

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ELEVATOR SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, May 21, 2019

BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Safety Advisory Committee Special Meeting was held at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, May 21, 2019, at the Department of Labor and Industries, 12806 Gateway Drive South, Tukwila, Washington.

Committee members present were: Brian Thompson, Robert McNeill and Scott Cleary. The Department of Labor & Industries was represented by Dotty Stanlaske, Chief Elevator Inspector, and Candace Lau who chaired the meeting.

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were held, to wit:

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

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

A G E N D A

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

May 21, 2019 - Tukwila

Page No.

Announcements/Introductions	3
ESAC Review	3
Break	51
ESAC Review	51

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

3

Announcements/Introductions

4

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So I guess we have a small
6 group today. Let's still do introductions.

7 I'm Candace Lau. I don't know if we've met, but I'm
8 a elevator technical specialist with the Department of
9 Labor and Industries. And I'll be chairing this this
10 morning.

11 MR. CLEARY: Scott Cleary, Mobility Concepts. I
12 represent the exemption from licensure 270, residential
13 and commercial accessibility stakeholders.

14 MR. McNEILL: Rob McNeill, KONE Elevator. I
15 represent licensed elevator contractors.

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Dotty Stanlaske, Chief Elevator
17 Inspector.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Brian Thompson, Aegis Engineering.
19 I'm representing registered architects and engineers.

20

21

ESAC Review

22

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So we're here today to
24 review what the TAC Committee has approved. So let's move
25 forward. Okay, so let's start with the first one.

1 Proposal number is 296-96. This is just a Table of
2 Contents.

3 Is there a motion?

4 MR. McNEILL: I move to approve this proposal.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

6 MR. CLEARY: I second.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? Okay, this has
8 been approved.

9 Okay, let's move --

10 MR. McNEILL: You have to vote on it.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh. Forgot.

12 Let's take a vote. All in favor, say "aye."

13 THE COMMITTEE: Aye.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, so that's three "ayes." Why
15 don't you just raise your hand, and then -- okay, three in
16 favor. Zero -- any opposed? I don't need to ask that,
17 right?

18 Okay, so this is -- okay, so all three.

19 Okay, let's move to the next one. The next one is
20 also a Table of Contents. 296-96-23605.

21 Is there a motion?

22 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

24 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Discussion? No? All in favor,

1 raise your hand. Three in favor. This has been
2 approved.

3 The next one is 2019-01055.

4 Is there a motion?

5 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve it.

6 MR. CLEARY: I second.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Discussion?

8 MR. McNEILL: Yes, there is discussion.

9 Actually who moved first? You moved?

10 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, I moved.

11 I would like to discuss whether the specific dollar
12 amount that's noted should be simply referencing a charge
13 that's customary and noted on the public record elsewhere.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Rob.

15 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I agree with Brian. I believe
16 that instead of having a fixed fee here, that we should
17 amend this proposal removing "a fee of \$80.30 per hour" to
18 say "by paying a fee as listed on the standard schedule on
19 the L & I Website."

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So there is an amendment to
21 the amendment --

22 MR. McNEILL: To the motion.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- to the motion to say -- so this
24 will be how it would read: "A person, firm, corporation,
25 or governmental agency may request elevator field

1 technical services from the department by paying a fee as
2 listed on the standard schedule on the L & I Website or
3 any portion thereof"? And then the rest is the same? Is
4 that what we're saying? Correct?

5 MR. McNEILL: (Nodding affirmatively.)

6 Any objections? Oh. Is there a second?

7 MR. THOMPSON: I object to the way that amendment
8 reads. I think -- I would move --

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Can you speak up?

10 MR. THOMPSON: I would move that we amend the
11 amendment to also strike "or any portion thereof" so that
12 the full charge that's noted would be responsible to be
13 paid.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

15 MR. McNEILL: We need a second on that amendment
16 first before we can discuss the --

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I just asked. Is there a second?

18 MR. CLEARY: I second.

19 MR. McNEILL: Madam Chair?

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

21 MR. McNEILL: Just as a point of reference, I believe
22 the "or any portion thereof" had to be included because of
23 -- is it the RCW's that -- that -- unless you put that in
24 there, the State could not charge -- if they went over to
25 61 minutes, they'd only be able to charge the 60 minutes.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Then I would move to revise my
2 amendment to retain the term "per hour."

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So -- Rob.

4 MR. McNEILL: Just for a point of information, so I
5 don't believe I was clear on my explanation of that "any
6 portion thereof." If it's per hour, they have to complete
7 that complete hour to charge. So if an inspector went for
8 an hour and 59 minutes, they would only be able to charge
9 for an hour.

10 MR. THOMPSON: So if --

11 MR. McNEILL: Rather than an hour and 59 minutes
12 worth of labor on this job.

13 MR. THOMPSON: My intent was to make it so that
14 rather than the dollar amount, it references the standard
15 charge that's noted on the Website "per hour or any
16 portion thereof" as opposed to reading as though someone
17 can pay whatever portion they elect.

18 MR. McNEILL: Okay, I apologize. I didn't understand
19 you.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, so let me clarify. So the
21 amendment to the motion would be for it to say: "A
22 person, firm, corporation, or governmental agency may
23 request elevator field technical services from the
24 department by paying a fee as listed on the standard
25 schedule on the L & I Website per hour or any portion

1 thereof."

2 THE COMMITTEE: (Nodding affirmatively.)

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And then the rest is the same.

4 So is there any objections to this amendment to the
5 motion? No?

6 Okay. So let's take a vote on the motion with this
7 friendly -- with this amendment added to it. So all in
8 favor of approving 01055 with the amended verbiage, raise
9 your hand. Three to nothing. So this is approved with
10 the amendment.

11 Okay. So let's go to the next one. The next one I
12 believe is the same. This piece of paper here, it doesn't
13 have a proposal number, but it's the same as the very
14 first one that we just did. It's just the Table of
15 Contents ... unless you guys see anything different.

16 Anybody see anything different? I think this is the same.

17 So we're going to -- this one doesn't have a proposal
18 number. Are you all with me? So we're going to pass this
19 one. It's exactly the same. So this doesn't have a
20 proposal number, so I can't even reference it. It's Part
21 C3, Construction, Operation, Maintenance and Inspection of
22 Private Residence. Okay? So we're going to skip that
23 one.

24 So the next one is 00650. And this is just changing
25 the -- correcting the dates that were incorrect.

1 Is there a motion?

2 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

3 MR. McNEILL: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. All in favor? Three. This
5 one has been approved.

6 The next one is 02552-2. This one is on location of
7 the equipment in hoistway.

8 Is there a motion?

9 MR. CLEARY: A point of -- parliamentary question.

10 Dotty's not here. Do we need to wait till she gets
11 back? She's a non-voting member, but she's still a
12 part ...

13 MR. McNEILL: She's the secretary. We should
14 probably wait.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We'll wait. Okay, let's take a
16 recess. Is there a --

17 MR. CLEARY: I motion --

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- motion for a recess?

19 MR. CLEARY: -- for a recess.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We'll take a recess. Is there a
21 second?

22 MR. McNEILL: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

24 (Brief recess taken.)

25 ///

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We're back. So we're back.

2 MR. McNEILL: (Directed at Ms. Stanlaske) We approved
3 the amendment. So had a cost per hour. And then we just
4 need to make sure with your help in the future that
5 there's a schedule of charges available on the Website.
6 They should be in there anyway.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes. I'll make sure we --

8 MR. McNEILL: Then we'll know not to do it again
9 because as they change, you just revise that schedule.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Perfect.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, are we ready to move forward?

12 Okay. So the next one is 02552-2. This is on
13 location of equipment in the hoistway.

14 Is there a motion?

15 MR. McNEILL: I move to approve.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

17 MR. CLEARY: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

19 MR. THOMPSON: I am curious at the relinquency of the
20 verification from DOSH's standard procedures.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Regarding -- what -- are we --
22 which one are we on? Are we on the 650?

23 MR. McNEILL: We're on 02552-2.

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Oh, okay. So this one must
25 have been approved, 650?

1 MR. McNEILL: Correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Rob.

3 MR. McNEILL: Madam Chair, I think to answer your
4 question, we'll defer to the secretary after -- in the
5 previous discussion if this passes, then L & I will send
6 this to DOSH for review.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Correct.

8 MR. CLEARY: Except we don't know if it's going to
9 pass.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any more discussion?

11 Okay, let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
12 hand. Three. This one is approved.

13 Moving on to 02580, key boxes. Motion? Is there a
14 motion?

15 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

16 MR. CLEARY: I second.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? All in favor? Oh.

18 MR. CLEARY: I just want to make sure that we're
19 clear on it because this was approved with amended as
20 shown. I got to figure out -- I'm trying to figure out
21 which -- what was amended.

22 Dotty, the amendments to clarify the City of Seattle
23 and Spokane, do you know --

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes. Well, --

25 MR. McNEILL: It was --

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: -- it was to change the note to
2 "exception."

3 MR. McNEILL: On 3 and 4. And they did that --

4 MR. CLEARY: Okay. Oh, they changed it, correct.
5 That's what it was, yeah.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any more discussion? All in
7 favor? Three. This one is approved.

8 The next one is 01057, accident investigations. Is
9 there a motion?

10 MR. THOMPSON: I move to bring it for discussion.

11 MR. CLEARY: Well, first we have to -- motion.

12 CHAIRPERSON THOMPSON: Any second to ...

13 MR. CLEARY: I second.

14 CHAIRPERSON THOMPSON: Okay. Discussion?

15 MR. THOMPSON: So the TAC discussion talked about
16 that termination will be made by a supervisor in the
17 department. I think that language should be included in
18 this WAC. So I would propose an amendment that between
19 the word "been" --

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Between the word what?

21 MR. THOMPSON: Between the word "been" and
22 "documented," that it be inserted "determined by a
23 supervisor in the department to be conclusively."

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Determined by the supervisor in the
25 department?

1 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, "determined by a supervisor in
2 the department to be conclusively."

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To be inclusively?

4 MR. THOMPSON: Conclusively.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To be conclusively?

6 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I can't -- I don't know where ...

8 MR. THOMPSON: So the underlined language would read:
9 "that has not been determined by a supervisor in the
10 department to be conclusively documented as mis-use"

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay. So you propose to amend
12 this motion to say: "The department shall investigate an
13 injury-related accident reported by the owner or owner's
14 duly authorized agent that has not been determined by a
15 supervisor in the department to be conclusively documented
16 as mis-use," blah, blah, blah.

17 MR. THOMPSON: Correct.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

19 MR. CLEARY: I'd like to make an amendment to the
20 amendment. I think if we changed about the rate in 01055,
21 we need to do the same language for the rate-per-hour
22 language.

23 MR. THOMPSON: So point of order. The amendment is
24 currently addressing a different section. So that
25 amendment would come after this amendment.

1 MR. CLEARY: Okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

3 MR. McNEILL: Yes. So we'll vote on this amendment,
4 then we can --

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So any objections to this amendment
6 that I just read to add "determined by a supervisor in the
7 department to be conclusively" in between "been" and
8 "documented"? Any objections to that? No?

9 Okay. So we can add that on there for the motion.
10 And then that's when Scott, you would like to ...

11 MR. McNEILL: No. We need a second now?

12 MR. THOMPSON: Well, no. It was --

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: There's no objections.

14 MR. THOMPSON: My amendment was approved by consent.
15 So now Scott can bring his amendment.

16 MR. CLEARY: I'd like to make an amendment to the
17 amendment that we strike the language of "rate of \$80.30
18 per hour" and add the same language that we agreed to in
19 01055.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Which is -- let me write
21 this down here.

22 Would you like to read that to me? Because I can't
23 seem to locate it. Didn't we just do it?

24 MR. CLEARY: We just -- it's in like the third one.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. As listed on the schedule?

1 That one?

2 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So the whole motion would
4 then read: "The department shall investigate an injury-
5 related accident reported by the owner or owner's duly
6 authorized agent that has not been determined by a
7 supervisor in the department to be conclusively documented
8 as mis-use through recordings or witnesses' or users'
9 statements. The department may charge a fee as listed on
10 the standard schedule on the L & I Website per hour or
11 portion thereof" and then it keeps going. Correct?

12 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any objections to that
14 addition -- amendment to the motion? No?

15 Okay. So all in favor of this motion with the two
16 amendments, raise your hand. Three. This one was
17 approved.

18 Okay. Let's move to the next one is 00912. This is
19 about license renewal requirements.

20 Is there a motion?

21 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

22 MR. CLEARY: I second.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions. No discussions?
24 All in favor, raise your hand. Three in favor. This one
25 is approved.

1 Okay. Next one is 02530, handrails.

2 Is there a motion?

3 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

4 MR. CLEARY: I second.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion?

6 MR. THOMPSON: I just want to note that as
7 representative of architects and engineers, I am not
8 supporting necessarily the specific geometry or location
9 of the elements described, but because handrails are not
10 required, I don't feel it's important. So ...

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Thank you for that comment.
12 Any other discussion on this?

13 Okay. So all approved, raise your hands? I mean,
14 all -- yeah. All in favor, raise your hand. Two.

15 MR. THOMPSON: I abstain.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And one abstention. So this is
17 approved.

18 Okay. The next one is 01030, plan approval and
19 application processing fees.

20 Is there a motion? Is there a motion on this one?

21 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

22 MR. CLEARY: I second.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

24 MR. THOMPSON: Is there a customary charge on the
25 L & I rate sheet that would potentially replace the \$33.20

1 value?

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Dotty, is there a ...

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I am going to look.

4 (Pause) I don't think this is. I would think we
5 would, but I don't think there is

6 MR. THOMPSON: I move to amend the language after the
7 dollar amount 33.20 to insert "for a charge as provided on
8 the L & I Website, whichever is greater."

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So you would like to add --
10 after "\$33.20," you would like to add something that says
11 -- or a charge? Or do you want to say "or a fee" just
12 like we did before?

13 MR. THOMPSON: The word should be "fee" just to be
14 consistent.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So would you like to add
16 the same verbiage as before? So "or a fee as listed on
17 the L & I schedule" -- on the L & I" -- oh, sorry; excuse
18 me -- "or a fee as listed on the standard schedule on the
19 L & I Website or whichever is greater"?

20 MR. THOMPSON: Or whichever is greater.

21 MR. CLEARY: Why are we leaving in the \$33.20?

22 MR. THOMPSON: Because we're not currently aware if
23 there is a charge that's shown. So the \$33.20 will apply
24 unless there's a different charge that is higher and shown
25 on the standard rate sheet.

1 MR. CLEARY: If the fees change before the WAC is
2 changed, does that limit to what they can charge? By
3 getting rid of a dollar amount and referring it back to
4 the Website will allow changes to be made without -- you
5 know, if we're doing it for the other fees, I think we
6 should take out all dollar figures and have it refer back
7 to the Website. And if the Website needs to be modified,
8 that's one thing. But I think once it's in WAC, we can't
9 change it unless we do an amendment or rule or something.

10 So I think my feeling is this is just like the other
11 two, just have it refer back. I just think it'll allow
12 more flexibility in the future. So that's ...

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: But currently it's not on the
14 schedule. So you're saying to leave the \$33.20 out?

15 MR. CLEARY: My feeling is that if we're going to do
16 that, let's be consistent across all of them, and then
17 make sure that it gets listed on the Website. Because
18 that way, it would allow the flexibility of that fee
19 changing over time without going back and doing a change
20 to the WAC. Because we don't know when the next WAC
21 change is going to come through.

22 So that's just my discussion.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Rob.

24 MR. McNEILL: I tend to agree. I know it's a little
25 messy. But we're not the final adoption of the rule. So

1 there will be a point of time where there will be public
2 discussion once the rules are posted. Once we look at
3 them, L & I's goes to determine what goes forward.

4 So this -- that gives them time to publish a standard
5 schedule. So I don't think we need to worry about that.
6 We can leave the dollar figure --

7 MR. THOMPSON: So I --

8 MR. McNEILL: -- and then leave it up to L & I to
9 determine how to develop their schedule.

10 MR. THOMPSON: So withdraw my amendment.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: The whole thing or ...

12 MR. THOMPSON: I withdraw my whole amendment, yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So you want -- so we're
14 going to leave it as is. What was proposed, the original
15 motion is just the way it is, "applications are \$33.20
16"

17 MR. CLEARY: I want to amend it to remove the dollar
18 amount and have it be consistent with the other two,
19 01055 --

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So you're amending that
21 it's a -- "The non-refundable fees for processing the
22 applications are a fee as listed on the standard
23 schedule" --

24 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- "on the L & I Website"?

1 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: "Are listed." So it's already
3 talking about the fees here. So "are listed."

4 Okay. So this is what it's going to read then,
5 you're proposing: "The nonrefundable fees for processing
6 the applications are listed on the standard schedule on
7 the L & I Website," correct?

8 MR. CLEARY: (Nodding affirmatively.)

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any objections to that? No?

10 Okay. So let's take a vote. All in favor with that
11 little amendment to the motion, raise your hand. Three to
12 zero. That passed.

13 Okay. So the next one 296-96-07xxx1. That one has
14 -- the next two, xxx1 and xxx2, they have been opposed,
15 voted -- down at the bottom it says "opposed." It did not
16 pass, so we're going to move on.

17 The next one is 296-96-0XXXX. This is private
18 residential elevators.

19 Is there a motion?

20 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

22 MR. McNEILL: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

24 MR. THOMPSON: I have a question. The justification
25 that's provided says that ASME A17.1-5.3 does not have the

1 requirements. Is there a specific issue in the state of
2 Washington that makes the insertion of requirements beyond
3 that at the national standard necessary?

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The State takes a position that
5 if a machine room is required, then they do need to comply
6 with certain rules such as the light switch where that's
7 located and also where the main line disconnect is
8 located.

9 MR. CLEARY: Within 24 inches of the -- (inaudible).

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

11 MR. CLEARY: This has been pretty confusing for the
12 people that write the permits and for things. So there is
13 no nomenclature whatsoever in 5.3 that refers to machine
14 room for residential. So we want to move away from that
15 and -- because we can have mixed use; you can put it
16 wherever you want to put it. But if you do have one, then
17 the WAC gives you some guidance on what you should have.

18 So we just want to make it very clear that there is
19 no such thing as residential machine room. But if you
20 want to call it that, then some other requirements kick in
21 that aren't in 5.3.

22 So that's what we wanted to clarify on this one.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other questions?

24 MR. THOMPSON: I understand item 1. What about item
25 2?

1 MR. CLEARY: I can ...

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

3 MR. CLEARY: In the original WAC there was always in
4 the WAC there was a requirement to have machine access to
5 motors on top of the hoistways, and that did include
6 residential. When that went away, the WAC referred 5.3 to
7 go back to section 2, which it can't do because there's no
8 requirements in 5.3, residential for access. I -- we feel
9 it's a safety hazard not to have it, so we wanted to make
10 sure that it was part of the WAC but was able to use a 6x6
11 box which is an industry standard.

12 So this is just to clarify. Because you can't drive
13 it back to section 2 because 5.3 doesn't drive you there.
14 So we just wanted to add some clarification.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other questions?

16 So let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
17 hands. Three in favor. This one is approved.

18 Okay. The next one is 296-96-237XX about A18.1
19 equipment.

20 Is there a motion?

21 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

23 MR. McNEILL: I'll second it.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion? No
25 discussion? Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your

1 hand. Two? Oh. Three. Okay. So this passed.

2 The next one, 296-96-00675. Is there a motion?

3 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

5 MR. THOMPSON: I second.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? This is on QEI

7 certification. Okay. All in favor, raise your hand.

8 Three in favor. This one passed.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. The next one is 00675 number
10 15, top-of-car operating devices.

11 Is there a motion?

12 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

13 MR. McNEILL: Second.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

15 Okay. Let's take a vote then. All in favor, raise
16 your hands. Two? Three. This one passed.

17 Okay. So the next one did not pass. This is 00906.
18 This one did not pass the TAC.

19 So we'll move to the next one, which is 00910,
20 elevator mechanic license categories.

21 Is there a motion?

22 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

24 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions? Scott.

1 MR. CLEARY: I just want to clarify why this was put
2 in there because (04) category was allowed -- that somehow
3 "special purpose" got put into it. And so all this is
4 removing their ability under an (04) license to pull
5 permits and work on special purpose elevators.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussion?

7 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
8 hand. Three. This one passed.

9 Okay. The next one is 00912, license renewal
10 requirements.

11 Is there a motion?

12 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

13 MR. CLEARY: I second.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? Scott.

15 MR. CLEARY: There's a note on here. It says, "Need
16 to research how this will impact other WAC rules." Has
17 that been made and do we know what that is?

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Not until this is completed.

19 MR. CLEARY: Okay. So that means that if it does
20 have impacts to it, no matter if it's been approved, it's
21 not going to be able to be accepted?

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's correct.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments? Discussion?

24 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
25 hands. Three. This one passed.

1 The next one, 001 -- I'm sorry; excuse me -- 00916,
2 continuing education course provider requirements.

3 Is there a motion?

4 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Second?

6 MR. CLEARY: I second.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Discussion?

8 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
9 hands. Three in favor. This one passed.

10 Next one is 02470, fireman's service for groups of
11 four or more.

12 A motion? Any motion?

13 MR. McNEILL: I move to approve.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Second?

15 MR. CLEARY: I second.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions? Scott.

17 MR. CLEARY: Can anybody help me understand why
18 there's so many abstained on this one?

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Were you at that meeting? I
20 have no idea why so many abstained. Probably because they
21 -- this affects the -- this is a common practice with the
22 City of Seattle, but not one that we follow. So I
23 don't know why so many abstained.

24 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I'm looking at my notes, and I
25 don't see that. But I do recall from my limited notes

1 that the city said they're still going to retain it.

2 Because they can have things greater than the WAC.

3 So I think it's a good move as this is -- this
4 proposal.

5 I think the other is a little onerous and could be
6 confusing in areas where the fire department isn't used to
7 having two key switches.

8 MR. THOMPSON: I would disagree. The statement of
9 problem and justification says that if there is a desire
10 to keep this requirement, rationale needs to be provided
11 as to the safety benefit. So I would submit that in the
12 event of a power-on event, which does not recall
13 elevators, or during a medical emergency where the use of
14 the other bank in a group by building occupants is
15 acceptable by the -- (inaudible), it avoids overtaxing the
16 fire department and emergency service responders from
17 having to shuttle people who would otherwise be unaffected
18 by the incident. So this is not a mandate; it's an
19 option.

20 So I -- I think we should oppose it. And if there's
21 a need for further clarification, which is the reason that
22 it was proposed -- (inaudible) -- I think we could amend
23 the section to say that there should be control per
24 hoistway, not per group.

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The issue with this is that

1 there are no instructions on how to utilize this. So
2 there's no instructions anywhere. No one doesn't -- no
3 one knows how to use this in this instance. It's strictly
4 an ease of -- from what I understand, an ease of testing.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Rob.

6 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I agree. The purpose -- when
7 this was brought up to the TAC last year, the purpose was
8 solely to test elevators with more than four units in a
9 group in two banks so you wouldn't disrupt the egress or
10 ingress of riders during regular business hours. But if
11 it's an emergency, we want to make sure that the
12 authorized persons have complete control of the complete
13 bank until they thoroughly understand what the exposure is
14 to the public to release an elevator. So that's why I
15 think it could be confusing if you have two key switches
16 and you -- you know, you will have complete control of the
17 system.

18 So just an opinion.

19 MR. THOMPSON: I think it's logical that if I hit the
20 key switch on one wall, I'm controlling that bank. And if
21 I hit the key switch on the other wall, I'm controlling
22 that bank which ... you know.

23 MR. McNEILL: Traditionally in ASME this doesn't
24 exist, so in the rest of the country we don't see this.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any more discussions?

1 Okay. So the motion is to remove this from the WAC
2 code. Correct? So all in favor of this, raise your
3 hands. Two. All opposed? One. This one passed.

4 Okay. So the next one, 07xxx1. This one was -- did
5 not go through the TAC, so we're not going to do that one
6 -- review that one.

7 And then the next one after that, 07xxx2, same thing;
8 it did not pass the TAC.

9 So the next one we get to is 02471, emergency
10 personnel lock box, to repeal this rule.

11 Is there a motion?

12 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

14 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

16 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
17 hands. Three. So this one passed three-zero.

18 The next one is 025XX, fire doors installed in front
19 of hoistway doors.

20 Is there a motion?

21 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Second? Is there a second?

23 MR. McNEILL: Second.

24 MR. CLEARY: I second.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Discussion?

1 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. I would like to offer some
2 amendments.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

4 MR. CLEARY: Can I -- parliamentary ...

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

6 MR. CLEARY: This doesn't have the TAC's -- was it
7 approved or not approved by the TAC?

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I know. It didn't. But I believe
9 it was -- it did get passed. I mean, I don't know.

10 MR. CLEARY: Because we can't have any discussion if
11 it apparently wasn't approved.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I know. I was trying to look for
13 it in this --

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, actually you should be
15 basing your votes on you, not what the TAC approved.

16 But the reason why it doesn't have that, Scott, is I
17 think there were two of them, maybe three that I didn't
18 have in my notes, and I neglected to check Milton's notes.

19 So we can go back to the meeting minutes.

20 MR. CLEARY: Just my question is that my
21 understanding of what the ESAC is doing is we only can
22 amend or review what has already been passed by the TAC.
23 Right?

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's correct.

25 MR. CLEARY: So that's why I just asked the question.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Right.

2 MR. THOMPSON: On page 117 of the transcript, it was
3 16 ayes, zero nays.

4 MR. CLEARY: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. McNEILL: Would you check that again? Was that
6 on the amendment or was that on the motion? On my notes,
7 I have 15 approved and one abstention on the main motion.
8 On the amendment, 16; unanimously passed. I could have
9 been wrong.

10 But regardless, it looks like it was approved, so we
11 can consider it.

12 MR. CLEARY: Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So back to Brian, you had
14 wanted to amend something?

15 MR. THOMPSON: So the first amendment I'd like to
16 propose is that we strike "international" and replace it
17 with "state."

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So there's a proposal to
19 amend -- strike "international" and add "State Building
20 Code" -- "state" instead of "international"?

21 MR. THOMPSON: Correct.

22 MR. CLEARY: Is there such a thing?

23 MR. THOMPSON: The State Building Code is adopted by
24 WAC 51-50. And the State Building Code adopts and amends
25 International Building Code. So it would be improper for

1 this WAC to refer to a code that the State doesn't
2 enforce. The State enforces the State Building Code.

3 MR. CLEARY: But sections of the IBC.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: There's a State amendment to the
5 IBC.

6 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. The State adopts and amends the
7 International Building Code.

8 MR. McNEILL: Under their state --

9 MR. THOMPSON: It's WAC 51-50.

10 MR. CLEARY: But could we just use the State-amended
11 IBC?

12 MR. THOMPSON: Or you could just insert WAC 51-50.

13 MR. CLEARY: Okay.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: What would you like to do?

15 MR. THOMPSON: My amendment is to replace
16 "international" with "state."

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Replace the word "international"
18 with "state."

19 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there any opposition to that?
21 Scott.

22 MR. CLEARY: Did you say "state" or just insert WAC
23 51-50? Because that'll drive you right back to where you
24 need to do. If you just say "state," there could be
25 ambiguity to it and create more confusion.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: He wants to say "State Building
2 Code."

3 MR. THOMPSON: So you could just --

4 MR. CLEARY: I'm just asking the question.

5 MR. THOMPSON: I believe that the term "State
6 Building Code" is defined in 51-50.

7 MR. CLEARY: But 51-50 is the main body that has the
8 content, correct?

9 The whole gist of this is to make it easier to
10 navigate this ... in my mind. And if we give them a
11 section to go back to

12 I'm in total agreement if we don't use the IBC and
13 it's amended to get rid of that.

14 MR. THOMPSON: So -- then I guess I would say we
15 should revise my amendment to strike "the International
16 Building Code" and replace it with chapter 51-50 WAC."

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: By the WAC 51-50? By WAC 51-50?

18 MR. THOMPSON: By chapter 51-50 WAC.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So you want it to say "If fire
20 and/or smoke doors are required to be installed by chapter
21 51-50 WAC or the local building official"?

22 MR. THOMPSON: Correct.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any opposition to that? Okay.

24 So we've amended this to say: "If fire and/or smoke
25 doors are required to be installed by chapter 51-50 WAC or

1 the building official."

2 MR. THOMPSON: Can I have another amendment?

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

4 MR. THOMPSON: After the word "installed," "in front
5 of hoistway doors" consistent with the title.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Say that once more.

7 MR. THOMPSON: Insert after the word "installed" "in
8 front of hoistway doors." Because the building code
9 requires hoistway doors to be fire rated. And this
10 section would prohibit the hoistway doors from being
11 permanently attached to the hoistway door assembly. So
12 the intent as stated in the title is to address doors that
13 are in front of the hoistway doors. So we need the
14 language to match that and say that -- after the word
15 "installed," we insert "in front of hoistway doors."

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So what you would like to
17 amend it to say is "If fire and/or smoke doors are
18 required to be installed in front of hoistway doors" --

19 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- "by chapter 51-50 WAC" --

21 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- "or the local building official,
23 they must" blah, blah, blah.

24 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any objections to that? No?

1 Okay. So let's take a vote. All in --

2 MR. THOMPSON: I would like to make another
3 amendment.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay. Another amendment.

5 MR. THOMPSON: So at the end of item (2) after the
6 word "opening" insert "when open."

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: "Not encroach upon the full width
8 and height of the hoistway door when open"?

9 MR. THOMPSON: "Not encroach upon the full width and
10 height of the hoistway door opening when open." Because
11 by their nature, fire or smoke doors would encourage when
12 shut. So when open, they shall not encroach.

13 So after the word "opening," insert "when open."

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: But you're talking about, yeah,
15 when the fire doors are open.

16 MR. THOMPSON: Correct.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any objections to that?

18 MR. CLEARY: Would "not in use" be a better way of
19 stating it than "open"?

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: He's talking about the fire doors.

21 MR. CLEARY: I know. When they're not in use,
22 they're automatically open, right?

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: When they're not activated.

24 MR. CLEARY: Yeah, when they're not activated, then
25 they're automatically open. Isn't that correct?

1 MR. THOMPSON: There's other times in the building
2 code when it talks about the position of the door being
3 open or shut, not whether it's in use or not. So I think
4 calling it when open maintains consistency in the
5 language.

6 MR. CLEARY: Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So number (2), again, to amend that
8 to say "Not encroach upon the full width and height of the
9 hoistway door opening when open."

10 Any objections to that?

11 MR. CLEARY: Can we have discussion?

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah, discussion.

13 MR. CLEARY: Would you -- do you think that how this
14 is written, that would -- adding "open" after "opening"
15 would be confusing?

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I do.

17 MR. THOMPSON: So should we insert between "when
18 open" "when the fire and/or smoke door is open"?

19 MR. CLEARY: I just think having "opening" and "open"
20 in that same sentence is confusing. And for this case,
21 the fire doors, if they're not in use cannot encroach.
22 Obviously, if they're in use, they're shut. So I just --
23 I've been working on the WAC for -- and navigating it for
24 years and trying to make it as simple as possible for
25 people that don't spend a lot of time in it. I just want

1 to try to make -- add some charity to it. That's all.

2 I understand your point about that. But having
3 "opening" and "open" in the same sentence I think can be
4 somewhat confusing.

5 MR. THOMPSON: What if we relocate it to the
6 beginning, "When open," comma, "not encroach upon the full
7 width and height of the hoistway door opening"?

8 MR. CLEARY: (Nodding affirmatively.)

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is that your proposal?

10 MR. THOMPSON: Right. So I revise my amendment to at
11 the beginning of item (2), "When open," comma

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any comments? Discussions?

13 MR. McNEILL: Do we know -- I haven't researched it.
14 Do we know what the IBC says in terms of their language?

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, if you go into chapter
16 51-50, isn't that the SBCC, the Seattle Building --

17 MR. THOMPSON: SBCC is the State Building Code
18 Council --

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: State Building Code Council --

20 MR. THOMPSON: -- who's responsible for maintaining
21 WAC 51-50.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

23 MR. CLEARY: I just think a lot of times, making it
24 so it's easy to understand for a 9th Grader, right? And
25 some of this stuff -- I know what you're saying. I agree

1 with it. Because we're talking about encumbrances; we got
2 to say when. I'm just saying, looking at it, if we
3 wordsmith it with another sentence, I'm fine. But in that
4 one there, I think it doesn't work for me. But if we come
5 up with another term of doing it -- I agree that we should
6 say what position that they need to be in when they can
7 encumber; it makes sense.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So you want to say "When the doors
9 are in the open position"? "When the fire doors are in
10 the open position"?

11 MR. THOMPSON: Can we -- I move we vote on my
12 amendment to insert "When open," comma, in front of item
13 (2).

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So you -- so -- okay. So
15 there's a proposal to amend number (2) to say: "When
16 open," comma, "not encroach upon the full width and height
17 of the hoistway door opening."

18 Any objections to that? Rob.

19 MR. McNEILL: No, I don't object. I was voting. I'm
20 sorry.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh. Any objections to adding that
22 to this amendment -- I mean, to this proposal? Sorry.
23 No?

24 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I don't want the "when open"
25 there. So I object.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

2 MR. CLEARY: We have to vote, so ...

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's vote on whether to
4 add this. All in favor of adding "when open" to the
5 beginning of the number (2), raise your hand. One.

6 And then all opposed, raise your hand. Two.

7 So this did not pass.

8 So we're back to ...

9 MR. THOMPSON: I have another amendment.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

11 MR. THOMPSON: So item (3), replace "Ensure the" with
12 "Maintain or not interfere with." I'm not sure --

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Which one?

14 MR. THOMPSON: I'm not sure -- I bring it to the
15 table for discussion to choose the right language. But
16 it cannot be the responsibility of the doors to ensure
17 adherence. I think the doors cannot interfere. So
18 let's use "not interfere with."

19 MR. McNEILL: So your proposal is to strike
20 "Ensure" --

21 MR. THOMPSON: "Ensure the" ... strike that. "And
22 not interfere with." So it would be "Not interfere with
23 adherence to."

24 MR. McNEILL: Would you consider just -- okay, it
25 doesn't matter.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So you want number (3) -- you're
2 proposing number (3) to say "Not interfere with adherence
3 to A117.1?"

4 MR. THOMPSON: Correct.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any objections to that?

6 MR. McNEILL: Can you repeat that?

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So it would say -- so the
8 whole thing would say, "If fire and/or smoke doors are
9 required to be installed in front of hoistway doors by
10 chapter 51-50 WAC or the local building official, they
11 must" -- number (3) "Not interfere with adherence to
12 A117.1" And the rest is the same.

13 Any objections to that amendment to the proposal?
14 No objections?

15 Okay. So then let's -- I added that on there. So
16 this is what the -- any more discussion on this proposal
17 in its entirety.

18 Okay. So I'm going to read this whole thing since we
19 changed a bunch of stuff.

20 Okay. So this is going to say: "If fire and/or
21 smoke doors are required to be installed in front of
22 hoistway doors by chapter 51-50 WAC or the local building
23 official, they must: (1) Not be permanently attached to
24 the hoistway door assembly. (2) Not encroach upon the
25 full width and height of the hoistway door opening. (3)

1 Not interfere with adherence to A117.1 as to hall buttons,
2 lanterns, jamb markings, key switches and position
3 indicators location and line of sight."

4 Okay? So all in favor? Let's take a vote. All in
5 favor, raise your hand.

6 Oh. Did you have ...

7 MR. CLEARY: I have a question.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

9 MR. CLEARY: On number (3), should we put in there
10 the latest-adopted version of 117? Or is that just by
11 default we use the latest one?

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So no more changes. Right?
13 Correct?

14 Okay. So let's take a vote. All in favor, raise
15 your hands please. Three. So this one passed.

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So that's going to say "Not
17 interfere with the adherence of the latest version"?

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No. They didn't -- they didn't
19 add that. Correct?

20 MR. McNEILL: Correct.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: They did not -- we did not add
22 that.

23 MR. McNEILL: Would you read that back just for --

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Just number (3)?

25 MR. McNEILL: "Not interfere with adherence to A117.1

1 as to hall buttons, lanterns, jamb markings," blah, blah,
2 blah. The rest is the same, right?

3 Does that make sense?

4 MR. McNEILL: (Nodding affirmatively.)

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So this one passed.

6 We'll move on.

7 The next one is 02605, private residence inclined
8 stairway chairlifts. Is there a motion?

9 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

11 MR. THOMPSON: I second.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions? No discussion?

13 We'll take a vote. All in favor. Three. This one
14 passed.

15 Next one is 02640, incline commercial stairway
16 chairlifts. Is there a motion?

17 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

18 MR. McNEILL Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion?

20 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
21 hand. Three. This one passed.

22 So the next one, 05050. That one did not pass
23 through the TAC, so we're going to move along to the next
24 one.

25 24600, hand-powered manlifts. Is there a motion?

1 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

3 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? No discussion?

5 All -- let's take a vote. All in favor? Three.

6 This one passed.

7 Okay. The next one is 24611, maintenance and rest
8 requirements. Is there a motion?

9 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

11 MR. McNEILL: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? Okay, no
13 discussion.

14 Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your hands.
15 Three. This one passed three-zero.

16 Okay. Next one. 24630, habitable space beneath the
17 car and counterweight. Is there a -- for electric
18 manlifts.

19 Is there a motion?

20 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

22 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion?

24 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
25 hand. Three in favor. This one passed.

1 The next one is 296-96 Subpart VII. It's just to
2 strike -- okay. Is there a motion?

3 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

5 MR. McNEILL: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

7 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor? Three in
8 favor. This one passed.

9 Next one, Subpart XII, special purpose elevators.

10 Is there a motion?

11 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

12 MR. McNEILL: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there any discussion?

14 MR. McNEILL: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Rob.

16 MR. McNEILL: (Addressing Mr. Cleary) You moved, so
17 you have the floor first.

18 MR. CLEARY: This is just -- it's a nomenclature.

19 Hand -- electric manlifts have always been regulated
20 before 1982 by the WAC. And if you call them SPE's, then
21 you have to 5.7, and these things cannot meet 5.7.

22 They've been designed, installed and inspected to the WAC
23 -- the 13000 section of the WAC. So this is just to add
24 consistency and keep things that were regulated by the WAC
25 under WAC and not push them into 5.7. Anything new will

1 be 5.7. But these old ones here, we got to call them
2 manlifts -- electric manlifts.

3 That's the justification for this.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussions? Rob, did
5 you have something?

6 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I think Scott just clarified it.
7 So I thought this rule was for new.

8 MR. CLEARY: (Shaking negatively.)

9 MR. McNEILL: It's not?

10 MR. CLEARY: No. These are -- this is in Subpart C.
11 So this is all for existing.

12 MR. McNEILL: Okay.

13 MR. CLEARY: Not for new. All new would be pursuant
14 to the latest version of 17.1 -- (inaudible).

15 That's where SPE is defined is in 5.7 of the ASME.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussions? Comments?

17 Okay. So let's take a vote. All in favor, raise
18 your hands. Two.

19 MR. McNEILL: I abstain.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Two-zero-one.

21 MR. McNEILL: Because I need to digest it a little
22 bit more. I'd need some time to get into the code book
23 and research it. So ...

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So this one passed with one
25 abstention.

1 Okay. The next one is Subpart XIII, hand elevators
2 -- hand-powered manlifts.

3 Is there a motion?

4 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

6 MR. McNEILL: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? Scott.

8 MR. CLEARY: This is the same exercise. These type
9 of hand-powered manlifts aren't found anywhere in ASME.
10 They've always been regulated by the WAC. And putting
11 them into 4.3 would take every one of them out of service
12 because they're not even close to being compliant to that.

13 So anything new of hand elevators, keep calling them
14 hand elevators.

15 And why we're doing this and the last one is so
16 inspectors when they go on their annuals know where to go
17 to be able to make sure they're compliant. And you can't
18 find this one here in 4.3 section of 17.1; you got to go
19 back to the 14000 section of the old WAC.

20 So it's just clarification and keeping the
21 nomenclature consistent.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anything else? Any other comments?

23 Okay. Ready to take a vote? All in favor, raise
24 your hand. Three. This one passed.

25 MR. McNEILL: Madam Chair?

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

2 MR. McNEILL: This is probably out of order. But on
3 the last proposal that was approved that I abstained on, I
4 think that we had to have -- didn't we have to have "7"
5 there rather than "3"?

6 MR. CLEARY: That's -- right. That's exactly right.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: "7" rather than "3" where?

8 MR. McNEILL: Can I make a motion to reopen
9 296-96-Subpart XII?

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Let's reopen this one.

11 MR. McNEILL: Need a second.

12 MR. CLEARY: I second.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Reopen. Reopen. Make a
14 motion to reopen. And there's a second by Scott.

15 Okay. Discussion? Scott.

16 MR. CLEARY: I'd like to amend the statement of
17 justification to read: "... A17.1-5.7" and strike "5.3"
18 because 5.7 is the appropriate section.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any objections?

20 Okay. So we have amended Subpart XII to replace
21 "5.3" with "5.7." There's no objections. So let's take a
22 vote on this proposal again with the replacement.

23 MR. THOMPSON: Just to confirm that the WAC language
24 is unchanged. It's just a clarification of the
25 justification.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Actually I thought that we made a
2 blanket statement at the last meeting to make those
3 changes, but I could be wrong, on all the upcoming --

4 MR. CLEARY: We did.

5 MR. McNEILL: We did. But it didn't get changed.
6 So ...

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay. Okay. All right.

8 Okay. So it's going to say: Need to re -- need to
9 -- wait a minute.

10 MR. CLEARY: Chair?

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

12 MR. CLEARY: It should read: "Need to retain the
13 title of Electric Manlifts, this is confusing other SPE's
14 that are installed to A17.1-5.7" instead of "5.3."

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Under the justification.

16 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Rob.

18 MR. McNEILL: And as a part of discussion, this is to
19 make sure that when this goes out to the public, that
20 they're not confused and they understand.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Right. Although, it doesn't change
22 the actual code is what you're saying.

23 MR. McNEILL: Correct.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote on
25 that. So are we -- then are we taking a vote on --

1 there's no objections to that, so I just added it, right?
2 But are we going to take a vote on the whole thing again?
3 Or are you still abstaining?

4 MR. McNEILL: No. I ...

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Let's take a vote -- a new vote on
6 this. Okay. So let's take a vote on this Subpart XII,
7 keeping the verbiage the same, but under the justification
8 we're changing "5.3" to "5.7." All in favor, raise your
9 hands. Three. Three in favor. So this one passed.

10 So where were we? Were we on 5000? Yeah. So moving
11 on to 5000, this one did not pass through the TAC, so
12 we're going to move forward; skip this one.

13 So the next one is 5140, material lifts, car
14 safeties. Is there a motion?

15 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

17 MR. CLEARY: I second.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

19 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor? Two.
20 Three. Three in favor. Okay, this one passed.

21 Okay. So the next one is 5190. Is there a motion?

22 MR. THOMPSON: Move to approve.

23 MR. McNEILL: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

25 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your

1 hands. Three. That one passed.

2 Next one is 23117, car top guard rails.

3 Is there a motion?

4 MR. McNEILL: I move to approve.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

6 MR. CLEARY: I second.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions? Scott.

8 MR. CLEARY: Can I -- can we have a minute?

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Sure, take a minute.

10 MR. CLEARY: I have a ...

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

12 MR. CLEARY: Under the exemption, this requirement
13 does not apply to electric elevators, i.e., special
14 purpose elevators. I think we need to -- I would like to
15 amend that we strike "Special Purpose Elevators" because
16 we have agreed that we'll change the nomenclature from
17 special purpose elevators to electric manlifts.

18 We can also say -- is it the State's intent to have
19 5.7 equipment exempt or just the old electric manlifts be
20 exempt?

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: This is for in the 23 section. So
22 this is for retroac -- this is for existing.

23 MR. CLEARY: Existing, yeah.

24 So what I'm asking, I guess, Doty, is if we're
25 changing back to electric, then I think we need to get

1 rid of the "i.e. Special Purpose Elevators" and strike
2 that.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yep, I think you're right.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So do you have --

5 MR. CLEARY: My amendment is to strike what's in the
6 parentheses under the exemption and just have it read:
7 "This requirement does not apply to electric manlifts."

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So there's an amendment to
9 strike everything in the parentheses. So it would be
10 reading: "EXEMPTION: This requirement does not apply to
11 electric manlifts."

12 All opposed to that? Any opposed?

13 MR. CLEARY: And I have another question.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

15 MR. CLEARY: And maybe an amendment.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: All right.

17 MR. CLEARY: Do we also want to put in the exemptions
18 residential elevators?

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That would make sense.

20 MR. CLEARY: So make an amendment that we add under
21 exemptions "residential elevators."

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So you want to say ...

23 MR. THOMPSON: I would amend the amendment to be
24 electric manlifts and residential elevators.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So there's an amendment

1 there for it to now read: "EXEMPTION: This requirement
2 does not apply to electric manlifts and residential
3 elevators."

4 Any opposition to that? Okay. Any other discussion?

5 Are we ready to vote? Okay. Let's take a vote. All
6 in favor, raise your hands. Three. This one passed with
7 those amendments.

8 Okay. So now it's 10:30. Let's take a -- make any
9 motion? I make a motion to take a recess.

10 MR. CLEARY: I second it.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, let's take a recess until
12 10:45.

13 (Recess taken.)

14

15 ESAC Review

16

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, let's begin. Recess is over.
18 Okay. So let's get back to --

19 MR. CLEARY: You have to call the meeting to order.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Let's call the meeting back to
21 order.

22 Okay. So where we left off is 23118. This is
23 removing car top guard rails for hydraulic elevators
24 because before the break, as you recall, it was added to
25 the one previous.

1 Okay. Is there a motion?

2 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

3 MR. CLEARY: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion. No discussion.

5 Let's take a vote. All in favor? Okay, three in
6 favor.

7 Okay. The next one is 23605, examination of standard
8 application material lifts, special purpose lifts,
9 electric manlifts and hand elevators.

10 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

11 MR. McNEILL: I second.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion? Scott.

13 MR. THOMPSON: I am curious why some of the items are
14 struck. For example, each subsection says "shall be
15 examined if installed." And it seems appropriate, for
16 example, the door reopening device if it's installed, it
17 needs to be checked.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

19 MR. CLEARY: There's absolutely none of this
20 equipment on any of this equipment.

21 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

22 MR. CLEARY: We can leave it there. But it's --
23 we're trying to clean things up so you don't have "n/a,
24 n/a, n/a, n/a" everywhere. So it's just -- that's the
25 logic behind that.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anything else? Scott.

2 MR. CLEARY: I'd like to make an amendment that we
3 change the title "Examination of standard application
4 material lifts, special purpose lifts, electric manlifts,
5 and hand elevators." There are no hand elevators in the
6 state of Washington that I know of. So we can leave "hand
7 elevators" in, but we got to put "hand-pulled manlifts."
8 Because this is mainly to address hand-pulled manlifts.
9 And hand elevators are out of 4.3, and none of them meet
10 any of those requirements. So these are for existing, so
11 we want to put in "hand-pulled manlifts" in addition to
12 hand elevators; we can leave hand elevators in there.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: What do you want to do?

14 MR. CLEARY: I'd prefer to get rid of hand elevators
15 and just put hand-pulled manlifts would be my amendment.

16 MR. McNEILL: So you want to strike "elevators" ...

17 MR. CLEARY: Yep. And insert "manlifts."

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So it would say at the very
19 end "electric manlifts and hand-pulled manlifts."

20 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

21 MR. THOMPSON: I would amend it to be hand-powered
22 manlifts.

23 MR. CLEARY: The nomenclature's always been hand
24 pull, not hand power. So I just want to keep nomenclature
25 the same.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So that was his amendment is
2 -- his proposed amendment is to strike "elevators" at the
3 very end of the sentence and add "pulled manlifts." So
4 it'll say "hand-pulled manlifts."

5 MR. THOMPSON: Can we table that amendment for some
6 further discussion?

7 When we discussed Subpart XIII --

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Earlier?

9 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

10 -- the language in Subpart XIII was hand-powered
11 manlifts.

12 MR. CLEARY: All right. I will withdraw my amendment
13 and have my amendment say "hand-powered manlifts." I'm
14 fine with that.

15 MR. McNEILL: Good catch.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So the amendment to the
17 proposal is going to read at the very end: "and
18 hand-powered manlifts."

19 Is there any objections to that? Okay. Any other
20 discussion on that -- on this proposal?

21 Should I -- do you need more time?

22 Okay. So let's take a vote with the addition -- or
23 change of "hand elevators" to "hand-powered manlifts."

24 All in favor, raise your hand. Two. All opposed? One.

25 So two to one. So this passed.

1 Okay. So let's move to the next one. 2374 is the
2 next one, maintenance and test of commercial accessibility
3 lifts. Is there a motion?

4 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

6 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody -- any discussion? Scott.

8 MR. CLEARY: I want to give some clarity. The reason
9 for this is in the existing -- or the new WAC that refers
10 you to maintenance back at 10.2, in 2017 they added a new
11 section, and that's section 11. That's where all the
12 maintenance is. So this just drives you back to the
13 appropriate maintenance section and gives some other
14 clarity.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussion?

16 Okay. All in favor, raise your hand. Three. This
17 one passed.

18 The next one is 24401, existing belted manlifts.
19 Motion? Any motion?

20 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

22 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody want to discuss? Open for
24 discussion. Oh, did you want to say something?

25 MR. CLEARY: Yeah. Just this goes back to that there

1 is no grandfathering in A90. So after a year of adopting
2 to the latest code everything must be current. So it just
3 adds some clarification onto that.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So no more discussions?

5 Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your hands.
6 Two. All opposed? Abstentions? Two-zero-one. This one
7 passed.

8 Okay. The next one is 24416. This one is a
9 proposal to repeal as this is found in A90.1.

10 So is there a motion?

11 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Second?

13 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? Rob.

15 MR. McNEILL: I'd like to amend this to include -- a
16 proposal to vote on a block of proposals because they're
17 all harmonizing with A90.1. And I -- if can do that
18 legally, I'd like to vote on proposal 24416, 24419, 24422,
19 24425, 24428, 24431, 24434, 24437, 24440, 244 -- through
20 54 because this is really just administrative.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And then after 40 is 41 to 54?

22 MR. CLEARY: To 24454.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So how many is that?

24 MR. McNEILL: I think we need the individual numbers,
25 Scott, because they're not all in order.

1 MR. CLEARY: Okay. I agree.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, okay. So I left off at
3 24441.

4 MR. McNEILL: Okay. And then it's 244 -- could you
5 give me your numbers ...

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So this is what I have so
7 far. 24416, 24419 -- are you with me, Rob?

8 MR. McNEILL: Uh-huh.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: 24412, 24425, 24428, 2 --

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 24412 or 22?

11 MR. McNEILL: 24422.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, I didn't get 22.

13 So 24416, 24419, and then 24422?

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

15 MR. McNEILL: Yes, yep.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Hang on, let me finish reading.

17 And then 24425, 24428, 24431, 24434, 24437, 24440,
18 24441. That's as far as I got.

19 MR. McNEILL: I don't have a --

20 MR. CLEARY: There's no 41.

21 MR. McNEILL: 24445.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh. From 40 to 45 you said?

23 MR. McNEILL: Yeah.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That's where I got lost right
25 there.

1 MR. CLEARY: Correct, 45.

2 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, that's where we all got lost.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah.

4 So after -- what's after 24445?

5 MR. CLEARY: 48. Then 51.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And then 54.

7 MR. CLEARY: And then, correct, then 54.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, that's where I got lost.

9 Okay.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Are they in order here?

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Let's take a moment to -- I got to
12 take a moment to pull them all. So are they in order in
13 this packet?

14 MR. McNEILL: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To 54 then?

16 MR. McNEILL: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So all of these are -- oh,
18 Scott.

19 MR. CLEARY: The reason why this is is that we
20 adopted the A90 code without any exceptions in 6.75. So
21 we're just taking things out of the WAC and going back to
22 the main body of the national standard, and that will
23 alleviate if there's been any kind of errors put in the
24 WAC over the years. So we're just going back to the
25 national body.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any more discussion on
2 this?

3 Okay. So we are -- let's take a vote on this as a
4 block.

5 Did you want to continue discussion?

6 MR. McNEILL: No, I don't want to continue any
7 discussion on this body.

8 MR. CLEARY: There's 13 in this block.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: 13, yes. So we're taking these 13
10 as a block, and we're taking a vote on the proposal, which
11 is to repeal this whole block as it is found in A90.1,
12 correct?

13 Okay. So all in favor, raise your hands. Two.
14 Opposed? Abstention?

15 MR. THOMPSON: I abstain.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So this passed as a block.

17 So then that brings us to 24457, up-limit stop
18 devices. Is there a motion?

19 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

21 MR. McNEILL: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions? Scott.

23 MR. CLEARY: The reason why this is here is the WAC
24 for existing belted manlifts only required two upper limit
25 safeties where A90 requires three. So what this says is

1 that they'll allow the ones that were regulated under the
2 WAC to have two. So that's why this is in here. Because
3 they can't -- the ones that are in -- most of them that
4 are in existence in the state of Washington cannot meet
5 A90's requirement for three upper landing -- or three
6 upper stops.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other discussion?

8 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
9 hand. Two. Opposed? Abstain? One. Two-zero-one. This
10 one passed.

11 Okay. So the next one is 24460. This one's repealed
12 because it's covered in A90.1.

13 Is there a motion? Rob.

14 MR. McNEILL: I would like to move that we vote on a
15 block for proposal 24460, 24466, 24470 and 24478, which
16 all are repealed and harmonize -- that harmonizes the code
17 with A90.1.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So there's four of them?

19 MR. McNEILL: Yes.

20 And we'll need a second to be able to ...

21 MR. CLEARY: I second.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: You second the moment or you second
23 the block?

24 MR. CLEARY: The block.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I need a moment. Did you say 45?

1 What did you say?

2 MR. McNEILL: I did not say 45.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 45 is a duplicate.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay.

5 MR. McNEILL: We already did that.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So 45 is a duplicate, huh?

7 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, we already did that. That's
8 already been approved.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I was going to say that's right in
10 the middle of everything.

11 MR. McNEILL: Just to keep us on our toes.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: It'll keep me on my toes.

13 Okay. So there's five in a row, but one of them's
14 already a duplicate of something else.

15 Okay. So I've got a motion to move four of them in a
16 block: 24460, 24466, 24470 and 24478. Is that a correct
17 statement?

18 MR. McNEILL: That is correct.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So we've got a motion and we
20 have a second. Anybody want to discuss this? Are we
21 ready to vote?

22 Okay. So let's take a vote. All in favor, raise
23 your hand. Two. Opposed? Abstention? Two-zero-one. It
24 passed.

25 Okay. Let's move to the next one would then be

1 24480, additional annual test requirements. Is there a
2 motion?

3 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

5 MR. McNEILL: I second it.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Discussion? Scott.

7 MR. CLEARY: The reason why this is in there is
8 because the WAC has always allowed a Category 1, Category
9 5, which does not exist in A90 nor has it ever. So it's
10 always intended to be a annual test, a weight test. So
11 this is consistency with the national standard that we've
12 adopted and are conforming to.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any more comments? discussions?

14 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor? Two.

15 Oppose? Abstention? One. Two-zero-one. Passed.

16 Okay. So the next one is 24500. Is there a motion?

17 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

19 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Discussion? Scott.

21 MR. CLEARY: I need an amendment. I can see under
22 the scope the administrative change was made from 5.3 to
23 5.7. I need to have that down in the statement -- or the
24 justification, change ASME A17.1-5.3 to 5.7 in two
25 different areas.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So you would like to ...

2 MR. CLEARY: Have it read: "ASME 17.1" to "5.7."

3 And then under (2), the same thing would be to strike
4 "5.3" to "5.7." It had been corrected up in the proposal
5 under "Scope."

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So under the justification,
7 you would like in number (1) where it says "5.3" to say
8 "5.7."

9 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And in number (2) where it says
11 "5.3," you want it to say "5.7."

12 MR. CLEARY: Yes.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any objections to that? No
14 objections? Okay. So any more discussion on this motion?

15 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor? Three.
16 This one passed.

17 Okay. The next one is 24516, maintenance
18 requirements. Is there a motion?

19 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

21 MR. McNEILL: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions?

23 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
24 hand. Three. Passed.

25 Okay. Next one is 24528. Is there a motion?

1 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

3 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions?

5 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor, raise your
6 hands? Three. This one passed.

7 Next one, 24537, suspension means. Is there a
8 motion?

9 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

11 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

13 Let's take a vote. All in favor? Three. This one
14 passed.

15 Next one, 24543, car safeties. Is there a motion?

16 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

18 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

20 Okay. All in favor? Three. This one passed.

21 The next one is 24553, drive machines. Is there a
22 motion?

23 MR. THOMPSON: I move.

24 MR. CLEARY: I second.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion?

1 Okay. Let's take a vote. All in favor? Three-zero.

2 This one passed.

3 Next one is 24560, additional applicable
4 requirements. Is there a motion?

5 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

7 MR. McNEILL: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Anybody want to discussion
9 this? All in favor then, raise your hands. Three. This
10 one passed.

11 Next one is 24670, hoistway requirements. Is there a
12 motion?

13 MR. CLEARY: (Raising hand.)

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott, motion?

15 MR. CLEARY: Yeah.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second? Anybody want
17 to second that?

18 MR. THOMPSON: I'll second it.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Somebody want to discuss?
20 Scott.

21 MR. CLEARY: Dotty, this one here also has some
22 research under DOSH requirements.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

24 MR. CLEARY: So this is subject to that ruling,
25 correct?

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, that's correct.

2 MR. CLEARY: Okay.

3 MR. THOMPSON: And I'm curious if there should be
4 emergency power or stand-by power for the adequate-
5 lighting provision.

6 MR. CLEARY: No. Because most of these are put in
7 areas that don't have it or they're outside kind of a
8 thing. So a lot of these are very rural.

9 And the standard is is if it's not adequate lighting
10 or it's night, they're locked out so no one can get on.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any more discussion?

12 MR. THOMPSON: Should we clarify that adequate
13 lighting is limited to when the lift is powered? I just
14 think "adequate" seems very subjective for a statute.

15 MR. CLEARY: But we gave adequate lighting a -- is
16 five foot candles. So we gave a definition of what we
17 consider "adequate" is. And that meets the other WAC
18 standards.

19 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any more discussion?

21 MR. THOMPSON: I would offer an amendment that after
22 five foot candles, we insert "under normal power."

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

24 MR. CLEARY: Can I make -- you said "under normal
25 power"?

1 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

2 MR. CLEARY: I would just say "under operational
3 use."

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: "During operational" --

5 MR. CLEARY: Or "during operational use."

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is that what you're getting at,
7 Brian?

8 MR. THOMPSON: Sure.

9 MR. CLEARY: These are just very atypical situations
10 where you're just -- you're in the middle of nowhere
11 sometimes. So I think having that in there under use is
12 helpful.

13 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So you want it to say after
15 five foot candle, you want to say ...

16 MR. THOMPSON: "When in use."

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: "When the lift is in use"?

18 MR. CLEARY: Or "operational." Because we want five
19 foot candles no matter if somebody's in it or not. If
20 it's operational, it should be illuminated.

21 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So what would you like it to say,
23 Brian?

24 MR. THOMPSON: "Five foot candles when operational."

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: "When operational"?

1 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

2 Whether it's in use or not is irrelevant. It's
3 whenever it's operational. And therefore, there's no
4 power if it's not operational; we don't need lighting.

5 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So it's going to say: "For
7 the purpose of this section, adequate lighting is five
8 foot candle when operational."

9 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

10 Do we need to clarify when the lift is operational,
11 not when the lighting is operational?

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is that what you --

13 MR. CLEARY: No. Because it's under hoistway
14 requirements.

15 MR. THOMPSON: I think if we don't clarify that it's
16 when the platform is operational, then we are referring to
17 the lighting being operational.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So ...

19 MR. McNEILL: I agree. Right now the way this
20 amendment's written, it's not clear.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So is it that you want to say:
22 "For the purpose of this section, adequate lighting is
23 five foot canal when the lift is operational"? Is that
24 what --

25 MR. CLEARY: I would like to give a point of

1 clarification. This is for emergency extrication. So the
2 lift may not be operable. That's why they're getting out
3 of it and we want light in the hoistway so they can walk
4 down the ladder. So I think -- so that's the reason why
5 -- it the lift isn't operational, that's when we need the
6 lighting more than anything. So this has to do with being
7 able to do emergency extrication.

8 MR. THOMPSON: So then should it say -- the amendment
9 should be revised to say: "Is five foot candles when
10 power is available"?

11 MR. CLEARY: No. I think "operational" is fine
12 because if you're -- you're using it and if something
13 happens and it stops, then this is for emergency
14 extrication. So I think that hoistway being illuminated
15 during operational is good enough. But if you say just
16 when the car's operational, you're using it when you need
17 that lighting when it's not operational, right? So I just
18 want to make sure you understand the context of where this
19 is coming from.

20 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. It just -- in the Building
21 Code, we provide emergency illumination so that when
22 there's a system failure, you can see your way out. And
23 so it sounds like you're trying to address an emergency
24 situation, but you are not asking for emergency power.

25 MR. CLEARY: In elevator's nomenclature and that

1 stuff, you have illuminations that are required at your
2 threshold and in the hoistway. This has never been
3 defined in the hoistway. You still got illumination for
4 our sills at our entries. This is just to say we also
5 want to put it in for path of travel.

6 So it -- you're not going to have emergency backup on
7 these things, but when it's operational you got to have
8 the light because it's never been required in the past. I
9 think this is even a little bit of a push to get them to
10 do this, but we just think that if you're up 150 feet and
11 you got to get out and walk down some, you need to have at
12 least five foot candles. So that's all the reason this
13 came up.

14 MR. McNEILL: Madam Chair?

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

16 MR. McNEILL: I don't think we need to put "when
17 operational." I think it should just be there, period.
18 So it's there so if someone decides to use it, it's there
19 rather than defining "operational" and ...

20 MR. CLEARY: That's how we wrote it originally. That
21 was our intent. But I want to make sure that it's -- it
22 adds clarity. I'm fine --

23 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, I understand what you're trying
24 to do. But I think it should just be -- since there is an
25 emergency power, we need the lighting, so it just needs to

1 be there.

2 MR. CLEARY: And I -- and if you look at it, we were
3 just trying -- when you say "adequate lighting," that next
4 sentence is just to define what "adequate lighting" is.
5 So it doesn't really say -- so all we're trying to do is
6 define what "adequate light" as, and that's five foot
7 candles.

8 So adding anything extra to that is superfluous I
9 guess. So ...

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So do you want to --

11 MR. THOMPSON: I want to withdraw my amendment.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: You want to withdraw, okay.

13 So any more discussion? So there is no amendment to
14 this.

15 Let's take a vote on the proposal as it was brought
16 to us from the TAC. So all in favor? Three. So this one
17 passed.

18 And the next one did not make it through. The next
19 one is the Part C1. This one did not make it through the
20 TAC, so that one, we're not going to review.

21 The one after that is Part D Material Lifts. Oh,
22 that's the last one.

23 MR. THOMPSON: I move to approve.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So is there a motion?

25 MR. CLEARY: I motion.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

2 MR. THOMPSON: Second.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? Do you need a
4 moment? No discussion, okay.

5 So let's take a vote. All in favor? Two. Oh.

6 MR. CLEARY: Well, can I -- I'm not sure if I want
7 to say something here.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Would you like a minute?

9 MR. CLEARY: I'd like a second or five or fifteen.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Scott.

11 MR. CLEARY: Okay. So I'd like to discuss more than
12 make a friendly amendment is that this is Part D, so that
13 means it's for existing, correct? And we talk about for
14 existing elevators, material lifts, dumbwaiters and
15 escalators. And then the subpart is calling it something
16 different than a material lift. So do we need to have
17 standard application up in the main body of the title?
18 I'm not sure how it was written like that. Does that make
19 sense?

20 And Dotty, that's more of a question for you.
21 Because we're calling them material lifts, but right now
22 in the state of Washington there is no 7.4 A or B material
23 lifts ... or there wasn't at the time ...

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So let me ...

25 MR. CLEARY: Because any new material lifts would be

1 regulated under the new section, not under Part D.

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's correct. That's
3 correct, Scott. I think you're right.

4 MR. CLEARY: So I think we just need to get rid of
5 "material lifts," and if you want to keep the nomenclature
6 "standard application material lifts," that should be up
7 in the main body.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So what do you propose? Would you
9 like to amend something?

10 MR. CLEARY: I'd like to amend and get -- and add in
11 front of "material lifts" "standard application."

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And then take the -- you want to
13 take it from the bottom and put it at the top?

14 MR. CLEARY: Correct. Because we don't want to
15 include the new 7.4 material lifts in Part D because
16 that's handled under 7.3 -- 17.3.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So we're going to cross off all the
18 verbiage under Subpart 5, correct?

19 MR. CLEARY: No. You can leave it there. I just
20 think --

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No. And then you just add --

22 MR. CLEARY: You just need to add "standard
23 application" in front of "material lifts" so ...

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Right. And then take away all this
25 stuff underneath Subpart 5.

1 MR. THOMPSON: No. It's -- to be consistent, they
2 did two out of the three. All three out of the three
3 should say "standard application material lifts."

4 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

5 So just --

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay.

7 MR. CLEARY: -- leave it all there and --

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So in the title, Candace.

9 MR. CLEARY: Yeah.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So you want -- so your amendment is
11 just to add "standard application" in front of "material
12 lifts."

13 MR. CLEARY: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any objections to that?

15 MR. CLEARY: Dotty, I think that will help clarify.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any more discussions on
17 this?

18 Okay. So we are going to take a vote on the proposal
19 with "standard application" in front of the "material
20 lifts." All in favor? Three. And this passed.

21 And this finish -- completes our review of all these
22 codes.

23 MR. CLEARY: Madam Chair, can I ask a couple
24 questions?

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: On ...

1 MR. CLEARY: On this.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: On this? Sure.

3 MR. CLEARY: Now, I think this is the same thing.
4 This is directed towards the State.

5 So basically what we've done in this exercise is
6 taken what came out of the TAC, went through it, made some
7 amendments, and then either voted up or down on it. Now,
8 all we do as a Committee is present them to the State,
9 right? The State still has the final ability to change
10 them a little bit or accept what we --

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's correct.

12 MR. CLEARY: Is it the State's intent to take what
13 we've done other than if we get negative feedback from
14 DOSH or somebody else saying, "You can't do that" is to
15 pretty much accept what we did in its entirety what we --
16 we're going to put up to the State?

17 I don't want to put you -- I'm just saying because we
18 had some wordsmithing last time that had unintended
19 consequences that wasn't meant by anybody; it just
20 happened.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

22 MR. CLEARY: So I just don't want this exercise to be
23 kind of the same --

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: For not.

25 MR. CLEARY: For not because we're pushing up against

1 looking at redoing the WAC in its entirety. So I just
2 want to make sure that I understand what's going to happen
3 with everything that we've done to these exercises.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And I agree with what you're
5 saying.

6 I would say for 98 percent of what was done, no,
7 there's no intention to make any changes.

8 MR. CLEARY: Thank you.

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: But there are one or two
10 proposals ...

11 MR. CLEARY: Okay.

12 MR. McNEILL: And just to piggyback that, Scott, when
13 we made the changes in terms of the standard -- the fee
14 table, we didn't put "fee" it there, so that's something
15 they can do administratively.

16 MR. CLEARY: And we also --

17 MR. McNEILL: We know what the intent was.

18 MR. CLEARY: So we also agreed I think at the TAC and
19 I guess here that the State is going to go through and do
20 the administrative changes globally then, right?

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct. That is
22 correct.

23 MR. CLEARY: Will that come back out for review to
24 the ESAC? Or is that --

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It will come out in the public

1 hearing.

2 MR. CLEARY: Okay. And that will be in WAC then, the
3 administrative things? I think that's the best way of
4 doing it. And I agree with that. You know, because I'm
5 sure -- we've been through a lot, and there's going to be
6 little things that have been missed. So -- and you know
7 nomenclature's important.

8 So thank you for the opportunity.

9 MR. McNEILL: So another question. This is for
10 Alicia.

11 So are we still on track for the public hearings in
12 July.

13 MS. CURRY: For the ASME A17.3? Or no, I'm sorry.
14 That's --

15 MR. McNEILL: No. It would be for this TAC review.

16 MS. CURRY: For this rulemaking, the public hearings
17 are tentatively scheduled for the very end of August,
18 possibly the first part of September.

19 MR. McNEILL: Okay.

20 MS. CURRY: We're scheduled to file the CR102 on July
21 23rd. As far as I know, we are on schedule. However,
22 that could be subject to change based on, you know, the
23 number of rules, the review process. We have to go
24 through for, you know, the AAG. But right now I don't
25 anticipate any delays.

1 MR. McNEILL: It was a selfish question so I can
2 manage my vacation time.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

4 MR. CLEARY: Basically -- this is a question for my
5 own edification.

6 The 17.3 changes that were left out of the last one;
7 they were part of the exemptions in 675, you were going to
8 -- those are being integrated in those. Will that be part
9 of the public comment or --

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That will be part of the public
11 hearings, yes.

12 MR. CLEARY: Okay, fine.

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And those are May 20th and
14 21st, right? The public hearings for 17.3?

15 MS. CURRY: May 30th and May 31st.

16 And the one on May 30th is scheduled for here in
17 Tukwila, and the one on the 31st is scheduled in Spokane.

18 MR. CLEARY: And those are just taking what is in
19 those seven categories and just making them applicable and
20 enforceable by the WAC, correct?

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

22 MR. McNEILL: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. McNEILL: Yeah, that's next week.

24 MS. CURRY: Yes.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any more questions?

1 comments?

2 All righty. I make a motion to adjourn.

3 MR. CLEARY: I second.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: All right. Thank you all.

5 (Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m.,
6 proceedings adjourned.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

