

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

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

STATE OF WASHINGTON

ELEVATOR SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TAC MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Monday, April 15, 2019

BE IT REMEMBERED, that an Elevator Safety Advisory Committee TAC Meeting was held at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, April 15, 2019, at the Department of Labor and Industries, 12806 Gateway Drive South, Tukwila, Washington.

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

WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were held, to wit:

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

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

A G E N D A

1		
2		
3	April 15, 2019 - Tukwila	Page No.
4		
5	Welcome, Safety Topic	3
6	Introductions	6
7	Meeting Guidelines	8
8	Review of Proposals	10
9	Break	54
10	Review of Proposals	54
11	Lunch	85
12	Review of Proposals	85
13	Break	137
14	Review of Proposals	137
15	Break	173
16	Review of Proposals	173
17	Recap and Adjournment	203
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

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

Welcome, Safety Topic

SECRETARY STANLASKE: All right. May I have your attention please. So we're going to get started. We have a few changes.

Kevin Brinkman -- hi, Kevin.

MR. BRINKMAN: Hi, Dotty.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: He was unable to be with us in person because they had a snow storm, believe it or not, and he was unable to make his flight. So he's joining us by Webex.

In addition, the fire marshal that was supposed to attend is -- I don't see her in person here.

And the elevator mechanics were not able to attend. So Ricky Henderson will be sitting in in one of those positions. Ricky originally applied for the TAC to sit in the position of elevator mechanic, but we were sort of -- no offense, Ricky -- looking for some new blood. So we didn't want too many people from TAC -- I'm sorry -- from TKE on the panel. So we tried to spread the wealth out so to speak.

So those are the changes in the committee members.

Thank you very much for being here.

1 We will supply lunch as we have in the past. And we
2 have coffee and tea and plenty of refreshments up in the
3 back. So please be sure you help yourself.

4 We start -- go ahead, Eldon.

5 MR. NICKENS: Is there an opportunity to fill that
6 other mechanic's position with anyone -- if I got somebody
7 to sit in, can they be a voting member?

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: If they had applied previously.

9 MR. NICKENS: Did they have to apply for that
10 specific position? I'm thinking Jim Norris.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No. No, because Jim sits on
12 the ESAC in Patrick's place, and Patrick has been out
13 quite a bit lately.

14 So -- which reminds me, so I'll cover that now so
15 Candace won't have to.

16 Please when you speak, state your name every time
17 that you speak because Milton is our court reporter. He
18 needs that information for the minutes. So please before
19 you speak, state your name. And you don't necessarily
20 have to state who you're with; just your name is fine.
21 And let's try to have one conversation because otherwise
22 it gets difficult for Milton to keep the minutes.

23 In addition to that, we normally start every meeting
24 with instructions if there's an evacuation. So if there
25 is an evacuation, if there's a fire in the building or

1 outside, if this entrance (pointing) isn't blocked -- or
2 this exit I should say -- and hopefully it's not blocked
3 -- go out that exit and go to the farthest side of the
4 parking lot, and we'll convene there and account for
5 everybody. If that's an issue, go out these double doors
6 here (pointing) and go to the back of the building, and
7 we'll meet there. The other option is always you can go
8 out here (pointing) and take a right to the front of the
9 building and go out to the parking lot there.

10 Restrooms are out the door. Take a right, your first
11 left, and they're on your left.

12 So I think we've covered all of those.

13 And we always start our meetings with a safety topic.
14 So this is the time of year a lot of people are doing
15 gardening, and they are starting to, you know, chip up
16 those branches that fell and clean up the trees and using
17 a lot of equipment outdoors. So make sure that you're
18 wearing the proper gear when you do that.

19 I saw a YouTube video where a gentleman was
20 instructing people on how to properly start an edge
21 trimmer, and he had no shoes on, which I thought was kind
22 of ironic. So make sure you wear the proper foot gear,
23 the proper eye gear. If you need hearing protection, some
24 of that equipment gets pretty loud, so make sure you use
25 your proper hearing protection.

1 Introductions

2

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So before we get started,
4 Candace will be running the meeting. So I'll have Candace
5 introduce herself, and then we'll go around and everybody
6 will introduce themselves.

7 I'm Dotty Stanlaske. I'm the Chief Elevator
8 Inspector.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Candace Lau. I'm one of the
10 technical specialists for the state of Washington, and
11 I'll be chairing this deal here.

12 MR. METCALFE: Rich Metcalfe, elevator program
13 supervisor.

14 MR. WILSON: Mike Wilson, Mobility Concepts
15 representing the grain industry.

16 MR. CLEARY: Scott Cleary, Mobility Concepts. I'm
17 the Vice Chair of the ESAC. And I'm representing that
18 Committee as a non-voter.

19 MR. OURY: Bob Oury, Pace Material Handling
20 representing the material lift industry.

21 MR. BALDWIN: Ross Baldwin, Elite Elevator
22 representing mechanics.

23 MR. MURPHY: Dermott Murphy, City of Spokane building
24 official representing the City of Spokane.

25 MR. FRIESEN: I'm Wade Friesen with Vertical Options

1 Elevator.

2 MR. McNEILL: Rob McNeill. I'm on the Elevator
3 Safety Advisory Committee. I represent licensed elevator
4 contractors. I'm a non-voting member on this TAC.

5 MS. GOULD: Jan Gould, City of Seattle elevator
6 inspector and the alternate and now the main for the AHJ
7 on the Elevator Advisory Committee's -- (inaudible).

8 MR. HENDERSON: Ricky Henderson representing elevator
9 mechanics.

10 MR. POTTS: My name is Charles Potts. I am
11 representing building owners.

12 MR. RUNYAN: I'm Jack Runyan. I'm also a building
13 owner.

14 MR. TURNER: Dylan Turner, Greenbusch engineering
15 representative.

16 MR. MESSINA: Dave Messina, Otis Elevator Company
17 representing elevator contractors.

18 MR. NICKENS: Eldon Nickens, International Union of
19 Elevator Constructors, voting member, representing labor.

20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm Bob McLaughlin. I'm a
21 residential owner of an inclined elevator and representing
22 the general public.

23 MR. CLEMENT: Scott Clement, state elevator
24 inspector.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, so that's everyone.

Meeting Guidelines

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

CHAIRPERSON LAU: Also before we start, I wanted to go through the guidelines. Some of you have done this before and some haven't. It could get a little bit confusing. But you've been given this booklet (pointing), and this booklet -- so let me read to you what I've written down.

So we will be reviewing each WAC proposal in numeric order beginning with the table of contents all the way to the end of the WAC code.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Oh. Excuse me for one minute. I'm so sorry.

In the back we have ...

MS. CURRY: Alicia Curry, Labor and Industries. I'm a management analyst, and I -- (inaudible).

MR. MOLESWORTH: And I'm Wayne Molesworth, the operations manager for the elevator division of L & I.

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Jane.

MS. NESBITT: Jane Nesbitt, (inaudible).

SECRETARY STANLASKE: Oh, and Kevin.

MR. BRINKMAN (telephonically): Yeah, this is Kevin Brinkman with NEII. I'm representing the ASME Code Panel.

And thank you for accommodating for me. So we had about five inches of snow yesterday in Central Illinois,

1 and the airport was totally unprepared to handle it and
2 everything was screwed up. So thank you.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, thank you for joining us
4 via Webex, Kevin.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: If we forget --

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That you're there.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- that you're there, let me know.

8 Because when I start doing the counting of the votes and
9 stuff, especially. Okay, Kevin?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes, I will.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

12 So back to this.

13 Okay, we will be reviewing each WAC proposal in
14 numeric order beginning with the Table of Contents. This
15 way if you have the WAC code for reference, you won't be
16 flipping back and forth between the WAC codes. It's
17 already set up in that booklet that you have in front of
18 you.

19 We're going to be following Robert's Rules of Order.
20 I will be the reading the proposal number followed by the
21 proposal and the rationale for each proposal. Then I'll
22 open up the floor for a motion, for discussion and will be
23 allowing time for the discussion, but it should be minimal
24 because we have like 76 of these proposals to get through.
25 You'll be asked to raise your hands to vote in favor or to

1 oppose. And if you're not voting, I'll be asking for
2 abstentions. I'll do the count, and then the consensus
3 will rule. And I will state whether the proposal passed
4 or not passed. And only the voting members can vote;
5 there's other people in this room that are not voting
6 members. And the only other people that are allowed to
7 speak are the ESAC committee members.

8 And there will be a court reporter here. Milton. So
9 there's going to be no off-the-record discussions. And as
10 Dotty said before, please state your name loudly and
11 clearly so that Milton can hear who is talking. And if
12 you haven't already written down your name, please do so
13 on the card.

14 And then please silence your cell phones so there
15 won't be any disruptions.

16 Any questions before we begin?

17

18 Review of Proposals

19

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So if there's no questions,
21 we'll start with the very first one.

22 I'm not sure if you know, Kevin, which ones we're at
23 because you're kind of -- you don't have the booklet in
24 front of you.

25 MS. NESBITT: I did send --

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: She did --

2 MR. BRINKMAN: I can see the screen, so I'm in good
3 shape. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay.

5 So the first one is 2019-296-96. This one really is
6 a Table of Contents.

7 So basically here what we want, what is proposed is
8 to instead of "Special Purpose Personnel Elevators," to
9 name that "Electric Manlifts."

10 The second one, to change the -- to add "Special
11 Purpose Elevators" and cross out "Hand Elevators" and put
12 in "Hand-Powered Manlifts."

13 The third thing on that is to add "Hand Elevators"
14 after "New installations"

15 And the last thing is to cross off "for this purpose
16 shall comply with ... A17.1/CSA B44, Part 7."

17 And the rationale for this is to ensure that any new
18 Electric Manlift of Hand-Powered Manlift is to comply with
19 the requirements in A17.1-4.3 or 5.7.

20 Casket lifts, there may be a conflict requiring these
21 types of lifts to comply with A17.1 as we have found
22 casket lifts on the Internet that say they comply with
23 ASME B.20 VRC. It would be more logical to retain the WAC
24 requirement for new and existing, maybe even to combine
25 some of the WAC material lift with casket lifts.

1 So do we have a motion? Any discussions?

2 MR. BRINKMAN: Candace?

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

4 MR. BRINKMAN: I only have one question.

5 On the last note it says -- if we strike "for this
6 purpose shall comply with ASME A17," et cetera, at least
7 it's with Brinkman the installation of new lifts. Was
8 there something else intended there? Because -- or was
9 the whole sentence supposed to be struck?

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. This one was proposed by
11 Mike Wilson. And he's here.

12 So did you want to respond?

13 MR. WILSON: So the intention I think would be -- was
14 to keep and retain the way the WAC is written current --
15 or the old WAC was regulating casket lifts. Because 17.1
16 doesn't have a casket lift section in there. And so to
17 comply with 17.1 would have been impossible.

18 So I think that the best thing would be to do would
19 be to have it stay with the way the old WAC had written
20 and regulated casket lifts.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Did you get that, Kevin?

22 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I guess I -- I heard that.

23 I'm not quite sure what that means. Because like I
24 said, my only concern was the writing was the installation
25 of new lifts but just end there. So if you got -- are you

1 saying we're supposed to say installation of new lifts
2 shall comply with the WAC code? Is that what we're
3 saying?

4 MR. WILSON: Yes.

5 MR. BRINKMAN: Okay, I'd be fine with that.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any more -- oh, Eldon.

7 MR. NICKENS: It was my understanding there would be
8 no amendments to these once they've been presented to the
9 table.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We're going to correct that
11 that there can be minor amendments made, but no major
12 amendments. So ...

13 MR. NICKENS: It was my understanding that -- the
14 e-mail I got said there would be no friendly amendments to
15 any of this language.

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct. But I checked
17 with some of the other programs, and they accept minor
18 amendments.

19 MR. NICKENS: With that being said, I think that we
20 should have been notified that amendments would have been
21 accepted. I would ask that we move on and consider this
22 one for further evaluation at our next meeting.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So are you making a motion to
24 that effect?

25 MR. NICKENS: Yes.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

2 MS. GOULD: Second.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. All in favor?

4 MR. BRINKMAN: Was there a previous motion on the
5 floor to approve this, though?

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: There -- we opened it for
8 discussion. It probably should have -- we should have had
9 a motion and then opened it for discussion.

10 Is that the proper process?

11 MR. NICKENS: Yeah.

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: My apologies.

13 So yes, there was a previous motion on the -- well,
14 we should entertain a motion on the floor before we --

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- start the discussion.

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Right.

17 So is there a motion to amend this language?

18 MR. WILSON: Motion to amend.

19 MR. OURY: I second it.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: All in favor to amend this
21 amendment -- or this proposal, say -- or raise your hand.

22 Nine. I counted nine.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Can you raise your hands again.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Ten. Eleven.

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And Mr. Brinkman?

1 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I would be in favor of amending
2 it so this complies with the WAC code.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That's twelve in favor.

4 And all that oppose? Three.

5 Any abstentions? One.

6 Anybody not voting?

7 Okay. So we're going to open it up for amendment, a
8 friendly amendment.

9 MR. WILSON: A friendly amendment would be that for
10 the last note for casket lifts is that "New installations
11 shall comply with the WAC requirements."

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Everybody got that?

13 MR. NICKENS: Could you help me? Where is that
14 language at?

15 MR. CLEMENT: The very last sentence in there is a --
16 not a complete sentence. It's just "the installation of
17 new lifts," and it just stops. So to amend that.

18 MR. NICKENS: Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To say -- can you say it one more
20 time?

21 MR. WILSON: To say -- to read that "New lifts shall
22 comply with the WAC or WAC requirements."

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So all in favor of adding to
24 that last sentence?

25 MR. NICKENS: A point of order.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

2 MR. NICKENS: Have we had an opportunity for
3 discussion?

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Open it up for -- is there a
5 second?

6 MR. MESSINA: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

8 MR. NICKENS: I don't want to step on your processes.
9 But there's not a second required for a point of order.

10 But my point of order is that we were directed that
11 no friendly amendments would be allowed at this meeting.
12 And the first thing we did with the very first resolution
13 that came to us was amend it. So I stand in opposition to
14 that process.

15 MR. MESSINA: Do we have to be more specific on WAC
16 requirements that it refers to? Or is that -- I mean, is
17 that too vague and leaves it up for debate when someone's
18 going and reviewing this for potential new install?

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So I would say that if we're
20 going to stay with prior WAC requirements, we'd better
21 make sure that the prior WAC requirements are put back
22 into the system. I was just making sure quite frankly
23 that that's not covered in A17.1 because I thought it was.
24 But ...

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty, was your question whether or

1 not the casket lifts were covered in A17.1?

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

3 MR. BRINKMAN: No, they would not be.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: They are not?

5 MR. BRINKMAN: That's correct.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay.

7 So at the request of some stakeholders -- and I
8 apologize that I didn't send this out previously -- it was
9 brought up that in the past, the only other TAC meeting
10 that we've had, we allowed friendly amendments.

11 I spoke with some of the other programs, and they
12 allow minor friendly amendments. I would consider this a
13 minor friendly amendment.

14 And my apologizes for not letting you know that ahead
15 of time.

16 I think the very first thing that we should do is if
17 we have some people that are in opposition to that and
18 some people that are not in opposition to that, well,
19 let's take a vote on that and go forward.

20 Scott.

21 MR. CLEARY: Basically what we're trying to do is
22 clean this up. Because you can't drive somebody to go to
23 17.1 when there's no content in 17.1 for this equipment.
24 So this is just to make sure that we don't send somebody
25 down a road where there's nothing they can glean from it.

1 These have always been regulated under the WAC. And so
2 that's the reason there.

3 And to talk to the friendly amendments is that my
4 understanding -- and I've been involved in code meetings
5 -- and Kevin, you can talk with this too -- is that this
6 is where we do the tweaking of any proposals because this
7 is where the experts are.

8 So I agree that major rewrites probably are --
9 (inaudible). Corrections here, I think this is what the
10 purpose of this TAC is all about. Because when they get
11 sent up to our ESAC, we should just vote "yea" or "nay"
12 and not worry about content. All content should be
13 worked out with all the experts here.

14 So I'm in support of doing minor amendments to make
15 sure that it's clean and that whatever is sent up to the
16 ESAC can be voted up or down.

17 MS. GOULD: How many casket lifts are there active in
18 the state of Washington right now? And is anybody putting
19 any more in?

20 MR. CLEARY: There is some, but they don't -- a lot
21 of them put in the past don't meet any code, right? And
22 any of the new ones, I don't know of anybody -- well,
23 there's a couple that might be thinking about it. But
24 they're usually regulated under B20 -- (inaudible).

25 MS. GOULD: So that WAC rule for casket lifts is

1 still an active code?

2 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

3 MR. NICKENS: I'd just like to go on the record, and
4 I'll read the e-mail that I received from Dotty Stanlaske
5 stating that "The TAC will not be allowed to make any
6 friendly amendments to the proposal. Your job is to
7 simply approve or deny the proposals as presented to you
8 without any modifications." That was the guidelines and
9 the precedence set for this meeting.

10 To change those guidelines and precedence at the
11 beginning of a meeting I feel is inappropriate.

12 MR. FRIESEN: I just want to point out that this is a
13 Table of Contents item; that's simply that. And from my
14 understanding, if this says it shall comply with WAC, that
15 WAC should be clearly explained later in the document, and
16 this should suffice just for this.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'd like to make a suggestion
19 because we are talking about two different issues here.
20 The first is a procedural issue that my colleague here has
21 raised. The second is the item of the casket lifts. And
22 we need to distinguish between those.

23 I would like to make a suggestion if it would be
24 agreeable with my colleague that you cease discussion on
25 agenda item 1, put that aside, conduct a vote on whether

1 minor comments will be acceptable, then go back and
2 revisit agenda item 1.

3 And my personal feeling is that I too saw that
4 language in Dotty's e-mail and have had several
5 discussions with my colleagues away from this meeting as
6 to the fact that if we cannot make suggestions and
7 interpretations and clarifications, we have nothing to do
8 here; we could resolve everything in this book in about an
9 hour and a half.

10 So it was my expectation coming into the meeting that
11 particularly the drafters of these agenda items would have
12 an opportunity to speak to them, and that the rest of us
13 would then make a decision.

14 So I would ask that Dotty ask my colleague if he
15 would be acceptable to getting a decision on the procedure
16 first and then going back and revisiting agenda item 1.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Would you like to make a motion on
18 that?

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And I will make that motion.

20 MR. CLEARY: A little more discussion.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh.

22 MR. CLEARY: I agree. I got the same e-mail too.

23 And I wasn't aware that everybody else on the committee
24 wasn't aware that we'd be able to have some friendly
25 amendments. So I understand your concern. I think if we

1 don't have some friendly discussion and amendments to what
2 we have now, I agree with Bob that we can do this as a
3 paper exercise.

4 So I'll second the motion that we discuss ground
5 rules right now before we go any further. Because if we
6 don't resolve this, then it doesn't make any sense to go
7 any further.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So you're not allowed to --

9 MR. CLEARY: Oh, that's right.

10 MR. OURY: I'll second Bob's suggestion.

11 MR. NICKENS: A point of order. I believe we are in
12 discussion of a previous motion.

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Would you like to refresh our
14 memory on what that motion is.

15 MR. NICKENS: I'll defer to the Chair.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So our first motion was to -- I
17 guess we forgot to have a motion to discuss this. But our
18 first motion was to add a friendly amendment to this. So
19 what -- so ...

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Take a vote on that motion.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So let's take a vote on that motion
22 then.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: But actually the discussion was
24 that -- what I would suggest is that the individual that
25 made that motion withdraw that motion to amend the

1 language, and then we have a vote on whether we can make
2 the friendly amendments or not.

3 MR. WILSON: Okay. I vote to pull the amendment back
4 -- and what did you say? What was the word you used?

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: You're going to withdraw.

6 MR. WILSON: Withdraw my amendment so that we can
7 make ...

8 MR. NICKENS: May I help?

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, you may help.

10 MR. NICKENS: Withdraw your proposal.

11 MR. WILSON: Okay, I withdraw my amendment to the
12 proposal.

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So that motion --

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That takes care of that.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- was taken off the table.

17 Is there another motion? Open it up?

18 MR. NICKENS: I make a motion that we table this
19 document until it can be clearly presented to the
20 committee for a fair and just vote.

21 MR. OURY: I second it.

22 MR. BRINKMAN: I have a question.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Go ahead, Kevin.

24 MR. BRINKMAN: I'm not clear on the motion. Eldon,
25 are you proposing that we table the whole discussion for

1 today and not look at any of these?

2 MR. NICKENS: No. My motion is that we don't allow
3 -- that we stick to the guidelines that were set forth
4 from Dotty Stanlaske who set this meeting up.

5 And I do understand that every meeting that I sit in
6 allows for friendly amendments and discussion. But that
7 was not the guidelines set forth for this meeting. In
8 fact, that was a change and out of the norm as far as I
9 was concerned.

10 So my motion is to table this particular document,
11 proposal number 2019-296-96, for further -- for correct
12 writing from the author. And that would be Mike Wilson.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second on that motion
14 first?

15 MR. NICKENS: There was already a second.

16 MR. OURY: My understanding was in my seconding that
17 motion was to table this and allow us time to go back and
18 actually have a motion on what the rules will be for this
19 meeting. Is that your intent as well, Eldon?

20 MR. NICKENS: No. My motion is to table this
21 document until it can be written correctly and presented
22 to the committee.

23 MR. OURY: Then I withdraw my motion -- or my second.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

25 MS. GOULD: I'll second.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

2 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, Kevin.

4 MR. BRINKMAN: I don't agree with the motion. I
5 think we need to allow friendly amendments. In fact, I
6 sent you an e-mail to that regard as soon as I saw your
7 first e-mail.

8 To me, the purpose of the TAC is to gather people
9 with knowledge of the industry, experts from different
10 areas, so that we can go through these topics and make
11 decisions. And it shouldn't be just an up or down because
12 there's some that maybe have some simple information
13 missing such as this one where something was struck but
14 nothing was added back in. If we throw all the -- throw
15 them out just because there's a missing sentence or a
16 missing word, I think we're wasting our time here today.
17 I think we really need to spend the time -- a little extra
18 time, get them right, and decide then if they should go
19 forward or not.

20 And I don't want to kick the can down the road for
21 another meeting. I don't think that saves any of us any
22 time. We all put in time and day to be here and be part
23 of this, and I think we need to have the discussion today,
24 and I oppose the motion.

25 MR. MESSINA: I second that.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We're still on discussion.

2 Bob.

3 MR. OURY: I agree with Kevin. I think -- I can
4 speak for myself and the proposals that I wrote and am
5 sure it's the case with others that have written proposals
6 that we are not expert technical writers. We also look at
7 it from our perspective and not necessarily see every
8 unintended consequence for every proposal that we write.
9 And without the ability to add friendly amendments to
10 clean these up and take care of some of those
11 clarifications, I agree with Kevin; we're wasting our
12 time.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's -- any more
14 discussions?

15 We're going to call for a vote on Eldon's motion,
16 which is to table this one. Okay? So all in favor, raise
17 your hand. We're going to table this one. Two. Okay,
18 that's two.

19 All opposed, raise your hand.

20 MR. BRINKMAN: And this is Kevin. I'm opposed to
21 that motion.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Thirteen.

23 Anybody not voting? One.

24 Abstentions? Zero.

25 Okay. So the -- so then this doesn't -- this moves

1 on I guess.

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The motion doesn't pass.

3 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

5 MR. BRINKMAN: I'd like to propose a new motion that
6 we amend the procedures for this meeting to allow friendly
7 amendments or minor amendments to the proposals, but not
8 complete rewrites.

9 MR. TURNER: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So we have a motion to
11 change the procedures a little bit to allow for minor
12 friendly amendments and open this up. Any discussion on
13 that? Any second?

14 MR. CLEMENT: It's been seconded.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I think somebody did second.
16 Yeah, Dylan seconded it.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So any discussion on this?

18 Okay, let's take a vote then. Okay. So approving
19 Kevin's motion on allowing for friendly amendments to the
20 proposals. All in favor, please raise your hand.

21 Thirteen.

22 All opposed? Two.

23 Abstentions?

24 Not voting? One.

25 So that passed. So the procedures are we are going

1 to allow for friendly amendments -- minor friendly
2 amendments to the proposals.

3 Okay. So we're going to go back to this first one of
4 the Table of Contents.

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

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any second?

7 MR. MESSINA: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

9 MR. WILSON: Do I say what I want to amend?

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah, go ahead.

11 MR. WILSON: I would like to make the amendment that
12 at the very bottom that "casket lifts comply with WAC
13 requirements."

14 MR. CLEMENT: So Mike, you're saying that you want to
15 get rid of your language that says "The installation of
16 new lifts," and replace it with a completely different
17 sentence?

18 MR. WILSON: Well, it's "The installation of new
19 lifts shall comply with the WAC -- with WAC requirements."

20 MR. CLEMENT: I second that.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? Eldon.

22 MR. NICKENS: I'm really struggling with the
23 procedural operation of this meeting. We've had multiple
24 seconds on a single motion. If we're going to use
25 Robert's Rules of Order, I suggest that we break out the

1 book and use the rules of order as they should be used.

2 Just an opinion.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Jan.

4 MS. GOULD: If we're going to add that language, we
5 need to reference the particular WAC rule for casket
6 lifts. Because then you're -- a whole lot of WAC rules
7 out there. To clarify.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any more discussion on that?

9 MR. McNEILL: Can we locate that WAC rule?

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I'm trying to do that now for
11 you.

12 MR. McNEILL: I'm just getting my computer up as well
13 so we can understand what we're ...

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any more discussions on this?

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I don't think there's --

16 MR. BRINKMAN: This is Kevin.

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Go ahead, Kevin.

18 MR. BRINKMAN: Candace?

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

20 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, the casket lifts are covered in
21 sub-part XIB of the WAC code.

22 MR. WILSON: 24,700 section.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Scott.

24 MR. CLEARY: I think by just putting it into the WAC,
25 it will refer to the WAC that is being used by whoever is

1 using the WAC at that time. I don't think we've in the
2 past put what version of it is. We could actually insert
3 the section, but the version is going to be different.
4 Because the City of Seattle works off a different version
5 than the State does. So just putting WAC -- and that will
6 drive back to whatever version of the WAC they're using I
7 think would be appropriate.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any more discussion?

9 I think we need to just move on here. We need to
10 take a vote.

11 And so the friendly -- any more discussion? So the
12 friendly amendment is to add at the very end of that --
13 the part that's there now says "The new installation of
14 lifts" And the amendment is to add "shall comply
15 with the WAC requirements."

16 So all in favor of that, raise your hand.

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Before you take a vote, I'd
18 just like to point out something. That -- because the TAC
19 is an advisory committee and the ESAC is an advisory
20 committee, this will come back to me as the Chief. And I
21 will clarify the language. I have the ability to clarify
22 the language and the terminology used. So we'll ensure
23 that that does happen.

24 My apologizes, Candace.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So are we -- we're ready to

1 vote. So all in favor of the amendment to add "shall
2 comply with the WAC requirements" please raise your hand.
3 Twelve.

4 MR. BRINKMAN: This is Kevin Brinkman. I vote aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: You vote in favor?

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Thirteen in favor.

8 All opposed? Two.

9 Anybody not voting?

10 Any abstentions? Zero.

11 Okay. So this one passed. It's going to say that
12 "installation of new lifts shall comply with the WAC
13 requirements."

14 Okay. Another -- the next one is also a Table of
15 Contents, and that's to strike "Subpart VII, Lifts for
16 Physically Handicapped."

17 MR. RUNYAN: A point of order. You passed the
18 amendment, but you haven't passed the page 1.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh. Good catch. I apologize.

20 So that was a friendly amendment. So was there a
21 motion?

22 MR. WILSON: I make a motion to accept the friendly
23 amendment to the proposal, and then to move to vote on the
24 whole proposal now.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

1 MR. OURY: Second.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion?

3 Okay, let's take a vote on the very first proposal.

4 All in favor of accepting the proposal with that friendly
5 amendment, raise your hand.

6 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Thirteen.

8 All opposed? Three.

9 Any abstentions? Zero.

10 Anyone not voting? Zero.

11 Okay. So the whole first proposal passed with the
12 friendly amendment.

13 Okay. Can we move onto the second one? Okay, the
14 second one, also a Table of Contents. And this is to
15 strike "Subpart VII, Lifts for Physically Handicapped" as
16 this part contains no content. And subpart IV already
17 contains the required information.

18 Is there a motion?

19 MR. TURNER: I make a motion that we accept subpart
20 VII.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

22 MR. OURY: A question.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

24 MR. OURY: You mean striking it as a proposal? Okay,
25 I second it.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And that's to accept this the way
2 it's written, correct? Any discussion?

3 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. I am looking at the WAC, and I
4 do not see a Subpart VII. Mike, is there any chance there
5 was a typo in there?

6 MR. WILSON: It was in the Table of Contents.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: There is not one.

8 MR. WILSON: So in the Table of Contents, it
9 references this subpart. But if you go into the main
10 body, there is no main body. It was just merely a Table
11 of Content reference.

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I see a Subpart IV. I see a Subpart
13 V. I see a Subpart VI. I see a Subpart VIII. I don't
14 see a Subpart VII. What am I missing?

15 MR. WILSON: On the Table of Contents?

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm looking at the WAC sections.
17 I'm looking at the Web pages.

18 I could be wrong here, but I'm just saying --

19 MR. WILSON: It was strictly on the Table of
20 Contents, not throughout the whole body.

21 MR. NICKENS: I believe he's referring to the Table
22 of Contents as having this language and no language to be
23 found in the body of that document.

24 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay, I do not know which Table of
25 Contents you're referring to, Mike. I'm sorry. I'm not

1 trying to nitpick every little item here, but I -- I just
2 wondered whether that was a typo. You're saying it's
3 not. I don't know what the reference is. If you see
4 something I don't, that's fine.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any more discussion on
6 this?

7 So what's on the table is we're going to accept to
8 strike these things from the current code and to accept
9 this page the way it's written.

10 Okay, let's take a vote. All in favor of accepting
11 this proposal, raise your hand. Kevin?

12 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Sixteen.

14 Any opposed? Zero.

15 Abstentions? Zero.

16 Anyone not voting? Zero.

17 Okay, so that one passed, accepted as is.

18 Okay, the third one, another Table of Contents to
19 strike part XII from the Table of Contents, strike
20 "Special Purpose Elevators formerly known as" -- excuse me
21 -- and add "Electric Manlifts" instead of the "Special
22 Purpose, Formerly Known as."

23 And the reason being, need to retain the title of
24 Electric Manlifts. This is confusing other SPE's that are
25 installed to A17.1-5.3 - Special Purpose Elevators.

1 Is there a motion?

2 MR. WILSON: I have a -- if there is a typo in the
3 statement, do you have to make a motion to amend your
4 statement?

5 Okay. I make it a motion to amend this proposal.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any second?

7 MR. McNEILL: What are you proposing?

8 MR. WILSON: That's a typo in here in my Statement of
9 Problem and Justification, there's a reference to 5.3.
10 It's supposed to be a reference to 5.7.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I don't think that you need to
12 make a motion to amend that. I think clarification will
13 suffice.

14 MR. WILSON: Okay. Then I'll withdraw.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So let me read it again. This is
16 going be a clarification. So what Mike meant to say was
17 "Need to retain the title of Electric Manlifts, this is
18 confusing other SPE's that are installed to A17.1-5.7 -
19 Special Purpose Elevators."

20 So this is to strike out "Special Purpose Elevators"
21 on the Table of Contents and strike out "Formerly Known
22 as" and add "Electric Manlifts."

23 MR. WILSON: Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: It's to retain the Electric
25 Manlifts.

1 MR. WILSON: (Nodding affirmatively.)

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Because Electric Manlift's already
3 there.

4 Okay. Any motion on this?

5 MR. WILSON: I make a motion that we vote on it to
6 pass.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: You can only make a motion.
8 You can't ...

9 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to pass.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: You can only make a motion.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion?

12 MR. CLEARY: This is just to make sure we got
13 standard nomenclature so there isn't confusion between
14 what was regulated as electric manlifts versus 5.7 SPE's
15 that they're defined in 5.7. So basically we're just
16 trying to clean the nomenclature up so basically we have
17 consistency with how it's been regulated in the past.
18 Because you can't regulate pre-1982 electric manlifts
19 under the 5.7. So all this is is changing the
20 nomenclature back to the way it was before the last WAC
21 change.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any more discussion?

23 MR. CLEMENT: I do have a little discussion. Forgive
24 me because I wasn't here.

25 Did it -- the language that you're wanting to put in

1 here, Mike, was that the way it read previous to the
2 changes last year?

3 MR WILSON: Yes.

4 MR. CLEMENT: Thank you.

5 MR. CLEARY: And also, everything we have in these
6 ones coming up have already been approved on the last TAC
7 and somehow it got messed -- it got changed during the
8 printing of everything. So what we're seeing here has
9 basically already been approved at the last TAC. We're
10 just trying to clean up some nomenclature. That's all.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So Mike, you made a motion
12 to accept this as is.

13 Rich, was yours a second or --

14 MR. METCALFE: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussions? Any more
16 -- oh, Eldon.

17 MR. NICKENS: I want to clarify. You said "as is."
18 Is that including the change from 3 to 7?

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Well, that one is the statement of
20 the problem. The actual -- that was just the
21 justification.

22 What I'm saying is the proposal is to strike "Special
23 Purpose Elevators" and the part that says "Formerly Known
24 as" and just retain "Electric Manlifts." That's what
25 we're voting on.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: With the clarification that
2 it's 5.7 rather than 5.3.

3 MR. NICKENS: I just want to make sure we're voting
4 correct.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any more discussions? Okay,
6 so let's vote on this. All in favor of this proposal,
7 please raise your hand.

8 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fourteen.
10 All opposed?

11 Any abstentions?

12 Anyone not voting? One.

13 Okay. So this one passed as just retaining electric
14 manlifts installed to 5.7.

15 Okay. So let's move on to the third -- the next one
16 is another Table of Contents. 2019-296-96 Subpart XIII.
17 So this one is to strike "Hand Elevators, Previously
18 Called" and retain "Hand-Powered Manlifts."

19 And the justification is: Need to retain the title
20 of Hand-Powered Manlifts. This is confusing other hand
21 lifts that are installed to A17.1-4.3 - Hand Elevators.

22 Do we have a motion?

23 MR. WILSON: Motion to vote.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Do we have a second?

25 MR. MESSINA: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Discussion? Any discussion?

2 MR. NICKENS: The motion was to vote?

3 MR. WILSON: Sorry. The motion is to accept.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any second?

5 MR. MESSINA: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion? No discussion.

7 Okay. So let's vote on striking "Hand Elevators,
8 Previously Called" and retaining "Hand-Powered Manlifts."
9 All in favor?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: 16.

12 Any opposed? Zero.

13 Abstentions? Zero.

14 Anyone not voting? Zero.

15 So this one passed with retaining Hand-Powered
16 Manlifts only.

17 Okay, the next one. 2019-296-96-0XXXX.

18 Okay. So this is a new -- these are all proposed to
19 be new. 296-96-0XXXX. Private Residential Elevators.

20 (1) Main line disconnects and car light disconnects
21 shall be located adjacent to the controller when not
22 located in a dedicated machine room. When located in a
23 dedicated machine room, machine room requirements must be
24 followed.

25 (2) Access to the motor brake.

1 (a) A lockable door that is a minimum 6x6 or 36
2 square inches.

3 (b) A "STOP" switch shall be located within reach of
4 the access door.

5 And (c) A light switch and GFCI outlet shall be
6 located within reach of the access door.

7 And the justification is: (1) ASME A17.1-5.3 does
8 not contain a requirement for a machine room and we are
9 constantly being asked to provide machine room layouts.

10 In most cases the controller is located in a large
11 room or garage and may have multiple points of entry.
12 This will add a greater level of safety to homeowners,
13 emergency personnel, and maintenance personnel as the
14 disconnects will be adjacent to the elevator control and
15 not in locations up to 20 feet away.

16 NEC 620 part VIII, Machine Rooms, Control Rooms,
17 Machinery Spaces, and Control Spaces.

18 (A) Motor Controllers shall be permitted outside the
19 spaces herein specified, provided they are in enclosures
20 with doors or removable panels that are capable of being
21 locked in the closed position and the disconnecting means
22 is located adjacent to or is an integral part of the motor
23 controller. This is to clarify that when a machine room
24 is not provided that the disconnects be centrally located,
25 rather than having them located at the point of entry,

1 which could be several, into a non-dedicated room.

2 (2) ASME A17.1-5.3 does not require an access door to
3 the motor brake. This is a safety issue for emergency
4 rescue by having a safe means to access the brake.

5 Any motions?

6 MR. WILSON: Motion to accept the proposal.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any second?

8 MR. RUNYAN: I'll second it.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Discussions?

10 MR. CLEMENT: My only question is "locked in the
11 closed position." I'm no electrician, but the open is
12 off, closed is on. I think we should follow what NEC
13 says in any other requirement that it has to be lockable
14 in the open or off position.

15 MR. McNEILL: I have a question. The way this is
16 written it only pertains to machine rooms. And I'm not
17 familiar with this equipment. Are there control spaces
18 and machine spaces as well?

19 MR. CLEARY: There is little reference in 5.3 to
20 machine spaces or machine rooms for -- (inaudible)

21 MR. CLEMENT: With that said, about the closed and
22 open, other than that, Mike, I like how you want to have
23 -- you're thinking of the safety of the guy working on it.
24 And I think that's important. I just want to state that I
25 agree with this as a whole. But I'd like to change that.

1 MR. WILSON: That was in the statements, right?

2 MR. CLEMENT: Yes, sir.

3 MR. WILSON: Because that was -- that statement came
4 by the NEC because that's the way the NEC's written.

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I think the confusion is that
6 it says -- you're thinking of disconnect, --

7 MR. CLEMENT: Yes.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: -- and it says "Motor
9 controller shall be permitted outside the spaces herein
10 specified, provided they -- the motor controllers -- are
11 in enclosures with doors or removable panels that are
12 capable of being locked in the closed position."

13 MR. CLEMENT: Thank you.

14 MR. WILSON: So I just want to make clarification
15 here. The reason for this proposal is that in 17.1 there
16 is not a requirement for a machine room. And by having
17 the disconnects located adjacent to our neutral part of
18 the controller is the key point.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any more discussion? Eldon.

20 MR. NICKENS: A lockable door that is a minimum of
21 6x6. Where did you come up with those -- that language?

22 MR. WILSON: That actually comes out of 17.1.

23 MR. CLEARY: It's an industry standard. 5.3 doesn't
24 require access to these, and we think that's unacceptable.
25 We want access to the upper brake assembly. And the

1 standard protocol is it's a 6x6 industry standard. That's
2 where that comes from.

3 MR. NICKENS: My position would be that's too small.

4 MR. CLEARY: All you're doing is -- the brake
5 assembly's right there. So all you're doing is looking at
6 the tail-shaft assembly, you turn the light on. We don't
7 want full-body entry. We don't want more than that in it.
8 And you're only probably nine, ten inches away from your
9 tail-shaft assembly. So in our residential equipment,
10 anything larger I think creates a safety hazard to work.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussions?

12 Okay. So we'll take a vote on this. So -- oh,
13 Kevin, did you want to say something?

14 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah. I was just going to make a
15 comment that the door is a minimum of 6x6. We don't have
16 a maximum on it. If you're worried about full bodily
17 entry, it doesn't say it couldn't be, you know, 60x60. So
18 in that case, you would have full bodily entry. So I'm
19 wondering if they're -- you know, I'm not opposed to the
20 idea of having exits for freight. But I -- you really
21 haven't solved the question of full-bodily entry with
22 what's -- (inaudible).

23 MR. CLEARY: Kevin, I agree. But where these are put
24 in residential homes, you don't have really much space to
25 go any larger than that, especially if you have 96 inch

1 ceiling heights in most homes.

2 This goes over by the header of the door. There's
3 really not -- the reason why 6x6 is preferred is because
4 you don't really have any room to go any larger. And
5 having much larger, there's just no room to put it with
6 the standard ceiling. So we didn't think it would be a
7 need to get a maximum size. We could add that. But
8 because of how things are spatially laid out, you can't go
9 much larger without doing really modifications to that
10 wall. So that's why 6x6 is an industry standard.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Charles.

12 MR. POTTS: It just seems like because the door is
13 lockable, it wouldn't make any difference how big it was
14 as long as it was big enough for you to get to it. If
15 it's locked, it's still not accessible to anybody who
16 doesn't have the key. So 6x6 is -- you know, it doesn't
17 need a maximum is what I'm saying if it's locked.

18 MR. CLEARY: These are for residential, so anybody
19 will have a key. But the reason why we didn't see a need
20 to add a maximum size is because spatially you're limited
21 to how big that door can be anyway.

22 MR. McNEILL: So the reason I asked the question
23 about machine space or control space is so we get into at
24 least -- and maybe I'm not thinking correctly, so you can
25 help me. So if we had a machine space or control space in

1 there, then you don't have the requirements for a machine
2 room, so you don't have to worry about full-bodily entry.
3 Just a comment.

4 MR. CLEARY: May I demonstrate real quick?

5 (Standing up, pointing to a wall with a door in it)
6 So basically this is your door to the hallway (pointing).
7 You usually have a 96 inch -- (inaudible). This door goes
8 right here (pointing). So you can get into the motor and
9 the brake. And so with the ceiling height being 96
10 inches, you can't really -- and the header being there
11 and the structure of the corner, it's just to be able to
12 go in and pull the brake if you to have, or get on the
13 tail shaft. There's very little room -- (inaudible) --
14 which is standard. So this little corner right here
15 (pointing) is what we're talking about. So it's nothing
16 you can really walk into. But that's the door we're
17 talking about is that door there in the hoistway above the
18 swing door in the hall.

19 Thank you for your indulgence.

20 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

22 MR. BRINKMAN: Scott is correct. In the 2016
23 edition, there are no requirements for private residence
24 elevator machine rooms or machinery spaces.

25 I will tell you that there was a change made for 2019

1 which does cover those requirements. And the situation
2 Scott's talking about here really is a machine space, but
3 there would be -- where the machine is found at the top of
4 the hoistway. And so the control would be mounted
5 somewhere else, possibly the hoistway, possibly in a
6 closet outside the hoistway. So there are some different
7 configurations out there, and the 2018 code does address
8 those.

9 But he's correct. 2016 doesn't really have criteria
10 for where these things are located.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody else? Any other
12 discussions?

13 So the motion on the table right now is to approve
14 this new language to be added to the WAC.

15 Scott.

16 MR. CLEARY: I just want a point of clarification,
17 that right now how the WAC reads, we don't have to have
18 any access to it. And we think that's unacceptable. So
19 we're putting this in -- right now if we left it and
20 didn't do anything with this, nothing drives us to have
21 any access to that. Because there's nothing in 5.3 that
22 takes us back to section 2.7. So that's why we put it in
23 there because we think it needs to be there, and it needs
24 to have these locked safety precautions put in. So this
25 connects through the layer that we feel needs to be there

1 because it's not there right now.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Ricky.

3 MR. HENDERSON: The wording on this proposal and your
4 example that you gave up there, so in part 2 says access
5 to the motor -- located in a machine room, machine room
6 requirements must be followed. And this is where it goes
7 in and asks for your 6x6 door. In the example that you
8 gave up there, is that a dedicated machine room or is that
9 the machine space?

10 MR. CLEARY: It's not defined as either.

11 MR. HENDERSON: But we're comfortable about adding
12 this verbiage in the WAC.

13 MR. CLEARY: What we're saying is that right now
14 there's nothing that drives any requirement for machine
15 room or machine spaces in 5.3. There's nothing that says
16 we have to have even access to that motor at the top of
17 the hoistway. And so we're saying that we want to put a
18 layer in there that tells us you at least have to have a
19 minimum of 6x6 so you can get in there.

20 We're trying to get away from the nomenclature being
21 used that we have residential machine rooms. There's
22 nothing in 17.1-5.3 that requires or has that nomenclature
23 whatever. So we just want to say if you do have one and
24 it meets everything that it's sole for that, will meet all
25 requirements for machine room. But other than that,

1 there's no such thing in 5.3. So we just want to add a
2 little bit of clarity and saying that if we do have a
3 dedicated machine room, it will meet all the requirements
4 in the WAC. If we don't, we still think we need to have
5 access to that machine. And if we want -- right now, the
6 way the WAC is, we don't have that, and we don't think
7 that's appropriate. So that's why we have it.

8 MR. HENDERSON: I was putting part of step 1 -- or
9 item 1 into item 2.

10 MR. CLEARY: Correct.

11 MR. HENDERSON: And that clarified it for me.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eldon.

13 MR. NICKENS: So Scott, your -- the location of that
14 stop switch is inside that six-inch door.

15 MR. CLEARY: Yes.

16 MR. NICKENS: With labeling or directions to the stop
17 switch? None of that's mentioned here.

18 MR. CLEARY: Yeah, it's -- well, it's in -- it's how
19 we've been doing it in the WAC in the past. We just want
20 -- in the new iteration in the new one, it went away. And
21 we said, No, wait a minute; we want to put back in
22 everything other than -- it used to be a 12x12 door,
23 right? And that is not enough space for doors that need
24 to be -- we want to still have 6x6 and everything that's
25 accessible right there on design for the stop switch and

1 everything else.

2 It's nothing new or novel other than we want to put
3 it back in. It got lost during the last WAC change.

4 MR. NICKENS: No, I understand where you're headed,
5 and I understand your purpose. I just think there might
6 be a need for more clarification as to location of said
7 switches, and I think this proposal leaves us wanting
8 somewhat.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Rob.

10 MR. McNEILL: I hate to beat a dead horse, but in
11 17.1 definitions of a room machine, it's a space outside
12 of the hoistway. So if we add machine space in there, and
13 that covers your 6x6, it's in the hoistway. Right?

14 MR. CLEARY: But nothing in 5.3 drives us to the
15 definition of -- (inaudible)

16 MR. McNEILL: But you're driving that by making this
17 change to the code by adding machine room.

18 MR. CLEARY: If -- if provided. We're not saying any
19 -- (inaudible)

20 MR. McNEILL: So it's provided -- (inaudible). Those
21 controls don't have to be outside the hoistway unless you
22 have machine space.

23 MR. CLEARY: No.

24 MR. McNEILL: Yeah. According to the definition of
25 machine room. So ...

1 MR. WILSON: So to clarify this, if the architect
2 makes a dedicated room, per se, on the drawings and says
3 it's an elevator machine room, then that -- we will follow
4 machine room requirements as spelled out in WAC or in 17.1
5 or in NEC. But if they do not specify it as a machine
6 room, just say take this room for an example, if that's
7 (pointing) my elevator, and I put the controller over
8 there (pointing), is this a machine room? No. This is a
9 space. But we want the disconnects to be located next to
10 the controller, not at that door (pointing) or at this
11 door (pointing) because you can come in either way. So
12 that was one -- that's one requirement.

13 The other part of it is the access hatch. What we're
14 saying in here is that you will always provide a 6x6
15 access hatch to the motor because the motor is located in
16 the top of the hoistway just like an MRL is what the
17 commercial industry's already putting out there.

18 But we have no access to get to that motor except for
19 through that hatch. If we -- the way it's written right
20 now, we don't have to do anything. So you have no access
21 to that motor for any -- you have zero access.

22 We're saying that that's wrong. We want this access
23 hatch put in because you need to be able to access that
24 brake.

25 MR. CLEARY: And what happened, it used to be in the

1 WAC. It got pushed out in references that you comply to
2 section 2. Well, nothing in 5.3 drives us to section 2,
3 so you can't make us be compliant to access requirements
4 in section 2 of 17.1 because 5.3 doesn't drive you back.
5 And we said we think that's a mistake. We want to make
6 sure we have access. So that's why we're putting it in
7 here. That's just a clarification. We're adding -- we
8 want another layer. Because if we leave it the way it is
9 now, we don't have to do anything. And we don't think
10 that's acceptable.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any more discussions?

12 MR. BRINKMAN: I don't disagree with what you're
13 trying to accomplish here, Scott. I mean, I think, yeah,
14 some direction for machinery access and location of
15 machines and the disconnecting means I think are all good.

16 The concern I have a little bit with this proposal is
17 I'm not sure it's clear enough. And I -- I don't know
18 what the rest of the process holds, if there's going to be
19 a chance for us to go back and take a look at this a
20 little bit closer. But I'd like to say it would be good
21 to compare this to the language that is approved for A17
22 5.3 in 2019 because I know they've put in a lot of
23 language relative to machinery spaces, machine rooms,
24 control rooms, et cetera to try to help clarify these
25 requirements. So if there's not later on, I think it

1 would be good to try to look at that. If not, yeah, I'm a
2 little -- I think I agree with Eldon on this a little bit.
3 It may not be as complete as we'd like to see it yet.

4 MR. CLEARY: I don't disagree that it lacks -- it may
5 lack a little bit of clarity and content. I'm concerned
6 about going in future codes that we haven't adopted and
7 pulling language out. Kevin, I think that might send --
8 set a bad precedent.

9 I agree that it needs to be worked, but it hadn't
10 been worked in the '16. And I appreciate that it's been
11 done for the '19.

12 You know, we're just trying to add more safety than
13 there is right now that's already been approved. So I
14 agree that we can add more content, but I think by itself
15 this adds more safety than what the WAC will allow us to
16 do now.

17 So that's my point of view on this.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments?

19 Okay. So with that --

20 MR. CLEARY: I'm sorry. Can I -- when this gets
21 uploaded to the ESAC, are we going to be able to do any
22 kind of wordsmithing or is it going to be just yes or no;
23 it was brought up to our committee? Because this might be
24 a time to change some of this stuff.

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We spoke about this previously

1 at this meeting today. And we agreed that most of the
2 language changes would be done here so when it went to the
3 ESAC ...

4 With that clarification, I will also let you know
5 that we will probably begin the process of reviewing the
6 2019 code later this year for adoption early next year.

7 MR. CLEARY: Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any other comments?
9 Eldon.

10 MR. NICKENS: Before we move to vote, I would request
11 that you remove your original proposal, period.

12 MR. WILSON: One other comment to make is that there
13 is a technical clarification that is out from L & I, and
14 in that clarification it says that if a residential
15 elevator is not in a machine room, it does not need to
16 comply with NEC. So we need to ensure that we have those
17 working clearances and stuff incorporated in here because
18 that would -- if we remove this and put in a residential
19 elevator in a house that does not have a dedicated machine
20 room, we do not need to comply with electrical clearances
21 -- (inaudible).

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

23 MS. GOULD: How old is that document for this WAC,
24 technical -- because they have a sunset. Does anybody --

25 MR. WILSON: It was produced I think this last --

1 MR. CLEARY: December.

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: All of the technical
3 clarifications have been reviewed. Are you talking about
4 when that was recently reviewed?

5 MR. WILSON: Uh-huh.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So --

7 MS. GOULD: We used to have a sunset on that.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: There is no sunset on it, no.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

10 So the proposal still on the table is to add this
11 language into the WAC as is written on the paper. So all
12 in favor of approving this as written, please raise your
13 hand. Seven.

14 So all opposed?

15 Kevin? What was yours?

16 Okay. All opposed? Four.

17 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty, I think I'll abstain on this
18 one because I'm still having a little concern that it's
19 ready. But ...

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Abstention, that's Kevin. And two
21 abstentions. Three? Three abstentions.

22 Anybody not voting? Zero.

23 Okay. So this one -- so that's -- this one is
24 approved as is written down.

25 Okay, so we're going to take a break, a 15-minute

1 break here. Be back 10 to.

2

3

(Recess taken.)

4

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Well, let's start with -- while
6 we're waiting for this guy (pointing) to get back, we're
7 going to try to streamline the process a little bit,
8 trying to get through all of this. I'm only going to be
9 reading the proposal and not so much the justification.
10 That might help us move along a little bit faster.
11 Because some of these justifications are kind of long.
12 And hopefully -- oh, you guys have it right in front of
13 you, or you guys might have already read it. So I'll only
14 be doing the proposal part. Okay?

15 Okay, so let's move on to the next one is the
16 2019-00650. And the proposal is to -- basically the last
17 go-around is to change the date from 9/1/2018 to
18 10/1/2018. Because the date was written wrong in the last
19 adoption cycle.

20 Do we have any discussion on that? Eldon?

21 MR. NICKENS: No, no discussion.

22 MR. POTTS: Call for the question.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Charles.

24 MR. POTTS: "Call for the question" means you vote on
25 it. It's just a date change. Vote. You don't need a

1 motion.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay. Okay. So I'll entertain
3 a motion to start the vote I guess. Anybody want to
4 accept the proposal?

5 MR. WILSON: I make a motion to accept the proposal.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any second?

7 MR. CLEMENT: I second.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Let's vote on this. All in
9 favor, raise your hand.

10 MR. NICKENS: An opportunity for discussion please.
11 Is this simply just a typo?

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It was a typo when these were
13 published, yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So let's take a vote to accept with
15 the new date on there. All in favor?

16 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Sixteen.

18 Opposed? Zero.

19 Abstentions? Zero.

20 Anybody not voting? Zero.

21 Okay. So the next one, 2019-296-96-00675. This is
22 to add -- okay, so currently it says "Exclude all
23 references to QEI certification in ... A17.1/CSA B44" and
24 we want to add "ASME A18.1, and ANSI ... A10.4" to the
25 code right now.

1 Discussion? Do we want to take a vote on this? A

2 motion? A motion to vote on this?

3 MR. POTTS: I motion to adopt.

4 MR. WILSON: Second.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So all in favor, raise your
6 hand.

7 MR. NICKENS: Point of order. Can we have an
8 opportunity for discussion please.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, Eldon.

10 MR. NICKENS: Is it open for discussion?

11 I guess I don't understand all the effort we put
12 forth in QEI credentialing of our inspector and others.
13 I'm not exactly sure why we're removing this language from
14 A17.1, A18.1 and A10.4.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Because we do not -- the State
16 does not require their inspectors to be QEI certified.

17 MR. NICKENS: No, I understand that. But simply
18 because they're not required, that justifies the removal
19 of that language?

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct. Because if we
21 adopt it, then we'd be in conflict with our collective
22 bargaining agreement, which the employees are covered
23 under, and they are not required to be QEI certified.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussions?

25 MR. OURY: I have a question.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Bob.

2 MR. OURY: So are we currently having inspectors QEI
3 certified?

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Many of our inspectors are QEI
5 certified. But again, it is not required of their job
6 position. So this would be in conflict with the
7 collective bargaining agreement.

8 MR. OURY: Are they doing it on their own then, the
9 QEI certifications?

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The State has agreed to pay for
11 those that are interested to -- we give them classes, and
12 we pay for them to take the exam. We cannot require it
13 because it is not required through the collective
14 bargaining agreement as a requirement for their
15 employment.

16 MR. OURY: So how many of our inspectors are --

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I think that's irrelevant quite
18 frankly. I've just explained what the rationalization is
19 behind this.

20 MR. OURY: Okay.

21 MR. RUNYAN: Question. What does QEI stand for?

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Qualified Elevator Inspector.

23 MR. RUNYAN: Ah.

24 MR. MESSINA: When does the collective bargaining
25 come up again?

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I don't know how often that
2 comes up. I don't know how often they go through that
3 process.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other --

5 MR. RUNYAN: Question. How do we qualify our
6 inspectors?

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Our inspectors are not
8 qualified, per se. They are required to have specific
9 education and experience prior to being hired as elevator
10 inspectors.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments? Eldon.

12 MR. NICKENS: Does the State have any position as to
13 the new collective bargaining agreement? I don't know
14 what the date this one is up. I never read that language.
15 Do you have a position that you want to pursue QEI in the
16 further agreement -- in the next agreement?

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Wade.

18 MR. MOLESWORTH: I know I'm not a part of your group,
19 but I handle all this type of stuff --

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Class and comp.

21 MR. MOLESWORTH: Yeah, class and comp and stuff.

22 What this would require is an RCW change requiring
23 our inspectors to have a QEI certification. Then we would
24 be able to put it into the bargaining agreement to bargain
25 against it.

1 Very similar to electrical has to have journeymen
2 electrical licenses in order to be hired as an electrical
3 inspector. So it's first an RCW change requiring this of
4 us to have that requirement -- have inspectors have that
5 requirement before we can actually hire them.

6 At the current time we don't have that requirement.
7 So for us to say, No, you have to be QEI certified, it
8 would be a violation of our contract.

9 We are -- very much would like to have that. But it
10 would also diminish our hiring capacity out there in the
11 field because we have very few people that are QEI
12 certified that would come to work for us prior to becoming
13 inspectors for the state of Washington. So it's going to
14 limit your ability to hire as well. So we have to work
15 that language out as to within so many months of becoming
16 an inspector, you have to become QEI certified. It would
17 have to be an RCW change in order to do that. And right
18 now we don't have that language.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eldon.

20 MR. NICKENS: I'd like an answer to my original
21 question. Does the State plan on pursuing that in the
22 future?

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I have no idea what the State
24 plans on pursuing quite frankly.

25 MR. NICKENS: I am not sure I understand. Do you

1 have any intentions of pursuing --

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I do not have an intention of
3 pursuing that.

4 MR. NICKENS: Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other questions/comments before
6 we take a vote? I think there's a motion to take a vote
7 on adding this verbiage to the current code.

8 All in favor, please raise your hands.

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

10 SECRETARY STANLAKSE: Ross, is your hand up or down?

11 MR. BALDWIN: It's up.

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Can you raise your hands again
13 if you're in favor?

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Twelve.

15 All opposed? Two.

16 Abstentions? Two.

17 Anybody not voting? Zero.

18 So this proposal moves forward as intact, as written.

19 Okay. So the next one 2019-296-96-00675(15). And
20 this proposal is to modify 3.10.3 in ASME A17.3-2015 as
21 follows. We wanted to add "(c) Where the car top stop
22 switch located in the inspection control station is not
23 acceptable from the landing, a separate car top stop
24 switch shall be provided as required by ... A17.1 ...
25 2.26.1.4.2(a)."

1 Any discussion on this? Bob

2 MR. McLAUGHLIN: A question. I'm looking at that
3 section, and I don't see a subpart 15 or --

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That would be a new.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: This is a new.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That would be a new.

7 MR. McLAUGHLIN: That is new. Okay, thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussions?

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, Kevin.

11 MR. BRINKMAN: Do we have any feel for how many
12 elevators are out in the field that would have to be
13 modified based on this?

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I'm -- I'm --

15 MR. CLEMENT: I've seen -- in my area, I've seen -- I
16 haven't been through the whole area yet. I'm still
17 working through it. But I bet I've seen 15 of them in
18 just one area.

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Out of about how many?

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I think I'm looked at 400
21 elevators in the Everett/Marysville area.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other questions?

23 MR. POTTS: I have a question for Scott.

24 These elevators that would need to be modified if
25 this proposal is adopted, how difficult is it to deal with

1 them and inspect them at the time present them without
2 this modification?

3 MR. CLEMENT: Going back to days in the trade -- and
4 I'll let Ricky follow up on this if I'm wrong. But it's
5 -- it is dangerous. You're getting on a car that you
6 don't have control of. And if you don't have control of
7 it, how do you know that the thing's not going to take off
8 on you?

9 I've had an employee who we were doing a safety
10 inspection with them, he pressed the stop switch, closed
11 the doors, gave it a call, waited for a few minutes,
12 opened the door, and the car was gone. So if you're
13 stepping onto a car and the thing would take off on you,
14 you're really putting your life in danger in my opinion.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Jan.

16 MS. GOULD: Currently the only way to safely do that
17 if you've got a double under or especially a big 4- to 500
18 pound car or 5,000 pound capacity, you'd have to leave
19 that hoistway door open so that that contact is not --
20 the electrical mechanical contact -- until you get over to
21 the other side of the car, and maybe the light's over
22 there also. So I'm guessing we probably got maybe 100 in
23 the City of Seattle.

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Out of how many units?

25 MS. GOULD: Oh, 8,600, 8,500.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Ricky.

2 MR. HENDERSON: On those that you all are seeing, is
3 it just the stop switch that's not there, but your
4 inspection and run station is accessible?

5 MR. CLEMENT: A lot of times, it'll be on a bigger
6 freight car that the inspection station is right near the
7 cross head. So you literally have to get physically all
8 the way off of the elevator to be able to stop it before
9 you know that you have control of it, and now you don't
10 even know if that switch works because you haven't tested
11 it typically.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody else? No more discussion?
13 Is there a motion to vote on this to -- as is?

14 MR. CLEMENT: I motion to vote.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: In favor? Vote in favor?

16 MR. CLEMENT: Yes. Sorry.

17 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm sorry. Not trying to nitpick
18 here, but I'm looking at the existing language, and I see
19 that this is a customary practice to cite ASME and adopt
20 -- what we're doing is in WAC we are adopting a Washington
21 interpretation of that ASME rule rather than writing a
22 whole new WAC; is that correct?

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We're amending. We're amending
24 3.10.3 in our WAC rule.

25 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I see that that is a regular

1 practice.

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

3 MR. McLAUGHLIN: But the question is -- it just seems
4 peculiar that we are amending a rule that we don't have
5 control over rather than interpreting a rule or adding
6 another requirement to it. It just seems like an odd
7 practice.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We have the authority. We are
9 the authority having jurisdiction, the State of
10 Washington, as is the City of Seattle as is the City of
11 Spokane. There's three authorities having jurisdiction
12 within this state. As the State of Washington, we have
13 the authority to amend national standards which is what we
14 are doing with this.

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Just haven't seen that
16 before.

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yep.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, so there's a proposal --
19 there's a motion right now to vote on this proposal as is.
20 Is there a second?

21 MR. MESSINA: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote. All
23 in favor of this proposal, please raise your hands.

24 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Nine.

1 All opposed? One.

2 Abstentions? Six.

3 Anybody not voting? Zero.

4 Okay. So this proposal is moving forward. It
5 passed.

6 Okay. So the next one is 296-96-00906, licensing
7 requirements for elevator mechanics.

8 And this is to add -- okay, so I'll just read the
9 whole thing. "Any person wishing to engage in the
10 installation, alteration, service, replacement or
11 maintenance of equipment covered by this chapter within
12 the state of Washington shall apply for a license with the
13 department of labor and industries." And then this is the
14 new part: "and shall pass an exam administered by the
15 department or by an entity authorized by the department.
16 Persons applying for temporary elevator mechanic licenses
17 or emergency elevator mechanics licenses are not required
18 to take an exam but must fulfill all other requirements
19 for these licenses."

20 And then the rest of it is proposed to be taken off.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Or modified. Or modified to
22 support the first --

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Or modified to support what we just
24 added.

25 Any comments on this?

1 MR. FRIESEN: This requirement from a contractor
2 perspective puts undo hardship on trying to hire folks
3 from outside the area, especially with the amount of work
4 going on right now, and to bring mechanics in from outside
5 of this area, now we're saying that the need for CET
6 certification isn't adequate for a license; they have to
7 actually sit and take a test. That's going to delay the
8 process and make it much more difficult to hire.

9 And furthermore, being from the east side of the
10 state, there are no provisions for anybody to take the
11 exam to my knowledge outside of coming to Tumwater to take
12 the test. So I think -- and maybe that's changed. But
13 that's my understanding.

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So for Category 1 license, that
15 is not correct. That is now administered through Elevator
16 World. And they can -- folks that apply for that can take
17 that exam anywhere in the state. We can make arrangements
18 for that to be done at our offices throughout the state.
19 Or the individual can make an arrangement to have that
20 proctored at a university or a library or other
21 organizations such as that. So in reference to Category
22 1, that is not connect.

23 MR. MESSINA: For the temporary mechanics license,
24 emergency elevator mechanics license, is there a reason
25 why they don't need to take that test or the exam?

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: They are not required to take
2 the exam now because they do not fully meet the
3 requirements. Typically temporary mechanics and emergency
4 mechanics, that's an emergency license; that's something
5 new for us, and that's only to be invoked say for a major
6 catastrophe such as an earthquake, not for work stoppage,
7 but a major catastrophe if the Governor declares a state
8 of emergency. And elevator companies need -- many
9 elevator companies have folks that are not licensed, but
10 are well versed in how to evacuate folks from elevators,
11 that type of thing if they don't have enough mechanics.

12 So right now, those folks are not required to test.
13 They're not -- their only requirement is to show that they
14 have the education and experience. And that is covered
15 under "but must fulfill all other requirements for these
16 licenses."

17 MR. MESSINA: Okay. And then I guess: What's the
18 reason for not having a temporary license? I thought --

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We're not saying that there is
20 no temporary license. We're saying --

21 MR. MESSINA: No. I --

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: -- that they don't have to take
23 the exam. And that's typically because right now, for
24 instance, we're in the midst of a construction boom, and
25 they may not have finished all of their schooling or their

1 experience, so they may not be qualified to sit for an
2 exam.

3 MR. MESSINA: Okay. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So my apologies. I didn't
5 finish reading the rest of the --

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I don't think it's necessary
7 to.

8 The other sections have been modified just to reflect
9 the first paragraph. So where it said --

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So there's a couple more pages
11 after that.

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Exactly.

13 MR. FRIESEN: Dotty, how about -- I didn't see this
14 in here. How about graduation from an apprenticeship
15 program? That used to be automatic qualification for
16 licenses. Do they now have to take the state test in
17 addition?

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: (Nodding affirmatively.)

19 MR. FRIESEN: Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes. The answer's yes.

21 Any other discussions? Ricky.

22 MR. HENDERSON: Reading this, it looks like this only
23 applies to new applicants for a license. So --

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

25 MR. HENDERSON: -- this wouldn't apply?

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct, moving
2 forward.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Could you repeat that again,
4 Ricky?

5 MR. HENDERSON: This only applies to new applicants
6 for licensure -- licensing. It would not apply for
7 renewal of an existing license.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No, it would not.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other discussions?
10 Eldon.

11 MR. NICKENS: I'd like to go on record as being in
12 strong opposition to eliminating the National Elevator's
13 Educational Program and/or the CET program that -- both
14 nationally approved entities. I would like to see this
15 stay in place as in the past. I'm not exactly sure why
16 we're eliminating that. Maybe you can help me with that?

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I can help you with that.

18 We found that many of the mechanics that have come
19 through the NEEP program and the CET program, once they
20 let their license lapse and they have to retest, they are
21 not knowledgeable enough to retest and not knowledgeable
22 enough to pass the exam.

23 So this is -- the licenses that we have are focused
24 on the codes. They're not focused on installation. Yes,
25 there is a focus on safety. And it has a lot of

1 different components. So it's a broader exam than what
2 was typically given by NEEP and CET.

3 MR. NICKENS: Is the exam changing?

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The exam has changed, yes.

5 MR. NICKENS: It's been a while since I've taken it.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

7 MR. NICKENS: So to clarify, it's because there's not
8 enough code requirements in the NEEP and the CET programs
9 to satisfy the needs for the licensing in the state?

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: This is to encompass that as
11 well as safety and some of the other items.

12 MR. FRIESEN: Dotty, can you clarify a little bit
13 more about the actual exam? You said it was administered
14 through Elevator World?

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

16 MR. FRIESEN: Is this something that has been written
17 by the State of Washington and given to Elevator World to
18 manage? Is that --

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It is managed by Elevator
20 World, yes.

21 MR. FRIESEN: But has the State of Washington
22 documented --

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The State of Washington
24 collaborated with Elevator World.

25 MR. FRIESEN: Understood. Thank you.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other discussions on
3 this?

4 Okay. So let me see. Was there -- so we still had a
5 motion to approve this language. We need a second.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No. We need a motion.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, he had a motion, right?

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Oh, did you make a motion?

9 MR. CLEMENT: No, not yet. No.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, I thought he did.

11 MR. NICKENS: I apologize if I was out of order
12 speaking on the event. I thought a motion was in play.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I thought that too.

14 Is there a motion to approve this -- is there a
15 motion on this?

16 MR. WILSON: Do we need a motion?

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We need a motion.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We need a motion.

19 MR. WILSON: I'll make a motion to accept this
20 proposal.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Is there a second.

22 MR. OURY: I'll second.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote. All
24 in favor of approving this proposal, please raise your
25 hand. Okay. So one approval.

1 Opposed? Seven.

2 And abstentions? Kevin?

3 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I'll abstain on that.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It did not pass.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, so this one did not pass.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, I have a question. We
7 had one approved. We had six opposed. We had eight
8 abstained. So did we have a not voting? Are we missing
9 someone?

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, so let's do this again. All
11 who approve, raise your hand. One.

12 Okay. All opposed? Seven.

13 And abstain?

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And Kevin.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eight with Kevin.

16 And anybody not voting?

17 Is it still fifteen?

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Nope. You have eight -- you
19 have one approved, seven opposed, eight abstained, right?
20 Sixteen.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So that one did not pass.

22 Okay. So the next one, 296-96-00910. The proposal
23 here is to strike (c) Special purpose elevators.

24 Okay. Any discussion on that?

25 MR. CLEMENT: I have a question. Mike, can you

1 supply more information on why you're wanting to exactly
2 do this?

3 MR. WILSON: Category 4 licensing was for category
4 personnel hoists and then material hoists which were part
5 of the construction personnel hoists. And they had
6 special purpose elevators put in here. And this license
7 category requires 700 hours of education where an 03
8 license category which has special purpose in there
9 requires 270 hours of education and three years I think of
10 experience.

11 This 04 license category was -- requires much less.
12 And a special purpose elevator is a lot larger than just a
13 construction personnel hoist. It was to remove it from
14 this license category, leave it in where it's supposed to
15 be at for that license category.

16 MR. MESSINA: Is it in the other category?

17 MR. WILSON: Yes.

18 MR. CLEARY: We sat down. We did the curriculum for
19 all the licensing which every -- Charlie was sitting at
20 the table. This was always either in an 03 category or an
21 01. It was never meant to be in 04. So how it got there
22 I'm not really quite sure. But the curriculum and OJT
23 hours are really a lot less for 04. We think it's
24 appropriate to be in the 03 or the 01, and it was
25 addressed for content at that time.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So the -- there was another
2 discussion had with the construction personnel folks. And
3 it was determined that they should not have to have as
4 many hours of education or experience. And the reason for
5 that is because in some of the other categories and the
6 way the educational policy was written up, they had to
7 have education in A18.1 which they'll never see. They had
8 to have education and experience in A17.1; they'll never
9 see.

10 So I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

12 Okay, is there a motion?

13 MR. WILSON: Motion to accept the proposal.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

15 MR. OURY: I second.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote. All
17 in favor of crossing the special purpose elevators off of
18 this category, raise your hands.

19 Kevin?

20 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Did you raise your hand?

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Can you do that again please. I'm
23 sorry. Fourteen.

24 All opposed? Zero.

25 Abstained? Two.

1 So this one passed.

2 The next one 296-96-00912, License renewal
3 requirements. And it has some new language. "Upon
4 applying for renewal the elevator contractor shall verify
5 the primary point of contact information is correct." So
6 the word "applying" is added there.

7 On (ii) "Renewal of an elevator contractor license
8 shall be conditioned upon the primary point of contact's
9 completion of not less than 4 hours of instruction on the
10 most current RCW and WAC rules. This instruction must be
11 completed within one year immediately preceding a license
12 renewal application."

13 And (iii) "The applicant must submit a certificate of
14 completion for the course along with the renewal
15 application."

16 And (iv) "Continuing education courses and
17 instructors shall be approved by the department."

18 Okay. And then the next page, "Renewal" --
19 "completion of not less than" -- instead of eight, it is
20 proposed to be twelve hours of instruction.

21 And then "Not less than four hours of instruction
22 shall be on the most current RCW and WAC rules." That is
23 the proposal to be added.

24 Any discussion on this?

25 MR. FRIESEN: It appears to me from reviewing this

1 that perhaps this might be better served with a civil
2 penalty type of situation. Because it looks like what the
3 Department is trying to enforce is compliance with
4 notification of change of point of contact and mechanics
5 renewing their license properly. So I'm not sure this is
6 necessarily the right avenue for trying to get compliance.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's not necessarily correct,
8 Wade. The purpose of this was to ensure that the primary
9 point of contacts know what their responsibilities are as
10 well as the mechanics out there. Because we so often hear
11 it is -- for instance, we've run into a number of
12 situations where elevator companies -- the primary point
13 of contact is responsible for ensuring that the folks that
14 are working for that company as mechanics are licensed and
15 have valid licenses along with meeting all the other
16 requirements of the RCW and the WAC. That includes
17 pulling permits, ensuring that mechanics don't work
18 without permits, that type of thing. What we are finding
19 over and over and over again is that the company's primary
20 point of contact changes. They never inform us until
21 perhaps they submit a temporary mechanic's license and
22 somebody else signs the paperwork. And mechanics are not
23 quite aware of what their responsibilities are under RCW
24 and WAC. So we are trying to take a proactive approach in
25 educating those individuals rather than a reactive

1 approach in penalizing those individuals for not knowing
2 what the WAC and the RCW's are.

3 MR. CLEARY: It also gives us an opportunity to
4 disseminate what happens at the ESAC level to one point of
5 contact for the company, especially when we have a lot of
6 code and "reg" changes, it makes it easier. And we found
7 that to be problematic when you don't know who that person
8 is. So I think -- we've discussed this before at our
9 meetings, and I think it would be very helpful to make
10 sure that companies know what the requirements are for
11 that point of contact.

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Rob.

13 MR. McNEILL: This is a question to the State.

14 So the continuing education courses that -- the
15 information, is that going to be compiled and developed by
16 the State for the --

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It could be. Or it could be
18 someone that the State approves as a continuing ed
19 provider.

20 MR. McNEILL: Okay.

21 MR. CLEARY: How much time will that provider have to
22 change the curriculum and make sure we have enough contact
23 for that changing out? Is that something that would be
24 phased ...

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Until the law passes. Or the

1 WAC rule is changed. I'm sorry. Until the WAC rule is
2 changed.

3 MR. CLEARY: So to become effective, does that mean
4 that any courses that are eight hours become obsolete?

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct. Or -- well,
6 it says 12 hours of continuing education. It doesn't say
7 that they can't take eight hours for mechanics, for
8 instance, that they can't take an eight-hour course and
9 something else that's been approved, and then a four-hour
10 course in the RCW and WAC. So no, I wouldn't say that
11 they would become obsolete.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussions?

13 MR. BALDWIN: So as far as the requirement now for
14 the elevator contractor, there is none, correct?

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: (Shaking negatively.)

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussions?

17 MR. FRIESEN: So I'm kind of hung up on this 12 hours
18 of instruction. This seems to be too ambiguous because it
19 doesn't say what type of instruction. I think your intent
20 is that at least four hours of this instruction be on WAC
21 codes and regulations, but it doesn't specifically say
22 that. So they could do 12 hours for mechanics on mechanic
23 type instruction and -- the requirement by the way this is
24 written.

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: If you read the entire

1 sentence, Wade, it says --

2 MR. FRIESEN: Oh, yeah, not less than four hours.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: -- twelve hours, not less than
4 four hours --

5 MR. FRIESEN: Yeah, I missed that. Sorry.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other discussions?

7 Okay. Is there a motion on this?

8 MR. CLEMENT: I'll make a motion to approve.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

10 MR. WILSON: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote on
12 approving -- to approve this proposal. All in favor,
13 raise your hand.

14 Kevin?

15 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eleven.

17 All opposed? Two.

18 Abstentions? Two.

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It's not right.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody not voting?

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Redo the vote.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, we got to redo it. All in
23 favor? And Kevin. Right, Kevin?

24 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eleven.

1 All opposed? Two.

2 Abstentions? Two.

3 How many is that?

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Do we have someone missing
5 right now? Someone not voting?

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody not voting?

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We have fifteen.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So you're going to have to raise
9 your hands higher. All in favor? Twelve.

10 Okay. All opposed? Two.

11 Abstentions? Two.

12 Okay, that's correct. Okay. So this one passed.

13 Okay. The next one is 296-96-00916, Continuing
14 education course provider requirements.

15 So this is added. On (c), what's added is
16 "296-96-00912."

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I think that's just underlined
18 because that was a hyperlink. That wasn't added.

19 So the very last sentence on that page.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So the last sentence --

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And the one prior to that.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. On the very last one, "(iii)
23 A sample copy of the certificate that will be provided to
24 the attendee. The certificate shall note the name of the
25 course, the number of hours as approved by the department,

1 a course number if one has been assigned by the provider,
2 the date the education was completed" -- strike the word
3 "and" -- "the instructor's signature and" -- and this
4 part's going to be new -- "the student's signature. The
5 certificate must state that it is not valid without the
6 signatures of the instructor and the student." So it was
7 just to add that last sentence.

8 Any discussion? Do we have a motion?

9 MR. WILSON: I make a motion to pass -- to approve
10 this one.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

12 MR. POTTS: (Raising hand.)

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Charles.

14 Okay. Let's take a vote to approve this proposal.

15 Raise your hand to approve.

16 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fourteen.

18 Opposed? Zero.

19 Abstentions? Two.

20 So this one passed.

21 The next one, 2019-01030, Plan Approval and
22 Application Processing Fees.

23 So there's a few words added to this. So "Prior to
24 the start of construction and the issuance of a permit,
25 the applicant shall submit to the department for approval"

1 -- and this is new -- "an application and" -- and then
2 plans -- the rest of it is the same. And then the last
3 sentence: "The nonrefundable fees for" -- cross out
4 "reviewing," add "processing" the -- cross out "plans" and
5 add "applications."

6 And the exception, there's some addition to that
7 "however the processing fee still applies." So on that
8 last chart with the exception.

9 Anybody want to discuss this? Any discussions?
10 Mike.

11 MR. WILSON: I have a -- a question I have is: This
12 is -- part of the justification says that this is for
13 processing the -- for major alterations, it says, take a
14 great deal of time. Can this or should this not be based
15 on a sliding scale depending on what kind of an
16 application is being submitted like a -- for an example, a
17 stair chair could take 15 minutes for processing. A
18 residential elevator may -- could take 30 minutes. A
19 major huge installation could take several hours or maybe
20 days. So should this not be based on a sliding scale for
21 equivalency?

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So your sliding scale comes in
23 at the cost of the permit. That's where the sliding scale
24 comes in. The cost of a permit or stair chair lift is
25 much less than the cost of -- and that cost for the permit

1 encompasses the plan review.

2 What this is trying to do is to cover the costs for
3 in-taking the permits. And -- so we have a front counter
4 cost, then it comes to us. We distribute that. "Us"
5 meaning the program. Then we distribute that to whoever
6 is going to look at those plans. So there is still costs
7 associated with bringing -- just even entering that into
8 the system and doing all that work. That's what this is
9 for.

10 MR. CLEARY: Is that sufficient? How is that that it
11 came up? Because that seems pretty low for --

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It is low, Scott. We cannot
13 increase our fees across the board. All our fees are
14 pretty low. We can't increase that without approval from
15 the "leg." We will be seeking that down the line.

16 MR. CLEMENT: So is this -- this fee of \$33, that's
17 over and above the cost of your permit?

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is connect.

19 MR. CLEMENT: Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other questions?

21 MR. BALDWIN: What is that fee now?

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It is \$33. But the way that
23 language was changed the last time, it said plan review
24 for \$33. That still doesn't cover the cost of entering
25 the data and processing all of the checks and doing all of

1 that.

2 MR. CLEARY: Did this precipitate out of residential
3 stair chairs not having any cost whatsoever because
4 there's no plan review required?

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

6 MR. CLEARY: Okay.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we still have to cover our
8 administrative costs, which we -- that was -- we
9 inadvertently removed that.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussion on this? Is
11 there a motion to move this forward?

12 MR. METCALFE: I motion to approve this.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

14 MR. MESSINA: I second.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So let's take a vote on approving
16 this proposal. All in favor?

17 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eleven.

19 All opposed? One. Two. Sorry. Two opposed.

20 And abstentions? Two.

21 And one not voting.

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: She's not in the room, so ...

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And one not voting.

24 So this one passed.

25 Okay. We're going to take a break now for lunch.

1 Right?

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: What I would suggest is a
3 working lunch. Are you in agreement to doing a working
4 lunch? Is the rest of the committee in agreement to doing
5 a working lunch?

6 THE COURT REPORTER: (Raising a concern) How am I
7 going to eat (demonstrating)?

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay. So let's take -- that's
9 right. You don't get to eat.

10 THE COURT REPORTER: (Tongue in cheek) If someone
11 wants to feed me ...

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: All right. So why don't we
13 take a really quick lunch break. And then we'll just take
14 a look around and see who's done and hopefully we'll be
15 able to continue.

16

17 (Lunch Recess.)

18

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, we're going to reconvene.
20 And hopefully Dermott Murphy will join us shortly.

21 So let's move on. 2019-01055, Technical Services and
22 Consultations, just adding a little bit of verbiage for
23 clarity. So currently it says "... paying a fee of \$80.30
24 per hour," and we're adding "or any portion thereof" to
25 this.

1 Any motion to bring this forward?

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Any discussion?

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussion on this?

4 MR. RUNYAN: Can I make a suggestion? If this comes
5 from Labor and Industries, Dotty ought to be the one who
6 brings it up.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Candace is with Labor and
8 Industries. And I can't make a motion.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Right. I can't make a motion.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: She's running the meeting.
11 You're --

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I can't make a motion.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: She's not part of the --

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I'm not part of the voting.

15 MR. RUNYAN: Are you part of Labor and Industries?

16 MR. METCALFE: I am, but she's running the --

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: But I'm asking for a motion.

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: You're asking for discussion
19 first.

20 MR. WILSON: I have a question.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

22 MR. WILSON: Is the reason why this is is because you
23 cannot charge like on a half-hour basis?

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We can't even charge -- so if
25 it's 5.95 hours, we can only charge 5 hours.

1 MR. WILSON: So it's just a -- so that way you can
2 charge additional time if --

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's correct.

4 MR. WILSON: Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody else?

6 Okay. Do we want to have a motion?

7 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to approve this
8 amendment -- or this proposal.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

10 MR. MESSINA: I'll second.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote to add
12 "or any portion thereof" to this current code. All in
13 favor, please raise your hand.

14 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Twelve. Thank you.

16 All opposed? One.

17 Abstentions? One.

18 Not voting? One.

19 Okay, so this passed.

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: You only have one not voting?

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah, one not voting.

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Was that Dermott?

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah.

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we didn't have -- that's
25 only fifteen. It should be sixteen.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, let's take a vote on that
2 again. We only had fifteen. Maybe I'm counting wrong.

3 All in favor, raise your hand. Thirteen with Kevin.
4 Kevin, was yours an approv --

5 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: All opposed? One.

7 Abstentions? Two.

8 That's sixteen. So it passed.

9 Okay. The next one is 2019-01057, Accident
10 Investigations. And this is to add some verbiage to this.

11 "The department shall investigate an injury-related
12 accident reported by the owner or owner's duly authorized
13 agent," and this part is new "that has not been documented
14 as mis-use through recordings or witnesses' or users'
15 statements." The department may charge a rate of \$80.30
16 per hour -- and then again added "or portion thereof" --
17 and the rest is the same.

18 So any discussion on this? Questions?

19 MR. FRIESEN: So for the record, I'm for this. I
20 think this streamlines the process a little bit. But I'm
21 unclear on who it is that makes the determination on
22 whether or not it was misuse of the equipment. Who's
23 making that determination?

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That would be the supervisors,
25 the --

1 MR. FRIESEN: The inspectors' field supervisors?

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

3 MR. FRIESEN: Okay. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

5 MS. GOULD: Would this hourly rate include the office
6 time it takes to finish this process and combine it and
7 put it in a official form?

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It includes the investigation
9 time.

10 MS. GOULD: So it would. Okay.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody else? Eldon.

12 MR. NICKENS: So we're not -- or the State's not
13 going to -- I'm concerned that we're going to miss an
14 opportunity to investigate an accident that isn't
15 witnessed or documented. A finger gets pinched in an
16 escalator, and there's no cameras, there's no one there,
17 there's no maintenance personnel or anyone authorized to
18 make that statement. How are we going to handle a
19 situation like that?

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Because the key words, Eldon,
21 "has not been documented as mis-use through recordings or
22 witnesses' or users' statements."

23 MR. NICKENS: I apologize. Thank you for clarifying
24 that.

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's okay.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Anybody else? Jack.

2 MR. RUNYAN: I got a problem with this. I was on a
3 fire department, and we'd get called for a fire. By the
4 time the fire department got there, we'd have -- the fire
5 would be out. The homeowner had either put it out. But
6 we got five fire trucks sitting there. And then he gets a
7 big bill for a fire that he's already taken care of.

8 Same thing on this thing. I think it's the
9 responsibility of everybody for safety, and it should not
10 have to be put right on one homeowner and underneath the
11 call of being investigated by Department of Labor and
12 Industries.

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So Jack, what we're talking
14 about here typically are escalator accidents. Typically.
15 We're not talking about private residence because they're
16 not -- although we would like them to report, we have no
17 way of ensuring that they report any accidents. So we're
18 talking about commercial use conveyances here. And we are
19 spending a lot of manpower and woman power on sending out
20 individuals to investigate accidents where there is clear
21 documentation such as a video of a person getting on an
22 escalator -- here's a perfect example -- getting on a down
23 escalator in a wheelchair. That's misuse of the
24 equipment. And we still send someone out to investigate
25 that. And there's charges. There is costs involved with

1 that that get passed on to the building owner. It takes
2 up the elevator company's time where they could be better
3 used assessing any damage to the equipment instead of any
4 obvious misuse.

5 So we're just trying to streamline the process a
6 little to utilize our inspectors, the mechanics, and to
7 also eliminate unnecessary down time for building owners
8 where that has been -- that specific accident or incident
9 has been created by misuse. That's all we're saying.

10 MR. CLEARY: Just for my own edification, if you are
11 called in to it by a claims -- or by an insurance company
12 on a residential, these fees will still apply. Is that
13 correct?

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: If it is reported to us and it
15 is requested that we go out and investigate it, yes.

16 MR. CLEARY: Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any -- Ricky.

18 MR. HENDERSON: And just for clarification here on
19 this one, what we're talking about here with the
20 modification isn't adding something new. (Inaudible) --
21 requires an accident investigation if the owner reports it
22 and there's a -- (inaudible). This is basically if I'm
23 understanding correctly with the ones that you mentioned
24 that have the recordings, there's owner statements,
25 there's something where it misuse, that building owner

1 wouldn't have to pay that fee. He wouldn't be charged
2 that option because it was a documented misuse. So it's
3 actually a reduction of the fee to the owners to a certain
4 extent unless it's -- is that --

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

6 MR. RUNYAN: The next question would be: How many
7 times have you been called out in the last year on any
8 incident?

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Most of our escalator accidents
10 are misuse. And when I say "misuse," people going up the
11 escalator with a handbag, a small carry-on and a roller
12 bag, things like that. So we have had, gosh, I don't know
13 how many falls would you say?

14 MR. METCALFE: We've had five in the last week and a
15 half.

16 MR. NICKENS: And those are all misuse?

17 MR. METCALFE: All but one.

18 MR. NICKENS: Point well taken.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Bob.

20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Dotty, you said "and." Reported and
21 requested by the owner. Both of those things have to
22 happen before you come out?

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: For private residence, we don't
24 have the authority to go into a private residence once the
25 unit has been passed.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: But you could investigate without
2 accessing the property in some cases.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We may be able to perform some
4 cursory investigation. But without the owner's
5 permission, we would not be able to go in and -- to my
6 knowledge, we would not be able to go in and inspect the
7 equipment.

8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Let me give you an example.
9 Fire department responds to an incident. So it's
10 reported. That information gets to L & I not from the
11 homeowner. You would --

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Correct.

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: -- not investigate.

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I am not aware that we have the
15 authority to go into a private residence.

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Could we discuss that --

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: -- outside this meeting?

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other questions about
22 this? Jan.

23 MS. GOULD: One more thing. So that means if you go
24 out and then you determine no matter how long you travel
25 or where you go, that if it's not misuse, then you do not

1 charge anything.

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No, that is not correct.

3 MS. GOULD: Oh, okay.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: There is a charge.

5 MS. GOULD: Okay.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: There is a charge.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other questions? Okay,
8 is there a motion to bring this forward here?

9 MR. METCALFE: I motion to approve this proposal.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

11 MR. TURNER: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So all approve, please raise
13 your hand.

14 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fourteen.

16 Any opposed? One.

17 Abstentions? Zero.

18 And one not voting. So this one passed.

19 Okay. The next one is 296-96-02470. And this is to
20 eliminate the WAC -- to repeal this WAC code as written.
21 Currently, "Fireman's service for groups of four or more."
22 It says, "Groups of elevators containing four or more cars
23 may be provided with two three-position key switches per
24 group. For purposes of this section, a group shall be
25 defined as all elevators serving the same portion of a

1 building. Hall call buttons common to a group will remain
2 in service unless both Phase I recall switches of a four
3 car or larger group are placed in the recall mode or a
4 fire alarm recall signal is initiated." So all that is
5 going to be repealed.

6 Anybody want to discuss this? Jan.

7 MS. GOULD: Just that the City of Seattle will be
8 retaining similar language since 1984, having the four or
9 more elevators.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments or discussions?
11 Do we have a motion to approve this?

12 MR. NICKENS: I'm sorry. I'll wait for the vote.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I'm sorry? What was that, Eldon?

14 MR. NICKENS: I'll wait till the vote for discussion.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay. Why don't you discuss it
16 now.

17 MR. NICKENS: I'm just trying to follow procedure.

18 Does this mean we won't have two key switches in the
19 lobby anymore and one of them could operate one side, and
20 the other one could operate the other side? Am I off base
21 on that?

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I -- this is -- oh, Jan.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Jan can answer.

24 MS. GOULD: Yeah. For the City of Seattle, we put
25 this in place -- say you've got eight elevators. So when

1 we come in to do our annual inspection on the elevators,
2 we have -- with four or more elevators, we have two key
3 switches so that we're not taking the entire eight
4 elevators out at 8:00 in the morning. So we're taking
5 four and four, something like that. That was the intent
6 for this.

7 MR. NICKENS: So that doesn't -- this doesn't
8 eliminate that.

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: This would eliminate that.

10 MS. GOULD: It would. For the State, it would
11 eliminate it.

12 You haven't had it that long, though. Four years?
13 Since --

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No, we've had it. We've had it.

15 MR. NICKENS: It seems to me that this has been in
16 place for a while, right?

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: It has been here for a while.

18 Rob.

19 MR. McNEILL: So just to clarify that there's also
20 two key switches in the lobby in the fire control panel
21 too.

22 MS. GOULD: No. No. Because you're only -- that's
23 under emergency situation where the fire department -- we
24 only -- for that group -- say it's eight elevators. We
25 only require one phase 1 key switch in the lobby -- I

1 mean, excuse me -- in the SEC for that group of elevators.

2 MR. McNEILL: That's not what happened --

3 MS. GOULD: Wayne. It was just Wayne. It got
4 clarified. Sorry. I should have mentioned the name.

5 MR. McNEILL: Okay. I didn't want to get into that.
6 I just wanted to make sure everybody understood the --
7 okay. That's good information.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments on this or
9 questions?

10 MR. WILSON: If they repeal this, would the elevators
11 that are out there that do have the two switches, are they
12 going to make them go to just the one single key switch?

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I don't think so.

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: This is for new -- this is just to
16 -- so that -- this comes out of the new section of the
17 WAC, right?

18 MR. WILSON: My mistake.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: 02470. So these were -- this would
20 have applied for all new elevators installed in the state.
21 So they're taking away this requirement is what this is
22 saying.

23 Okay. Any other questions? Jan.

24 MS. GOULD: It's not in the retroactive part. It's
25 not in the --

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That's correct.

3 Anybody else? Okay. So do we have a motion? Did we
4 already have a motion?

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Do we have a motion to bring this
7 forward?

8 MR. METCALFE: So I'll motion to bring this proposal
9 forward.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To approve this?

11 MR. METCALFE: Or to approve it. Excuse me.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Do we have a second?

13 MR. OURY: Second.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: All right. Okay. So all in
15 approval to repeal this code, raise your hand. To repeal.

16 MR. CLEMENT: To approve?

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To approve --

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: To approve it as written.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: As written. To repeal it.

20 Four. Kevin?

21 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Five.

23 So all opposed of repealing this, raise your hand.

24 So you're opposed to getting rid of this. Raise your

25 hand. Three.

1 Abstentions? Seven.

2 Anybody not voting?

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: There's one missing. We're
4 missing one.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We have to do this again. We're
6 missing one.

7 All approving this repeal, raise your hand. Four.
8 And Kevin.

9 Oh, did you raise your hand?

10 MR. McLAUGHLIN: No. I was pointing to the speaker.
11 I'm sorry.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, four. And Kevin, are you
13 approving?

14 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Five.

16 All opposed? Three.

17 Abstentions? Eight. Okay. So eight abstentions.

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Five approved, three opposed,
19 eight abstained.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So this --

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Zero not voting.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So this was approved, so
23 this will be appealed.

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Repealed.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Repealed. Sorry.

1 Okay. The next one is 2019-296-96-02471, Emergency
2 personnel lock box.

3 So this is also to repeal this lock box -- it used to
4 say "A lock box is required to house the keys specified in
5 ... A17.1 ..., Section 2.27.8. And this one no longer has
6 value based on the rewrite of 296-96-02580. So there's
7 going to be a rewrite of 02580 later, so they want to get
8 rid of this one. Any --

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Or there was a rewrite of
10 02580.

11 MR. NICKENS: Madam Chair, do we have that rewrite
12 available?

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah, I think it's coming up. I'm
14 looking for it. Yeah. So if you flip a few pages -- or
15 maybe we should do that one first, the 02580, some pages
16 later.

17 MS. GOULD: So you've got it here on Ricky's --
18 (inaudible) referred to authorized personnel in front of
19 -- (inaudible) -- A17.1 slash, you know, Canadian,
20 parentheses, shall be located in a locked key retainer box
21 and --

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Hang on, Jan.

23 MS. GOULD: Sorry.

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So Jan, 02580, that's all been
25 rewritten.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: In the book, if you flip a few
2 pages in your book, you'll come to a 02580, and that's
3 going to be the proposed new language. So because of that
4 -- so maybe we should go here first because --

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Probably.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- because this one that wants to
7 be repealed, it just kind of all hinges on whether or not
8 you guys approve this 02580.

9 MR. WILSON: It's about ten pages back or --

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Forward, yeah.

11 MR. WILSON: Find the one that says 052 --

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 02580.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: 02580. Everybody there? Like the
14 one up on the board here.

15 So let's work on that one first.

16 MR. HENDERSON: Which ones are we working on first?

17 MS. GOULD: 02580.

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 02580.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So basically the whole code
20 is going to be rewritten. A bunch -- all the stuff that's
21 crossed off. And then it's going to be rewritten as
22 "Inspection Keys. 1. All keys necessary for the
23 operation and maintenance of the elevator(s) shall be
24 provided and kept on site as follows:

25 "2. The key retainer box shall be:

1 "a. Located in a locked key retainer box in the
2 elevator lobby at the designated level above the hall
3 buttons or located by machine room doors at no more than
4 six feet above the floor provided access to the key box
5 doesn't require passage through locked doors.

6 "b. Readily accessible to inspection personnel;

7 "c. Clearly labeled 'Elevator';

8 "d. Securely mounted;

9 "e. Equipped with a 1-inch mortise cylinder cam lock
10 with keyway set to a #39504 Fort type key;

11 "f. Keys for access to elevator machine rooms and
12 for operating elevator equipment shall be tagged and kept
13 in the key box;

14 "g. Mechanical hoistway access devices shall be
15 located in the key box. Where the key cannot fit into the
16 key box, it may be located in the machine room; and

17 "h. Where the box cannot be located as indicated in
18 2(a) of this rule, it shall be permitted to be in an
19 unsecured location (such as the outside portion of a
20 condominium). Other arrangements shall be accommodated
21 with the written permission of the department.

22 "i. No persons except the building owner and
23 inspectors shall have access to the key box.

24 "j. All other keys kept elsewhere on site shall be
25 segregated into groups and secured as required as ASME

1 A17.1 ... Section 8.1."

2 And "3. The cities of Seattle and Spokane shall be
3 permitted to designate their own option for keys and
4 lockbox arrangement.

5 "4. Residential elevators are exempt from this
6 rule."

7 So that's what the new proposed language is for key
8 boxes.

9 Discussion?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, Kevin.

12 MR. BRINKMAN: Well, in number 2 you say "The key
13 retainer box shall be ... located in a locked key retainer
14 box" So I think --

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Oh. Yes.

16 MR. BRINKMAN: -- something's wrong with that
17 language.

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

19 MR. BRINKMAN: The key shall be -- an extra set of
20 keys shall be located in a locked container box?

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Located in a --

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, I think it should say
24 "The key retainer box shall be" and then "located in the
25 elevator lobby."

1 MR. BRINKMAN: Okay. That would work.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

3 MS. GOULD: I have a comment on 2.j. (sic) where it
4 says "No persons except the building owner and inspectors
5 shall have access to the key box." But the key in "e"
6 39504, anyone can buy that. So I don't know how you could
7 prevent alarm companies, telephone companies or elevator
8 companies or anyone from that -- because anyone can buy
9 that key. Just a comment.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Scott.

11 MR. CLEARY: This is just a format question. Is it
12 the State's intent to get rid of notes and exemptions?
13 Because now 3 and 4 were notes and exemptions in the old
14 one. Is that the intent?

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It is not the intent to do
16 that. That just happened to be the way that this was
17 submitted.

18 MR. CLEARY: So do we need a friendly amendment?

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: (Nodding affirmatively.)

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Did anybody want a friendly
21 amendment on this? Any more discussions?

22 MR. METCALFE: I've got a question. So regarding
23 number "e", I'd like to propose a friendly amendment.

24 39504 Fort type key, it's actually -- the key is a barrel
25 or a tubular type key.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That key is a barrel-type key.

2 Jan.

3 MS. GOULD: That key is a barrel key.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussions? Rob.

5 MR. McNEILL: I have a question just so -- to make
6 sure I'm not confused. Because I think I am.

7 So originally they were group 2 keys that were keys
8 for authorized personnel. So are we now going to a group
9 1 key?

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes. Some of these are.

11 MR. McNEILL: Which is for elevator personnel only.
12 Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't think that's true.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That's not -- yeah. All the keys
15 that -- it's exactly the way it's written is it's grouped
16 together.

17 So "b," Rob, so "b" says "Readily accessible to
18 inspection personnel." So that's what this key box is
19 for. Inspection personnel. It doesn't say elevator
20 personnel.

21 MR. McNEILL: Okay. So only -- if it's inspection
22 personnel, okay.

23 So are they under elevator personnel in the code or
24 are they -- I know this is the WAC, but I'm trying to
25 harmonize this with the ASME code. I'm not trying to be

1 difficult. I'm just trying to understand it. Because we
2 don't want authorized personnel to have access to these
3 keys, right?

4 MR. HENDERSON: Follow it up with what Rob was
5 talking about, because what we're talking about putting in
6 here is keys to hoistway access, getting into the
7 hoistway. So that's getting into the group 1 keys, which
8 are elevator personnel only. I believe the code does say
9 inspectors are elevator personnel.

10 I guess where I'm curious in making sure that we're
11 all aware of, we get down into "i" because where it says
12 "the building owner and inspectors are (sic) to have
13 access to this box." So this is giving access to group 1
14 keys to the building owner if I'm reading it right.

15 MR. McNEILL: So we may want to have a friendly
16 amendment to that part is kind of where I was going.

17 MR. HENDERSON: Well, because this is one of those
18 things. I'm not really against it; I'm just bringing it
19 up for discussion.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

21 MS. GOULD: But again, I just wanted to state that
22 39504, anybody has access to that barrel key switch. So
23 by having the language -- I mean, you can't prevent people
24 from opening it unless you visually see it.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

1 MR. CLEARY: Can I -- on stuff like the changes like
2 on 3 and 4, can the State just do that without any
3 friendly amendments, just bring it back under the
4 exemption or note form without discussing? Would that be
5 okay?

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

7 MR. FRIESEN: I'd like to point out too that if you
8 have a 39504 key, it is readily available. But for that
9 matter, so is an elevator drop key. I mean, it's not
10 super readily available. You don't have to have a license
11 or anything or go and buy an elevator drop key which gives
12 anybody access to that elevator hoistway. So -- and I
13 don't -- yeah.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any more discussion on this?
15 Okay, do we have a motion?

16 MR. TURNER: I would like -- we talked about amending
17 "a" but there wasn't that change. But if we changing,
18 getting rid of the "a locked key retainer box" then we
19 need to vote on it through a friendly amendment.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Do you want to --

21 MR. TURNER: So I propose making a friendly
22 amendment.

23 MR. HENDERSON: (Raising hand.)

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And Ricky second.

25 And what's your proposed language?

1 MR. TURNER: Just removing the words "a locked key
2 retainer box in." So it should just read "Located in the
3 elevator lobby at the designated landing (sic)," which was
4 already discussed but never actually voted on.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

6 MR. HENDERSON: And it's also as far as that friendly
7 amendment was Scott's notation on 3 and 4 to --

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: You want to add that to your --

9 MR. TURNER: That's fine.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To make number 3 and number 4
11 instead of numbering it 3 and 4, to have exemption 3 and
12 4. I mean, that part on 3 and 4 to be exempted.

13 Okay? So that's what we're going to be voting on for
14 the friendly amendment.

15 MR. NICKENS: I'm sorry, Candace, you want to
16 eliminate 3 and 4 from this --

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No. To put --

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Put it in a note and exception
19 format -- or exemption format.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: In a different verbiage.

21 Okay? Does everybody understand what we're -- this
22 is the friendly amendment to the proposal.

23 MR. NICKENS: Could you please read the entire
24 amendment.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So the amendment -- well, the only

1 thing that would be changed would be number 2. 2.a. would
2 say "Located in the elevator lobby" and the rest is the
3 same. Does that make sense? So cross off that "in a
4 locked key retainer box."

5 And then on the very bottom, it'll say exception or
6 exemption, something like that to the rule.

7 And then it'll say "The cities of Seattle and Spokane
8 shall be permitted to designate their own options for keys
9 and lockbox arrangement." And "residential elevators are
10 exempt from this rule." Basically it'll say that.

11 Okay. So that's what we're friendly amending.

12 Bob.

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay. I just had a side bar with
14 Scott. And my -- since he can't make the friendly
15 amendment, let me see if I can articulate that. What we
16 want to do is make sure that 3 and 4 reflect the same
17 format as in -- and I don't have the, you know, the rule
18 that we were starting with a minute ago.

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So Bob, we don't need an
20 amendment to do that. We can do that. If you'd like to
21 put it in as a friendly amendment, you can certainly do
22 that. But I think it was already covered.

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: If it's clear to the people that
24 count.

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Do I count?

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Do you want me to repeat that or do
2 you guys understand what you're friendly amendment voting
3 for right now? To remove a few words from it to say
4 "Located in the elevator lobby" on "a."

5 And then at the bottom, 3 and 4 are going to be under
6 exemptions. Okay?

7 Okay, let's --

8 MR. MESSINA: Did we confirm that elevator mechanics
9 are classified as inspectors as well?

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We did not do that.

11 MR. MESSINA: So this is just State inspectors and --

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: This is just what I just -- I said
13 unless somebody, whoever did the friendly -- Jan.

14 MS. GOULD: Elevator personnel are mechanics, so they
15 would have access.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Anybody else?

17 MR. NICKENS: I'm not -- is that the intent that you
18 want -- because I know the City of Seattle went to a Medco
19 key, right? And it was hell bent for an elevator guy to
20 have that key.

21 MS. GOULD: You can't. Yeah. Yeah, nobody can.

22 MR. NICKENS: Is it the intention to go that
23 direction? Because if it is, this key isn't going to
24 satisfy that.

25 MR. MURPHY: A question through the Chair. So by

1 moving numbers 3 and 4 under exception, if I was to read
2 this correctly, the city's exception being "The cities of
3 Seattle and Spokane shall be permitted to designate their
4 own options for keys and lockbox arrangement."

5 My interpretation would be that Seattle and Spokane
6 does not have to comply with that.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That's correct.

9 Okay. So let's get back to the friendly --

10 Did you have a question, Scott?

11 MR. CLEARY: No.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Let's get back to this
13 friendly. We've got to get through this. So again, it's
14 going to be crossed off -- on "a," it's only going to say
15 "Located in the elevator lobby."

16 And 3 and 4 is going to put as an exception --
17 exemption; they don't have to comply. Those cities do not
18 have to comply. And residential don't have to comply
19 with this code.

20 Okay. So all in favor of that, raise your hand.

21 Okay, stop doing that. Okay, raise your hand.

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And keep them up please.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah.

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And only one please.

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fifteen including Kevin.

2 All opposed? Zero.

3 Abstentions? One.

4 Not voting? Probably -- oh.

5 So the friendly amendment passed.

6 So does anybody want to discuss the rest? Or can we

7 take a vote on the proposal with the friendly amendment?

8 Do we want to discuss -- any more discussions? Do we

9 have --

10 MR. OURY: I make a motion to pass.

11 MR. BALDWIN: I second.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're talking about the second

13 one, right? The --

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: The proposal was --

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: -- 02471 where we talked about

16 the --

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No. We're still on the same

18 one.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We're on the same one. The
20 proposal with the friendly that we just voted for, 02580.

21 So is that what you're proposing, Mike?

22 MR. WILSON: I'm proposing that we vote on the

23 amendment -- on the proposal with the amendments.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: With the friendly amendment.

25 MR. WILSON: Yes.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Was there a second?

2 MR. BALDWIN: I second.

3 MR. NICKENS: Excuse me. For the record, you have to
4 state if you're voting "yea" or "nay." If you're voting
5 to move this forward, you have to state -- you just can't
6 say "I'm voting." You have to have an affirmative action
7 or a negative action. Just -- it's screwing my little pea
8 brain up quite a bit.

9 MR. CLEARY: I think he was just --

10 MR. WILSON: I was trying to bring the motion
11 forward. That's all.

12 I'll be a specialist at this in about a week.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion?

14 MR. NICKENS: Sorry. I'm not trying to cause too
15 much -- I just -- I'm a old guy.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's -- so -- and then
17 there was a second. So should we take a vote? All in
18 favor of this proposal with the friendly amendments, raise
19 your hand.

20 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fifteen with Kevin.

22 Opposed? Zero.

23 Abstentions? One.

24 Okay. So this one passed.

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Now we're back to --

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So -- yeah. Now we're going
2 to go back to where we were which is the 02471.

3 And this one is going to be repealed because it's all
4 written up over here on 02580.

5 Any questions? Comments? Discussions? Do we have a
6 motion?

7 MR. NICKENS: I make a motion that we move forward
8 with this proposal.

9 MR. WILSON: I second.

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Second.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So let's take a vote. All
12 in favor?

13 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Sixteen including Kevin.

15 Okay. The next one is 296-96-025XX. This is in
16 regards to fire doors installed in front of hoistways.

17 The proposed language is "In (sic) fire and/or smoke
18 door" -- sorry -- "If fire and/or smoke doors are required
19 to be installed by the International Building Code or the
20 local building official, they must: (1) Not be permanently
21 attached to the hoistway door assembly, (2) Not encroach
22 upon the full width and height of the hoistway door
23 opening," and "(3) Ensure that adherence to A117.1 as to
24 hall buttons, lanterns, jamb markings, key switches and
25 position indicators location and line of sight."

1 And this was previously in the WAC rules as written,
2 and it was deleted. And so we're trying to bring it back.

3 MR. NICKENS: I make a motion we move forward with
4 proposal number 025XX.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

6 MR. OURY: Second.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any comments? Scott.

8 MR. CLEARY: I just want to make sure that it's
9 understood, at least in my mind, that anything that's got
10 "XX" in it is a new section.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Correct.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That's correct.

13 MR. FRIESEN: I'm just a little confused -- and
14 somebody can maybe help me out -- understanding why we
15 have adherence to A117.1 hall buttons, lanterns, jamb
16 markings and key switches for smoke doors?

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No, not for the smoke doors. It's
18 -- the smoke door doesn't block the line of sight of all
19 the other things that we need to --

20 MR. FRIESEN: Oh, okay. It doesn't clearly say that.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

22 MS. GOULD: A friendly amendment, or can I do it at
23 this point?

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Sure.

25 MS. GOULD: Okay. I'd like to see a reference to

1 ASME A17.1-2016 of 2.11.6 because it now has requirements
2 -- additional requirements for doors in front of the
3 elevators such as a brake bar and a vision panel so that
4 the fire department when they're in a car they can see
5 what's going out. So I'd just like to make sure people
6 are aware that --

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: How would you like it worded?

8 MS. GOULD: I guess "(4) See additional requirements
9 for hoistway for fire doors, ASME A17.1, 2.11.6."

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So you want it to say "See
11 additional requirements in A17.1, 2.11.6?"

12 MS. GOULD: Yes.

13 MR. NICKENS: I respectfully amend my motion to
14 reflect Jan's request.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay.

16 MR. NICKENS: You'll need a second on that change.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, because you changed yours.
18 Okay.

19 MR. METCALFE: I second.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any more comments?

21 Okay. So let's take a vote on this requirement -- or
22 this proposal with the addition of number "(4) See
23 additional requirements in ASME A17.1, 2.11.6."

24 MR. NICKENS: Could you say that number one more time
25 please.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: "See additional requirements in
2 A17.1, 2.11.6."

3 MS. GOULD: And a "ASME" in front of that. "ASME
4 A17.1."

5 MR. McNEILL: It was "A17.1-2016."

6 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, Kevin.

8 MR. BRINKMAN: I guess the question would be if -- is
9 this anything really different about this than what's
10 already in A17.1 and by the fact that we've adopted
11 A17.1-2016? Haven't we already covered this and maybe
12 it's not necessary?

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Number (2) isn't in the -- in
14 fully. And number (3) -- well, number (2) and number (3)
15 for sure. It doesn't talk about A117.

16 MR. BRINKMAN: Okay.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other questions? Comments?

18 Okay. So let's take a vote to add on number (4) --
19 add a number "(4) See additional requirements in ASME
20 A17.1-2016, 2.11.6."

21 Okay. All in favor? Fifteen.

22 Kevin?

23 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, sixteen. Sixteen.

25 Opposed?

1 Abstentions? Zero.

2 Okay, so that one passed.

3 The next one, 02530, Handrails. Handrails are not
4 required -- oh.

5 MR. HENDERSON: Did we just jump to the next one? We
6 voted on the amendment, but we never voted on the rule to
7 accept the rule.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, that was the vote. I thought
9 we did -- I thought he --

10 MR. RUNYAN: He made an amendment.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So now you need to vote on the
12 -- he's right.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. That was --

14 MR. MESSINA: That was just adding number (4).

15 MR. NICKENS: My fault.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I thought he added to the amendment
17 -- to the proposal. No? Okay.

18 Okay. So that was the friendly. So now we're going
19 to -- for the actual proposal.

20 So all in favor of the proposal with the friendly
21 added to it?

22 MS. GOULD: Do we need a motion?

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yep.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That was his --

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- original motion. Fifteen.

2 Opposed?

3 Abstention? One.

4 And zero no

5 So that one passed.

6 Okay. So let's move to 02530, Handrails. "Handrails
7 are not required. Where handrails are provided in
8 elevator cars," cross out "their configuration" and add
9 "they shall comply with the following" with the "ADAAG"
10 crossed off.

11 "(a) be securely attached to the wall;

12 "(b) be located at a height of between thirty-two and
13 thirty-five inches from the top of the handrail to the
14 floor;

15 "(c) be attached to the wall with a 1-1/2 inch space
16 between the wall and the rail;

17 "(d) be constructed with the hand grip portion not
18 less than 1-1/4 inches but not more than two inches wide;
19 and

20 "(e) be constructed with smooth surfaces and no sharp
21 corners."

22 And those are the new parts. The rest of it stays
23 the same. Jan.

24 MS. GOULD: I propose that we accept this language as
25 written.

1 MR. CLEMENT: I second that.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions?

3 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Go ahead, Kevin.

5 MR. BRINKMAN: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, a couple
6 comments.

7 One, I really don't feel this is necessary. I think
8 this actually is a little too restrictive. I liked the
9 previous references.

10 I don't understand how we came up with 32 to 35
11 because if you look at a handrail in ADAAG or A117 for a
12 stairway or ramp, it's 34 to 38. So they do allow -- the
13 other thing is they allow some ultimate gripping surfaces.

14 So we're restricting it to one and a quarter by -- or
15 two maximum. I think it's very restrictive. And a lot of
16 these handrails are installed in elevators; sometimes
17 they're more decorative; sometimes they're just a barrier
18 so people pushing carts in and out don't hit the wall and
19 damage the wall.

20 So I think we're trying to make this something it's
21 not. A handrail with ADAAG or A117 is typically used for
22 mobility aids, somebody to reach and hold onto while
23 they're walking or moving. And in an elevator, they're
24 standing still. So I think it's really more restrictive
25 than is needed. So I would urge you to vote against it.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Kevin, what's happening is
2 that handrails are being installed in the elevators. And
3 because the handrails that are being installed in the
4 elevators -- there's no requirements in ADAAG or A117.1
5 for handrails in elevators.

6 So what's happening is that inspectors are writing
7 up, and elevator contractors as well have questions about
8 the location.

9 Before, the language in the WAC rules was much more
10 restricted. It said it had to be substantially oval and
11 there were many other things. So we were trying to put
12 the language back in there without making it as
13 restrictive. Because previously in the WAC rules it said
14 "handrails" -- I believe it said "Handrails shall be
15 required." That was before the change last year.

16 And so we were trying to put some guidance in there.
17 Because there is no guidance for inspectors in A117.1 or
18 ADAAG.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments? Scott.

20 MR. CLEARY: I'm just asking the State to be
21 consistent on notes. This note for residential
22 conveyances are excluded. It should be an exemption, not
23 a note ... just to be consistent with the rest of the TAC.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments? Eldon.

25 MR. NICKENS: This question is to you, Kevin.

1 Would it be more acceptable if they changed the
2 height requirements of that handrail to comply with the
3 ADA requirements?

4 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I certainly think that would be
5 an improvement. I still think it's a little bit too
6 restrictive, requiring too much with the sizes and the
7 shape of the handrail.

8 Again, those shapes and sizes are required for
9 certain types of handrails for ramps and stairs where
10 you're trying to use as a mobility aid as you're moving.
11 We're just talking about something that's kind of
12 protecting the wall. I think maybe somebody's putting
13 their hand on it when they're standing still. But it's
14 really -- the gripping surface is not as critical.

15 So my preference would be to get rid of -- I'd be
16 okay with securely fastened to the wall and providing a
17 height between 34 and 38. But I think beyond that, I
18 think it's unnecessary information personally.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Charles.

20 MR. POTTS: I'd like to agree with Kevin. I think
21 this is superfluous.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

23 MR. CLEARY: Kevin, would you be okay if it didn't
24 have the requirements for an inch and a half, inch and a
25 quarter, and you could use a flat handrail other than just

1 on something that's ovoid or round?

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: There's nothing in here saying
3 oval or round.

4 MR. BRINKMAN: And yeah, again, if we get rid of --
5 getting rid of parts of it certainly helps be less
6 restrictive. But I think it's overly restrictive for what
7 we need.

8 My preference would be just to have the first one,
9 and then -- or have (a) and then have (b), but change (b)
10 to 34 to 38 regarding -- if we're going to put anything in
11 it at all.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments?

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So it's my understanding -- and
14 perhaps some of the contractors in the room can speak to
15 this -- that those handrails come predrilled at 32 inches
16 for many of the elevators. So -- and if that's the case,
17 and we're changing it to 34 and 38, that means that the
18 manufacturers are going to have to change their stuff
19 before it gets to us, or they're going to have to request
20 variances. And we're not going to start issuing buckets
21 of variances.

22 MR. RUNYAN: Could we just change -- question. Could
23 we just change that from 32 to 38? That I don't know off
24 the top of my head where Otis puts their handrails from
25 the factory. But if we left it open to that, then you

1 don't have the variances that need to be requested.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments? Or is that a
3 friendly amendment? What are we -- are you --

4 MS. GOULD: I think we need to vote and vote down
5 what I proposed, and then talk again. Is that right? We
6 have to vote on the language.

7 MR. McNEILL: You can withdraw.

8 MS. GOULD: I can withdraw.

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, Kevin.

11 MR. BRINKMAN: If there's interest, I can make a
12 friendly amendment. I think it might resolve my concerns
13 and also deal with 32 that was mentioned.

14 So a friendly amendment would be to change (b) to say
15 "be located at a height" -- strike "of." We don't need
16 "of between." So "between 32 and 38 inches from the top
17 of the handrail to the floor." And completely strike (c),
18 strike (d). And I'd be okay with leaving (e) and
19 renumbering it to (c).

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So is there a second?

21 Is that your friendly amendment?

22 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is that a motion to --

24 MR. OURY: I second that.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So this is to change the

1 verbiage as is. This friendly amendment to say on (b),
2 Kevin, is that what you're saying? on (b) to change it
3 from 35 to 38 inches?

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 32 to --

5 MR. BRINKMAN: Correct.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Right, right. But change the 35 to
7 38, to say 32 and 38, correct?

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Oh. Right.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And then what was that second part
10 is strike (d) as in dog?

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: (c) and (d).

12 MR. BRINKMAN: Charlie and Delta.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, strike Charlie and Delta, and
14 rename (e) as (c) as in Charlie.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Correct.

16 MR. BRINKMAN: Correct.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So was there a second on
18 that? I missed it.

19 MR. OURY: (Raising hand.)

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, Bob Oury.

21 Okay. So this is a vote to change the friendly --
22 change the proposal around. Anybody need me to repeat
23 that?

24 Okay. So all in favor of changing this, raise your
25 hand.

1 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fourteen. That's including Kevin.

3 All opposed? One.

4 And abstentions? Nothing.

5 That's only fifteen. We're missing one.

6 Okay, let's do this one more time. All approve?

7 Fifteen including Kevin.

8 And oppose? One. One opposed.

9 Abstentions? So this one ...

10 Okay. So now we're going to go for the proposal as
11 amended.

12 MR. WILSON: I motion that we move forward with this
13 proposal and its amendments.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Do we have a second?

15 MR. MESSINA: I second that.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any discussions? Let's move
17 forward on this. Okay. All in favor of this proposal
18 with the friendly amendment, raise your hand.

19 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fifteen including Kevin.

21 Oppose? One.

22 Okay, this one passed with the friendly.

23 The next one -- oh, okay. So this one is -- there's
24 three options. So we have to go through all three options
25 before we take a vote. We need to vote for option 1, 2

1 or 3.

2 Let's see. How do we do this?

3 So the first one is option 1. So this is 02552
4 option 1.

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So let me help out a little
6 here.

7 So we cannot delete all the language in 02552 because
8 that would be in conflict with DOSH. So we would not be
9 able to delete all that language.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So we can't entertain --

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So option 1's not available?

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we can't --

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So option 1 is not available.

14 Okay. So option 2, this is 2019-02552-2, revise as
15 follows:

16 So location of equipment. "Elevator equipment shall
17 be permitted to be located within the hoistway subject to
18 the requirement in ASME A17.1" ... and the following:

19 "(1) Where an elevator cannot be prevented from
20 movement electrically and mechanically prior to entering
21 the" -- strike "hoistway" -- "entering the pit area, motor
22 controllers, motion controller, drive, hydraulic control
23 vales, hydraulic reservoir (tank), hydraulic pump motor,
24 and driving machines shall not be located in the
25 pit."

1 Strike "driving machines shall not be located in the
2 pit." So we're kind of combining.

3 "(2) Where a means is used to secure the elevator
4 electrically and mechanically prior to entering the pit,
5 the means shall be designed such that the activation can
6 be performed without full bodily entry into the pit."

7 The rest of it is stricken.

8 So that's the first -- or the second proposal, which
9 is the first.

10 So the third one, 02552 third option, revise as
11 follows:

12 "Location of equipment in hoistway. Elevator
13 equipment shall be permitted to be located within the
14 hoistway subject to the requirements in ASME A17.1/CSA B44
15 and the following:

16 "(1) Where an elevator cannot be prevented from
17 movement electrically and mechanically prior to entering
18 the pit area, motor controllers, motion controller, drive,
19 hydraulic control vales, hydraulic reservoir (tank),
20 hydraulic pump motor, and driving machines shall not be
21 located in the pit.

22 "... Where a means is used to secure the elevator
23 electrically and mechanically prior to entering the pit,
24 the means shall be designed such that the activation can
25 be performed without full bodily entry into the

1 pit.

2 "... Elevator controls and machinery other than
3 driving machines, hydraulic cylinder, piston, governor,
4 and their components shall be located in a room or space
5 dedicated exclusively to elevator equipment.

6 "... Drive sheaves, deflector sheaves, machine parts
7 and supports are permitted to project into the hoistway."

8 So discussion? You want some time to --

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Go ahead, Kevin.

11 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I -- my understanding, at least
12 from my discussions with Dotty, is that the prohibition in
13 DOSH is to give -- (unintelligible -- bad phone
14 connection) -- hoistway. Therefore, options 2 and 3, I
15 definitely -- (unintelligible).

16 I also wanted to reemphasize that everything else has
17 to comply with A17.1 -- (unintelligible) -- part of it.

18 And after that, it was kind of clean-up. Because in
19 number (1), with the changes there was no need to have --
20 (unintelligible) -- so I just included it in the main
21 paragraph.

22 And number (2), I wanted to make it clear that number
23 2 was the same things as we had talked about in number
24 (1). Because of -- it wasn't -- to me, it wasn't clear,
25 the language, so I just thought cleaned it up a little

1 bit.

2 And then the reason for striking (3) and (4) in
3 option 2 is that these are already specified in A17.1. So
4 with the addition of A17.1 at the top, I didn't think it
5 was necessary.

6 So my preference is really option 2 because I don't
7 think those last two are needed. But I threw them both
8 out just in case we might have some concerns that there
9 was something I missed.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So which -- what proposal is
12 your preference outside of 1?

13 MR. BRINKMAN: 2. I motion to approve option 2.

14 MR. MESSINA: I second that.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any comments? Any other
16 comments?

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So I have some.

18 So I just want you all to be aware that there were
19 changes proposed to this last year. And some of those
20 changes could not be considered because they were in
21 conflict with DOSH. If -- no matter what the outcome of
22 the vote, this will have to be studied better and
23 discussed with DOSH to make sure that we are not creating
24 any conflicts with them. So with that said, I want you to
25 be prepared and recognize that the vote that takes place

1 here may not be able to be enforced.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

3 MS. GOULD: To clarify, your elevator inspectors
4 cannot enter the pit.

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The elevator inspectors cannot.

6 MS. GOULD: So having this equipment in the pit and
7 not being able to inspect it is a real problem.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

9 MR. CLEARY: Can we have that interpretation before
10 -- if this is approved before it is recommended to the
11 ESAC, can we have that determination made by the State by
12 then?

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

14 MR. CLEARY: Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Bob.

16 MR. OURY: So based on what you said, Dotty, are you
17 suggesting or is the intent then to vote on number 2 and
18 number 3 in case number 2 can't be?

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: (Shaking negatively.)

20 MR. OURY: It's just a vote on 1?

21 MR. NICKENS: I believe the motion was to -- was
22 option number 2.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Wade, you had something to
24 say?

25 MR. FRIESEN: Yeah. I'm just trying to get clear on

1 this. Is the intent on this in boiling this down, in
2 essence, is the intent of this to figure out whether or
3 not we're going to allow either hydro MRL's in Washington,
4 they -- to be put in the pit? Is that what this comes
5 down to?

6 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Go ahead, Kevin.

8 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, a couple things. I'll try to
9 answer them in order.

10 The Dotty's comment, the first comment was, yeah,
11 there was a change proposed last cycle. That change was
12 basically the same as option 1 which we've ruled out
13 already.

14 So then to the question about option 2 versus option
15 3, I think the is -- if one is in conflict with DOSH, then
16 they both will be. So I don't think it's going to matter.

17 And then the question about hydros in pits, none of
18 -- option 2 and option 3 would not allow hydraulic tanks
19 and pump and drives in the pit. It would still be an
20 effective ban on hydro MRL.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Wayne, having a background in
22 DOSH, do you want to comment?

23 MR. MOLESWORTH: Yeah. I just wanted to clarify a
24 couple of things.

25 Kevin's right, that there are portions of any one of

1 these three that are -- that there are DOSH standards that
2 pertain to it. This -- a vote on this or this being
3 adopted into the elevator WAC in no way limits your
4 responsibility as contractors, building owners for making
5 sure that you abide by the DOSH rules as well.

6 That pit is a confined space. It has been designated
7 as a confined space and should be evaluated every time
8 your guys to a site. And if the car and any other hazard
9 in that pit could not be eliminated as a hazard, that
10 means that car is locked up in some way and it can't -- it
11 has no way that it can fall. It's just not electrically
12 shut off. Then that constitutes a hazard, and now it's a
13 permit required confined space still. It starts out a
14 permit required confined space. It stays that way until
15 you can eliminate all the hazards that are in the space.

16 So just keep that in mind. I just want to make sure
17 that we're clear on that that that's still a
18 responsibility of everybody to make sure that we look at
19 those rules separate than we look at our rules here in
20 elevator. So ...

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments?

22 MR. MESSINA: I've got a question. So is this --
23 because there's MRL application where the equipment is not
24 in a pit, just say in the hoistways. Top landing, access,
25 things like that. Would that still allow that

1 application?

2 MR. MOLESWORTH: So the top of the car, there's some
3 discussion going on right now whether the top of the car
4 and the hoistway are considered confined space as well.
5 Because by definition, they are. But DOSH -- (inaudible)
6 -- in how they're looking at that, they've been having
7 some discussion -- (inaudible).

8 MR. MESSINA: So where we have the hydraulic where
9 you could actually access that from outside of the
10 hoistway, the door that opens up outside?

11 MR. MOLESWORTH: If you're outside the hoistway and
12 not in the pit, it's outside, you know, and it's not in a
13 area that you would consider a confined space which has
14 limited egress and your whole body can fit in it.

15 MR. MESSINA: Okay.

16 MR. MOLESWORTH: So those are -- there's three
17 different criteria that it falls into. So as long as
18 you're outside of that criteria, then you're not in a
19 confined space and you can put your equipment in it as
20 long as it pertains to these rules.

21 MR. MESSINA: Okay. Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other discussion? Comments?

23 Okay, let's see. Where were we?

24 So Kevin, was there a motion to move option 2 forward
25 then?

1 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes, my motion was to approve option

2 2.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

4 MR. MESSINA: I seconded that already I think.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I'm trying to figure out where we
6 were. Okay. So back on track.

7 Okay. So all in favor of option 2 moving forward,
8 raise your hand.

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Including Kevin is seven.

11 All opposed? Three.

12 Abstentions? Four.

13 And one person's not here, so -- Jan's not here. So
14 one's not voting.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Fifteen.

16 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

18 MR. BRINKMAN: Can you -- I'm sorry, I didn't hear
19 the count. What was the vote?

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We're trying to figure that
21 out.

22 MR. BRINKMAN: Okay.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So when you put your hands up
24 to vote, whether it's approved or opposed or not voting,
25 can you please keep your hands up until you make sure that

1 we get the count? I'm sure that we don't want to have to
2 do a second count on every single proposal. And it seems
3 like that is the standard for the day.

4 So we have sixteen people voting. We should have
5 sixteen votes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're missing somebody.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I understand that. But I'm not
8 sure that Jan was -- was she here when we were voting?

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No, she wasn't.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So that's fifteen. We have
11 sixteen people voting.

12 So let's try this again.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We're missing one now.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We're missing Eldon.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay, we'll wait till Eldon
16 comes back. This might be a good time for a short bio
17 break for ten minutes.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay. So Eldon's back. Let's
19 take a quick vote again. The same thing. We just need to
20 get the count straight.

21 MR. NICKENS: I thought we were done. I apologize.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So all in favor of approving
23 option 2, raise your hand.

24 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eight. Oh, see, look. He just

1 raised his hand again. See?

2 Okay, keep it up. Eight. Including Kevin is nine.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We have nine now?

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Including Kevin is nine.

5 All opposed? Five.

6 Any abstentions? One. Oh. Two abstentions.

7 How many is that?

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's sixteen.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Now let's take a break.

10 So that one passed, right?

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Option 2 passed.

13

14 (Recess taken.)

15

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: We're going to start without Jan.

17 Anyway, this one, just to get an official on this.

18 Kevin, are you going to withdraw your third proposal?

19 Kevin?

20 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes. Based on the action of the

21 second one, I'll withdraw the third.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So the number 3 is

23 withdrawn.

24 Okay. So the next one on the page is 02580. We

25 already did earlier, and that one passed.

1 So the next one would be 026XX. This one's a new
2 one. Commercial Vertical and Incline Platform lifts.

3 "For the purpose of two-way communication, i.e.,
4 telephone, intercom, etc., lifts installed in areas that
5 are not visible means that the lift is located in an area
6 that is not in the normal path of travel during the hours
7 that the building is occupied. This will include lifts
8 that are provided with full enclosures where the user
9 cannot be seen."

10 Discussion?

11 MR. WILSON: I am making a motion to make an
12 amendment to this proposal.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

14 MR. CLEMENT: I'll second it.

15 MR. WILSON: Okay. So 18.1 has gotten rid of the
16 term "not visible." The intention of having this in here
17 was to clarify that these would be lifts that are located
18 in areas that are not in the normal path of travel. So I
19 would like it to reread "For the purpose of two-way
20 communication, telephones, intercoms, et cetera, lifts
21 installed in a location of a building that is not usually
22 occupied means areas that are not in the normal path of
23 travel during the hours that the building is occupied.
24 This will include lifts that are provided with full
25 enclosures where the user cannot be seen."

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Mike, can you repeat that one
2 more time please.

3 MR. WILSON: So the clarification here is: "For the
4 purpose of two-way communication, i.e., telephone,
5 intercom, et cetera, lifts installed in a location of a
6 building that is not normally occupied means areas that
7 are not in the normal path of travel during the hours that
8 the building is occupied. This will include lifts that
9 are provided with full enclosures where the user cannot be
10 seen."

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So the part that you're
12 interjecting is "lifts installed in areas" ...

13 MR. WILSON: Pretty much get rid of the "not visible"
14 portion of what was originally integrated in the proposal.
15 And that's because A18.1 got rid of the term "not
16 visible."

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So in areas that are in a location
18 of a building ...

19 MR. WILSON: That is not normally occupied.

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So is that in addition to --

21 MR. WILSON: It kind of clarifies what 18.1 has.
22 18.1 is saying that these are lifts that are in buildings
23 that are occupied, but they don't really go into the
24 distinction of the areas of the building that may not be
25 occupied. They're just using the general term that the

1 building is occupied no matter where the lift is; you
2 don't need to have communication. And that's not I don't
3 think the intent.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So the amendment that you just
5 made would read: "For the purpose of two-way
6 communication, i.e., telephone, intercom, et cetera, lifts
7 installed in a location of a building that is not normally
8 occupied" -- correct?

9 MR. WILSON: Correct.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: "... that the lift is located
11 in an area that is not in the normal path of travel during
12 the hours that the building is occupied." It doesn't make
13 sense.

14 MR. WILSON: So -- okay. Let me --

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: If you said, "Lifts installed
16 in a location of a building that is not normally occupied
17 or located in an area that is not in the normal path of
18 travel during the hours that the building is occupied."

19 MR. WILSON: That would -- yeah. It's just -- the
20 intent of this is to clarify that -- just trying to define
21 what "not visible" is. So that way if the -- if we have a
22 vertical platform lift that is -- like in a auditorium, it
23 is not a normal path of travel, but it is within the
24 occupied building. What I'm saying is that that lift
25 should have a telephone in it because it's not in the

1 normal path of travel. That's what I'm trying to get at.

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Right.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So I'm kind of confused on
4 what --

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So it would be "For the purpose
6 of two-way communication, i.e., telephone, intercom, et
7 cetera" -- and the sentence is still unfinished, just to
8 let you know.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eldon.

10 MR. NICKENS: I believe this falls under more than a
11 friendly amendment. So I would ask you to remove your
12 friendly amendment or what you called a friendly amendment
13 and return this to the author for --

14 MR. WILSON: I'll withdraw my proposal.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Your proposal or your friendly --

16 MR. WILSON: The whole thing. I'll remove -- I
17 withdraw this proposal from discussion.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So 026XX has been withdrawn.

19 Okay. So let's move on to the next one is 02605.

20 And this is for private residence inclined stairway
21 chairlifts. And this is to add a number (3) to the rest
22 of what is already in the code.

23 And number (3) would say "ASME 18.1-2017 10.4.1.1.

24 Governor overspeed/platform safety testing shall be
25 verified by manufacturer documentation and manually

1 tripped at rated speed with no load."

2 Scott.

3 MR. CLEARY: The reason why this is in here is
4 because 7.8 is a new section in the 2017, 18.1. They
5 don't talk -- and 7.8 says that all carriages including
6 residential must have an overspeed. But they don't tell
7 you how to test it. They tell you how to test it for
8 commercial, and we're saying that it should be the same
9 for commercials, the same overspeed. It should do the
10 same kind of testing should be allowed for residential.
11 It's just to clarify.

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: But making the reference to
13 ASME A18.1-2017, that's sort of confusing.

14 If you're saying that that's to clarify it, you may
15 want to amend that and take out ASME A18.1-2017 10.4.1.1.
16 Because this topic is private residence inclined stairway
17 chairlifts.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

19 MR. CLEARY: That testing method which 10.4 is how
20 you test at overspeed. So I don't think it differentiates
21 between commercial and residential.

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Okay.

23 MR. CLEARY: So referral to that I think would be
24 sufficient.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any more questions? Eldon.

1 MR. NICKENS: Doesn't 10.4.1.1. provide a procedure
2 for testing?

3 MR. CLEARY: Yes.

4 MR. NICKENS: So you're requesting that that be
5 foregone and rely on the manufacturer documentation?

6 MR. CLEARY: No, no. All we're saying is that they
7 define how to do a commercial. Let's say you can have --
8 you don't have -- what's changed -- and Kevin, you can
9 help me with this a little bit too -- what's changed in
10 the 18.1 for 2017 is that you don't have to -- you don't
11 have to trip this at rated load, rated speed. They allow
12 you that. So -- and commercially you can do it at rated
13 speed, no load hand trip.

14 What's new is that 7.8 is requiring the same
15 overspeed governor on residential carriages, but they
16 don't tell you how to test it. We're saying test it
17 exactly the same as you do for commercial.

18 So it just -- it gives guidance to the inspectors in
19 the field that we're testing it the same way we do in
20 commercials with no load rated speed hand trip is all
21 we're saying.

22 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah. Go ahead, Kevin.

24 MR. BRINKMAN: I think what you're trying -- what you
25 really want to say, Scott, is maybe we want to move that

1 ASME requirement to the end --

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

3 MR. BRINKMAN: -- and say "Governor overspeed/
4 platform safety testing shall be verified by manufacturer
5 documentation and manually tripped at rated speed with no
6 load per the procedures in ASME A18.1-2017 10.4.1.1."

7 MR. CLEARY: That would be great as a friendly
8 amendment.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Would you like to do that?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: I will make it a friendly amendment.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So with no load per ASME A18.1?

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Per the procedures in --

13 MR. BRINKMAN: The procedures in that section.

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: A18.1-2017 10.4.1.1.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So that's -- so the friendly
16 -- or any second on that friendly?

17 MR. CLEMENT: I second it.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So any discussion? We're
19 going to take a vote on this friendly -- to add this as a
20 friendly amendment to the proposal. And so it's --
21 instead of the A18.1 at the beginning, it's going to read:
22 "Governor overspeed/platform safety testing shall be
23 verified by manufacturer documentation and manually
24 tripped at rated speed with no load per the procedures in
25 the A18.1-2017 10.4.1.1." Is that correct?

1 So all in favor of that friendly amendment being
2 added -- or changed, raise your hand.

3 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Thirteen including Kevin.

5 All opposed?

6 Oh, did you raise your hand, Bob? Sorry. It's
7 fourteen.

8 All opposed? One.

9 Abstentions? Okay.

10 We're still at only fifteen, aren't we.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Uh-huh.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, we're going to have to redo
13 this.

14 All approved, raise your hand.

15 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: See, Jan just raised her hand.

17 See, I just -- I just passed you, Jan. Fifteen including
18 Kevin.

19 Opposed? One.

20 So this one -- so the friendly passed.

21 So the proposal is now the way it's written with the
22 friendly. Any discussion on that? Or can we take a vote?
23 Let's take a vote. All in favor of the proposal with the
24 friendly?

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Including Kevin is fourteen.

2 All opposed? Two.

3 So this proposal passed with the friendly.

4 Okay. So let's move to the next one, 02640. And
5 this is on incline commercial stairway chairlifts. We're
6 adding "ASME A18.1-2017 10.4.1" in front of what is
7 already there, and adding "platform safety" in front of
8 the testing.

9 Any comments? Questions?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Kevin.

12 MR. BRINKMAN: I would like to recommend the same
13 friendly amendment that we made on the previous one and
14 moving that reference to the end with "per the procedures
15 in"

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any second?

17 MR. MESSINA: Second.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So we're voting on the
19 friendly. It's now going to say "Governor
20 overspeed/platform safety testing shall be verified by
21 manufacturer documentation and manually tripped at rated
22 speed with no load per the procedures in ASME A18.1-2017
23 10.4.1." Correct?

24 So let's take a vote. All in favor of the friendly
25 amendment?

1 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fourteen including Kevin. Oh, did
3 he just -- sorry -- fifteen including Kevin. Fifteen.

4 All opposed?

5 Abstention? One.

6 So that friendly amendment -- didn't go into this
7 proposal. Any comments on that?

8 Okay. Let's take a vote on the proposal with the
9 friendly included in there. All in favor?

10 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fifteen.

12 Opposed?

13 Abstention? One.

14 That one passed.

15 Okay. The next one, Part C1. This is for material
16 lifts. Minimum standards for new and altered -- want to
17 cross out the "standard application" and put in "WAC
18 material lifts." And this a proposal of changing of the
19 terminology of the material lift.

20 Any discussion? Bob.

21 MR. OURY: Yeah. I wrote this, so I would like to
22 explain why we want it changed. This was changed last
23 year. When ASME A17.1 was brought in because there are
24 two material lifts described in A17. And so they had to
25 differentiate between what's defined in WAC what we've had

1 for the last 30, 40 years as material lifts, and the
2 wording was chosen "standard application." If we are
3 going to continue with material lifts defined in some
4 other code besides the WAC, it makes sense to call these
5 lifts WAC lifts instead of standard application, which
6 means absolutely nothing to anyone outside of the material
7 lift world such as architects, owners and other
8 manufacturers. So that's why I suggested it be changed to
9 WAC material lift.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comment? Scott.

11 MR. CLEARY: If this is accepted, does that mean that
12 that needs to be a definition change in the definition
13 section of the WAC? Because I think you do define
14 "standard application material lifts." So that would have
15 to include some administrative changes to it.

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

17 I'm not sure that it's appropriate to name a
18 conveyance as a WAC conveyance.

19 MR. OURY: I don't disagree. I'm not so sure it was
20 appropriate to name it "standard application" either.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comment? Eldon.

22 MR. NICKENS: I would tend to agree with Dotty. I
23 don't think it's appropriate to use the Washington
24 Administrative Code as a defining piece of equipment. So
25 I would entertain an alternate, but ...

1 MR. OURY: Okay. I'd like to make a friendly
2 amendment. I would like to change that to "Minimum
3 standards for new and altered material lifts" as it was
4 originally since that's what it defines.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Dotty.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And I will tell you that you
7 cannot do that because of the inclusion of A17.1's
8 material lifts. So by doing that, you would be excluding
9 those or requiring them to come into compliance with a
10 specialized code when that is the national standard.

11 MR. OURY: In comment to that, my next proposal is to
12 eliminate them from code, the ones that do -- or are Type
13 A and Type B because --

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, let's stay on this one first.

15 MR. OURY: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Let's just stay on this one. Can
17 we stay on topic here? We'll get to that.

18 But that is a separate issue, though, don't you
19 think? That's a separate --

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, it is.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah, that's a separate issue.

22 Scott.

23 MR. CLEARY: I think where things run a little bit
24 awry is that they've always -- they've never been -- the
25 State -- the WAC has always regulated them different.

1 They're not part of B20. They're not part of anything
2 else. So you're taking -- in the past B20 lifts have been
3 taken and modified to meet the WAC. So we've got what I
4 consider Frankensteins out there that really don't live in
5 any world other than the state of Washington.

6 So we've always been used to that nomenclature, so by
7 changing that nomenclature, it may make it hard for
8 inspectors in the future to figure out which standard to
9 go to. So nomenclature's very important.

10 So we're just trying -- I think what Bob's trying to
11 get at is we're trying to keep nomenclature consistent
12 with the past. Obviously that will all change for
13 anything new. But I think under existing, keeping the
14 nomenclature consistent is going to help the industry go
15 forward with existing lifts that don't live in any other
16 state other than the state of Washington.

17 So I think that's what we're trying to get at here
18 is that's the problem we have is nomenclature. It's not
19 content; it's nomenclature.

20 MR. OURY: True. That is true. Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

22 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Go ahead, Kevin.

24 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So Kevin --

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, this is Kevin.

1 Based on the changes we made last year, will we be
2 allowed to have any new lifts of this nature?

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

4 MR. BRINKMAN: Or would all -- the answer was yes?
5 Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The answer is yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: There's three types of material
9 lifts right now that we're approving: Type A, type B, and
10 the ...

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Specialized.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: These other ones which we used to
13 call material lifts. But because it got too confusing
14 between material lifts and some material lifts A and
15 material lifts B, that at the last rule change the old
16 material lifts got changed to standard application
17 material lifts.

18 And so Bob is proposing that it get changed to WAC
19 material lifts right now. That's what is on the table
20 right now.

21 Bob.

22 MR. OURY: So WAC has always referred to material
23 lifts by that terminology. And ASME has two material
24 lifts that they describe and they refer to them as
25 material lifts. They also refer to them as Type A and

1 Type B lifts. And one of those lifts you can actually
2 ride. And in the state of Washington, the definition of
3 material lifts is you cannot ride material lifts. So by
4 allowing all three types of lifts and using two different
5 codes to define them, and some of them able to ride, some
6 of them not, I'm not so sure anyone outside of the
7 material lift world, and certainly not outside of the
8 state of Washington, is ever going to know, or even
9 inspectors, are going to know what they're really
10 inspecting and what code it really came from.

11 And my point is the ASME code material lifts, Type A
12 and Type B have never even been requested in the state of
13 Washington and aren't really requested in the United
14 States anywhere. That comes from when the code from
15 Canada was merged with ASME. And it's something that came
16 from Canada; it's not something that's used in the United
17 States to any great degree.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

19 MS. GOULD: I disagree. They had material lifts in
20 ASME before we harmonized with Canada in 2000. But it is
21 a national consensus code. So the WAC rule we currently
22 have is just in the state of Washington. So that's
23 probably why you've not seen them in this state. But in
24 the national consensus code, that's what the rest of the
25 nation is putting in if they're putting material lifts if

1 they're being in A or B.

2 MR. OURY: Nationally material lifts are more often
3 installed as vertical reciprocating conveyors which means
4 -- (inaudible), not ASME.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So this -- again, this is --
6 we're not trying to decide whether we're allowing this or
7 allowing that. This particular proposal is name change
8 only. Correct?

9 MR. OURY: Correct.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Name change. Any other comments on
11 name change?

12 Okay. So --

13 MR. BRINKMAN: Could I -- this is Kevin.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Sure.

15 MR. BRINKMAN: If I understand Bob's concern, he's
16 worried about all the lifts that were installed prior to
17 last year that were called material lifts now might be
18 confused that they are a Type A or Type B. I think. And
19 Bob, please correct me if I'm wrong. But -- so would it
20 help if we just put a statement in here somewhere that
21 says "all material lifts installed prior to the date of
22 these rules becoming effective last year will be
23 considered standard application material lifts"? Then you
24 point them to that new term, and hopefully that -- that
25 might be enough just to get people heading in the right

1 direction rather than changing the term all the way
2 through the standard again.

3 MR. OURY: Well, Kevin, that's certainly part of it.
4 But going forward, I've already been contacted by one
5 inspector asking me what he was inspecting, an ASME
6 material lift or a WAC material lift.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Dotty.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: This is Part C that we are
9 speaking about. Part C has to do with new installations.

10 MR. OURY: True.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It does not have to do with
12 existing; it has to do with new installations. So I just
13 wanted to clarify that.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments? So I --
15 I got lost here. I think -- was there a friendly
16 amendment to change the standard application to a WAC
17 material lift? Is that where we left off?

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No. That's the -- that's the
19 proposed. The standard application --

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, that's right. To the WAC.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Right.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Was there a second to that?

23 MR. METCALFE: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So we're going to take a
25 vote on the language. The proposed language to say "WAC

1 material lifts" as opposed to "standard application."

2 Okay. All in favor of changing it to WAC material lifts,
3 raise your hand. Three.

4 All opposed? Six.

5 Abstentions?

6 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Seven including Kevin.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Are you abstaining, Kevin?

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So the nays have it. So this one
11 didn't get passed.

12 So the next one is 05000. This is to strike the
13 whole code as written, to get rid of this whole thing that
14 says "The requirements in this part are intended to cover
15 those stand-alone standard application vertical lifts."
16 And then it says, "Where Type A or ... B material lifts
17 are installed, they shall comply with ... Part 7"
18 basically.

19 Discussion on this? Bob.

20 MR. OURY: Okay. So the reason I have this is this
21 scope was written last year really to differentiate the
22 Type A and Type B lifts which is ASME. And as I mentioned
23 earlier, nobody requests those lifts. By eliminating this
24 whole scope, we go with the lifts -- material lifts as
25 defined in WAC. And that's the intent of this.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Questions? Comments? Do we have a
2 motion?

3 (Webex interruption.)

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Are you still with us, Kevin?

5 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, I think we're good. We're
7 good maybe.

8 Dotty.

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So I think by going forward
10 with that proposal, you'll be in conflict with the
11 previous one.

12 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Kevin.

14 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I did get blanked out for a
15 little bit there when that message came up.

16 Was there actually a vote on 05000?

17 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No, not yet.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Do we have a motion? Bob.

19 MR. OURY: Just some -- should I make a comment to
20 your comment, Dotty?

21 I don't see where there's a conflict between Part C1
22 minimum standards and this scope.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So basically by eliminating
24 this scope -- by eliminating the entire scope, you're
25 saying that the requirements in this part are no longer

1 intended to cover those stand-alone standard application
2 vertical lifts. And we're not even recognizing Type A or
3 Type B material lifts.

4 MR. OURY: This scope was written and added to the
5 material lift WAC code in order to bring Type A and Type B
6 material lifts into -- to have a place to allow people to
7 jump to the ASME code. By striking this -- it wasn't
8 there before when we had material lift codes in WAC. By
9 striking it, it just eliminates Type A and Type B.
10 There's still a definition in WAC for material lifts.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: For standard application
12 material lifts.

13 MR. OURY: As they are currently, yes.

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments? Rob.

16 MR. McNEILL: I think we have to have some type of
17 scope here. I don't think we can't have a scope.

18 MR. OURY: There wasn't one there before.

19 MS. GOULD: Because we didn't adopt the ASME.

20 MR. OURY: What's that?

21 MS. GOULD: Because we didn't adopt these ASME's.

22 MR. OURY: So that was to bring ASME in. That's
23 correct. For Type A and Type B's.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

25 MS. GOULD: But when you adopted the A17.1, you did

1 not strike those, so those would still be in force without
2 a scope. And as I understand it, you need a scope. So
3 now you got a problem.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Mike.

5 MR. WILSON: I was just looking at the next proposal
6 we have on our docket is they wrote the same thing but
7 (a).

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's an alternate.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, there's two. Okay.

10 MR. WILSON: So there's actually two proposals for
11 the same requirement.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Now, those two would be in
13 contradiction.

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes. So which is your
15 preference on those two?

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So there's a 05000 and a 05000-a.
17 They're both on the same code reference.

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Understanding that WAC material
19 lifts was already voted against, and that this would have
20 to be amended to say -- actually you have -- you can
21 either withdraw (a) or you can -- I'm sorry -- 05000 or
22 you can withdraw 05000-a.

23 MR. OURY: Agreed. So if I withdraw 000-a and 05000
24 is voted down, it stays the same as it is currently,
25 correct?

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Well, theoretically --

2 MR. OURY: Right. Because then --

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Realistically, Bob, you cannot
4 propose 05000-a because WAC material lifts was already
5 voted down.

6 MR. OURY: Right.

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That term.

8 MR. OURY: Exactly. So that doesn't even --

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So you want to withdraw
10 05000-a?

11 MR. OURY: Yes.

12 MR. RUNYAN: A question.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jack.

14 MR. RUNYAN: He's trying to decide whether a material
15 lift or a standard lift -- if I was to read the code under
16 "standard lift," that would mean anything. If he goes
17 underneath a material lift, now you're talking about a
18 specific type of lift that's not obscure under the
19 standard. Material lift could -- go ahead.

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Can I answer that, Jack?

21 So the national standard recognizes two different
22 types of material lifts. The WAC rules are exceptions to
23 that standard or amendments to that standard. The WAC
24 rules recognize another type of material lift. The
25 concern here I believe -- and correct me if I'm speaking

1 out of turn -- is if we only recognize those in the
2 national standard, then certain types of material lifts
3 will no longer be allowed in the state of Washington. If
4 we only recognize what we're terming "standard application
5 material lifts," then those that are recognized in the
6 national standard will not be allowed in the state of
7 Washington.

8 Last year we went through an exhaustive exercise to
9 align the WAC rules with the national standard. And we
10 eliminated a lot of the cross-overs and a lot of the
11 exclusions and exceptions. However, we had some
12 stakeholders that were pretty adamant that we should also
13 allow -- we should allow the material lifts that are in
14 the standard as well as those that do not fall within that
15 scope. That's the dilemma.

16 MR. OURY: Can I add to that, Dotty?

17 So on the national standard, you have Type A and Type
18 B lifts. Type B lifts you can actually ride. One rider
19 can ride them. That's different than our state's code for
20 the last 40 years and for the Type A type material lifts
21 that is the national. Type A national material lifts as
22 defined in ASME would meet state code as well. It's just
23 the rider ones, Type B, would not. But you can see the
24 confusion.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Does that answer your

1 question?

2 Okay. Where were we here? Let's see. So this
3 proposal is to strike the whole scope, everything. That's
4 what it is.

5 Is there a motion? Did you -- who did the motion to
6 -- did anybody --

7 MR. OURY: I make a motion to vote.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To approve this?

9 MR. OURY: To approve it.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Is there a second?

11 MR. HENDERSON: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So all those in favor of
13 approving the striking of the scope, raise your hand.

14 MR. RUNYAN: Wait a minute. Which one you voting on?

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 05000.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So on 05000. And 05000 is to
17 remove everything. That's 05000.

18 All in favor of removing 05000, raise your hand.
19 Kevin? Three.

20 All opposed?

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Raise your hands up if you're
22 opposed.

23 MR. BRINKMAN: Nay.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Eight, and Kevin makes nine.

25 Oh, wait. Did you -- this is opposed.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Opposed. Raise your hands
2 please if you're opposed.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Let's do that again. Opposed?
4 Eight, and Kevin makes nine.

5 Abstain? Four.

6 Okay, so --

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So that did not pass.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: It did not pass.

9 Okay. Moving on. So the next one, 05000-a was
10 withdrawn.

11 MR. OURY: Yeah. And I'll withdraw the 05010 because
12 that was just a change to the WAC.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So the next one, 05010
14 you're going to withdraw?

15 MR. OURY: Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So then now we're onto 05050.
17 Okay. So this one is for the same thing for these
18 standard application material lifts. The drive machines
19 are all listed. This proposal is to strike (h) scissor
20 lifts from the drive machines because scissor lifts are
21 already covered under a different standard MH-29.1. And
22 they are outside of our jurisdiction.

23 Any comments? Bob.

24 MR. OURY: Yeah, I'd like to comment on it.

25 The 05050 description of drive machines is just

1 description of scissors. It does not refer to scissors
2 lifts which are manufactured to MH 29.1. A scissors lift
3 is a complete assembly. Scissors is a drive component to
4 something just as winding drums are, tractions are,
5 hydraulics are. So it's not referring to a complete
6 assembly, though, it's just referring to a drive. And a
7 scissor drive could be used in a material lift application
8 to raise and lower the material lift. It's not unlike the
9 comparison of all of the manufacturers currently in the
10 United States for material lifts actually advertise that
11 they are built to ANSE B20.1, not to the WAC code, not to
12 ASME A17.1. They can be modified to meet our codes here,
13 and that's what they have to do. But if you look on any
14 of their literature, on any of their manuals, it's all
15 built to 20.1.

16 Scissors lifts -- all the manufacturers in the United
17 States of scissors lifts are built to MH 29.1 just as
18 material lift companies built to 20.1. But when they are
19 used as a scissors lift table for say work positioning in
20 a manufacturing facility, they add certain components to
21 make those safety standards and meet those needs the same
22 as what most of us might know as scissors lifts as dock
23 lifts -- scissors type dock lifts in a ground level
24 building; they are also manufactured with added
25 componentry to meet the dock lifts standards in this

1 world.

2 You can make a scissors lift or you can make the
3 scissors meet a material lift code, and there are
4 conveyances in the state of Washington that have done
5 that. The one I can think of is Toray Composites in
6 Puyallup is -- they use a scissors lift for a material
7 lift, and it adds the enclosures and the interlocks and
8 all the necessary safeties to meet the material lift
9 codes, and it's actually licensed as a conveyance. We
10 have an MCP contract with them.

11 The same thing is true in the city of Seattle with --
12 the most recent one is Danforth Seattle LLC where they
13 used a scissors component to make a material lift and
14 added all the necessary safeties and interlocks to make
15 that work as well. And that is a licensed conveyance in
16 the city of Seattle.

17 So I disagree with taking scissors away from drive
18 machines because you are allowing a manufacturer or
19 someone to apply a scissors lift in the state of
20 Washington as a material lift without adding all the
21 necessary componentry to make it a safe working piece of
22 equipment in the right application.

23 And I don't know if you guys can see this photo
24 (showing). That is a scissors lift from a ground level
25 going up to a second floor in an application that we would

1 all think would be a material lift. But as you can see,
2 it doesn't have the necessary enclosures, interlocks and
3 safety componentry to make it work as a material lift in
4 our state. This is what you would end up with if you
5 allow scissors to be removed from drive machines for --
6 as a possible drive system for material lift. Someone
7 could actually sell something like that in the state of
8 Washington and not have to meet our codes. So I'm against
9 it.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Dotty.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I agree with what you're saying
12 in concept. However, if a conveyance is manufactured to
13 meet a particular code and we do not have jurisdiction
14 over that code, then we have no business.

15 MR. OURY: So that would be the same as a company as
16 some of you might know as PFlow or Custom Industrial
17 Products or any of these other manufacturers of vertical
18 reciprocating conveyors which is what they're described in
19 most states. Here we describe them as material lifts.
20 For those manufacturers to say "We actually manufacture to
21 the B20.1 standard, so we don't have to meet your WAC
22 codes," that's the same thing as a scissors lift
23 manufacturer saying "We don't have to meet your WAC codes
24 in a material lift application because we meet MH 29.1."
25 Those are -- we still make the vertical reciprocating

1 conveyor companies who do it to B20.1, then they come
2 into our state, they have to add the safety necessary to
3 meet our codes just as I would expect we would do the
4 same for a scissors lift company manufacturing to 29.1. I
5 think those are equivalent comparisons.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments?

7 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Go ahead, Kevin.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Go ahead, Kevin.

10 MR. BRINKMAN: I would agree with Bob in the fact
11 that this is a drive type. It's not a lift type. We use
12 this -- we actually ASME A18, we allow a scissor drive
13 mechanism. It's not a scissor lift. It's different; a
14 scissor drive mechanism. So I don't necessarily agree
15 with the idea that it's regulated by another standard
16 because all we're doing -- (unintelligible) -- if you can
17 put a scissor drive in instead of a hydraulic drive or
18 something else and make it conform with material lift
19 standards, I don't know why we would take it out.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments? Jan.

21 MS. GOULD: I'll just make a comment. In ASME for
22 part 7, dumbwaiters material lifts, that under 7194 it
23 just says "shall be secured and supported by guide rails
24 and structural walls." So is there some type of guide
25 rail -- I know that the City of Seattle has a few of

1 these, more than a few. So I can't remember if they -- I
2 guess lifts --

3 MR. OURY: Scissors do -- scissors on the end of the
4 scissors have wheels, and they ride in a guide, correct.
5 They do. It's not a vertical guide; it's a horizontal
6 guide, but it's a guide, correct.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments? Dotty.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So I'm a bit confused, Bob.

9 So you're likening the material lifts, the standard
10 application material lifts, you're -- did I understand you
11 right -- correctly that you are likening them to vertical
12 reciprocating conveyances?

13 MR. OURY: What I am saying, in the state of
14 Washington we add a lot more safety componentry to get to
15 material lifts from a -- what a from the national world
16 calls a vertical reciprocating conveyor. Here we describe
17 a vertical reciprocating conveyor as something totally
18 different that is automatically fed and released. In the
19 national standard, all of these manufacturers manufacture
20 to B20.1 which is a conveyor code. That's what that is.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So I'm still a bit confused
22 because -- and this is part of the problem. With the WAC
23 rules and the national standards, the different
24 terminologies used for both has created a huge amount of
25 confusion. So -- but you're saying that -- if I heard you

1 correctly -- that the units that are being used in the
2 state of Washington as material lifts aren't truly
3 material lifts, but are VRC's that were manufactured to
4 B20.1 and then we make them put all these little
5 additional bells and whistles on.

6 MR. OURY: I am, but I'm not saying that they're
7 vertical reciprocating conveyors. I'm saying the rest of
8 the manufacturing world of these lifts calls them vertical
9 reciprocating conveyors. In the state of Washington we
10 don't call them that. And we limit the definition where
11 they have to have gates and enclosures and interlocks and
12 meet certain dimensional requirements as well that they
13 don't have to meet in the majority of the states.

14 Does that help?

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we're -- the state of
16 Washington then is requiring more than what's required in
17 other states.

18 MR. OURY: Yes, we are.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

20 MR. CLEARY: If you go to PFlow or the other
21 manufacturers, they design everything to the B20 code. So
22 the other states, they're VRC's. So they've had to add
23 extra things just to meet this. So they don't live in
24 either world out in the ether of regulations and any part
25 of the country. They customize the lifts for this state

1 to meet what the WAC was, not to meet 7.4. So they're
2 originally designed -- if you go to their facilities, you
3 look at what do you design these to? B20.1. And then
4 they put extra layers on to meet what the WAC required,
5 you know, in the past. So here we go again. I can use
6 for the path to Frankensteins, right? They don't live in
7 any other state like they live here. And that creates the
8 problems that are in 7.4 -- (inaudible) -- is that these
9 things were never meant to live in the 7.4; they were
10 meant to live in B20.1. So that's the ambiguities and the
11 problems at best, and how do you eliminate them and how do
12 you inspect them. So that's what Bob has been fighting
13 with.

14 MR. OURY: And we've done a really good job over the
15 years until we decided to bring in A17.1 and really
16 confuse the issue.

17 MR. CLEARY: And what's really -- what started off
18 is the definition of a conveyance in the WAC. Riding
19 among two, you know, between rails, serving more than one
20 floor is that's how I think this got caught up in the past
21 as being regulated that way.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments? Jan.

23 MS. GOULD: Can I ask: I know that the state -- the
24 city has some of these. Do you have some also?

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Have some of what?

1 MS. GOULD: A material lift --

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, we do.

3 MS. GOULD: Okay. Thank you.

4 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, we do.

5 We also have scissor lifts that were installed to MH
6 21.1 -- I mean -- 29.1. Yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other questions or
8 comments?

9 Okay. So again, this proposal is to strike scissors
10 as one of the driving machines for a standard application
11 material lift. And we had a motion to approve, and I
12 think we had a second somewhere. Did we have a second?

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: I think we just had discussion.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay.

15 MR. OURY: We didn't have a motion. But I would like
16 to make a motion to disapprove this.

17 MR. MESSINA: I second.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: To disapprove it?

19 MR. OURY: Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Disapprove it means --

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: To not approve it.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- I don't want this --

23 MR. OURY: To vote against it. Scissors should be
24 left as a driving machine in our code.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, okay. Okay. The vote is to --

1 the motion is to disapprove.

2 MR. MESSINA: And I seconded it.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So does everybody know what we're
4 voting for?

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: To make it a little clearer,
6 could I suggest that you make a -- or someone make a
7 motion to approve it. And then if it gets voted down
8 Because if you make a motion to disapprove, and then it's
9 opposed, it gets kind of confusing.

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

12 MR. OURY: Very good. I second.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So this proposal is -- yeah, that
14 got confusing. The proposal is to strike scissors as one
15 of the drive machines. So if you're voting in favor, that
16 removes the scissors from the code -- current code.
17 Everybody clear?

18 So all in favor --

19 MR. McNEILL: We have to withdraw the other motion,
20 right, that got seconded first.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: He seconded it.

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: He has to withdraw his motion.

24 MR. OURY: I withdraw.

25 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And now we need that motion to

1 approve it as --

2 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
3 this proposal.

4 MR. CLEMENT: I second.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So again, we're voting to
6 move forward on this proposal which is to strike the
7 scissors as part of the driving -- one of the driving
8 machine items on the list.

9 All in favor of this proposal as written, raise your
10 hand. Zero.

11 All opposed to this, raise your hand.

12 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Thirteen including Kevin.

14 All opposed?

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That was opposed?

16 MS. GOULD: You mean abstained.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes, abstained. Two.

18 Anybody not voting? Let's do that again.

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Candace, some of us are having a
20 little difficulty following the flow here. If you --
21 just, you know, when you call for the vote, if you'd give
22 us the number, then we'd know that that vote had ended and
23 now we're on the next portion of the vote.

24 So what I heard happen here was there were no votes
25 for, thirteen against; is that correct?

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That is correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON LAU: And two abstentions.

3 MR. McLAUGHLIN: So now we're voting on -- now you're
4 looking for abstentions.

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Right. One. One abstention.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That still doesn't make it ...

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh, two abstentions. Oh, three
8 abstentions.

9 Okay. So that particular one did not pass.

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Let's do a break. Five.

11 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Let's do a break.

12

13 (Recess taken.)

14

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, everybody back? Anybody
16 missing? Okay, we're going to --

17 So the next one, Bob, is --

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Could I just interrupt for one
19 minute?

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So we did find a room for
22 tomorrow. Did you all hear this already? It's at the
23 Ramada Inn, which is -- what's the address -- 15901 West
24 Valley Highway, and that's in Tukwila here.

25 MR. WILSON: What is that? 15901?

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 15901 West Valley Highway in
2 Tukwila. And we are starting at 9:00.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, let's begin because Bob has
4 something to say about the next one. The proposal is
5 05070. Right, Bob?

6 MR. OURY: Yes, withdraw please.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Bob's going to withdraw that one.

8 So the next one we have is 05140. That's where we're
9 going to start.

10 And what's proposed to change is changing the rated
11 load from 125 percent to 100 percent for testing the
12 safeties.

13 Any comments?

14 MR. OURY: Can I comment? So the code for years has
15 said 125. It should have been changed a long time ago.
16 So this is really in my mind more administrative. We
17 still have to test to stop and sustain at 100 percent just
18 like you do any other elevator.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any other comments?

20 MR. MESSINA: Does the material does not hold up at
21 125?

22 MR. OURY: We've been testing over the years at 125.
23 But more and more manufacturers are making this product,
24 and we have been concerned with some of the various
25 manufacturers. We haven't had a failure. But we've been

1 concerned that a lot of them don't do them as stout as
2 we'd like them to. So -- and this is the I think the
3 standard for the rest of the elevator industry. So since
4 we don't even ride these things, they are not allowed to
5 be ridden, we feel that we ought to do what's right and
6 make them at 100 percent instead of trying to destroy
7 something.

8 MR. NICKENS: When you say this is the standard of
9 the rest of the industry, could you explain that
10 statement?

11 MR. OURY: Well, that's just my -- what I've heard.
12 Maybe you can tell me.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

14 MS. GOULD: Passenger elevators, their safeties only
15 need to be tested at 100 percent. In a passenger elevator
16 or freight, they have to be designed to pick 125, but
17 there's no requirement for that. That's only in design.
18 So other than brakes for passenger elevators, they have to
19 be tested with 125. Everything else is 100 percent of the
20 load, except for NTSD down on -- no control and stopping
21 devices.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

23 MR. CLEARY: Yeah, that's right. Because usually 125
24 percent is your brake test. And everything's designed --
25 the safeties are already designed at a rate of speed rated

1 -- (inaudible). So at 125, we never know where that came
2 from. And we talked about that the last iteration too.
3 So 100 percent is the standard for your safety test, and
4 obviously anything to do with your braking would be done
5 at 125 of rated load.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

7 Okay. Is there a motion?

8 MR. CLEMENT: I make a motion to vote for approval.

9 MR. MESSINA: I second that motion.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Let's -- all in favor of
11 this proposal, raise your hand.

12 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fifteen including Kevin.

14 Opposed? One.

15 So that passed.

16 Okay. The next one. 05190. Again, we're still on
17 material lifts. And this one is to remove some language
18 in number (4) to say "Where provided" instead of -- so
19 instead of saying that these material lift pits shall have
20 drains, instead of saying that they shall have drains,
21 we're going to be saying, "Where provided, drains shall
22 not be directly connected to sewers." Because most of
23 these material lift pits are pretty shallow, and they
24 don't have room for a drain in them.

25 So anyway Any comments? Questions?

1 MR. MURPHY: Question. So "Where provided, drains
2 shall not be directly connected to sewers." Where would
3 the water be expelled to from the pit? Into the right-of-
4 way?

5 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That part of it, we don't regulate.
6 It's just -- we're kind of -- I think this is written in
7 line with --

8 MR. MURPHY: They're just making a statement.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Just so that the sewer gases don't
10 back up and things like that. That's basically all it's
11 about.

12 Any other comments? Questions?

13 Oh, I guess number (6) also has "Provide an approved
14 access ladder for pits deeper than 3 feet." So the word
15 "access" got added to that as well.

16 Any other comments? Questions?

17 Okay. So ...

18 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
19 this proposal.

20 MR. OURY: I second.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, all right. So all in favor
22 of this proposal, raise your hands please.

23 Kevin?

24 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Fourteen including Kevin.

1 Opposed? Zero.

2 Abstention? Two.

3 So this proposal passed.

4 Okay. Next one.

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: This -- just for this one and
6 the next one, the format is going to have to be changed
7 just so that you know. Because we went from a question
8 format to a statement format at the last go-around. So
9 please don't concern yourself with the questions there.
10 That format will be changed to match the format that we
11 have currently.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So this next one is
13 296-96-07xxx1. And this is for residential incline
14 elevators that these are -- the ones that go down to like
15 a beach or something like that. This is the proposed
16 language except it won't be in question format.

17 WAC 296-96-07080, that's the old language.

18 "What are the load and size requirements for car
19 platforms? The minimum rated load shall not be less than
20 the following:

21 "(1) For net platform areas up to and including
22 twelve square feet, the rated load shall be not less than
23 forty pounds per square foot or three hundred and fifty
24 pounds whichever is greater."

25 And number "(2) For net platform areas greater than

1 twelve square feet, the rated load shall be based upon
2 sixty-two and one-half pounds per square foot."

3 Okay. Open up for discussion. Scott. Or Bob.

4 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I move that this be presented and
5 voted on.

6 MR. WILSON: You what? I didn't hear what you just
7 said.

8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Rich, help me with your phrase.

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

11 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I make a motion to move forward.

12 Thank you, Rich.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Is there a second?

14 MR. WILSON: I'll second it.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any discussion?

16 MR. WILSON: I have one question. There's a note
17 here that says that this was retained as to solve a
18 problem. Was this originally a WAC rule?

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I can speak to that, if I may.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes, Bob.

21 MR. WILSON: Just as the whole thing's written, it
22 was about the way it was written.

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Let me give you a little background.

24 This is more of an administrative than a technical
25 review. So I can speak to the specifics of what's going

1 on here. If I have questions or if you need more
2 information, let me just give you a little bit of history
3 about this.

4 This goes back to about the year 2002 when we had a
5 very similar process to this that Dotty resided over where
6 we reviewed all of section C2, a very extensive process,
7 but not as thorough as this. And in the review that was
8 done last year and the shift from WAC to ASME rules, in
9 that process, there were three items that were particular
10 to Washington. And the state of Washington probably has
11 more expertise on residential conveyances, inclined
12 elevators of two different types, than any other state
13 that I've encountered. And since 2002 a lot of things
14 that were reviewed became standard practice. But in the
15 energy that was involved in converting to ASME last year,
16 there were three items, only one of which was caught in
17 time. And if you look at part C2, you will see it listed
18 there. It concerned guide rails, tracks, supports and
19 fastenings. That was caught in time to be introduced into
20 that process and get retained because it's very important
21 to the types of inclined elevators that are used in the
22 state of Washington.

23 Two more that were not caught in that process you see
24 in front of you. And I'll just ask whether there's any --
25 whether Dotty is comfortable voting on both of these at

1 the same time or whether you want to break them in two
2 pieces; it doesn't make much difference. But that's the
3 history behind this. Nothing has changed since 2002 on
4 this when it was thoroughly reviewed. But they are
5 important. Not only -- it's a benefit to the Department
6 which has used these for years to their advantage. Also
7 to the consumers, and also to the manufacturers.

8 Now, the only one -- the only technical item that I
9 do want to mention is when you're looking at the platform
10 area, the crucial thing there is that a lot of these are
11 used for the primary access to a residence, and it's very,
12 very important that they be wheelchair compatible. And by
13 retaining this, wheelchair accessibility to all those
14 residences is maintained to the standards that it has been
15 for the last 15 years.

16 So that's the driving force, not so much on load as
17 the capacity.

18 The other one concerns types and diameters --

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Wait a minute. Can we --

20 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Let's just take one at a time.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah, let's take it one at a time
22 so we don't get too confused so we can talk about this one
23 passing issue.

24 Jan.

25 MS. GOULD: And this matches -- or the national

1 consensus code, the reference for 5.3.10.1 allows for this
2 also, so it matches it for the poundage and square
3 footage.

4 MR. HENDERSON: But 5.3.10.1 limits it to 15 --
5 (inaudible).

6 MS. GOULD: Yes, it does.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: This one will allow for more.

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Does it?

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Because number (2) says "For net
10 platform areas greater than twelve square feet" So
11 there's no maximum on this one. Right? This one will
12 allow for more than 12 square feet platform.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Inaudible).

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No. This one does not -- the one
15 that is being proposed right now does not limit it to 15
16 square feet.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Correct.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: The 5.3 that -- correct?

19 MS. GOULD: It just says "For net platform areas
20 greater than twelve square feet, the rated load shall be
21 based upon 62.5 (sic) pounds per square foot."

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: I think there's a limit on that.

23 MR. HENDERSON: It's not 3.1.10, one capacity ...
24 yeah, it's "shall not exceed 15 square feet."

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Right. So there's a limit. This

1 one will not have a limit, correct? And you're saying you
2 need a bigger size platform? Is that -- Bob.

3 MR. McLAUGHLIN: What I'm saying is that the
4 important thing that we need to retain is the ability for
5 these units to be wheelchair compatible.

6 Now, my memory going back to the discussion 15 years
7 ago is not that tight. I do recall that one of the
8 problems we ran into was a triple spec on this issue. And
9 we spent a lot of time in this room discussing that
10 because we had a floor loading spec, we had an area spec.
11 And at the end of a long discussion on that, we settled on
12 this language as a way of handling reasonable guidelines
13 for the manufacturer. And all of that, of course, is
14 subject to Department approval upon installation.

15 I could probably go back in my notes and reconstruct
16 that, but I'm not really prepared to do that today.

17 But I can say that this is what we have used for a
18 long time. This reflects our current practice.

19 So the underlining is simply to show that this is the
20 part that we would like to have restored.

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Dotty.

22 SECRETARY STANLASKE: But this language is already in
23 A17.1 verbatim. And we've already accepted that portion
24 of 17.1.

25 17.1 5.3.1.10 says "Capacity. The maximum inside net

1 platform area shall not exceed 1.4 square meters or 15
2 square feet. The minimum rated load shall be not less
3 than the following: For net platform areas up the and
4 including 1.1 square meters, 12 square feet, the rated
5 load shall be not less than 195 kilograms per square
6 meter, 40 pounds per square foot or 159 kilograms, 350
7 pounds, whichever is greater. For net platform areas
8 greater than 1.1 square meters, 12 square feet, the rated
9 load shall be based upon 305 kilograms per square meter or
10 62.5 pounds per square foot."

11 (Webex interruption.)

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So the language is already the
13 same in A17.1 that has been adopted.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

15 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Go ahead, Kevin.

17 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I lost a little bit at the end
18 of your comment there. But I think the point that is
19 different, and it's not clear from this proposal, but I
20 think what the gentleman earlier was trying to do is
21 actually allow for greater than 15 square feet, which I
22 think was previously allowed in the state of Washington.

23 The ASME code currently limits it to 15 square feet.
24 But I think his intent was to bring back that portion that
25 allows something bigger to accommodate some of the larger

1 wheelchairs and scooters that people may have.

2 And there is actually a proposal that's been in the
3 system for a while in A17 that's still being discussed
4 about increasing it from 15 to 18 for private residence
5 elevators, but that has not passed at this point.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So the only difference would be
7 the allowance of -- the only difference from A17.1 would
8 be the allowance for greater than 15 square feet.

9 MR. BALDWIN: And couldn't that be done through the
10 variance anyway?

11 MR. TURNER: I think the intent was to avoid the
12 variance process. Although, this doesn't explicitly state
13 anything about the 15 square feet. If A17.1 is what's in
14 effect, this doesn't actually allow for greater than 15
15 feet the way it's currently written.

16 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments? Bob.

17 MR. McLAUGHLIN: The note I have here -- and -- but
18 let me comment on the one that was just made.

19 The large number of variances that were being sent
20 to L & I were part of the driving process years ago, that
21 homeowners were asking for the additional capacity, and
22 that was generating a lot of variances. And so that was
23 one of the factors that came into the discussion back then
24 also was to reduce the number of variances because they
25 were coming up repeatedly.

1 The other comment that I have here is from the
2 manufacturer of one of these systems who says "Using the
3 62.5 pound square foot capacity requirement already
4 incentivizes keeping the size to a minimum as the
5 equipment cost goes up with a higher-rated load." So
6 there's a push-back to increasing it simply because
7 everything else gets increased and the costs go up. And
8 this is very much a consumer-driven product.

9 MR. MESSINA: Wouldn't it make more sense for the
10 person that wrote this or the company that wrote this to
11 just have it reflected as greater than 15 square foot,
12 complies with the 62 per pound per square foot?

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: You know, I --

14 MR. MESSINA: Since it's already in the code right
15 now for 15 or less.

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Speaking for myself, I don't think
17 there's been a lot of effort put into wordsmithing a
18 proposal. The desire was to retain the accepted practice
19 as written and not get into a review of what we had
20 already done. It needs more review. It's certainly
21 something that can be done in the future. But we needed
22 to grab this brass ring as it came around, and Dotty
23 created this opportunity for us to take a look at those
24 two items, this one and the next one, while this
25 opportunity was here.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

2 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah, go ahead, Kevin.

4 MR. BRINKMAN: I think the point that's being missed
5 by Bob, and I think you might be the person that wrote
6 this proposal. But the -- when this was in the WAC
7 originally there was no maximum platform size listed.
8 When we used this in combination with the A17.1
9 requirement that's already there that limits platform
10 size, this proposal really doesn't do anything. You have
11 to have a second proposal to go with this or some
12 modification to it to say, you know, the 15 square foot
13 limit in A17.1 does not apply, but these rules do.
14 Because the way it's written today, it's really not going
15 to give you anything different than A17.1.

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's correct.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, that's a good point.

18 So currently we have adopted the A17.1, which already
19 -- we just read it -- already has capacity written in
20 there.

21 So this code used to be in our WAC code, and it's
22 just put back in here as a proposal. But it doesn't --
23 but we've moved on and adopted a different standard for
24 the residential incline elevators.

25 So this would conflict with what's in A17.1 now if

1 you don't write something on there to say this isn't, you
2 know, takes the place of A17.1.

3 That's what Kevin's trying to say.

4 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Well, that's a broader discussion
5 that I'm not prepared to get into today.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

7 MR. NICKENS: Is there a motion on the floor, Chair?

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: There was. There was a motion to
9 approve it and a second I believe.

10 So any other comments?

11 So currently the motion on the floor is to approve
12 this verbiage, this language to be added to the WAC code.
13 All in favor? Let's take a vote. All in favor of this
14 being added, raise your hand. That's four.

15 All opposed? Seven.

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Kevin?

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Seven.

18 MR. BRINKMAN: I'll abstain.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Abstentions? Four plus Kevin.
20 Five.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: You got it.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So ...

23 SECRETARY STANLASKE: It did not pass.

24 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So this did not pass.

25 Okay, let's move to the next one. The same thing.

1 These are residential incline elevators. 296-96-07xxx2.

2 This is to add some verbiage that was already in the
3 code before we adopted the new A17.1 standards. And it
4 says "WAC 296-96-07210(3) The minimum diameter of hoist
5 ropes or cables must be 1/4 inch galvanized elevator wire
6 rope and 3/16 inch aircraft cable."

7 Any comments? Motion?

8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I motion that we -- I move that we
9 move forward on this.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any second?

11 MR. CLEMENT: I'll second it.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any comments? No comments?

13 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Oh. Kevin.

15 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, just one comment. I'm not
16 really opposed to this. I just -- I'm not sure it's
17 necessary because if you look at the requirement in 2016
18 A17.1 there's a minimum safety factor and a minimum
19 braking strength. But they don't actually specify a
20 minimum diameter. If you have -- if you don't -- you meet
21 this minimum safety factor and minimum braking strength,
22 the diameter's fully whatever you want to use as long as
23 you meet those requirements. So I'm not sure it's
24 necessary. I'm really not opposed to it either, but I
25 just want to bring that up.

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Where are you looking at,
2 Kevin? In 17.1?

3 MR. McNEILL: It's 5.4.8. --

4 MR. BRINKMAN: 5.4.

5 MR. McNEILL: It's 5.4.8.2. I think the confusion's
6 coming in because when you look at 5.4.8 the suspension
7 means, it refers you back to residential elevators. And
8 that's where you start getting into the sizes of rope and
9 the suspension means; whereas, for the private residence
10 incline elevators, as Kevin mentioned, it specifically
11 talks about the force, the number of newtons for braking
12 strength and so forth.

13 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So does it not say 3/8ths?

14 MR. McNEILL: Not in 5.4.8.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No, but it refers you -- I'm
16 sorry, Rob; I didn't mean to interrupt you.

17 MR. McNEILL: No, go ahead.

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: But it refers you back to
19 5.3.1.12.

20 MR. McNEILL: Correct.

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Right?

22 MR. McNEILL: Depending -- and then when you go to
23 5.3.1.12.2, it's talking about the weight. But 5.3.1.12.2
24 doesn't discuss the fact for safety of the suspension.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So the person that submitted

1 this --

2 MR. McNEILL: So that's -- excuse me; I'm sorry. But
3 it's -- one's a factor of 7 for the residential elevators,
4 and it's a factor of 8 for the inclined elevators. That's
5 in 5.4.8.2 for the inclined and 5.3.1.12.3 for the
6 residential, private residence elevators.

7 So the inclines have -- the requirements are greater.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Than the residential elevators.

9 MR. McNEILL: Right.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. On the justification, this
11 person lists that "A17.1-2016 would specifically increase
12 minimum wire rope sizes from 3/16th to 3/8ths diameter."
13 But you don't see that anywhere?

14 MR. HENDERSON: It's in 5.3.1.12.2. It's -- I can
15 read it.

16 SECRETARY STANLASKE: 5.3.1 --

17 MR. HENDERSON: 5.3.1.12.2 suspension ropes and
18 elevators having a rated load of 500 pounds or less and
19 operating at a rated speed of 30 foot per minute or less,
20 suspension ropes should not be less than a quarter inch in
21 diameter. When a rated load exceeds 500 pounds and rated
22 speed exceeds 30 foot per minute, the rope shall be not
23 less than 3/8ths of an inch in diameter.

24 MR. McNEILL: So Ricky, I think what -- (inaudible)
25 -- was saying and what I was attempting to say is that for

1 those 5.3.1.12.2's, their factor of safety is 7. And if
2 you look at the factor of safety for the 5.4.8, the factor
3 of safety is 8. So the sizes may be different. I'm not a
4 mechanical engineer, so I can't tell you right off the top
5 of my head.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

7 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Kevin. Go ahead, Kevin.

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Yeah, I -- after looking at it a
10 little bit closer and tying it back to 5.3.1.12.2, there
11 actually -- it may -- it looks like the prior description
12 may be there.

13 That was not a change from the 2016 edition, but the
14 fact that we're referencing 2016 now instead of the WAC
15 requirements may have actually changed the minimum
16 diameter of the rope. So I think he may have a point that
17 it changed it.

18 So the question is: Do we want to -- do we like the
19 change or not?

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yes. So that's the question here.

21 So the justification is that in A17.1, the rope
22 diameter is now required to be 3/8ths in diameter. And
23 the proposal is to -- the proposal says "The minimum
24 diameter of hoist ropes or cables must be 1/4 inch
25 galvanized elevator wire rope and 3/16 inch aircraft

1 cable."

2 So that's what is one -- that's the proposal on the
3 table right now to be added in lieu of what it says in the
4 A17.1. Correct? That's what's on the proposal right now.
5 Any more comments?

6 MR. FRIESEN: I've got a comment. I'm concerned
7 about the quarter of galvanized elevator wire rope. I'm
8 not a wire rope expert by any means. I've never seen
9 galvanized elevator wire rope. I have worked on incline
10 platform lifts, and I know that you need galvanized rope
11 because they're outdoors and they're exposed to the
12 weather. But galvanized wire rope does not have anywhere
13 near the strength that elevator wire rope has. So by
14 putting that in there, my concern is that somebody that's
15 unfamiliar with the safety readings and all that might end
16 up putting wire rope on there that's not strong enough for
17 the job.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

19 Okay. So the motion on the table right now is to
20 pass this proposal to have the minimum diameter of the
21 hoist ropes be different than in the A17.1. Correct?

22 Okay. So all in favor of this proposal, raise your
23 hand. One.

24 All opposed?

25 MR. BRINKMAN: Nay.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Seven plus Kevin is eight.

2 Abstentions? Six.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: You need seven.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Huh? Am I missing one?

5 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Are we missing -- yeah.

6 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay, let's do this one more time.

7 Approved, all in favor please raise your hand. One.

8 Opposed?

9 MR. BRINKMAN: Nay. I'm opposed.

10 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Seven and Kevin is eight.

11 Abstentions? Seven.

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So it did not pass.

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Candace, would you tell me the count
14 please.

15 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Approved, one. Opposed, eight.
16 Abstained, seven.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So this did not pass.

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No, it did not.

19 CHAIRPERSON LAU: That's a statement, not a question.
20 It did not pass.

21 All right. Let's move on to the next one, 23117.

22 This is car top railings. It used to say "Car top
23 railings for traction elevators." It's now being changed
24 to just plain "Car top guard railings."

25 And it's -- so what it's doing is it's putting

1 traction and hydros together. It's not just for traction
2 cars anymore. Because there's no need to distinguish a
3 hydraulic elevator from a electric since the fall
4 potential from either car top is the same. And A17.3 does
5 not address car top guard railings for existing elevators.

6 So it's pretty much the same code I believe. It's
7 trying to mirror A17.1, but it's including hydros as
8 opposed to just for traction cars.

9 Any questions?

10 MS. GOULD: So it wouldn't affect hydros that haven't
11 been affected in the past.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Correct.

13 MS. GOULD: Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any questions? Comments? Charles.

15 MR. POTTS: Could someone tell me on the statement of
16 the problem where it says "... there is no reason guard
17 rails cannot be installed on existing elevators to the
18 same requirements as for new installations where
19 feasible." Who's to determine what "feasible" means?

20 And "Where site constraints impair that goal, this
21 proposal provides alternatives to compliance with the
22 prescriptive requirements of 2.14.1.7."

23 Could somebody tell me what those alternatives are?

24 MR. TURNER: So "where feasible" means when the car's
25 gone through it's overtravel, if it had a 40 inch rail and

1 it's -- (inaudible), that wouldn't be feasible. So
2 there's -- (inaudible).

3 So if there's an existing hoistway that the overrun
4 is not tall enough to install a 42 inch rail without it
5 striking the overrun, that would be a non-feasible
6 situation. And so the amendment here is allowing for a
7 slightly reduced railing height based upon existing
8 instruction conditions.

9 MR. POTTS: So the feasibility would be determined by
10 the potential clearance? I mean, -- (inaudible) -- make
11 your hoistway higher so it could be put in?

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Dotty.

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So Charles, what we're talking
14 about here are for existing structures. So structures
15 already in place.

16 So we don't want to say to a building owner "In order
17 to get these railings on top of your car to prevent fall
18 issues or fall hazards, you have an existing building, but
19 now you're going to have to extend that hoistway." That
20 doesn't make sense.

21 So instead we're saying where it is possible and the
22 overhead allows it and the overtravel allows it, then the
23 railings have to be put in to these requirements.

24 If the overhead does not allow it, we will allow for
25 alternative methods to garner the same factor of safety

1 for those working on top of the car.

2 MR. POTTS: And the alternatives are ...

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: The alternatives would be,
4 depending on, as Dylan said, maybe lowering the handrail.
5 And maybe there has to be signage up there even before you
6 get on -- before an individual gets on top of the car to
7 work on it.

8 What we're trying to prevent are not only fall
9 hazards, but we don't want to introduce something that now
10 is going to create a crushing hazard. So we're trying to
11 prevent those as well.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

13 Okay. Is there a motion?

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

16 MR. WILSON: Make that motion to amend.

17 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So there's no second on --

18 SECRETARY STANLASKE: He made a motion. You cannot
19 make a motion to amend on his motion.

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So is there a second on his motion?

21 MR. CLEMENT: I second the first.

22 CHAIRPERSON LAU: What was that?

23 MR. CLEMENT: I'll second Rich's proposal -- or
24 motion. Sorry.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. Any more discussion?

1 MR. WILSON: Can I make a motion to amend now?

2 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No. It has to be a vote on
3 the --

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: You can make a discussion.

5 MR. WILSON: So on the exemption they say they have
6 included special purpose personnel elevators. Special
7 purpose -- well, it's not really a such thing as a
8 personnel elevator. But SPE's in the 5.7 already have
9 requirements for hand rails. And some SPE's are located
10 on the outside of -- for instance, ship-to-shore cranes.
11 And they are -- they need to have the railings around
12 those. But that's already covered in 5.7.

13 So I just ask that we strike the reference on the
14 exemption.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan.

16 MS. GOULD: This is for existing retroactive.

17 MR. WILSON: Uh-huh.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So what you're saying, Mike, is
19 that the requirement doesn't apply to electric manlifts,
20 but it does apply to the special purpose personnel
21 elevators.

22 MR. WILSON: Correct.

23 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So the part that's in the
24 parentheses should be stricken. That's what your --

25 MR. WILSON: That's what my --

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: -- comment is.

2 MR. WILSON: Yeah, my comment. Or my concern.

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

4 MR. CLEARY: Here we have nomenclature again. What's
5 being crossed out is this requirement does not apply to
6 electric manlifts. And then the exemption on the new one
7 says this requirement does not apply to the electric
8 manlifts, i.e., special purpose -- SPE's. Here we go
9 again. Those -- the old electric manlifts that were
10 regulated by the WAC don't fall under 5.7. So there are a
11 lot of electric manlifts out there that aren't covered
12 under 5.7. Anything that's pre-1982. So we got two
13 different exemptions/changes from the old WAC to this new
14 proposal.

15 So I just want to make sure we're consistent. That's
16 all.

17 MR. RUNYAN: I got a question. How much distance is
18 there outside your elevator? Could you fall off the top
19 of a elevator car?

20 VARIOUS: Yes. Oh, yeah.

21 MR. MESSINA: It depends on the hoistway.

22 MS. GOULD: Anything over 12 inches from the outside
23 face of the car to the inside face -- (inaudible)

24 MR. RUNYAN: (Inaudible)

25 MS. GOULD: I think your four inches is from the

1 outside of the car to the inside car top so that you're
2 not -- (inaudible)

3 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Rob.

4 MR. McNEILL: I have a question. So this affects
5 hydraulic elevators which -- do we know what the
6 population is by any chance or any guess? What I'm really
7 trying to determine just to protect the State is if it's
8 over a certain dollar amount, do we have to have some type
9 of study here or something?

10 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So the answer is yes if we're
11 not adopting a national standard. But all we're doing
12 here is combining 118 that was for hydraulic with 117 that
13 was for traction. So because it was already in there,
14 no.

15 MR. McNEILL: Okay. Good. Yeah, I -- or this just
16 to be safer for the inspectors and the elevator mechanics
17 that are working on the top of the car.

18 CHAIRPERSON LAU: But it was in -- just a
19 clarification, though. It was in there, but it wasn't --
20 it was only in there for -- hydros was an enclosed
21 landing. So this will change that part of it.

22 Jan.

23 MS. GOULD: So it will affect a lot of hydros,
24 though. And it's not a consensus code, but you still
25 don't need to do a --

1 SECRETARY STANLASKE: We may have to.

2 MS. GOULD: Okay. We got a lot of them in the city;
3 I know that.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Scott.

5 MR. CLEARY: So under existing, this is not covered
6 in 17.1 at all?

7 SECRETARY STANLASKE: No.

8 CHAIRPERSON LAU: No.

9 SECRETARY STANLASKE: That's why it's --

10 MR. CLEARY: So it'll be caught under annual testing;
11 is that correct?

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

13 MR. CLEARY: And written up?

14 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Annual inspections.

16 Any other comments?

17 MR. FRIESEN: I'm not seeing in here anywhere where
18 it talks about your 12 inches of horizontal clearance. So
19 you're talking about a car top guard rail for any car
20 regardless of --

21 CHAIRPERSON LAU: If you go to 2.14.1.7 --

22 MS. GOULD: Which takes you to 2.10.

23 MR. FRIESEN: Oh, okay. I didn't look through the
24 reference. Okay, thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Any other comments?

1 Okay. So the motion on the floor right now is to
2 approve the new verbiage.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Approve it as proposed.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: As proposed.

5 All in favor, raise your hand.

6 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Jan, what are you doing? Nine and
8 Kevin makes ten.

9 All opposed? Three.

10 Abstentions? Three.

11 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So it passed as proposed.

12 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So this one passed as proposed.

13 Okay. The next one -- these are all retroactive
14 codes by the way. Anything that begins with a "23." This
15 is 23118.

16 This is similar to the one previous. This is to
17 strike the previous hydraulic elevator car top hands rail
18 code because we just --

19 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Inserted it into ...

20 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Yeah, put it in the one that we
21 just voted for.

22 So do we have a motion?

23 MR. METCALFE: I make a motion to move forward with
24 this proposal.

25 MR. MESSINA: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON LAU: So all in favor of striking this --
2 repealing this from the code, raise your hand.

3 MR. BRINKMAN: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Thirteen with Kevin.

5 All opposed?

6 Any abstentions? One.

7 Who's -- okay, so let's do this again. Did you guys
8 vote? I didn't -- let's do it again. We don't have
9 enough hands up.

10 So all in favor of striking this, repealing this code
11 as proposed, raise your hand. Fourteen, and Kevin was
12 fifteen.

13 MR. BRINKMAN: I was in favor.

14 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Okay. So that's fifteen.

15 Opposed?

16 Abstentions? One.

17 So this one passed.

18

19 Recap and Adjournment

20

21 SECRETARY STANLASKE: So I'm going to make a
22 suggestion that we break at 4:00 rather than 5:00. Will
23 that help people as far as commuting?

24 MR. CLEARY: 100 percent.

25 I'd recommend that we break now because all the rest

1 of them are the grain industry stuff. So we could start
2 fresh tomorrow.

3 SECRETARY STANLASKE: And then we'll continue on at
4 9:00 tomorrow morning. And hopefully we can get through
5 the rest of them.

6 MR. CLEARY: They're all grain industry stuff.

7 MR. BRINKMAN: Dotty?

8 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Yes, Kevin.

9 MR. BRINKMAN: I just wanted to check to see that
10 Webex and telephone will be available tomorrow and if it
11 will be the same number as today or will it be new
12 information.

13 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Jane, can you respond.

14 MS. NESBITT: It will be the same number. And we --
15 the room that we reserved does have a screen and hopefully
16 the right connectors for a laptop. Otherwise, I'll --
17 (inaudible) -- and put you on a table so you can see.

18 Did you receive that with all the proposals, Kevin?

19 MR. BRINKMAN: I did get the PDF. So if it's --
20 (inaudible).

21 MS. NESBITT: I'm sorry, Kevin, I did not hear you.

22 Can you repeat that?

23 MR. BRINKMAN: Yes. I did get the PDF that she sent.
24 So if the Webex would not work, I could use the PDF. The
25 main thing is that I have the phone so I could

1 communicate.

2 MS. NESBITT: Yes. Either way, we'll have you
3 connected.

4 MR. BRINKMAN: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. NESBITT: Thank you.

6 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

8 MR. CLEMENT: I make a motion that we adjourn.

9 CHAIRPERSON LAU: Second?

10 MR. METCALFE: Second.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll third.

12 SECRETARY STANLASKE: Thank you, everyone.

13 (Whereupon, at 3:50 p.m.,
14 proceedings adjourned.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

