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CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: We're going to go ahead and start in respect of your time. So they'll continue to work on WebEx. I'd like to welcome everybody to the May 15, 2018, Elevator Safety Advisory Committee. My name's Rob McNeill. I'm the Chairman, and I represent licensed elevator contractors.

I'll start with Garry and let everybody introduce themselves.

MR. WOOD: Garry Wood. I represent general contractors.

MR. NORRIS: Jim Norris. I represents labor.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Dotty Stanlaske, Chief Elevator Inspector.

MR. CLEARY: Scott Cleary, Vice Chair, and I represent the 270 and residential.

MR. JONES: Paul Jones, City of Seattle Chief.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

The first order of business is to give you some quick safety information.
If there is a catastrophe or a fire while we're in here, we'll exit through this door (indicating) to the west/northwest of this room. We'll meet in the parking lot, and then we'll count belly buttons and determine what we need to do from there. So please do so in an orderly fashion in the event we have to do that.

The purpose of this meeting is to review and act on old and new business as well as communicate information to you through the Chief's Report during business items.

The format changed last year for these meetings to synchronize them with the electrical safety committee group. So there will not be any stakeholder participation until we're done. And as everyone noted, this morning we had a session before so you can give us input as well as afterwards. So I appreciate your understanding of that.

Comments Regarding February Minutes

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: The first order of business is the February minutes. Is there a motion to approve the minutes or amend the minutes?

MR. CLEARY: I motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Is there a second?

MR. NORRIS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: It's been moved and seconded.
All in favor?

THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Opposed? The minutes of the February meeting have been approved.

Chief's Report

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: We will now commence with the Chief's report. Dotty, would you be kind enough to discuss that?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Certainly.

Scorecard/Accidents

SECRETARY STANLASKE: There are printouts in the back of the room. We'll start with the accidents.

So the number of accidents for the second quarter in 2018, we had no at-fault accidents, and we had approximately four escalator accidents where it was determined that it was the user's fault and not the equipment's fault.

For our annual and other inspections completed, sadly we are still behind the curve. We're looking at 65 percent, and it appears as though we're at approximately -- we're hovering about 12 percent. But that's for the
annual inspections. It does not include the other
inspections that have been completed. And we've had quite
an influx in those. We are working on various methods to
make our inspectors more efficient as well as we are still
looking to hire people.

Any questions on the scorecard and accident report?

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: On the scorecard, on
inspections for the commissioning inspections ... 

SECRETARY STANLASKE: New installations? Is that
what you mean?

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Yeah.

Do you -- and that would be under all other
inspections completed?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: As well as any alterations or
so forth? It looks like things are staying pretty
constant with that number.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Do you see that based on the
number of permits going down or is it going to remain
steady or ...

SECRETARY STANLASKE: I see it remaining steady --
pretty steady for a while.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Okay.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Any other questions?
Open Seats on ESAC

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay. We have one open seat on the Safety Advisory Committee, and I believe that's an architect/engineer position. So if you know of anyone that's interested in fulfilling that seat, please encourage them to apply.

Combined Stakeholder Meeting in September

SECRETARY STANLASKE: In September we are looking to -- we've had various separate stakeholder meetings. So I believe we had two with the elevator companies, two with building owners, and I think just one so far with labor. And we're looking at doing our second meeting -- or maybe it was two with labor. But we had a really poor showing at the last meeting. So we are -- we've asked IUEC if we can go to their meeting in September and talk with their folks about any concerns that they might have. And then later in September, we're going to bring all three groups together to sort of talk about what we've heard from each party as far as the concerns that they're facing.

As you can imagine, the companies are saying that they don't have enough labor. And labor -- the mechanics are saying that they're overworked. And the building
owners are saying that they're being penalized for work that their maintenance companies should do and haven't been doing. So we're trying to -- our goal is to bring everybody together, to get them in the same room, to start talking about some of these issues as well as see if there's somehow a way that we can address those.

Hot Topic: Training - Recap of March and Preview of June

SECRETARY STANLASKE: In June, June 26th, 27th and 28th we'll be holding three days of training. And those -- that training will focus on A17.3 because this is the first time that we've adopted 17.3. And it will also focus on the rules that were in WAC that have been repealed because of the adoption of A17.3.

We had a really good safety -- I'm sorry -- really good inspector training in March. And we had some internal presentations. We had one on grounding and bonding. We had one on NRTL's from the electrical program and what's required for prints and plans. We also had some training for our inspectors on ethics and conflict of interest. And we had some outside companies come in and present their new products for us to look at. So it was a really good training session.

The one in March was limited just to inspectors. And
that would be inspectors from the State as well as City of
Seattle and City of Spokane.

But again, the June meeting is open to everyone,
particularly since we will be talking about A17.3 in
relationship to the WAC rules that were repealed.

And that's all I have for now.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Good. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE IN AUDIENCE: Do you have a
location on that training?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Oh, I'm sorry.

That's in Tukwila.

MS. ERICKSEN: Tacoma.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Do you have the dates?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: I'm sorry?

MS. ERICKSEN: Tacoma.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: I get Tukwila and Tacoma mixed
up all the time.

June 26th through 28th.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Thank you.

Old Business

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: We'll move on now. I will
start with old business.
CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: The first old business item, the report from the Risk Assessment Subcommittee. So everyone should have received a package that's quite thick. And I'll run everyone through the package.

In the back of this package, the third page back is an executive summary on what this subcommittee has done.

We've had five meetings with the subcommittee. The purpose was to review inspection frequencies which were requested by the state elevator study. That's only one of the three requests by the state elevator study. So this is the first part of three for the subcommittee.

What we did is we determined what potential risks to the public, elevator inspectors and elevator mechanics exist for elevators when the annual inspection was extended from one year to every other year annual inspections.

We looked at traction units, hydraulic units, and special-purpose lifts, in this case, crane applications using ISO standards for risk assessment. For traction elevators, there were 11 different building categories. For hydraulic elevators, there were 12 because we also added single-bottom cylinders.

So we looked at the categories listed here: schools,
parking garages, churches, fraternal organizations, mass
transit, sports venues, public institutions, office
buildings, retail buildings, medical facilities,
industrial and manufacturing, elevators exposed to the
environment. There were three different categories when
we started for traction, hydraulic and special-purpose
lifts. And those were units that operated 24/7 during
regular business hours which is approximately 12 to 14
hours a day and low-frequency-use scenarios.

What the subcommittee found as we went through this
work was that the risks remained consistent regardless of
how often the unit was used during the day, whether it was
on 24/7 or if it was on 12 hours or slow frequency. Most
of the items were the same: doors, leveling, so forth.
And the causes and effects didn't vary. So when I run you
through one of these sheets, you'll have a better idea of
what we did.

The committee had very good representation. We had
building owners. We had elevator inspectors. We had
independents. We had major elevator contractors. And we
had some excellent input from the grain industry which
helped us considerably for people on the committee that
didn't have experience with that industry.

So I want to thank everyone that participated in that
right now before I forget. I couldn't have done it
without everybody's help and input.

So after we looked at the units, we did a risk assessment. And that risk assessment, if you go to one of the risk assessment pages, and let's just take the first -- let's take -- just before this executive summary we have Hydraulic Units Exposed to the Environment. We'll look at a couple.

So in this case, what the subcommittee did is they determined the building environment. In this case, it was exposed to the environment. So this is would be elevators that were exposed to the elements; they were outside. We looked at what the hazardous situations were. For instance, doors. The event that could happen would be a person being hit by the door or a door lock being ticked while the car is in flight causing a bump or intermittent stop. Safety edge failure. And also torque and kinetic energy not set correctly on the doors. The effect would be a bruise, a minor break, or cuts.

And then using the risk assessment matrix, if you go into your package you're going to find a matrix that's in color. I'll give you a second to find that.

This information had previously been distributed to the Advisory Committee so they could get familiar with this prior to the meeting and have that advantage as a stakeholder.
So using the risk assessment matrix that we used from the ISO standards, we then determined the severity and frequency of a hazard and the cause and effect that we identified.

In the case of our first one here, we have an actual assessment, and that would be an elevator without any service or any maintenance control program, just an elevator sitting out there being used.

And for doors, we determined that the severity was marginal and that the frequency was occasional. And you have to reference this risk matrix to determine what those definitions are. So marginal would be a minor injury, minor system or environmental damage for severity. And the frequency and probability in this case was occasional. And the occasional definition is it would occur at least once in the life cycle of the system. The life cycle of the system for an elevator is roughly 25 years.

After we determined the initial assessment, then we determined corrective actions to reduce the risk which you'll see on the sheets.

The corrective actions that the subcommittee felt were applicable were things that we could control or ask the State to control. And those were the proper use of a maintenance control program and that the maintenance was completed per the schedule. So it would be the
maintenance control program with the items being completed, and a process as required by code to complete and do those items correctly.

We didn't ask for anything else because we didn't want to overstep our boundaries as a subcommittee directly in controlling maintenance providers.

So as you can see in this example, for doors, the severity stayed the same after we implemented a maintenance control program and maintenance processes.

But the frequency went down to remote. And the definition of remote is unlikely but may possibly occur in the life cycle of the system. So we may have an incident in the life cycle of the system by adding the measures we did to prevent the initial event to occur. So we did this for 23 scenarios for hydraulic and traction elevators and three scenarios for special-purpose lifts in the grain industry, and that's what your package is here.

And then what the committee did is we put together, which is on the first page of the documentation, a -- and it's also in the executive summary on the second page of the executive summary. We put together a handy recommendation chart for our recommendations to the Elevator Safety Advisory Committee on what frequencies we felt were acceptable for annual inspections.

And the verbiage is a little strange because we say
every other year annual inspections, and that was to
define that it's still an annual inspection, but it would
occur every other year.

Does that make sense to the committee?

The other thing you'll see on this sheet is that in
some instances we recommended annual inspections or every
other year inspections except for freight elevators. And
the elevator risk assessment subcommittee felt strongly
that the additional risk with vertical freight elevator
doors was enough that we didn't want that risk to be
extended for a year. Astragals could be broken. You have
a lot of stored energy coming down. Oftentimes on manual
doors a strap will be missing or broken, so someone has to
reach inside to pull the doors down, which if you know
any physics, somebody's going to get hurt, whether it's
the public or a mechanic or an inspector just by
happenstance.

The other thing that we agreed upon was that with the
freight elevators there should be specific training. We
can't control that environment completely. And someone
that isn't trained to operate a freight elevator as
they're required to may use it, and that increases the
risk of an incident.

So you'll see for industrial and manufacturing and
retail buildings that have freight elevators, that we want
them to remain annually.

The only other thing of note -- and hopefully you've had a chance to review this -- for two different venues: parking garages and mass transit. We felt that within the environment there was a high probability of fluids, bodily fluids being exposed to the environment and the workers or the inspectors or the riding public as well as for mass transit. So in both cases there could be needles, there could be bodily fluids. We want to make sure that those are inspected annually. And we also recommended a mitigation that the mechanics, the inspectors do not go into those areas where they may be exposed, and that they -- the unit would be shut down at that time, and the owner would have to manage that issue. So generally in most MCP's it already has that instruction for the mechanics.

So that's a quick overview. So does the Committee have any questions regarding the work that we've completed today?

The intent of the committee is to ask for -- or the subcommittee is to ask for the Committee to take action on these items so the State can determine -- L & I what they wish to accept or not accept, and then move their recommendations, meaning the State, to the legislature for any changes that would have to occur to change the inspections from annual to every other year.
So are there any questions?

MR. JONES: Is insurance considered with this -- (inaudible) -- inspection?

Some insurance companies require for building owners to have a certificate of inspection on an annual basis. I'm just curious.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: No, we did not consider that.

MR. JONES: (Inaudible) -- we can probably make a change to those -- (inaudible).

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Right. That makes sense.

MR. CLEARY: Was any thought given to how this would change the efficiency of the inspections based on cutting them down on an annual basis? Does the State have any idea how this will increase the percentage completed?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: I haven't looked at that yet, Scott.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: We did not as part of our scope do that. And anything I give you at this point would be anecdotal. We expected an improvement on the annual inspections based on the frequency except for the higher-risk facilities.

There were certain facilities that we felt could be nothing other than annual such as medical buildings, sports venues where you have very large crowds -- (inaudible) -- with a lot of people in places they may or
may not want to be at a certain time. So in that case we -- and also schools where based on the environment and the people using those elevators, if they be children or in the college setting where horseplay could happen. And we've all read about elevators certainly in the past that we wanted to protect the public as much as possible in that situation.

One thing that we did determine, and I didn't mention it, is that for public buildings, we separated public buildings out with jails and day-care -- public day-care centers as annual inspections. And we felt that the other buildings that are public buildings, city halls, et cetera, state buildings are no different than a regular office building. So we felt we could extend those frequencies if that makes sense to you. We didn't want to treat state officials or city officials any differently than the rest of the public.

MR. CLEARY: Was there any -- was it part of your scope to figure out how to sequence or how to integrate like going to every other year with some percentage?

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: We know that we're going to have to face that. And our intent is to work with L & I to develop a frequency matrix based on what they accept as a recommendation and what they don't. Once we know what that balance is -- they may accept part of it. They may
accept all of it. They may accept none of it. So as soon
as we know what's accepted, then the intent is for the
subcommittee to work with L & I to set up a frequency
because we are definitely going to have to face this so
they can increase the number of annual inspections and
optimize that.

MR. CLEARY: Dotty, this is from the State. Other
than the City of Seattle and the City of Spokane who has
jurisdiction over elevator -- (inaudible), how will --
will other municipalities have the option of staying or
will they all go -- have to follow what is adopted if this
does change? Like the City of Seattle has the ability to
say, Okay, we're going to stay with annuals for
everything. But maybe the City of Lakewood or Tacoma say
they won't have the ability if this is accepted, correct?
They'll go to whatever the State ... 
SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct. Because they
don't have their own authorities and jurisdictions.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Any other questions?

MR. WOOD: Well, one question -- or two questions I
had. One was fees. Did that come into play at all as far
as any discussion with the subcommittee to see if property
only goes to every other year, would potentially the State
change the fee structure for those type of accounts? is
one part of it.
And the other part is obviously now the owners have
to watch the MCP's a little closer and be able to --
(inaudible) a recommendation before they go out if it
becomes adopted that the owners will be a little bit more
attentive to their MCP's to make sure that they're
receiving the service obviously to help keep the risk
down.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: To answer your questions, the
first question, the fee issue was not within the scope of
our subcommittee. And we felt that that is the
responsibility of the State L & I to determine if there
would be any changes. So we didn't enter that arena at
all.

The second question you had we did discuss. We also
determined that it was not within our scope. But we did
early discuss what happens if the maintenance isn't
performed. And from a subcommittee recommendation
position based on our scope, we didn't enter that. That
is a responsibility of enforcement with the State and how
they enforce their program.

So the only thing we did in our scope is determine
what type of buildings were examined, the different
environments that those buildings are in, and what the
hazards were, what they could do to mitigate those
hazards, and what we felt based on the risk matrix was
acceptable or not acceptable to extend.

MR. WOOD: Understood. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Thanks. Good question.

Scott.

MR. CLEARY: Is the State looking at having -- since category testing won't get looked at on some of these till every two years, is that something the subcommittee looked at of having paperwork sent in to be sure that category testing is being done so there's not like "I got a year of grace before I get it looked at"? Is that something that was discussed, making sure that the category 1's are done?

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: It was understood within the subcommittee that regardless of any changes that the code must be followed. That's why we changed the language here as awkward as it is to say every other year annual inspections allowed. That's for inspections. That's not for the annual testing that's required.

So all 8.6 items and 8.11 items that are required by elevator companies at this time until any other code changes occur would continue to be in force. So there's no grace period.

And we were hopeful that the State would -- and I do put it in the executive summary -- would put together a bulletin if they decide to go with this and it is approved by the legislature of what the rules of the road are
moving forward with the change in frequency.

MR. CLEARY: But there's a little more -- I guess I have to put this in a graceful way is that making sure that companies -- service companies understand that they're still going to be required, but they're not going to get looked at for 24 months, there still should be some mechanism to make sure that work's getting done other than getting caught on that every other year. You see what I'm saying?

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Yeah, yes.

MR. CLEARY: There's got to be some way of making sure that it's put in within that 12-month period and is being done in a timely manner. We do it for five-year tests, but we don't do it for category 1's. So just ...

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Based on the scope of the subcommittee, that wasn't part of the mechanics. But I think that we could -- the subcommittee will continue on with the other actions. And there's no reason that we could not partner with the State to help work on those issues. And we definitely need everybody's input when we have those meetings.

So that's my report.

If the Committee wants to act on these recommendations, then I would ask for a motion to do so. We can take them individually or we can take them as a
whole. So what's your pleasure? So we either need a
motion to approve or not approve or table.

Yes, sir.

MR. CLEARY: I think there's been an awful lot of
good work done with this. There's a lot to it.

Now, my understanding is if we as a subcommittee --
as the ESAC, if we go ahead and vote on this, is this
going to go to the State as is or is there still more work
to be done on this? Or do you feel that this is a
complete enough document to go ahead and recommend to the
State?

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: I feel that it's a complete
enough document. If you get into the minutia of each
spreadsheet, we just didn't cut and paste; we went through
each category completely. We also vetted the traction and
hydraulic risk analysis assessments for two meetings after
we completed the initial work for hydraulic one meeting
after we finished the work on traction.

The only recommendations that weren't reviewed a
second time were for the special-purpose lifts for grain
elevators. But we spent a significant amount of time in
our last meeting to make sure we thoroughly understood the
environment and how the units were used and what the risk
was to everyone that would be exposed.

So I hope that answers your question.
Now, the question is: Does the Committee want to act on this or not?

MR. CLEARY: Can the Committee take a five-minute break to discuss amongst the members? Three minutes.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: You have to make a motion.

MR. CLEARY: I make a motion that we have --

MR. NORRIS: Second.

MR. CLEARY: -- five minutes.

MR. NORRIS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: All in favor?

THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Opposed?

We'll break for a five-minute executive committee meeting.

(Off the record. Recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Okay, the Elevator Safety Committee meeting will reconvene. It is 10:00.

So where we left business before the executive committee meeting was to ask this Committee if there was a motion to approve, amend or not approve the recommendations from the subcommittee. So I open that up to the floor.

MR. CLEARY: I make a motion to amend.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Okay, there's a motion to
amend.

MR. NORRIS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: And the motion is?

MR. CLEARY: Is to be able to have some sort of a sunset or a re-evaluation of this at a given interval to be yet to be determined.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Okay. So you want that to be determined by the next ESAC meeting?

MR. CLEARY: I'm not sure who makes the determination. Is it the State? Is it the stakeholders? Or is it the ESAC? I just want to make sure that it's something that we'll have the ability to say, Okay, it's either working or not working and be able to take it off the table or amend at a future date.

If this does what it's intended to do, and that is to help with the backlog and try to get as many annuals current as possible, maybe once the big influx of new units, maybe we don't have to -- we can go back to annuals again.

So I just want the flexibility to be able to ...  

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Okay. So there's a motion to amend. And the recommendation is to have a re-evaluation period at a given interval to be determined --

MR. CLEARY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: -- at a later date.
Is there a second?

MR. WOOD:  Second.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL:  It's been seconded. Any discussion?  Seeing none, all in favor?

THE COMMITTEE:  Aye.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL:  Opposed?  So the amendment passes.

So do we have a -- so now we have to vote on whether we're going to accept these or not.

MR. WOOD:  Motion to accept.

MR. CLEARY:  Second.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL:  It's been moved and seconded to accept. Any discussion?  Seeing none, all in favor?

THE COMMITTEE:  Aye.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL:  Opposed?  Abstentions?  So the motion to recommend changes in frequencies as noted in the matrix has been approved with an amendment for re-evaluation at a given interval to be determined in the future. Very good.

MCP Subcommittee

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL:  So the next item of business is the MCP subcommittee. Dave Nieman isn't here, so I will fill in with a brief report.
There was a meeting of the MCP subcommittee to review the progress on electronic MCP potential within the state. There were some unanswered questions after that meeting that haven't been completed yet, and that was really on the effectiveness of the inspectors to get the information in the machine room at their desk and how those logistics would work. So there's still work to do there.

There has been a recommendation due to Dave's workload to have Leonard Winslow (sic) help with the subcommittee. And the subcommittee will also begin meetings on reviewing the present MCP structure and any recommended changes to that.

So we'll have a meeting within the next month. And we'll make sure that everyone who's signed up on the new database for notifications gets notification.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: That would be Leonard Fleming.
CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: I'm sorry. Leonard Fleming. I'm sorry. Excuse me.

(Addressing court reporter) Please change that.
I know that, Leonard. I'm sorry.

MR. FLEMING: I'd rather be in Palm Desert playing golf.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Yeah, I bet you would. I bet you would.

So the only other old business, just as a point of
information, I mentioned it during the stakeholder meeting, but that wasn't an official part of the meeting, is at the last meeting we talked about providing stakeholder updates.

Due to some glitches in the databases that the State is using, some of the information for your addresses to get notifications didn't happen. That will be fixed. But we will be providing between meetings ideally 90 days before this meeting an update to all of the stakeholders that we have on record so you clearly understand what things are being worked on, what things need your input, and what things that you can provide input to your representative on this Committee prior to the next meeting so we can be more effective, so we can get a better feel for what you need and what you want and we can balance that within the Committee.

So this'll continue on. I hope that you like it. If you haven't seen it, expect to see it in the near future.

New Business

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: So that brings us to new business.
Update on Code Adoption

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: And the first item of new business is a update on code adoption. And Dotty's going to take that.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we're up against a tight time frame as far as having the rules be effective September 1st. It's still our expectation that they be adopted then. But the assistant attorney general has to review them and ensure that there's no issues with them. And the packages are quite big. So we're still hoping that we can get those done in enough time for us to have a September 1st effective date.

Next Steps Regarding Code Adoption and Licensing Rules

SECRETARY STANLASKE: The next steps regarding code adoption and licensing rules, we'll review what went forth this year, and I expect there may be some issues with -- because it was such a big undertaking, there may be some issues, some items that we missed or that maybe were translated incorrectly. So if that happens, then we'll begin the code review process again with the TAC and all of that and start probably --

When did we start last year? August, Melissa?
MS. ERICKSEN: For the TAC? Yeah.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: So probably in August we'll begin that process.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Virtual inspections. We have been working with one company, and we have had success with the equipment itself in the process.

The issue that we're having is more with the company and getting their schedule cemented. It fluctuates minute by minute evidently. So -- which is difficult for this time we have only Sergei performing those inspections. But we are training two of the technical specialists -- actually all three of the tech specialists will be trained in that as well as we will be utilizing that for inspectors that go out for injuries and come back on light duty. So we'll be utilizing that to get them back to work.

We will be reaching out to some other companies regarding their participation and getting them on board. And when it does work, it works well. And we have had some issues with homeowners. So we're going to have to figure out how to take care of those issues.

I know, Rich, you sent me an e-mail the other day,
and we can talk about those and address those.

So that is my report on IVIP.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Thank you.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Do you want me to keep going?

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: I'll take the second part of

the code changes with the ...

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: So I'll start off.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay, you can start off.

Preview of Future Code Changes

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: So one thing that we'll attempt
to do for the stakeholders is as we find code changes,
we'll let you know about them.

There was one on the back table that is for the NFPA
70, 2017 electrical code, and there's a new requirement --

Has the State adopted the 2017 electrical code yet?

SECRETARY STANLASKE: I believe so, yes.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: So this requirement I've
highlighted in yellow. It's NFPA 620.16. It's
short-circuit current rating. And panels have to be
marked with the current rating based on feeder demand.

And I've -- on the back of this, I have provided an
example of that documentation. With this supplier, it
says, "Suitable for use on a circuit capable of delivering not more than 10,000 RMS symmetrical amperes."

So what other states are doing, not all of them, some of them is they're requiring -- a couple in particular which I won't name -- but the states are requiring that a sticker be located next to the disconnect that is signed off by the electrical engineer that designed the building based on the controller rating that this is satisfactory for the SCCR rating for the equipment. In some states it's a little more important where they use generators for power due to their grids like in Florida in some places. So they need to make sure that the ratings are adequate for the power that generates the buildings.

So that's just a point of information. It's particularly important for people that are getting bigger equipment as well as major elevator companies that need to make sure that this is integrated into their control -- (inaudible). So it's to protect the licensed elevator contractors as well as everyone else that is involved in the units.

And if you're completely baffled by this, call an electrical engineer and he could help you out.

That's the only update I had on that.

Okay, future code changes. Dotty, do you want to ...

SECRETARY STANLASKE: At this time we're not
anticipating any code changes unless something comes out of the recent changes that we did. So there's always that possibility.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: However, we are -- I'm going to move to preview of possible proposed changes to the RCW. We are proposing four changes -- five changes to the RCW's.

One is a temporary use construction permit. In the RCW now it says that that permit can only be issued for 30 days. We're looking to extend that to 90 days so that the companies and the inspectors don't have to go out again every 30 days for that. In speaking with the inspectors, they've indicated that they're not finding any significant changes from the time they go out for the first temporary operating -- temporary use operating permit to the time they go out for the second one and the third one. So that will free up our inspectors, hopefully make them -- give them another tool to become a little more efficient. That is the first change to the RCW that we're proposing.

The second change is kind of a little silly, but in the RCW it states that two permit applications will be submitted for new installations. We have never required
two permit applications. We have required one permit
application with two sets of plans. So we're changing the
language to say one permit application and a set of plans
shall be submitted to the Department. So it's sort of a
minor change, but it's housekeeping. So we're looking at
that one.

The third is chair lifts, has to do with chair lifts,
and it has to do with the removal of chair lifts.

We know in our hearts that homeowners -- and it's
residential chair lifts only -- that homeowners are either
removing those chair lifts when they're done with them and
not informing us or they're having someone else do that.
If we wanted to, we could enforce the law that says that
only mechanics -- licensed elevator mechanics can do that,
but we have no real way of knowing who's doing that. So
instead of having to tell a homeowner who's trying to do
the right thing and call us and ask us what needs to be
done and rather than just take it upon themselves to
remove it, we're putting this in place so that -- or we
hope to have this in place so that we don't have to tell
those folks that are trying to do the right thing, No, you
have to go out and hire a licensed elevator mechanic to
remove that. So that's -- that's the third proposal that
we have.

The fourth is the temporary mechanics license,
extending that for up to a year. And that's ongoing from last year.

And the last one has to do with the Safety Advisory Committee and the makeup on the Safety Advisory Committee. We're suggesting that the Advisory Committee be extended to I think between seven to nine members, and each authority having jurisdiction having a seat on the Advisory Committee so that the entire state can be represented. As well as we're also asking that we have some flexibility as to when the meetings occur, especially when we're going through the code-review process. Because it was kind of tight on some of those meetings, getting the information out, that type of thing. So we're asking for some flexibility. Right now, the RCW says it will be the second Tuesday of -- this is May. So May, September, October --

MS. ERICKSEN: No. May, August, November, February.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay, thank you.

So we're asking for some flexibility on that.

And those are the changes that we'll be proposing to the RCW.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: Thank you.

Does anybody have any other new business on the -- that they'd like to bring up?

Okay. I just want to make one comment in general.
That is, the last year has been very hectic with a lot of change. Change is always difficult. I appreciate everybody's patience while we've been working through code changes and other changes. The intent of this Committee as we go through the subcommittees is to increase the effectiveness of those subcommittees at the speed at which we complete tasks. So this has been unusual. We just need to make sure that when we complete them that we give everybody time to absorb all the information. Thank you everybody for your patience during the transitions we've been making.

Since there's no other business, is there motion to adjourn?

MR. CLEARY: Motion to adjourn.

MR. NORRIS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: It's been moved and seconded.

All in favor?

THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON McNEILL: We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 10:22 a.m., proceedings adjourned.)
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