

Elevator Code Adoption Committee
Thursday, July 17, 2008
Minutes

Members Present: Frank Dottl, Reliant Elevator
Ron Easley, Port of Portland
Frank Regalado, International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local #23
Bruce Soihl, Norris-Stevens
Scott Super, Thyssen Elevator

Members Absent: Rene Behrendt, Electrical and Elevator Board Member
Tom Faires, Otis Elevator
Warren Hartung, Kone Elevator

Guests Present: Jim Runyan, Elevator Consulting Services

Staff Present: Celina Patterson, state inspection services interim manager
Ron Crabtree, chief elevator inspector
Chris Huntington, policy and technical services interim manager
Matt Barber, policy analyst
Shauna Parker, rules coordinator
Dana Fischer, code para-technical specialist

Introductions

The committee and staff introduced themselves.

Overview of current process and procedures

Chris Huntington, policy and technical services interim manager, explained the code review process, including the committee's role in reviewing the national model codes for inclusion in the Oregon Elevator Specialty Code. He explained that most codes are adopted on a three-year cycle. A forty-five day window is open to the public to submit code change proposals, however no proposals were submitted for consideration for this model code. Once the forty-five day window closes, a committee is selected to help review the current model code and what has been revised, added, or deleted. This review process helps ensure Building Codes Division (BCD) and the industry is comfortable with adopting the elevator standards in the state of Oregon.

The committee's goal is to work through the proposed provisions and make recommendations to the Electrical and Elevator and Board. The board will then have an opportunity to look at the recommendations and make any necessary changes. Once the board has finished its review, BCD will look at the recommendations and make a decision to either agree to, or disagree with, the changes.

Interim Manager Huntington further explained that the matrix provided to the committee outlines each standard and its new sections. He asked the committee to consider the possible impact to businesses and public safety, when making a decision on whether to adopt the standards, as well as any added cost or regulation imposed by the standards. He explained that a committee member will need to make a motion concerning the adoption of the code once the committee has finished its review. The motion process was explained to the committee.

Review Oregon amendments to ASME A17.1

Table 1: ASME A90.1-2003 (Revision of ASME A90.1-1997), Safety Standard for Belt Manlifts

1.5 standard uses SI (metric) units as well as customary units

The committee discussed section 1.5, in which the metric system was added as a measuring option. Both the customary units and metric units of measurement can now be used.

5.5.9 high contrast color requirement for step or step surfaces

Ron Crabtree, chief elevator inspector, stated section 5.5.9 refers to new safety requirements requiring moving walkway steps to be painted with a bright yellow strip of paint. The bright yellow helps the public see where to step safely on to or off of the moving walkway.

A motion was made by Bruce Soihl, Norris-Stevens, recommending that the Oregon Electrical and Elevator Board approve the Safety Standard for Belt Manlifts, ASME A90.1-2003, for adoption as part of the 2008 Oregon Elevator Specialty Code, with the finding that the added cost, if any, is necessary to the health and safety of the public or necessary to conserve resources.

Motion carried unanimously.

Table 2: ASME A18.1-2005 (Revision of ASME A18.1-2003), Safety Standard for Platform Lifts and Stairway Chairlifts

2.8.8 platform safeties not required for lifts with certain driving means

The committee discussed section 2.8.8, noting that the new standard will require a safety valve for the screw drive nut on platform lifts. They discussed the possible costs and limitations on the availability of valve products since the product is on recall. They noted that if devices aren't available that meet this new code, there could be a significant impact on building owners and their ability to meet ADA requirements. Such circumstances could create setbacks for architects who are designing a project, including having to wait for a product to be manufactured.

The committee agreed that ensuring continued safety of mobility-impaired people is very important and asked for clarification on this requirement as to whether existing units require installation of the safety valve or if this only applies to new units being built?

Chief Crabtree explained the safety valve would only be required on new units being built.

Celina Patterson, state inspection services interim manager, explained that a person or organization could submit the proper paperwork for a new product to be used as a statewide alternate method, and if approved, the product could be used until manufacturers can make and offer a new one that meets the new code requirements.

Other concerns discussed by the committee included the issue of changes in ownership and dropped service contracts resulting in units potentially missing their three-year inspection cycle. The committee agreed that when regularly scheduled maintenance is skipped, the end result is that valve parts break. The committee requested clarification on the change to this section in order to make sure its definition is clearly understood.

Interim Manager Patterson explained that the committee should make a decision today to amend, adopt, or not adopt section 2.8.8. Asking for clarification from the national code committee would hold up the code adoption process. The committee could pursue an answer and then bring that to the board if they wished to make changes based upon the new information.

3.6.10 certain lifts shall have a folding seat and seatbelt

Mr. Sohr asked whether the new requirement in section 3.6.10 of a chair on the lift means the lift area would need to be larger.

Chief Crabtree explained that the lift area does not need to be larger because to meet this code requirement, the seat can fold down.

Interim Manager Patterson proposed that instead of making a motion on this standard right now, that the committee move forward to Table 4 and Table 3, and then return to Table 2 at the end of the meeting to allow for further discussion on section 2.8.8.

Table 4: ASME A17.2-2007 (Revision of A17.2-2004), Guide for Inspection of Elevators, Escalators and Moving Walks

1.17.3.2 hydraulic elevators

Jim Runyan, Elevator Consulting Services, clarified that section 1.17.3.2 relates to the requirement in 1.17.3.1.b, where freight or passenger elevator load capacity is tested using 125% of the rated load for passenger elevators. Now section 1.17.3.2 allows load capacity tests on hydraulic elevators, using 100% of the rated passenger elevator load.

9.3.2 periodic testing of moving walks

Chief Crabtree explained that section 9.3.2, requires a person or firm maintaining the equipment to provide a written checkout procedure and demonstrate that the handrail speed does not change when a retarding force is applied opposite to the direction of travel for moving walks installed under A17.1-2000 and later editions. He explained that section 10.16 has been added which describes different testing techniques for speed and force.

A motion was made by Frank Dottl, Reliant Elevator, recommending that the Oregon Electrical and Elevator Board approve the Guide for Inspection of Elevators, Escalators and Moving Walks, ASME A17.2-2007, for adoption as part of the 2008 Oregon Elevator Specialty Code, with the finding that the added cost, if any, is necessary to the health and safety of the public or necessary to conserve resources.

Motion carried unanimously.

Table 3: ASME A17.1-2007 (Revision of ASME A17.1-2004 and CSA B44-04), Safety Code for Elevators and Escalators

2.2.2.5 inclusion of drain or sump pumps in certain elevators

The committee discussed section 2.2.2.5, which states that in elevators with firefighters' emergency operation, a drain or sump pump shall be provided. The sump pump or drain shall have the capacity to remove a minimum of 3,000 gallons per elevator.

Chief Crabtree clarified that the dimensions on elevator units would not need to change.

2.7.5.2.1 mechanical device requirements

Chief Crabtree explained the changes in section 2.7.5.2.1, which states a mechanical device, shall be provided to stop vertical car movement. This creates a clearance space beneath the car. Also, it is now required to post a sign in the work area stating the requirements of ANSI Z535.2 or CAN/CSA-Z321, referring inspectors to follow the manufacturers instructions before inspecting mechanical devices.

3.18.6 marking of hydraulic jack

Chief Crabtree explained the new requirements in section 3.18.6 that requires the exposed portion of each hydraulic jack after installation to be plainly marked in a permanent manner with the name or trademark of manufacturer, model, and year manufactured.

The committee agreed that this is a good requirement.

Scott Super, Thyssen Elevator, asked if these requirements would be completed at the time a unit is manufactured.

Chief Crabtree said yes, confirming that the new units should be marked with a tag or stamp.

Mr. Soihl asked why the committee is not discussing section 5.9 relating to mine elevators and asked why the section cannot be deleted?

Interim Manager Patterson explained that the mine elevator section does not apply to the state of Oregon, and it is best to leave the statutory reference out of the standard.

8.6.1.2.1(1)(f) and (2)(e) requirement for written maintenance control program

Chief Crabtree explained section 8.6.1.2.1(1)(f) and (2)(e) relating to the new requirements which include written records of scheduled examinations, maintenance, and tests of equipment, based on the age, condition, usage, and manufacturer's recommendations. He explained that a record of maintenance checks must be kept in a central location. These requirements help to keep equipment in compliance.

Mr. Dottl voiced concerns about the specific requirements on the maintenance log in Oregon he also asked if the log will be used as the permanent record, showing the frequency of visits.

8.6.1.2 general maintenance requirements

Mr. Runyan explained the general maintenance requirements in section 8.6.1.2 stating that this section is not a new section, as it was adopted by Oregon in 2000. He clarified that the part of this section that is new is subsection (f), where unique or product-specific procedures or methods are required to inspect or test equipment.

The committee continued to discuss the maintenance log and what should be included in it. Currently, the frequency of maintenance visits is not tracked. It was suggested that a tag be placed on the controller unit, which includes space for written documentation of when inspectors complete inspections. Another suggestion was that a maintenance log be placed on the machine room door, which would be more accessible for inspectors.

The committee did not discuss items #59-87 in Table 3 because they only apply in Canada.

8.10.2.2.2 requirements for machine and control rooms and spaces

Chief Crabtree discussed section 8.10.2.2.2, which defines a machine room as: "machinery space outside the hoistway containing an electric driving machine and a motor controller."

Mr. Dottl voiced a safety concern about the manual break, explaining that although machine room areas usually have a door that closes off the room, most doors are not kept locked and anyone could go into the area and release the break.

The committee agreed the public should not have access to the machine rooms.

Mr. Soihr asked for clarification on modernization installations, stating his concern in regards to historic buildings and the size limitations within those buildings when a firewall needs to be installed.

Interim Manager Patterson clarified that the scoping language at the beginning of the standard states that the requirements apply to new and existing installations only.

A motion was made by Frank Regalado, International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local #23 recommending that the Oregon Electrical and Elevator Board approve ASME A17.1-2007 (revision of ASME A17.1-2004 and CSA B44-04) Safety Code for Elevators and Escalators, for adoption as part of the 2008 Oregon Elevator Specialty Code, with the finding that the added cost, if any, is necessary to the health and safety of the public or necessary to conserve resources.

Motion carried unanimously.

Interim Manager Patterson referred the committee back to Table 2, section 2.8.8 for its final review and consideration. She explained that safety devices are required and the additions to this section are new exemptions, which means there are more items a contractor can use without a safety device.

Ron Easley, Port of Portland, voiced his concern that a lack of product availability could force construction projects to stop. This is a concern because construction may continue without proper permits being purchased.

Interim Manager Patterson explained that this is not a new requirement, only the exemption is new, so it should not effect the manufacturers who have already made a product. The exemption expands the use of new products.

Interim Manager Huntington agreed that this requirement does not hinder new construction.

A motion was made by Mr. Regalado, recommending that the Oregon Electrical and Elevator Board approve ASME A18.1-2005 (Revision of ASME A18.1-2003) Safety Standard for Platform Lifts and Stairway Chairlifts, for adoption as part of the 2008 Oregon Elevator Specialty Code, with the finding that the added cost, if any, is necessary to the health and safety of the public or necessary to conserve resources.

Motion carried unanimously.

Interim Manager Huntington explained that the recommendations approved by the committee today will be given to the board to review and approve at its next meeting. The code will then go through a public comment period in connection with the rulemaking process.

Adjourn

The committee meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.