



Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

Department of Consumer and Business Services

Building Codes Division

1535 Edgewater Street NW

PO Box 14470

Salem, OR 97309-0404

(503) 378-4133

FAX (503) 378-2322

bcd.oregon.gov

Elevator Code Adoption Committee

Thursday, August 14, 2008

Minutes

Members Present: Ron Easley, Port of Portland
Tom Faires, Otis Elevator
Warren Hartung, Elevator (via phone)
Frank Regalado, International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local
#23 Bruce Sohr, Norris-Stevens
Scott Super, Thyssen Elevator

Members Absent: Rene Behrendt, Electrical and Elevator Board
Member
Frank Dottl, Reliant Elevator

Guests Present: Mark Flagg, self
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

Celina Patterson, state inspection services interim manager explained that the committee will be reviewing the Oregon Amendments to the national model code ASME A17.1 (*Oregon amendments*). She further explained that the division's goal in the adoption of this code is to align the Oregon amendments with national model code language as much as possible. Chief Elevator Inspector, Ron Crabtree has reviewed the Oregon amendments and noted which sections are

additions, revisions, or deletions to the existing code. Interim Manager Patterson explained that the committee will review the recommended changes and make a motion at the end of the meeting to either adopt, or not adopt, the changes to the Oregon amendments.

Review of Oregon amendments to ASME A17.1

Electric Elevators

2.2 pits

2.2.5.4 access to pit equipment

The committee discussed concerns about deleting this section, explaining that incandescent light bulbs tend to burn out more quickly and have caused illumination issues in the past.

The committee determined that this section is covered in the national elevator code, so an Oregon amendment is not needed. They noted that it is an inspector's responsibility to address low illumination issues during their regular inspection.

The committee agreed with the proposal that the language is not necessary and can be deleted.

2.2.5.4 Lighting Fixtures

The committee discussed their concern that by deleting this section there may be a lack of training provided to inspectors, contractors, and electricians.

The committee determined that training could be provided. For consistency, lighting measurements should be done following a consistent process, and training should focus on how and where instruments should be placed when lighting is measured.

2.7 Machine Rooms and Machinery Spaces

2.7.3.3 means of access

The committee discussed background on this section and the original intent of the language relating to stairwell access.

Jim Runyan, Elevator Consulting Services, provided historical knowledge explaining that Oregon Occupational Safety and Health Division (OR-OSHA) has regulations pertaining to access in stairwells and that the language in this section was added to supercede model code to better align the code with existing state requirements regulated by OR-OSHA.

Interim Manager Patterson stated Building Codes Division (BCD) usually does not adopt another agency's regulations, but that when another agency's requirements supercede model code, the division tries to communicate those requirements to industry.

The committee agreed that deleting the language could create a safety hazard in the future. It was suggested that an *appendix A* be developed to use as a reference, which would help maintain compliance with OR-OSHA regulations. The appendix could be posted on the BCD Web site and include a link which takes the user to OR-OSHA's rules. The appendix could also be updated automatically as OR-OSHA's rules change because it links directly to OR-OSHA's web site.

2.8 Equipment in Hoistways and Machine Rooms

2.8.1.4.2 machine room lighting panels

Mr. Runyan provided background information on the original intent of this section explaining that there was a need to clarify the issue of the types of electrical wiring that is allowed to be distributed through a machine room. He further explained that typically, all wiring going into an elevator machine room or space such as sprinkler or conduit lines, must terminate in that space.

The committee agreed with the proposal that the language is not necessary and can be deleted.

2.14 Car Enclosures, Car Doors and Gates, and Car Illumination

2.14.2.7 car interior handrails

The committee discussed concerns about deleting this section because model code does not address this section the same way as the Oregon amendments do. They discussed the fact that handrails were originally installed in elevator cars to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

The committee decided that the language is necessary and should not be deleted.

2.14.7.1.4 illumination of cars and lighting fixtures

Tom Faires, Otis Elevator, stated that a single light would not meet the minimum code requirements with this code amendment.

Ron Easley, Port of Portland, stated there is a safety issue when inspectors do not have enough illumination on a job site.

The committee recommended that in order to address the safety issue of too little illumination on a job site, the language in the second sentence of this section which states, "*Where pendant style work lights are provided, an additional stationary light fixture shall be provided*" should be kept. The committee agreed that the rest of this section should be deleted because the language is already addressed in model code.

2.20.11 Other Suspension Means

The committee discussed their concerns about aramid fiber being used for suspension means. They feel that because the technology is new, some engineers may not be as familiar with the requirements when reviewing structures using aramid fiber suspension.

Mr. Easley stated a concern he has about reported cases in other states where aramid fiber has heated to a high temperature causing it to break.

Mr. Runyan stated that aramid fiber as a suspension means will be addressed when the standard A17.6 is published. Until then, using aramid fiber could put the public at risk.

The committee agreed aramid fibers should be removed from the language in this section until it is specifically addressed in a new standard.

The committee also agreed the title of the section should be changed to "*Suspension,*" and the first sentence should read, "*The suspension means not covered in ASME A1 7.1 shall be approved by the*

authority having jurisdiction.” The committee noted that these changes allow the use of suspension, but refers the user back to ASME 17.1 for specific guidelines.

5.11 Correction Facility Elevators

5.11.1 scope

Mr. Runyan explained that the intent of this section is to clarify elevators installed at correctional facilities. This section was established to provide specific requirements for controls to elevators when prisoners are being transported, helping to ensure the safety of correction facility staff.

Interim Manger Patterson stated that removing the language in this section gives the rule flexibility; leaving the language in gives the rule consistency. She suggested that since the safety of correctional facility staff is very important, this section should not be changed.

The committee decided that the language is necessary and should not be deleted. The committee also decided the language in *5.11.5 Emergency Doors*, should not be deleted from the Oregon amendments.

8.6 Maintenance, Repair, and Replacement

8.6.1.2.3 general maintenance requirements

Mr. Runyan stated that the original intent of this section was to give industry procedures for measuring the maintenance of pits and machinery areas. He explained that the code requires pit and machinery areas for areas to be clean and free of debris, however code does not describe how to meet this requirement.

The committee agreed that the language in sections 8.6.1.2.3, 8.6.1.6.2, 8.6.1.6.3, and 8.6.5.5 should not be deleted from the Oregon amendments because these sections provide consistency for inspectors during the inspection process.

8.10 Acceptance Inspections and Tests

8.10.1.1.3 persons authorized to make acceptance inspections and tests

The committee discussed the need for inspectors to be Quality Acceptance Inspection (QAI) certified. They agreed that model code does not need to specifically address inspector certification because it is addressed in Oregon statutes. A suggestion was made that because inspector certification is addressed in statute this section should be removed from both the Oregon amendments, and model code.

The committee agreed the language in this section should be deleted from the Oregon amendments.

8.11 Periodic Inspections and Tests

8.11.1.1 persons authorized to make periodic inspections and tests

Frank Regalado, International Union of elevator Constructors stated *8.11.1.1* should not be deleted from the Oregon amendments because he feels licensing does not fully address elevator testing issues and it restricts elevator personnel.

Mr. Runyan stated *8.11.1.1* refers to persons authorized to conduct periodic inspections. He explained that the language needs to be revised because it refers to inspectors, rather than elevator personnel who are working on the equipment or performing tests.

Interim Manager Patterson reviewed the committee's decision on section 8.11.1.1, stating that the committee has agreed the language in section 8.11.1.1 should be deleted, and that the language in

section 8.11.1.2 should remain the same and should include a reference about the requirements for inspector licensing and certification.

8.11.1.1.2 periodic tests

The committee discussed the fact that model code states "periodic tests shall be witnessed by the authority having jurisdiction or by persons authorized by the authority having jurisdiction", however an Oregon amendment supercedes this section of code, and states elevator personnel may choose to have tests witnessed. The committee discussed whether this language should be left in as reinforcement.

Interim Manager Huntington stated that as a general rule, the division's tries to keep licensing requirements out of code because statutes dictate licensing requirements.

Interim Manager Patterson summarized the changes to the Oregon amendments that the committee agreed to:

- **2.7.3.3**, adds a reference to OR-OSHA's requirements for industrial sites and creates an appendix listing OR-OSHA's requirements
- **2.14.7.1.4**, deletes provision except for the sentence that reads "*Where pendant style work lights are provided, an additional stationary light fixture shall be provided*"
- **2.20.11**, title will be changed to "*Suspension*," and the first sentence shall read "*The suspension means not covered in ASME A1 7.1 shall be approved by the authority having jurisdiction, providing they comply with the following requirements...*"
- **5.11.1**, retain language
- **5.11.5**, retain all provisions
- **8.6.1 through 8.6.5.5**, retain all maintenance requirements
- **8.10.1.1.3 and 8.11.1.1**, delete section and add language to specify model code provisions that explain inspector licensing and certification requirements in sections 8.10 and 8.11
- **8.11.1.1.2**, retain all provisions

A motion was made by Tom Faires, Otis Elevator, for the committee to adopt the 2007 edition of ASME 17.1 as amended by the proposed 2008 Oregon amendments, 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.

Adjourn

The committee meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.