



---

**CONVEYANCE SAFETY CODE COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Room 121C, 1400 East Washington Avenue, Madison**  
**Contact: Helen Leong (608) 266-2112**  
**January 17, 2018**

**9:00 A.M.**

*The following agenda describes the issues that the Council plans to consider at the meeting. At the time of the meeting, items may be removed from the agenda. Please consult the meeting minutes for a record of the actions of the Council.*

**AGENDA**

**OPEN SESSION – CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL**

**A. Adoption of Agenda (1)**

**B. Approval of Minutes of December 11, 2017 (2-3)**

**C. Administrative Matters (4)**

1. Election of Chair
2. Council Meeting Date Scheduling

**D. Legislative and Administrative Rule Matters - Discussion and Consideration (5-38)**

1. Review and Discussion of Proposed Changes and Recommendations to the Conveyance Safety Code, SPS 305 and SPS 318

**E. Public Comments**

**F. Adjournment**

\*\*\*\*\*

MEETINGS AND HEARINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, AND MAY BE CANCELLED WITHOUT NOTICE. Times listed for meeting items are approximate and depend on the length of discussion and voting. All meetings are held at 1400 East Washington Avenue, Madison, Wisconsin, unless otherwise noted. In order to confirm a meeting or to request a complete copy of the board's agenda, please call the listed contact person. The board may also consider materials or items filed after the transmission of this notice. Times listed for the commencement of disciplinary hearings may be changed by the examiner for the convenience of the parties. Interpreters for the hearing impaired provided upon request by contacting the Affirmative Action Officer, 608-266-2112.

**CONVEYANCE SAFETY CODE COUNCIL  
TELECONFERENCE/VIRTUAL MEETING MINUTES  
December 11, 2017**

**PRESENT:** Scot Bromann (*arrived at 10:24 a.m.*), Steven Ketelboeter, Keith Misustin, Ronald Mueller, Brian Rausch, Paul Rosenberg, Kenneth Smith

**EXCUSED:** Jennie Macaluso

**STAFF:** Robin Zenter, Section Chief; Helen Leong, Administrative Rules Coordinator; Laura Smith, Bureau Assistant

Paul Rosenberg, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum of six (6) members was confirmed.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

- *Amendment: Add Below Item D, 'Update on progress with the Standard Review'*

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steven Ketelboeter, to adopt the agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3, 2017**

- *Amendments:*
  - *page 3, sixth motion from bottom, remove extra '18'*

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Mueller, to approve the minutes of November 3, 2017 as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

**Review and Discussion of Proposed Changes and Recommendations to the Conveyance Safety Code, SPS 305 and SPS 318**

*(Scot Bromann arrived at 10:24 a.m.)*

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Keith Misustin, to require residential and commercial elevators installed in single-family dwellings to meet the minimum of 4-hours requirement for emergency signaling devices. (Item 20) Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steve Ketelboeter, to adopt the amended language relating to SPS 318.1705(3)(am) to allow replacement of a previously approved residential elevator with another in the existing hoistway. (Item 25) Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Steven Ketelboeter moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to adopt the proposed language as given in the table for Item 27. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Paul Rosenberg moved, seconded by Kenneth Smith, to adopt the proposed language as given in the table for Item 29. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Keith Misustin, to table discussion of Item 32 until language can be proposed. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steve Ketelboeter, to table discussion of Item 33 relating to rated versus actual speed, and to request that the Department prepare language. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Paul Rosenberg, to dismiss Item 34. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Paul Rosenberg, to dismiss Item 35. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Keith Misustin, to request that the Department prepare language creating 318.1708(2)(b)4.b. (Item 36) Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Keith Misustin, to table discussion on Item 37. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Paul Rosenberg, to dismiss Item 38. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steve Ketelboeter, to dismiss Item 39. Motion carried unanimously.

*(Robin Zenter left the meeting at 2:21 p.m.)*

**MOTION:** Steve Ketelboeter moved, seconded by Kenneth Smith, to dismiss Item 40. Motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION:** Steve Ketelboeter moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to table Item 41. Motion carried unanimously.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steve Ketelboeter, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

**State of Wisconsin  
Department of Safety & Professional Services**

**AGENDA REQUEST FORM**

<b>1) Name and Title of Person Submitting the Request:</b>  Laura Smith, Bureau Assistant, on behalf of Brittany Lewin, Division Administrator		<b>2) Date When Request Submitted:</b> 1/10/2018  Items will be considered late if submitted after 12:00 p.m. on the deadline date which is 8 business days before the meeting	
<b>3) Name of Board, Committee, Council, Sections:</b> Conveyance Safety Code Council			
<b>4) Meeting Date:</b>  1/17/2018	<b>5) Attachments:</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<b>6) How should the item be titled on the agenda page?</b>  Administrative Matters/Updates 1) Election of Chair	
<b>7) Place Item in:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open Session <input type="checkbox"/> Closed Session	<b>8) Is an appearance before the Board being scheduled?</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<b>9) Name of Case Advisor(s), if required:</b>  N/A	
<b>10) Describe the issue and action that should be addressed:</b>  <p style="text-align: center;">The Board should elect a Chair for 2018</p>			
<b>11) Authorization</b>			
<i>Laura Smith</i>		1/10/2018	
Signature of person making this request		Date	
Supervisor (if required)		Date	
Executive Director signature (indicates approval to add post agenda deadline item to agenda)    Date			
<b>Directions for including supporting documents:</b> 1. This form should be attached to any documents submitted to the agenda. 2. Post Agenda Deadline items must be authorized by a Supervisor and the Policy Development Executive Director. 3. If necessary, provide original documents needing Board Chairperson signature to the Bureau Assistant prior to the start of a meeting.			

**State of Wisconsin  
Department of Safety & Professional Services**

**AGENDA REQUEST FORM**

<b>1) Name and Title of Person Submitting the Request:</b>  Helen Leong, Administrative Rules Coordinator		<b>2) Date When Request Submitted:</b>  January 8, 2018 <small>Items will be considered late if submitted after 12:00 p.m. on the deadline date which is 8 business days before the meeting</small>	
<b>3) Name of Board, Committee, Council, Sections:</b>  Conveyance Safety Code Council			
<b>4) Meeting Date:</b>  January 17, 2018	<b>5) Attachments:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>6) How should the item be titled on the agenda page?</b>  Review and Discussion of Proposed Changes and Recommendations to the Conveyance Safety Code, SPS 305 and SPS 318	
<b>7) Place Item in:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open Session <input type="checkbox"/> Closed Session	<b>8) Is an appearance before the Board being scheduled?</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes ( <a href="#">Fill out Board Appearance Request</a> ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<b>9) Name of Case Advisor(s), if required:</b>	
<b>10) Describe the issue and action that should be addressed:</b>			
<b>11) Authorization</b>			
Signature of person making this request		Date	
Helen Leong		January 8, 2018	
Supervisor (if required)		Date	
Executive Director signature (indicates approval to add post agenda deadline item to agenda)    Date			
<b>Directions for including supporting documents:</b> 1. This form should be attached to any documents submitted to the agenda. 2. Post Agenda Deadline items must be authorized by a Supervisor and the Policy Development Executive Director. 3. If necessary, provide original documents needing Board Chairperson signature to the Bureau Assistant prior to the start of a meeting.			

**Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services  
 Conveyance Safety Code Council  
 Administrative Rule Recommendations SPS 305 & 318**

Items in **GREEN** were discussed and either 1) tabled, or 2) no decision finalized. We will return to items that are highlighted in GREEN. “Proposed language pending” means that there is no recommended language to consider.

Items in **ORANGE** were dismissed after discussion and consideration. These items are recommended by the Council to not be included in the Code update.

Items in **PINK** were adopted by the Council – a draft of proposed amendments are included in the spreadsheet in red. The Council needs to review the specific proposed amendments highlighted in PINK. “Proposed language pending” means that there is no recommended language to consider.

Item in **YELLOW** is where the Council ended discussion during the previous meeting.

SPS 318						
NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
1.	SPS 318.1003 (1) (d) Application	Building code exempts agricultural buildings but the elevator code is not clear on this issue	DIS	<p>“(d) This chapter does not apply to any conveyances for any of the following buildings or structures:</p> <p><b>1. a.</b> Buildings or structures located on Indian reservation land that are held either in trust by the United States, or in fee by the tribe or a tribal member.</p> <p><b>b.</b> Buildings or structures which are located on off-reservation Indian land that is held in trust by the United States – and which are held either in trust by the United States, or in fee by the tribe or a tribal member.</p> <p><b>2.</b> Buildings and portions of buildings that are federally owned or exempted by federal statutes, regulations, or treaties.</p> <p><b>3.</b> Portions of buildings leased to the federal government provided all of the following conditions are met:</p>	None	Add allowances for Ag. buildings to be exempt similar to exemption in commercial building code.

**SPS 318**

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				<p>a. A statement is recorded with the register of deeds that describes the steps necessary for compliance to this chapter if the space is converted to a nonexempt use.</p> <p>b. The statement recorded with the register of deeds is recorded in a manner that will permit the existence of the statement to be determined by reference to the property where the building is located.</p> <p>c. The owner of the building submits a copy of the recorded document to the department or its authorized representative.”</p> <p><b>Commercial Building Code still pending approval. Recommend postponing discussion until it is further in the process.</b></p>		
2.	SPS 318.1004 Definitions	Correct definition of “hoistway” to allow it to end at the underside of a ceiling of proper construction as required by the building code.	DIS	<p>Definition of "Hoistway"?</p> <p><b>Problem:</b> Does not address conditions where there is a ceiling between the elevator shaft and the roof. The current definition may cause unintended restriction of the use of space between a hoistway ceiling and roof above if considered in the hoistway.</p> <p><b>Hoistway, suggested definition 1:</b>  <b>hoistway (shaft), elevator, dumbwaiter, or material lift:</b> an opening through a building or structure for the travel of elevators, dumbwaiters, or material lifts, extending from the pit floor to a ceiling above where there is a ceiling, or to the underside of the roof above where there is no ceiling.</p> <p>Or accept the dictionary definition of a ceiling as the surface at the underside of the top of the space no matter whether it is a typical ceiling assembly, the underside of a roof or the</p>	None	Allow the hoistway to be defined as a smaller volume of space, thereby not limiting the use of space that may exist between a proper hoistway ceiling and the building roof above it.

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				underside of a penthouse machine room floor. Suggested definition 2: <b>hoistway (shaft), elevator, dumbwaiter, or material lift:</b> an opening through a building or structure for the travel of elevators, dumbwaiters, or material lifts, extending from the pit floor to a ceiling above.		
3.	SPS 318.1004 Definitions	Definitions in the adopted ASME A17.1 for up and down speeds are confusing and incomplete. For example, "Rated speed" for an elevator is in the Up direction with rated load only. Speed in the Down direction for a traction elevator is not defined. It is not "operating speed" because that is only for hydraulics elevators.	DIS	Define traction elevator Down speed. Define hydraulic elevator Down speed with a word clearer than "operating speed". Consider defining "rated up/down speeds" and "actual up/down speeds", eliminate use of "operating" and "set" terminology.  <b>Working on language to propose to the Council. Recommend postponing discussion until we have prepared some language.</b>	None	Reduce confusion and improve clarity for application of codes regarding testing and inspecting, and where an alteration changes a speed by more than 5%.
4.	SPS 318.1005 Adoption of standards by	Code has required regulation of stage and orchestra elevators, applying parts of A17.1 that	DIS	Locate and adopt a national standard for the design and inspection of stage and orchestra elevators. Recommend ANSI E1-42: Entertainment Technology – Design, Installation, and Use of Orchestra Pit Lifts, <i>approved August 5, 2016.</i>	Unknown	Allow industry to meet a common standard. Will save DSPS time in product and plan review.



**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	reference, SPS 318.1700 (1) (b) Penalties	may apply, however very little translates.		<p><b>Task Group: Paul Rosenberg and Adam Smith will review the standard in detail and make a recommendation consideration by the Council.</b></p> <p><b>Per Adam Smith: Will need to incorporate some Wisconsinisms, but will likely recommend adopting the standard. Plan to number SPS 318.42--12.11.2017 Update.</b></p>		Make product design more uniform for the manufacturer and product review more efficient for them and DSPS.
5.	Table SPS 318.1007-1, Item 5	Permit and immediate inspection are not required when replacing components of driving machine brakes	Tim Motel	This contractor has seen brake components that were not properly tightened and brake linings that were not properly worn-in to safely hold the car prior to being turned over to the owner for use, creating a dangerous situation.	\$400 per elevator per occurrence	Require permit and immediate when replacing components of driving machine brakes.  <b>Dismissed 11.03.17</b>
6.	Table SPS 318.1007-1, Plan review and approval. Elevators	Alteration to a door operator (not like for like replacement) should require permit and inspection of door timing and closing force.	DIS	<p>Add alteration to door operator to the tables for plan review and inspection.</p> <p>New Item 11, renumber the remainder accordingly</p>	\$520 - \$600 per occurrence except no cost when part of a larger project	Assure door timing and closing force are inspected before waiting for the next annual inspection. <b>Dismissed 11.03.17</b>
7.	Table SPS 318.1007-1, Plan review	Code is unclear regarding the word "change" here. Does it include	DIS	Alteration Table 1 change Item 14 to "Change of or repair to Safety Device"	\$520 - \$600 per occurrence	Assure alterations to safety devices are to code and are inspected

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	and approval. Elevators, Item 14	replacement only or also an alteration?		<p>Anytime the table 1 is altered (or anything reflecting what requires plan/permit review), the part of the code describing plans will need to also be updated</p> <p>SPS 318.1007 Plan review and approval. (3) <u>SCOPE OF ALTERATIONS, REPAIRS, AND REPLACEMENTS.</u></p> <p><b>(a)</b> For proposed alterations, <u>repairs, and or</u> replacements listed in Table SPS 318.1007-1 Items 1. to 4. and Tables SPS 318.1007-2, 318.1007-3, and 318.1007-4, all of the following shall be submitted with the request for approval:</p>	none except no cost when part of a larger project	before waiting for the next annual inspection.

**For the purposes of Council review, the following proposed table includes edits without red text. The table listed below has not been adopted by the Council, but is a working draft to be considered for the January 11, 2018 meeting:**

**Table SPS 318.1007-1  
Elevators**

Item	Scope of Work
1.	Alteration or replacement of hoistway enclosure walls, pit, or ceiling; or to number or location of landings served
2.	Alteration to machine-room, machinery-space, control-room, or control-space walls, floor, ceiling, or entrance; or to location of machinery
3.	Alteration of passenger elevator to freight type, or freight to passenger type
4.	Alteration of loading class for a freight elevator
5.	Alteration of traction driving machine, motor, sheave, driving machine brake or emergency brake
5m.	Replacement of entire driving machine, driving machine brake or emergency brake
6.	Installation of a fire sprinkler in a machine room, machinery space, control room, control space, or top of hoistway
7.	Increase in loading of more than 5% to machinery, beams, supports, or foundations

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		8.		Alteration of hoistway door or gate		
		9.		Alteration of hoistway-door interlock or combination mechanical lock and contacts		
		10.		Alteration of a solely contact type to another type of reopening device on an elevator with firefighters' emergency operation		
		11.		Increase or decrease of more than 5% of the total load of car deadweight plus rated load		
		12.		Increase or decrease in rated load		
		13.		Increase or decrease in speed of more than 5%		
		14.		Alteration or replacement of safety device		
		15.		Alteration or replacement of overspeed governor		
		16.		Addition of an emergency brake or device protecting against unintended movement or ascending car overspeed		
		17.		Alteration to suspension material, grade, number or size as defined in 8.7.2.21 and 8.7.3.25		
		18.		Increase in stresses of more than 5% to guidrails, supports, and fastenings		
		19.		Alteration to type or location of car or counterweight buffer or bumper		
		20.		Alteration to type of terminal stopping device		
		21.		Alteration to or addition of a top-of-car operating device		
		22.		Replacement of controller		
		23.		Alteration to type of motion control		
		24.		Alteration to type of operation control		
		26.		Addition of emergency or standby power system		
		27.		Alteration to or addition of firefighters' emergency operation system		
		28.		Alteration to or addition of auxiliary power supply raising or lowering operation		
		29.		Replacement or addition of a plunger gripper		
		30.		Replacement of a complete hydraulic pumping unit including motor, pump, and tank		
		31.		Alteration or replacement of hydraulic control valve		
		32.		Alteration or replacement of hydraulic plunger or cylinder		

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
----	----------------	-------------------------	-------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

33.	Increase in hydraulic working pressure of more than 5%
-----	--

**Table SPS 318.1007-2  
Escalators and Moving Walks**

Item	Scope of Work
1.	Alteration or repair of truss
2.	Alteration to-rated speed or installation of speed varying system
3.	Installation or addition of skirt brushes
4.	Alterations to safety component or safety switch as defined in 6.1.6.3 and 6.2.6.3 'Electrical protective devices'

**Table SPS 318.1007-3  
Dumbwaiters and Type B Material Lifts**

Item	Scope of Work
1.	Increase or decrease in rated load
2.	Increase or decrease in speed of more than 5%
3.	Alteration to car size

**Table SPS 318.1007-4  
Platform Lifts**

Item	Scope of Work
1.	Alteration to or replacement of overspeed or slack suspension safety device
2.	Alteration to or replacement of hydraulic jack plunger or cylinder
3.	Alteration to or replacement of hydraulic valve
4.	Alteration to or addition of machine room

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
8.	Table SPS 318.1007-1, Plan review and approval. Elevators, item 16	This does not require a permit when replacing a rope gripper like-for-like.	DIS	Should consider including "replacement" now that rope grippers are getting old enough that they may need to be replaced. One such question has been asked already.	\$600 per occurrence, often not part of a larger project	Will require test witnessing to assume operation to code as is required for safety devices and governors.
9.	Table SPS 318.1007-1, Plan review and approval. Elevators, item 17	First comma was possibly not intended to be there. By including the comma, every time suspension members are replaced, a permit would be required.	Andy Zielke - formerly with NEIS	Remove the comma for conventional suspension means. Perhaps require a permit or at least some sort of reporting for replacement of non-circular elastomeric suspension members? Should their like-for-like replacement be monitored because they are new technology?  <b>See table above for this change (17)</b>	\$600 per occurrence, often not part of a larger project	Continue to not require permit and immediate inspection for conventional suspension means replacement but consider keeping track of replacements for newer unconventional means, to be aware of possible defects.  <b>Adopted 11.03.17, language pending</b>
10.	Table SPS 318.1007-	Scope of Work Table item 27 states: Change to or	Ed Sabo	Clarify item 27 Change or addition to Firefighters' Emergency Operation system components		<b>Tabled 11.03.17</b>

**SPS 318**

NO .	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	1 Plan review and approval. Elevators	addition of firefighters' emergency operation system		<p>Must be clearer about whether this covers an alteration and what qualifies as an alteration. Clarification. Will ensure more code compliance for alteration to firefighters emergency operation.</p> <p><i>See table above for proposed language to address this (27)</i></p> <p><b>Information from Robin:</b> From DSPS Alarm FAQ:</p> <p>Projects involving the alteration or addition of 20 or fewer devices to an existing fire alarm system do not need to be submitted. A “device” includes both detection devices and notification appliances. This includes, but is not limited to, all the following: fire alarm control panels, power supply panels, annunciators, horns, strobes, combination horn / strobes, speakers, combination speaker /strobes, smoke detectors, heat detectors, pull stations, and door holders. Relay modules or monitoring modules are not considered alarm devices.</p> <p>For the purpose of plan review requirements, detection or monitoring systems which are not connected to the building fire alarm system (e.g., smoke detection in an unoccupied storage facility with off-site monitoring, sprinkler system monitoring or elevator recall operations in a building without a fire alarm system), are not required to be submitted for review.</p> <p><b>From Alarm reviewer Tom Frechette:</b> Alarm Review looks for devices, smoke and/or heat detectors, signaling devices as well as Elevator recall in the sequencing diagrams. He is checking with an alarm contractor as to who and how the final connections and testing is done.</p>		

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
11.	Table SPS 318.1007-2 Plan review and approval. Elevators	There is nothing in the escalator scope of work table in regards to an escalator mod/alt. An elevator contractor does not have to submit for a permit.	Ed Sabo	Add when performing mod or alteration to the table under escalators. Determine what modernization or alterations to existing escalators should require review and inspection.  <b>See table above for proposed language to address this (4)</b>	\$560 per occurrence	
12.	Table SPS 318.1007-2 Plan review and approval. Escalators and Moving Walks	Kone Ecomod and Schindler replacement of escalator parts except truss is not clear in code as a complete replacement.	DIS/Ed Sabo?	Make clear in the table or elsewhere that replacement of nearly all escalator components except the truss is a complete replacement.	None	Eliminate any confusion at time of budgeting and plan submittal.  <b>Adopted 11.03.17, Proposed language pending</b>
13.	SPS 318.1011 Inspections and permits to operate	Contractors work on conveyances with expired permits. Illinois Rules that requires a mechanic to only work on registered and licensed (pto'd) conveyances. That way, as a requirement of their license, mechanics	Mark U.	Illinois Rule § 1000.80 (i) Miscellaneous Requirements  1) No licensee shall work on non-registered or non-permitted conveyances covered by the Act, except for those conveyances exempted from registration by the Act or Section 1000.120(g).  2) All license holders are required to report violations of the Act, this Part and the standards listed in Section 1000.60 to OSFM.  3) Each licensee shall have his/her valid license, and each elevator industry apprentice or helper shall have his/her valid	No new cost	1) we would reduce the number of expired PTO's, which would collect revenue currently being missed, 2) reduce the number of re inspection fees to owners, 3) and reduce the

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		become our eyes and ears in the field.  useful in getting conveyances registered and keeping permits up to date.		registration card, in his/her possession when working on conveyances covered by the Act.		delays we see when owners ignore recorded violations noted during annual inspections Dismissed 11.03.17
15.	SPS 318.1011 (7), Inspections and permits to operate, Preparations for department inspection	Elevator and lift contractors occasionally only send a helper to be present at an inspection.	Mark U.	Helpers can be limited in knowledge needed to make adjustments or perform tests often necessary to complete an inspection.  Require a licensed mechanic to be present at acceptance inspections.  <u>Review Proposed Amendment:</u> <u>SPS 318.1011 (7) PREPARATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT INSPECTION. (bm) The installation contractor or the owner or owner’s agent shall make arrangements to ensure that the elevator mechanic, under SPS 305.992, or elevator mechanic-restricted, under SPS 305.993, is present for the inspection of the conveyance or related equipment during the scheduled time.</u>	Minimal	Unlikely to affect current costs. Most now send a mechanic but should be required to continue to do so.  Adopted 11.03.17, Discussed 12.11.17, language pending
16.	SPS 318.1013, Accident Reporting	Elevator entrapments occur without a means to learn the cause and prevent future entrapments.	DIS	Change Accident Reporting to Accident and Entrapment Reporting. Include the ability for the department to send an inspector to investigate the cause of the entrapment and determine whether any damage occurred from a rescue of trapped passengers.	\$160-\$320	Will improve rider safety and reduce entrapments Dismissed 11.03.17



**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
17.	SPS 318.1702, Electric Elevators for ASME A17.1, 2.5.1.5.1	Strength and deflection of fascia are not specified in code.	DIS	Specify strength and deflection criteria for fascia.	May vary by manufacturer	Improve rider safety if strength and deflection of fascia are adequate. <b>Dismissed</b> 11.03.17
18.	SPS 318.1702, Electric Elevators, for ASME A17.1, 2.27.1	The A17.1 elevator code is not clear regarding performance of elevator telephones and answering services.	DIS/several users	Specify requirements of telephone operation, answering and responding.	Unknown	Provide clarification requested by many interested parties. <b>Dismissed</b> 11.03.17
19.	SPS 318.1702, Electric Elevators, for ASME A17.1, 2.27.2	Testing of generators supplying stand-by power to elevators do not provide for a pre-transfer signal to the elevator controller to allow it to prepare for testing.	Doug Schoeller	Require a pre-transfer signal.  Will allow elevators to proceed to a floor, discharge any passengers and remain there until power is transferred to the generator during testing.	Unknown	<b>Dismissed</b> 11.03.17
21.	SPS 318.1702 (10), Electric Elevators, Emergency Operation	Using voice over internet protocol (VOIP) can save a lot of money for a small owner but cannot meet the 4-hour battery requirement.	Chris - St. Michaels Church Wausau	Allow elevator telephones to have less than 4-hour battery backup, possibly based on travel distance.	\$40-\$50/month for analog business line	Would allow modern VOIP phone systems that rely on 20 minute uninterruptable power supply (UPS) to replace

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	and Signaling Devices					building phone systems including for elevators <b>Dismissed</b> 11.03.17
22.	SPS 318.1702 (10), Electric Elevators, Emergency Operation and Signaling Devices	New cellular, internet and other shared systems are too easy to avoid required telephone monitoring system, have the service lapse or are just not working at all points in elevator travel.	John Reese - Schindler	Require land lines or strict performance requirements for other systems.  Provide for code compliant, reliable telephones.		<b>Dismissed</b> 11.03.17
23.	SPS 318.1702 (10) (b) 3. Electric Elevators, Emergency Operation and Signaling Devices	A building can have several elevator emergency key boxes with different keys to open each key box. Firefighters can waste valuable time in finding keys in an emergency.	DIS	Council already discussed whether state code should specify a standard key for lobby key boxes but decided against it because there are so many different keys out there at this time. It's impossible to pick one. But should all <i>key boxes</i> in a <i>building</i> open with the same key, whatever key that is, similar to all elevators in a building using the same key for firefighters emergency operation?  <b>Review Proposed Amendment:</b> <b>SPS 318.1702 (10) (b) 3.</b> a. An additional set of switch keys shall be kept in a lockable metal box mounted in a conspicuous location adjacent to the main elevator entrance or entrances at the designated level landing. <u>Where a building has no fire command center and multiple lockable metal boxes, each box shall be openable by the same key.</u> The box shall		Save time in emergency situations.  <b>Adopted</b> 11.03.17, 12.11.2017: language pending

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				be openable only by the fire department, police department, elevator inspector, and other authorized personnel. This does not prohibit additional keys from being placed in other approved locations.		
24.	SPS 318.1705, Special application elevators, for A17.1, 5.2.1.4.4	Code limits use of alternative car top clearance device for LULA elevators to within existing buildings	DIS	Car top clearance device is considered safe for use in existing buildings and should be considered safe in new buildings also.	Beneficial to building owners and design industry	Protect persons, for example in living units of a condominium building where a neighbor above has an elevator. <b>Dismissed 11.03.17</b>
25.	SPS 318.1705, Special Application Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3 Scope	Code does not allow residential elevators in commercial buildings	DIS	Add allowance to replace existing Part Vs that Wisconsin used to allow in churches and limited commercial buildings to be replaced. Still require petition for variance for any other Residential elevator in a commercial building (very rare).  <b>Review proposed Amendment:</b> <b>SPS 318.1705 (3)</b> <u>(am) This is a department rule in addition to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 5.3: A previously approved residential elevator installed to serve a commercial building may be replaced with a residential type elevator in the existing hoistway. A new installation permit is required.</u>	\$300 reduction in cost per occurrence	Alleviate the need and cost of a formal petition for variance to replace.  <b>Adopted 11.03.17;</b> <b>Proposed Language Adopted 12/11/17</b>
26.	SPS 318.1705 (3), Special Application	Residential elevators are installed in commercial buildings in rare cases, such as to replace an existing	DIS	Add a note or code requirement directing readers to the ICC/ANSI A117.1 when a residential elevator is installed to serve a commercial building.  <b>SPS 318.1705 (3)</b>	Unknown	Prevent design decisions that may be difficult or expensive to correct later

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Elevators, Private Residence Elevators	one or where a larger elevator is infeasible. Architects, contractors and owners are not aware of the need to meet ICC/ANSI A117.1, Section 409.		<u>Note: Accessible and Usable Buildings and Facilities, ICC A117.1, Section 409 for private residence elevators standards is applicable in commercial buildings, under the incorporation of the International Building Code® in SPS 361 to SPS 366.</u>		Adopted 11.03.17, language pending
27.	SPS 318.1705 (3) (c), Special Application Elevators, Private Residence Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3.1.7.2	No vertical clearance specified between hoistway door and sill or floor surface	Mark U.	Limit clearance to 3/8"  Review proposed amendment: <b>SPS 318.1705 (3) (c)</b> <u>5. The clearance between the hoistway door and the floor surface may be up to 3/8 of an inch.</u>	None	Prevent the door from closing over someone's feet reducing the likelihood that a child will be able to fit in the space and possibly be injured or killed. <b>Adopted 11.03.17;</b> Proposed Language Adopted 12/11/17
28.	SPS 318.1705 (3) (c), Special Application Elevators, Private	Space guard dimensions are not specified	DIS	Adopt as code the recommendations in the current web article regarding space guards ( <a href="http://www.safetyresearch.net/blog/articles/elevator-design-hazard-%E2%80%99s-been-killing-children-decades">http://www.safetyresearch.net/blog/articles/elevator-design-hazard-%E2%80%99s-been-killing-children-decades</a> ) ?  space guards are often installed but are made to different dimensions	Non	Clarify safe standard <b>Tabled 11.03.17</b>

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Residence Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3.1.7.2			Return to review this once the standard updates have been fully reviewed.		
29.	SPS 318.1705, Special Application Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3.1.14.3	Code does not protect persons in spaces below a hoistway for a residential elevator	DIS	<p>Address code for protection of space below the hoistway for a residential type elevator.</p> <p>Protect persons who may be below a residential type elevator, especially because such an elevator is not subject to requirements for maintenance, periodic testing or inspection.</p> <p>Review proposed amendment:  <b>SPS 318.1705 (3)</b>  <u>(ce) This is a department rule in addition to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 5.3.1.14: Where the hoistway ends above an occupiable area, the floor below the car and counterweight must have sufficient strength to withstand, without failure, the impact of the car with rated load and counterweight descending at 125% of rated speed or governor tripping speed if a governor is provided.</u></p>	Unknown	Adopted 11.03.17; Proposed Language Adopted 12/11/17
30.	SPS 318.1705, Special Application Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3.1.16.3	Code does not require protection of persons from shearing or crushing from winding drum machinery	DIS	<p>Require guarding of drums, shafts, suspension means and moving parts.</p> <p>Review proposed amendment:  <b>SPS 318.1705 (3)</b>  <u>(cm) This is a department rule in addition to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 5.3.1.6.1: Ropes and chains passing through a wall outside the hoistway enclosure shall be enclosed with a solid or openwork enclosure. If of openwork, the enclosure shall reject a ball 13 mm (0.5 in.) in diameter.</u></p>	Minimal	Protect persons, especially children who may gain access to spaces containing winding drum elevator equipment. Adopted 11.03.17;

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				<p><u>Means for inspection shall be provided. The openings shall not be larger than is necessary to clear the suspension means.</u></p> <p><b>SPS 318.1705 (3)</b>  <u>(cs) This is a department rule in addition to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 5.3.1.16: Rotating parts located outside of the hoistway for private residence elevators shall be enclosed with a solid or openwork enclosure. If of openwork, the enclosure shall reject a ball 13 mm (0.5 in.) in diameter. Means for inspection shall be provided. The openings shall not be larger than is necessary to clear the rotating parts.</u></p>		Discussed 12/11/17, language pending
31.	SPS 318.1705 (3) (e) Special application elevators, Private Residence Elevators	A residential elevator may have a phone keypad that gives the rider the impression that there is an operable phone when it may not be connected.	Mark U.	Require covering or elimination of the keypad if not operable	None	Avoid reliance on a device that is not operable <b>Dismissed 11.03.17</b>
32.	SPS 318.1705 (4)	Use of an elevator that is not complete during construction of the building may continue indefinitely by current code. Requests have been made to allow for as long construction	Mark U.	Issuance of Temporary Construction Use Permit and occasional verification inspections.	Re-inspection fee	Will make it clear that such operation is not open-ended. Will allow inspector to verify the incomplete items and conditions remain safe and

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		(incomplete) use of elevators as one year.				that trained operators are operating the elevator as required. 12/11/17 Proposed language pending
33.	SPS 318.1708, General requirements, for A17.1, 8.7.2.17.2 and 8.7.3.22.2	Currently ASME A17.1 only addresses change in rated speed (up direction).	DIS	Add code for Change in Operating Speed or change in speed in the down direction  Clarify code requirements associated with increasing speed in the down direction. For example proper runbys, buffer stroke, setting of safety device and forces, buffer engagement and safety setting imparts on the building structure at an increased speed.	Minimal	12/11/17: Proposed language pending
34.	SPS 318.1708 for A17.1, 8.6	Many elevator lobbies are missing lobby key boxes due to older codes not requiring them, allowing for another approved location or removal of boxes that had been installed at one time.	Mark U.	Require lobby key boxes for existing elevators. See SPS 318.1702(10)(b) 3. a. - c. “3. These are department rules in addition to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 2.27.8: a. An additional set of switch keys shall be kept in a lockable metal box mounted in a conspicuous location adjacent to the main elevator entrance or entrances at the designated level landing. The box shall be openable only by the fire department, police department, elevator inspector, and other authorized personnel. This does not prohibit additional keys from being placed in other approved locations. b. Where the elevator has a machine room, control room, or control space, the key box shall also contain a key to access the machine	Council estimates: \$250 to \$1000/installation	Dismissed 12/11/17

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				room, control room, or control space, and the key shall be labeled for its use. c. Where the elevator has an inspection and test panel without a machine room, control room, or control space, the key box shall also contain the key for the lock used to secure the space, panel, or panels for the main disconnect, car light disconnect, and disconnects for any other elevator-utilization equipment. A label inside the key box shall provide directions to the location of the disconnects including room number where applicable.”		
35.	SPS 318.1708, General requirements, for A17.1, 8.6.5.16.5 to modify A17.1, 3.19.4.7.3 (a)	Some elevators have valves that work like overspeed-type valves but are not located near the hydraulic jack(s) so do not meet code to be considered overspeed valves. By not meeting the code, they could be considered exempt from testing.	Ed Sabo or Paul Rosenberg	Apply testing requirements for overspeed valves to valves of the same type but that are in locations such as at the control valve.	Minimal	Ensure that valves installed for safety operate as designed.  Dismissed 12/11/17
36.	SPS 318.1708 (2) (b) 1. a., General requirements, Maintenance, Repair,	Elevator installers have left documents on the car top where they can be dropped into the pit or are not accessible when needed or as required	DIS	Make clear in one location in the code that the car top is not acceptable for storing maintenance control program, wiring diagrams, maintenance records and test reports.	None	Ensure that records are available to elevator personnel when needed.



**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Replacement, and Testing	by SPS 318.1708(2)(b) 4. b.				12/11/17: Proposed language pending
37.	SPS 318.1708 (2) (b) 1. a., General requirements, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Testing	Exact scope of mod. project is often not transferred to the maintenance record, or if transferred, is not done in a timely manner.	Mark U.	Require the plan review information, approval letter, application form and any specification to remain in the maintenance record immediately after a mod. project.	None	Ensure that records are available to elevator personnel when needed. 12/11/17: Proposed language pending
38.	SPS 318.1708 (2) (b) 1. b., General requirements, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Testing	Elevator installers have removed SIM cards, other devices or instructions necessary for performing tests.	Several recommended this	Make clear that these are property of the owner.  Provide the owner with more than the original installer as an option for future service and testing. Would eliminate conflict and complaints to DSPS.	None	Dismissed 12/11/17
39.	SPS 318.1708 (2) (e) 1., General requireme	Contractors unable/unwilling to produce testing procedure	John K	Require that testing procedures become a component of the periodic test record or maintenance control program	None	Consistency in testing - ensuring competency Dismissed 12/11/17

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	nts, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Testing					
40.	SPS 318.1708, General Requirements, for A17.1, 8.6.4.19.7 and 8.6.5.14.3 (f)	Scheduling of testing of emergency or stand-by power (therefore certain related elevator tests) in some facilities like hospitals can be difficult.	Several recommended this	Allow the owner to perform the emergency/stand-by power Cat 1 test if trained to do so.  Elevator tests would be performed by the owner and not signed off on by a licensed elevator contractor or personnel.		Dismissed 12/11/17
41.	SPS 318.1708 (2), General requirements, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Testing	Dumbwaiter test cycle to too frequent for a device that does not carry a rider.	Steven Theys, owner's rep - Shawano Hotel	Change dumbwaiter test frequency to be similar to VPLs, IPLs and SCLs: a test is required only when an inspection finds a need for such a test  [new (k), renumber current (k), (L) and (m) accordingly]	Reduce by \$300 + per year per dumbwaiter	Reduce costs for building owners for small devices that do not carry a rider.  Discussed 12/11/2017; Proposed language pending
42.	SPS 318.1708 (3), General	Large scale elevator modernizations take place without updating 120 volt	DIS	Require updating 120 volt lighting and receptacle circuits when performing large scale elevator mod projects. This is almost always done voluntarily or because of a perception that it is required but it is not required.	\$500	Provide safer and more complete installations once completed

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Requirements, Alterations	lighting and receptacle circuits.				
43.	SPS 318.1708 (3), General Requirements, Alterations	Owners and elevator contractors sometimes plan to modernize one elevator in a group at a time, not knowing some codes require all elevators of a group to function the same way after a mod. project. Inspectors may give a wide range of compliance dates for the remaining elevator(s).	DIS/ Ed S.?	Require each subsequent elevator in a group, or that shares a hoistway or machine room to be modernized within a certain number of days, for example 90 days where the modernization includes updating the firefighters emergency operation.	Varies	Make clear for planning purposes that each elevator in a group operation must meet certain codes
44.	SPS 318.1708 (6) (d) 1., General Requirements for Periodic Inspections and Witnessing of Tests,	Dumbwaiter inspection cycle to too frequent for a device that does not carry a rider.	DIS	Change to a 3-year inspection and PTO cycle.	\$300/year reduction for inspection fee, \$50/year reduction for	Reduce costs for building owners for small devices that do not carry a rider.

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	A17.1, 8.11.5.4 and SPS 302				PTO fee	
45.	SPS 318.1708 (6) (e) 1. c., General Requirements for Periodic Inspections and Witnessing the Tests, Installation placed out of service	Code is unclear regarding how hoistway entrances are to be secured when placing an elevator out of service.	Adam S.	Require all to be bolted or locked from the inside. Allow only the entrance where the elevator is stopped to be held closed using the interlock. No need to further secure that entrance if the car is blocked to remain there.	None	Clarifies the process and makes it more logical.
46.	SPS 318.1708, General Requirements, for A17.1, 8.10.2.2.2 (cc) (3) (a)	This is a potentially very destructive test with benefits that are very questionable. Architects might not be aware of the impact forces the test will impart on the building. May be especially destructive for older	Brian Beauchamp - Otis	Remove this test requirement from the code.	None	Avoid possible damage to building structure and elevator equipment.

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		existing buildings that may not have been built to withstand this impact.				
47.	SPS 318.1708 (6) (f) General Requirements for Periodic Inspections and Witnessing of Tests, Installation covered to a material lift	It was not the intent to imply that all material lifts are exempt from regulation. Only Type A material lifts are exempt.	DIS	Insert "Type A" into title, 1., 2. and 3.	None	Correct an error
48.	SPS 318.1802 (10), Vertical Platform Lifts, Emergency Signals, for A18.1, 10.3.3.3	A18.1, 10.3.3.3 requires loading a "platform" for brake testing. This is unclear as how it applies to VPLs and IPLs because they do not have a brake and to SCLs.	DIS	Remove a requirement that does not apply.	None	Eliminate confusion about a requirement.

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
49.	SPS 318.1802 (10), Vertical Platform Lifts, Emergency Signals	Using voice over internet protocol (VOIP) can save a lot of money for a small owner but cannot meet the 4-hour battery requirement.	Chris - St. Michaels Church Wausau	Allow lift telephones to have less than 4-hour battery backup.	Reduce cost by \$40 - \$50/mo for analog business line	Would allow modern VOIP phone systems that rely on 20 minute uninterruptable power supply (UPS) to replace building phone systems including for lifts
50.	SPS 318.1802 (10), Vertical Platform Lifts, Emergency Signals	Telephone service is required to be maintained for vertical platform lifts (VPL) similar to elevators however elevators require monitoring the phone line for a dial tone. Current SPS 318 does not adopt the phone line monitoring for VPLs.	Tim Motel, 12-2-14	Require phone line monitoring for VPLs going forward.	Per Tim Motel \$80 per lift	Ensure that vertical platform lift telephone service is maintained to be available in an emergency.
51.	SPS 318.1804, Inclined Stairway Chair Lifts, and	There is no allowance for reduced fees or temporary reduction in stairway width to allow a SCL to be	DIS	Allow temporary installations of stairway chairlifts where elevator is down for repairs	Unknown	Make possible the temporary use of stairway chair lifts.

**SPS 318**

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	SPS 302, Fee Schedule	installed temporarily where an elevator is down for service.				
52.	SPS 318.1810, Routine, Periodic, and Acceptance Inspections and Tests, and SPS 302, Fee Schedule	Stairway chair lift inspections and PTO cycle are too frequent based on simplicity and lack of use of stairway chair lifts.	DIS	Return to a 3 year PTO cycle for stairway chair lifts.	\$300/year reduction for inspection fee, \$50/year reduction for PTO fee	Reduce unnecessary costs for building owners, especially where a building has multiple SCLs.
53.	SPS 318.1810 (7)	Completion of a 5-year full load safety test is not shown on the outside of the unit where visible to inspectors unless they remove panels to find a hidden tag or find test forms	Mike Moran	Require VPLs, IPLs and SCLs to have a test tag similar to elevators, not readily visible to the general public where it might be defaced but visible to inspectors	Minimal	Reduce time wasted finding evidence that tests were done prior to completing inspections or issuing PTOs
54.	SPS 318.1008 (2) (e) Plan	There have been some a few installations that were “in process” for	Kim Schmitt	SPS 318.1008(2)(e)(e) <i>Expiration</i> . As required under s. 101.983 (1) (d), Stats., an approval issued under this chapter expires under any of the following circumstances:		

**SPS 318**

NO .	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Review Actions, Determinations	over 3 years and created confusion for the owner, contractor and department.		<p><b>1.</b> If the work authorized under the approval does not commence within 6 months after the date on which the approval is issued.</p> <p><b>2.</b> If the work authorized under the approval is suspended or abandoned for 60 consecutive days at any time following the commencement of the work.</p> <p><b>3.</b> <u>Two years after the approval date on the initial plan review conditional approval letter.</u></p> <p><b>(f) Re-submittal.</b> When an approval expires under par. (e), plans shall be resubmitted in accordance with s. SPS 318.1007.</p>		



**Conveyance Safety Code Council**

**Council Member & Public Recommendations, SPS 318**

<b>SPS 318</b>						
<b>NO.</b>	<b>RULE PROVISION</b>	<b>ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE</b>	<b>PROPOSED BY</b>	<b>EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE</b>	<b>POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST</b>	<b>COMMENTS / STATUS</b>
1a.	Hydraulic Elevators	SPS language currently adopts all testing requirements from ASME A17.1, but does not apply rule 8.6.15.4.1 and 8.6.15.4.2 to elevators with a contract date after 1994 or an elevator without an underground hydraulic cylinder. All of the other portions of the testing sections of ASME A17.1 apply to hydraulic elevators, making this change would eliminate a Wisconsin specific requirement to the elevator code.	Paul Rosenberg	Hydraulic tests required by ASME A17.1 8.6.5.14.1 and 8.6.5.14.2 shall be made on ALL hydraulic elevators. SPS language currently adopts all testing requirements from ASME A17.1, but does not apply rule 8.6.15.4.1 and 8.6.15.4.2 to elevators with a contract date after 1994 or an elevator without an underground hydraulic cylinder. All of the other portions of the testing sections of ASME A17.1 apply to hydraulic elevators, making this change would eliminate a Wisconsin specific requirement to the elevator code. Many companies already test the hydraulic system per company safety standards and go beyond the requirements of SPS 318 (testing items 8.6.15.4.1 and 8.6.15.4.2) in order to follow the recognized industry testing procedures. Elevators serviced in this manner would see no change. If the change is not made, companies wishing to service and test elevators in Wisconsin will have to continue to be reminded that there are Wisconsin specific rules and exemptions not found in the adopted elevator code ASME A17.1.	The cost would be determined by the scope of their elevator service contract. For most elevator owners, it is expected that there would be no cost associated with this change.	
2a.	Permit to Operate	Elevators are required to maintain a valid Permit to Operate	Paul Rosenberg	An elevator inspector should be able to review a Permit to Operate during the course of an inspection. It should be displayed inside the elevator or with the	No cost is associated with this change if the original Permit to	

**SPS 318**

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
		<p>in order to operate in Wisconsin. The Permit to Operate should be displayed in a conspicuous location along with the maintenance records in order to be viewed by elevator and inspection personnel. Over time it will become increasingly difficult to ascertain if an elevator has a valid Permit to Operate.</p>		<p>maintenance records. Although many owners still display the Permit to Operate, without Code language there is no enforceable requirement to do so.</p>	<p>Operate is displayed, otherwise it would be the cost of copying the original.</p>	
3a.	On-Site Documentation	<p>It is not uncommon, during the first annual inspection, to find that an elevator lacks the Code required On-Site documentation. There is no data to review to determine the history of service, callbacks, and the requirements of an MCP for an elevator. Having</p>	Paul Rosenberg	<p>On an acceptance inspection for new equipment or alterations, ASME A17.1 8.6.1.2.2 On-Site Documentation should be verified as being in place at the inspection as a condition of the elevator passing the inspection. The problem seems to affect about 50% of the elevators currently being installed. The proposed change would only affect new elevators being installed. It will benefit the industry and the owner to make sure the proper documentation is on the job site from day one.</p>	No cost	

**SPS 318**

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
		the installation company provide this at the time of acceptance inspection, would be a simple way of ensuring it gets provided on site.				
4a.	Testing	A Wisconsin requirement should be added to 8.6.5.14.3(f) that where provided, an Auxiliary Power Lowering Operation system (see 3.26.10) shall be tested as part of a Category 1 test because they are often found not to be working.	Paul Rosenberg	The testing of auxiliary lowering operation on hydraulic elevators is not currently part of the test requirements for a Hydraulic Elevator in ASME A17.1 2016. There is an industry expectation that the requirement will be included in the 2019 edition. Because these devices are not required to be tested, they are often not maintained and they do not function when needed or inspected. Auxiliary Lowering is not a requirement, but where provided, it would be tested. It is estimated that <15% of hydraulic elevators have this device installed. This prevents passengers from becoming trapped inside an elevator during a loss of normal power. If the change is not made, little confidence can be had that the device will function properly during a power loss event.	Testing this device would add about ten minutes to a Category 1 test. Where the device functions properly no cost is associated with the proposed change, other costs would vary depending on the elevator service contract.	
5a.	Category 1 Test	If the change is not made, it is possible that the auxiliary power device will not function when needed to remove	Paul Rosenberg	On a traction elevator, any auxiliary power system designed to move the car to evacuate passengers shall be tested as part of the Category 1 test. Examples: Schindler PEBO, MCE TAPS, Reynolds & Reynolds	Testing this device would add about ten minutes to a Category 1 test. The costs would vary according to	

**SPS 318**

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
		an entrapped passenger.		Rescuator, Otis MRO, etc. This proposed change would affect new and existing machine room-less traction elevators. The test would occur once a year during the Category 1 test.	the elevator's service contract.	
6a.	Construction Use Elevators	ASME A17.1 2016 lists 90 days as a recommended interval to perform inspections on Construction Use elevators. It is a recommended interval and without specific language in SPS 318 it can not be clearly enforced. Though SPS 318 adopts Section 5.10 of ASME A17.1, which governs Construction Use elevators, there is currently no specific language clearly indicating the time intervals for inspecting.	Paul Rosenberg	Issue a 90 day permit for Construction Use elevators. Every 90 days a periodic inspection would be required and then a new 90 day permit can be issued. When 365 days has elapsed since the initial Construction Use permit was issued the applicable Cat 1 tests must be performed and documented. This would only affect elevators on construction sites that are not capable of meeting the full requirements of ASME A17.1, but are needed to transport personnel and material during the construction phase of the building. Such elevators are usually only found on high-rise job sites.	The cost would be any costs associated with a periodic inspection.	
7a.	Counterweight Runby Data Plate	Under the current conditions of a periodic elevator inspection, if rope or belt stretch has	Adam Smith	This issue affects every traction elevator. Without a minimum runby provided, that takes into account allowable stretch, the inspectors may cite every elevator with more than 6" of	For elevators being installed by companies that already use the proposed sign, no	

**SPS 318**

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
		<p>occurred in the suspension means, the inspector is unable to determine if the stretch is acceptable. The counterweight runby data plate is required to list the maximum runby so that the elevator does not drift too far into the overhead. The Code lists 6" as a minimum runby at time of acceptance inspection, but then allows for this to decrease over time, provided that it does not prevent the elevator from engaging the final limit. Without a listed minimum runby, the inspector is unable to determine whether or not the elevator can engage the final limit.</p>		<p>stretch in the system. Many of these elevators technically may not need to have their suspension means shortened, but without additional data, rope stretch may continue to be listed as a violation.</p> <p>With this concern in mind, many counterweight runby data plates already include this information. Without the SPS 318 language change however, there will continue to be many installed that do not contain this information.</p>	<p>cost. Less than \$50 for the elevator companies that are not using the sign. Providing this information can allow for significant cost savings, if it allows the inspector or elevator personnel to determine that the suspension means do not need to be shortened.</p>	

**SPS 318**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>RULE PROVISION</b>	<b>ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE</b>	<b>PROPOSED BY</b>	<b>EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE</b>	<b>POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST</b>	<b>COMMENTS / STATUS</b>
8a.	Hydraulic Control Valves	Add language to SPS 318 that the hydraulic control valve on an A18.1 conveyance shall be tested to meet the requirements of SPS 318.1808 at acceptance and during a Category 5 test where applicable at time of alteration of replacement.	Adam Smith 12.11.2017	ASME A18.1 does not contain language to indicate when the hydraulic control valve should be tested. Most companies would still test the valve, as most companies are not aware of the lack of language in ASME A18.1 covering this item. ASME A18.1 used to be contained within ASME A17.1 and at that point the testing language was included through reference, but it was not carried over when ASME A18.1 was created as a stand alone standard.	None.	