
6 basic MCP and what that means to a customer. You're
7 testing your things. You know, I don't think we want to
8 get involved in all the minutia, but I certainly --

9 MR. DAY: Becky -- Becky, hang on a second. This
10 group is not -- this group (indicating) will determine
11 what this group (indicating) wants to get involved. Be
12 careful.

13 MS. ERNSTES: Okay. But what I hear from the owners
14 is they want the basics, what do they have to do. And I
15 don't think that they're getting that from the elevator
16 companies.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, if I could respond to a
18 little bit of that, you know, that's true, Becky, you're
19 absolutely right. But unfortunately a lot of our
20 elevators or material lifts or other equipment is put in
21 in new construction or in remodel construction, and by the
22 time the owner gets it, he has no clue that a maintenance
23 control plan was even part of the deal.

24 And, in fact, I talk with a lot of architects on our
25 equipment and have to educate them; they aren't aware.

1 And I see a lot of specs that don't say anything about
2 maintenance control plans, that don't say anything about
3 the manufacturer guaranteeing that they're going to meet
4 the standards of WAC or whatever the other codes are. And
5 contractors, you know -- and I'm not trying to pick on
6 contractors -- they don't know. They're assuming that
7 whoever's selling this stuff knows what they're doing.
8 But by the time the owner gets it, he had no clue he was
9 actually buying something that had to have an MCP. He had
10 no idea. So -- you know.

11 MR. WHEELER: Good points there. And I think
12 there's an interest to bring that to the stakeholders and
13 -- or to the Advisory Committee, moving it forward to new
14 business, then those stakeholders should bring that forth.

15 The next topic, Residential Maintenance Licensing.

16 MR. DAY: That's another item that was set forth
17 given to me to present as future business. I think this
18 has been on the docket as future business for at least a
19 year. And those that brought it forth are should the
20 residential maintenance be required to be licensed.
21 That's about all I can talk about that.

22 MR. WHEELER: A comment, Bob?

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Bob McLaughlin, the Tramway User
24 Group.

25 Just to give you a little bit of flavor, our group is

1 focused on residential incline elevators which is a small
2 percentage of residential maintenance. But this is --
3 this item is getting a lot of discussion within our
4 community. And I just want to present to you the fact
5 that this is already being actively discussed.

6 One of the big driving forces for that -- well,
7 actually there are two. One is the imposition of the
8 maintenance control programs. And the other is the fact
9 that the Department has gone through a recall of some
10 earlier models which has generated -- in fact, Becky gave
11 me some information today of status report on the recall
12 and upgrade program. And that has resulted in a lot of
13 new installations and upgrades and so on.

14 And so people who have not been required to address
15 maintenance as owners now are very much involved with
16 this.

17 And one man that I had hoped could be here today is
18 involved in a totally new construction. And it turns out
19 that his profession is writing maintenance control
20 programs. And very much plugged in, very much aware. He
21 and I have frequent discussions about maintenance as --
22 some people in the residential elevator community are very
23 involved in the maintenance of their units. Others are
24 not.

25 That discussion is ongoing, and I -- it will

1 continue. But unfortunately we're not in a position now
2 to make a presentation to you as to what our group would
3 like.

4 So what I would ask is that you just factor that in
5 when you look at a time table on this. And I think it
6 would -- I'm always in favor of something coming from the
7 manufacturers, the owners back to you folks rather than
8 something coming down the other way before we've had a
9 chance to look at it.

10 So it's a hot tissue. It's being discussed. I don't
11 have anything that I can present to you today, but
12 hopefully as time goes on we'll be able to work with you
13 on that.

14 MR. WHEELER: Great. Any other comment or question
15 on that topic?

16 All right. The FAID: Consider Re-evaluation. This
17 is the fire -- smoke alarm devices, right?

18 MR. DAY: Fire alarm initiation devices. Smoke and
19 heat. Consider re-evaluation.

20 As some of you may know, Rob McNeill worked on this
21 along with others in his immediate world including some
22 fire marshals I believe. And we had decided at the time
23 that -- or he had decided at the time that it was proper
24 to utilize the existing log for initiation devices and to
25 see how that worked out.

1 And since then, we at the Department would listen to
2 -- if there was concern that this is going well or if
3 there's concerns. And there's some concerns about this.

4 The City of Seattle will regulate this to a degree
5 where they license the entity that is performing the test.
6 We in turn put it to the owners through WAC. The owner
7 authorizes somebody including themselves to do the test.

8 So what we're seeing is still to this day people do
9 not know what they're signing off. They don't know if it
10 works or not. And worse yet, we're seeing folks that know
11 it's wrong and signing off. That's even worse. That's
12 what we're seeing today.

13 Now, part of the reason is these folks don't -- so I
14 think another step is necessary for this. And that step
15 is those written procedures are not there. They're not on
16 site on how this is supposed to work or what you're
17 signing off so that it's more applicable to hold somebody
18 accountable.

19 But the overwhelming problem is we won't really know
20 that it's wrong until that project gets modernization and
21 nobody upgrades the smoke system. And that's when we find
22 out the smokes haven't been working for the last ten years
23 on alternate landings. And nobody's been there to see any
24 different.

25 So the point here is this problem, it still exists,

1 and we're going to have to talk about it at a much deeper
2 level in the next years -- next year to come on what to do
3 about the fire alarms and the testing thereof by somebody
4 that's going to sign it off saying that they're actually
5 working per the code.

6 So I do have some fire alarm companies that are
7 starting to chime in and have an interest in being
8 involved with this.

9 So I -- Rob's not here, but I wanted him to know that
10 this has to be resurrected again because it needs to be
11 addressed.

12 And the firemen need to be assured, and I want folks
13 to know that I want the firemen to buy on this too. We
14 don't want to stand alone. This is fire fighter's
15 operation at the end of the day. Where is their role at
16 in this. And I don't believe it's fair that it all falls
17 upon the elevator inspection department and the elevator
18 companies either. This should be spread out throughout
19 those fire jurisdictions too.

20 So -- and maybe it's they become -- I don't know.
21 We'll have to see.

22 But I do know there's a problem, and the problem
23 isn't going away. We're still seeing this same problem as
24 before.

25 MR. WHEELER: Any additional comment or question on

1 that topic?

2 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I have a question.

3 MR. WHEELER: Yeah.

4 MR. WRIGHT: So, you know, again, just as you say,
5 installations vary between elevator company and elevator
6 company. Fire alarm inspections vary quite a bit between
7 different jurisdictions.

8 I know in new construction when we put in a fire
9 alarm system, that system runs a self diagnostic every
10 week and prints out a report. And that report is supposed
11 to be reviewed by the fire department on their annual
12 inspection. If alterations are being done in the
13 building, ten percent of the existing alarm system gets
14 inspected and put through a test.

15 So it's not like it isn't being done in all
16 jurisdictions, but I'm sure there are some where it isn't
17 and some that are much more diligent than others.

18 MR. DAY: I agree.

19 MR. WRIGHT: And so if a fire -- if a smoke detector
20 or a heat detector is not functioning, that's reported in
21 the weekly self test.

22 But obviously that's new construction. And under the
23 older codes, that doesn't occur.

24 But again, like you said, is that -- is that
25 something to raise to the jurisdictions of the fire

1 department level or is that something else to put on the
2 coat of an already strapped elevator inspector?

3 MR. DAY: Exactly. And I don't -- today it's a
4 signature or it's an initial. And it's something that the
5 fire departments used to do way back when. And now
6 they've gotten strapped and stopped doing it.

7 Well, I think we need to at least let them know that
8 there's a problem, and we aren't the do all be all for
9 you, fire department. You have a role as well. And if
10 you can't do it, maybe you come up with a plan to make it
11 happen yourselves.

12 For all intents and purposes this is NFPA code, which
13 our code refers to "shall install and test too." But it
14 is the fireman's code. It's their code. And I'd like to
15 see them in a position to assist with this and not us
16 being -- like you said and I've been saying it's not just
17 us; it needs to be them.

18 MR. WHEELER: A question? Yes.

19 MR. WILSON: Mike with Mobility Concepts.

20 I just wanted to make a comment to -- I can't --

21 MR. DAY: Clyde Wright.

22 MR. WILSON: Clyde, true that the fire panels today,
23 they are much smarter and do self tests -- (inaudible) --
24 state of the smoke detector. But what it does not do is
25 it does not go through a functionality test. And I know a

1 lot of the problem is the functionality; it's where a lot
2 of the problems are at. You know, the smoke detector
3 might be working, true. But when you actually go to test
4 it, it's not recalling the elevator. That's the part you
5 need to capture.

6 MR. WRIGHT: And what I'm saying is that, you know,
7 sometimes that is done when there's an alteration in the
8 building that has a more modern system. Some
9 jurisdictions require that 10 percent of the existing
10 devices that aren't being remodeled but are existing go
11 through that level of testing. And if they find failure
12 in some of those, they can increase the number of devices
13 they want to test. So, you know, it is a little bit of a
14 hit and miss. But, you know, in the south test you're
15 sending a signal to every device that -- and testing
16 whether or not that signal's returned. So there is some
17 functionality test, but you're not putting it under a
18 smoke condition and testing recall and those types of
19 things.

20 MR. WHEELER: Good. Any other comments on the fire
21 alarm initiation device?

22 Okay. We'll move to the ASNI A10.4 Maintenance.
23 Details on that?

24 MR. DAY: This again is another future business
25 that's been there for a while. It raised its head under

1 A10.4 which is temporary construction when we first moved
2 personnel and material either in the construction of,
3 demolition of a building. We've all seen these stuck to
4 the side of buildings.

5 What was going on or what has gone on and why this
6 has gotten here is A10.4 does have a maintenance section
7 in it, and it had gotten away from a few folks to realize
8 that these things must be maintained by a licensed person
9 in the state of Washington. And what we're looking for is
10 there had been a couple of accidents because of the sheer
11 fact that they were not being maintained by, and those
12 folks that were maintaining it actually got themselves
13 hurt, and they were not licensed people. And so it
14 started there.

15 And as far as I'm aware, the industry has
16 straightened up most of this itself by informing the
17 people that rent these things that you can't go down to
18 the local labor store and pick up a laid-off high school
19 kid in the summer and say, Oh, you're the operator of
20 these, and by the way, here's a -- (inaudible). That has
21 to be somebody that's trained, licensed.

22 So there's been some of that. But we're concerned
23 that it might raise its head again. And so the intent
24 here was to get a group of these folks together to
25 outline, again, a standardized process for what this looks

1 like for maintenance.

2 And for those of you that are unfamiliar with A10.4,
3 there's daily tasks, weekly tasks, and monthly tasks, and
4 quarterly tasks outlined in A10.4.

5 And so the need to assimilate or determine on these
6 daily tasks which -- are there any of these daily tasks
7 that can be done by an unlicensed person. Okay?

8 So that's what this is about.

9 MR. WHEELER: Questions/comments on that?

10 All right. Acceptable LULA applications (limit to
11 install).

12 MR. DAY: As hopefully everybody is aware, LULA's are
13 limited for installations in the state of Washington.
14 There are a few folks, but very -- and very few that are
15 interested in expanding where they can be installed.
16 Currently the only places they're allowed to be installed
17 is existing churches and existing --

18 MS. ERNSTES: Clubs.

19 MR. DAY: -- clubs, schools, --

20 MS. ERNSTES: And historical.

21 MR. DAY: -- historical --

22 MS. ERNSTES: Not schools. Not schools.

23 MR. DAY: -- and places of historical value.

24 MS. ERNSTES: Not schools.

25 MR. DAY: Historical society. Am I correct?

1 So there's limitations. But there's a interest in,
2 ah, now I want one in my bank. I'm building a new bank
3 building, and I want one there. And right now the WAC
4 doesn't let you do it.

5 So one of the things that's been a struggle I think
6 both with the ASME itself and the State of Washington is
7 to find when and where you are actually allowed to use a
8 limited use device in its entirety.

9 To go on just a little bit more, probably every other
10 week somebody calls Becky or me and says, "I want to put
11 in a LULA in place of a vertical platform lift" or
12 somebody called them a wheelchair lift. And they want to
13 do it to meet ADA codes. And LULA isn't required with a
14 foot platform to meet ADA codes for a wheelchair. So they
15 don't understand what a LULA is for. And we don't help
16 much and neither does A17.1 in defining the fact of where
17 it should or should not be used.

18 And it keeps postponing because I'd rather A17.1
19 define it where it's supposed to be used than us.

20 And so the interest -- the reason this is here is
21 there's one person that's interested in doing this. Are
22 there others interested in doing this and defining when
23 and how and where you use a LULA elevator in the state of
24 Washington?

25 MR. WHEELER: So on this one, you would like to hear

1 from stakeholders if --

2 MR. DAY: If they're interested.

3 MR. WHEELER: -- if there's interest in moving this
4 to a permanent agenda item. Okay.

5 MR. DAY: And when we do --

6 MR. WHEELER: They can do that e-mailing you.

7 MR. DAY: They can e-mail me. Also, when we do, we
8 have to make sure that we understand it's not just us,
9 it's going to be the building official. The local
10 building official is also involved in this. Because they
11 are the end "yes, you can" or "no, you can't" on this.

12 MR. WHEELER: Okay. Proposal for Comb Impact Device.
13 I think this is another item that's been on the agenda in
14 the past. Is there information in here?

15 MR. DAY: It starts on page 5 and -- page 5 and 6. I
16 think that's it. Yeah, it is.

17 And there is some concern comments also on these
18 sections.

19 Do I -- would I need to explain what I'm talking
20 about, escalator comb impact device? Is everybody
21 familiar with that? Okay. So --

22 MR. WHEELER: Maybe you could explain why it was on
23 the agenda before and now it's not.

24 MR. DAY: Why it was on the agenda and got then moved
25 down to future business is there's been some serious

1 accidents with escalators in the state of Washington, and
2 that may be a fact but conclusive that a comb impact
3 device would have either limited the severity of it or
4 prevented it in total, altogether. And some of the
5 accidents resulted in amputation. Some of the accidents
6 resulted -- one comes to mind of somebody that basically
7 got scalped. Another one that's widely published is the
8 individual that was strangled and died.

9 And so would and could these have helped?

10 And it got tabled because ASME A17.3 committee had
11 been working on this subject at a national level. And
12 where -- we were watching to see if ASME put this into the
13 -- for existing escalator codes. All existing escalators
14 shall da-da-da. And that would make that quite a process
15 of -- putting something like this into rule would have
16 been very simple. However, they actually moved it away
17 and sent it to another committee to work on. And
18 currently I don't actually know where it is. But I don't
19 feel like it's moving anywhere at the national ASME level.

20 And so the intent here for this is: Do we need to
21 move this item forward as a minimum requirement for
22 escalators in the state of Washington to promote public
23 safety and building safety?

24 And so I just basically resurrected the form that we
25 began with way back then, a year and a half ago, and am

1 interested in those folks that are willing to work on
2 this.

3 Part of the problem is we're -- again, we're missing
4 the BOMA -- the building owner. That person's not here.
5 So -- they're the one that's going to have to foot the
6 brunt of this cost of doing it.

7 But the consideration here is can we make these
8 things safer than what they are right now. And I would
9 like to believe that we have an interest in doing this.

10 Any questions about this particular subject?

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Manufacturers -- do you have any
12 feedback regarding -- like what is required --
13 (inaudible). But have you heard feedback from
14 manufacturers as to what --

15 MR. DAY: I actually -- not too much manufacturers.
16 Manufacturers had feedback and I put it into this proposal
17 in number 3 and number 4 of this.

18 So what I did, though, was contact the manufacturer
19 who makes the device. And they make the device for a
20 large majority of the escalators that have ever been
21 built. And you may not know that many of the escalators
22 use the same truss design. It just has somebody else's
23 name on it.

24 And so they supplied many of the devices for the
25 State of New York. So as New York is much more

1 diversified in the number of escalators and different
2 manufacturers than the state of Washington ever would
3 consider being, and New York's done this already.

4 I also know how much that manufacturer -- the company
5 that makes the device, and it's a plate that replaces the
6 plate that's on there. You take the plate that's on there
7 off, and you put this plate on there and adjust it and
8 wire it in place. So I know how much the plate costs with
9 the device. And I also know -- understand the average
10 length of time it takes to do the work. And knowing that
11 most of the older escalators are directional -- they may
12 say they go up and down, but they really will only go one
13 way. You know, they might go the other way in an
14 emergency for a minute, tops, then you will have a
15 problem.

16 MR. WHEELER: So again, you're looking for input from
17 stakeholders on this to move it -- see if we want to move
18 this forward again?

19 MR. DAY: You know, it's a interest to this group.
20 This group. My interest is this group. Because this
21 group is public safety. And this is put here for --

22 MR. WHEELER: Public safety, sure.

23 MR. DAY: -- for this group and for public safety,
24 and do we need to move forward with it.

25 MR. WHEELER: I think the action item then for this

1 group would be to consult with our stakeholders and be
2 prepared at the next meeting to --

3 MR. DAY: Me too.

4 MR. WHEELER: -- provide a recommendation to move
5 forward from your stakeholder groups or not.

6 Good? All right.

7 Any other questions on that topic?

8

9 Future Business (Other)

10

11 MR. WHEELER: Okay. We do have a couple more minutes
12 in -- are there -- I guess I'll ask: Is there any other
13 future business items that this group or the stakeholders
14 in the room would like to see added or discussed in future
15 business?

16 Mike.

17 "MIKE": Well, one thing that was not on the front
18 page was licensing criteria but it's on the page 3 for
19 future business.

20 MR. DAY: Was that licensing for residential?

21 MR. WHEELER: It says "Licensing criteria."

22 MR. DAY: Yeah, that wasn't talked about. Sorry.
23 Didn't mean to skip that.

24 MR. WHEELER: Can you --

25 MR. DAY: What that is in interest -- when you read

1 the bullet points, it's interest in combining some of the
2 categories.

3 Many of you know we have nine categories. But when
4 you look across other states, they don't -- nobody has
5 nine categories. And is it possible to combine some of
6 these such as category 2 with category 6? And can 7 be
7 combined? You know, remove commercial dumb waiters and
8 now can this be combined?

9 So these are subjects to be discussed.

10 Combining category 3 and 4. These are industrial
11 type of situations. Special purpose elevators I believe
12 is in there. Belt man-lifts. An interest in combining
13 these since they're a similar conveyance type. Not
14 exactly the same, but very similar.

15 The other interest when you go down to the fourth
16 bullet it looks like was right now if you do not -- if you
17 do not pass a test through NEIP, the elevator trade union
18 for apprenticeship, if you don't pass that, then you may
19 have to sit for a test. But also here recently within the
20 last year is the CAT and CET.

21 And so what this means is we have an interest --
22 there's an interest to combine certain categories, and
23 then move to -- you can take your test here, here or here,
24 meaning NEIP, CET or CAT. And that's where you go to take
25 a test and you pass the test there. And to move the

1 Department further away from taking a Department test
2 where we would just authorize NEIP, CAT or CET and go with
3 that position. We would probably still need some
4 specialized tests that are out there for some categories.

5 Bob was talking about -- we were talking about the
6 residential incline elevator. That's something quite
7 unique. So that -- we probably could give that CET or
8 CAT. Or maybe we couldn't. Maybe partial we could and do
9 it that way.

10 Anyway, that's -- what that's about is having other
11 options available for folks to become qualified and
12 certified licensed elevator professionals and limit the
13 number of license types we have and start combining them.

14 So we -- the Department has an interest in that. And
15 to put it more in the hands of the industries that
16 actually do this work anyway. That's what they do for our
17 profession.

18 Becky.

19 MS. ERNSTES: Well, this kind of jogged my memory
20 when you were talking about that.

21 We still have an outstanding educational policy that
22 we need to turn into rule at some point. And that's old
23 business that we need to. So it seems like we should work
24 on the categories at the same time we work on education
25 because we need to transform that education from a policy

1 to a rule, which means we will get out of the business of
2 evaluating, maybe, depending on what the rule turns out to
3 be, evaluating the people who have not gone through a
4 formal program, which takes up a lot of our time.

5 So combining education and testing and -- it's all
6 together in my mind as far as categories, testing and
7 education.

8 MR. DAY: I might follow -- basically what Becky is
9 saying, CAT, you have to pass -- you have to be able to
10 show/demonstrate a certain level of skill and ability to
11 even get in, and this is what you're doing as a trade to
12 even get in CAT. Then you go through the CAT program and
13 you pass it. Now you become certified through CAT.

14 Currently there's another method which is you show us
15 that you've been through that policy Becky was talking
16 about and come and take our test.

17 And what I am saying here is we want to get out of
18 having to test for this and those training programs
19 because there's entities out there that are nationally
20 recognized that do it now. They do it now. And why do
21 we need us doing it when they're doing it now?

22 It means, though, that we're going to have to combine
23 some of these categories for licenses in order to achieve
24 that. Okay?

25 MR. WHEELER: All right.

1 You had one more question?

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, just a comment on this.

3 And this has just popped up recently in some conversations
4 I've had with the Port of Seattle. I've talked with Bob
5 Oury with Material Lifts. And I've talked with some folks
6 up at -- (inaudible) -- in Snohomish County. And the
7 concerns are is the people coming in and working on the
8 equipment that really have not received any training on
9 that equipment, meaning, you know, be it IPL, VPL. It
10 could be a material lift. It could be a rack and pinion
11 elevator. And concerns are is the way the licensing is is
12 that they're not really getting training on that
13 equipment, but they're licensed to go work on it. And
14 some of these entities are asking for, Is there anyplace
15 else that we can get training so we can work on our own?
16 You know, there are 270 exempt people.

17 So there's some concerns I have, you know, just from
18 what I've been talking with about on all these licensing
19 and getting these fees combined and the categories. You
20 know, there are people out there that are working on
21 equipment that have not had training on the equipment, but
22 they're licensed to work on them.

23 MR. WHEELER: Okay.

24 All right. Again, if there's interest in moving
25 this, there should be, you know, from stakeholders to

1 bring it up and form a group to provide a recommendation
2 and maybe work on the rule that's still out there that
3 needs to be in play.

4 So with that, we are at our 11:00 time line. I
5 officially close the meeting.

6 Please know that at 11:15 there will be a
7 stakeholders meeting, a little bit more informal
8 conversation, ask questions of the Department and so
9 forth, if you can stick around.

10 (Whereupon, at 11:00 a.m.,
11 proceedings adjourned.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

November 17th, 2015

Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-in

Last Name	First Name	Contact Number	Are you the Primary Point of Contact? Y or N	E-Mail Address
Joe Day	Jack	360 902 6128	N	DAY1235@Lni.c.wa.gov
Wright	Clyde	425 785 8721	Y	cwright@trammellcrow.com
SORENSEN	ALAN	206 - 684-8456	Y	ALAN.SORENSEN@SEATTLE.CO
Whitelee	Bayan	425-786-7113	N	Bayan.whitelee@ThyssenKrupp.com
LARSON	SWEN	206-465-8072	Y	slarson@iuc19.org
Wood	Steven	509-939-2264	N	swoodp@comcast.net
Lundberg	Dan	206-622-5565	Y	dlundberg@fujiteramericas.com
Ross	Spencer	425 864 2352	N	ross@eltec.cc
HASTINGS	MIKE	425-864-0500	Y	MHASTINGS@ELTEC.CC
McLAUGHLIN	BOB	206 246 3062	Y	TIDELINE@MINDSPRING.CO
RYAN	ANDY	253-653-3379	Y	nordic44@comcast.net
Ernstes	Becky	360-902-6456	N	ERNB235@LNI.WA.GOV
Jensen	Jack	503-255-0079	N	josh.jensen@thyssenkrupp.com
Jensen	Eric	509-703-9200	N	eric.jensen@thyssenkrupp.com
Felder	Todd	425-518-2184	N	todd.felder@thyssenkrupp.com
HENNING	RON	425-247-5637	N	ron.henning@thyssenkrupp.com
Pop	Marius	425-503-8406	Y	mpop@primariuslevator.com
Chain	Lee	206 954 1821	Y	lchain@hkaconsulting.com
SPAFFORD	DAVID	206 425 7602020	Y	DAVID.SPAFFORD@SEATTLE.CO

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

November 17th, 2015

Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Meeting Sign-in

Last Name	First Name	Contact Number	Are you the Primary Point of Contact? Y or N	E-Mail Address
M McBride	Tom	360 481 1824	Y	tom@mcbridepa.com
Burstin	Kip	206-794-8881	Y	harvey.burstin@otis.com
Koenig	David	425-305-9707	N	david.koenig@meus.com
Molesworth	Wayne	509-880-6942	N	Molw235@LNI.wa.gov
Metcalfe	Richard	425-990-1461	N	metr235@LNI.wa.gov
COTE	John	253 596 3939	N	cote235@LNI.wa.gov
ERLICH	MATTHEW	360 902 6508	N	mat235@LNI.wa.gov
Brewer	Christine	360 688 1098	N	christine@olyga.gov
Reed	Greg	(253) 872-9006	N	greg.reed@pnhinc.com
Quinn	BIBB	253 872-9006	Y	bob.avery@pnhinc.com
CLARY	MELISSA	253-891-0170	Y	melissa@mobilitygroup
Wilson	MIKE	253-370-3665	N	MIKE@MOBILITYCONCEPTS.WA.GOV
Baker	Ted	360-902-4334	N	bakt235@LNI.WA.GOV
CORDARO	DAVID OF SEATTLE CITY	206-684-7933	N	dave.cordaro@seattle.gov
tenderon	Ricky	425-864-3584	Y	ricky.tenderon@thegreenkey.com

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