



CONVEYANCE SAFETY CODE COUNCIL MEETING
Room 121C, 1400 East Washington Avenue, Madison
Contact: Helen Leong (608) 266-2112
December 11, 2017

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 November 3, 2017 (2-4)

C. Administrative Matters

D. Legislative and Administrative Rule Matters - Discussion and Consideration (5-35)

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
November 3, 2017**

PRESENT: William Grubbs, Steven Ketelboeter, Jennie Macaluso, Keith Misustin, Ronald Mueller, Brian Rausch, Paul Rosenberg, Kenneth Smith

EXCUSED: Scot Bromann

STAFF: Helen Leong, Administrative Rules Coordinator; Laura Smith, Bureau Assistant; and other Department staff.

Paul Rosenberg, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. A quorum of eight (8) members was confirmed.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOTION: Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Jennie Macaluso, to adopt the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2016

MOTION: Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steven Ketelboeter, to approve the minutes of September 9, 2016 as published. Motion carried unanimously.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

COUNCIL CHAIR

NOMINATION: Kenneth Smith nominated Paul Rosenberg for the Office of Board Chair.

Paul Rosenberg called for nominations three (3) times.

Paul Rosenberg was elected as Chair by unanimous consent.

VICE CHAIR

NOMINATION: Paul Rosenberg nominated Kenneth Smith for the Office of Vice Chair.

Paul Rosenberg called for nominations three (3) times.

Kenneth Smith was elected as Vice Chair by unanimous consent.

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULE MATTERS

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

MOTION: Paul Rosenberg moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to appoint a task group of Paul Rosenberg and Adam Smith to review ANSI E1-42 and make recommendations to the Council. Motion carried unanimously.

- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to dismiss proposal #5. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Jennie Macaluso moved, seconded by Kenneth Smith, to dismiss proposal #6. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** William Grubbs moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to remove the comma after 'suspension members' as outlined in proposal #9. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to table proposal #10. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Keith Misustin, to adopt the recommendation in proposal #12. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Ronald Mueller moved, seconded by William Grubbs, to dismiss proposal #13. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Jennie Macaluso moved, seconded by Kenneth Smith, to table the suggestion laid out in the table as proposal #14. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Ronald Mueller moved, seconded by William Grubbs, to adopt the recommendation in proposal #15. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** William Grubbs moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to dismiss proposal #16. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Steven Ketelboeter moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to dismiss proposal #17. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Jennie Macaluso, to dismiss proposal #18. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Ronald Mueller moved, seconded by William Grubbs, to dismiss proposal #19. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steven Ketelboeter, to adopt the recommendation in proposal #20. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Jennie Macaluso, to dismiss proposal #21. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Ronald Mueller moved, seconded by William Grubbs, to dismiss proposal #22. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steven Ketelboeter, to adopt the recommendation in proposal #23. Motion carried unanimously.

- MOTION:** Jennie Macaluso moved, seconded by William Grubbs, to dismiss proposal #24. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Ronald Mueller moved, seconded by Keith Misustin, to adopt the recommendation in proposal #25. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by William Grubbs, to adopted the suggestion in proposal #26 as a note. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Paul Rosenberg moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to adopt the recommendation given in proposal #27. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to table proposal #28. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Steven Ketelboeter, to adopt the recommendation in proposal #29. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Ronald Mueller moved, seconded by William Grubbs, to adopt proposal #30 with the addition of 'not in hoistway'. Motion carried unanimously.
- MOTION:** Jennie Macaluso moved, seconded by William Grubbs, to dismiss proposal #31. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

- MOTION:** Kenneth Smith moved, seconded by Ronald Mueller, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

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

AGENDA REQUEST FORM

1) Name and Title of Person Submitting the Request: Helen Leong, Administrative Rules Coordinator		2) Date When Request Submitted: December 4, 2017 <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>	
3) Name of Board, Committee, Council, Sections: Conveyance Safety Code Council			
4) Meeting Date: December 11, 2017	5) Attachments: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	6) How should the item be titled on the agenda page? Review and Discussion of Proposed Changes and Recommendations to the Conveyance Safety Code, SPS 305 and SPS 318	
7) Place Item in: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open Session <input type="checkbox"/> Closed Session	8) Is an appearance before the Board being scheduled? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Fill out Board Appearance Request) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	9) Name of Case Advisor(s), if required:	
10) Describe the issue and action that should be addressed:			
11) Authorization			
Signature of person making this request		Date	
Helen Leong		December 4, 2017	
Supervisor (if required)		Date	
Executive Director signature (indicates approval to add post agenda deadline item to agenda) Date			
Directions for including supporting documents: 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.

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.

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>1. a. 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. 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>2. Buildings and portions of buildings that are federally owned or exempted by federal statutes, regulations, or treaties.</p> <p>3. Portions of buildings leased to the federal government provided all of the following conditions are met:</p> <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>	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>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>Commercial Building Code still pending approval. Recommend postponing discussion until it is further in the process.</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>Problem: 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>Hoistway, suggested definition 1: hoistway (shaft), elevator, dumbwaiter, or material lift: 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 underside of a penthouse machine room floor. Suggested definition 2: hoistway (shaft), elevator, dumbwaiter, or material lift: 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.</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
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	<p>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.</p> <p>Working on language to propose to the Council. Recommend postponing discussion until we have prepared some language.</p>	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 reference, SPS 318.1700 (1) (b) Penalties	Code has required regulation of stage and orchestra elevators, applying parts of A17.1 that may apply, however very little translates.	DIS	<p>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>.</p> <p>Task Group: Paul Rosenberg and Adam Smith will review the standard in detail and make a recommendation consideration by the Council.</p>	Unknown	Allow industry to meet a common standard. Will save DSPS time in product and plan review. Make product design more uniform for the manufacturer and product review more efficient for them and DSPS.

SPS 318						
NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
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. Dismissed 11.03.17
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	Add alteration to door operator to the tables for plan review and inspection. New Item 11, renumber the remainder accordingly	\$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. Dismissed 11.03.17
7.	Table SPS 318.1007-1, Plan review and approval. Elevators, Item 14	Code is unclear regarding the word "change" here. Does it include replacement only or also an alteration?	DIS	Alteration Table 1 change Item 14 to "Change of or repair to Safety Device" SPS 318.1007 Plan review and approval. (3) <u>SCOPE OF ALTERATIONS, REPAIRS, AND REPLACEMENTS.</u> (a) 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:	\$520 - \$600 per occurrence except no cost when part of a larger project	Assure alterations to safety devices are to code and are inspected before waiting for the next annual inspection.

SPS 318

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

**Table SPS 318.1007-1
Elevators**

Item	Scope of Work <u>Alteration, Repair, or Replacement</u>
1.	Change to hoistway <u>Hoistway</u> enclosure walls, pit, or ceiling; or to number or location of landings served
2.	Change to machine <u>Machine</u> —room, machinery—space, control—room, or control—space walls, floor, ceiling, or entrance; or to location of machinery
3.	Conversion of passenger elevator to freight type, or freight to passenger type
4.	Change in class <u>Class</u> of loading for a freight elevator
5.	Change to complete <u>Complete</u> traction driving machine, motor, sheave, and 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
8.	Change to type <u>Type</u> of or addition of hoistway door or gate
9.	Installation or addition of hoistway <u>Hoistway</u> —door interlock or combination mechanical lock and contacts
10.	Change to or addition of non <u>Non</u> —contact type 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.	Change in rated <u>Rated</u> load
13.	Change in speed of more than 5%
14.	Change of safety <u>Safety</u> device
15.	Change of or repair to speed <u>Speed</u> governor
16.	Change in type or addition of an emergency <u>Emergency</u> brake or device protecting against unintended movement or ascending car overspeed
17.	Change in suspension <u>Suspension</u> member, type, material, grade, size, equalizers, fastening, or monitoring
18.	Increase in stresses of more than 5% to guiderails, supports, and fastenings
19.	Change to type <u>Type</u> or location of car or counterweight buffer or bumper

SPS 318

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

20.	Change to type <u>Type</u> of terminal stopping device					
21.	Change to or addition of a top <u>Top</u> -of-car operating device					
22.	Change of controller <u>Controller</u>					
23.	Change in type <u>Type</u> of motion control					
24.	Change in type <u>Type</u> of operation control					
25.	Change to or addition of a car <u>Car</u> emergency signaling device					
26.	Change or connection to emergency <u>Emergency</u> or standby power system					
27.	Change to or addition <u>Alterations</u> of firefighters' emergency operation systems					
28.	Change to or addition of auxiliary <u>Auxiliary</u> power lowering operation					
29.	Change to or installation of a plunger <u>Plunger</u> gripper					
30.	Change to a complete <u>Complete</u> hydraulic driving machine including motor, pump, and tank					
31.	Change to hydraulic <u>Hydraulic</u> control valve					
32.	Change to hydraulic <u>Hydraulic</u> plunger or cylinder					
33.	Increase in hydraulic working pressure of more than 5%					

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

Item	Scope of Work <u>Alteration, Repair, or Replacement</u>
1.	Change to truss <u>Truss</u>
2.	Change to rated <u>Rated</u> speed or installation of speed varying system
3.	Installation or addition of skirt brushes
4.	Alterations to safety component or safety switch
5.	Replacement of majority of internal parts, even if retaining majority of the truss

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

Item	Scope of Work <u>Alteration, Repair, or Replacement</u>
1.	Increase in rated load

SPS 318

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

2.	Change in speed of more than 5%
3.	Change to car Car size

**Table SPS 318.1007-4
Platform Lifts**

Item	Scope of Work Alteration, Repair, or Replacement
1.	Change to safety or speed governor Overspeed or slack suspension safety device
2.	Change to jack Jack
3.	Change to hydraulic Hydraulic valve
4.	Change to or addition of machine Machine room
5.	Speed governor

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? See table above for this change (17)	\$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

SPS 318

NO .	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
						unconventional means, to be aware of possible defects. Adopted 11.03.17, language pending
10.	Table SPS 318.1007-1 Plan review and approval. Elevators	Scope of Work Table item 27 states: Change to or addition of firefighters' emergency operation system	Ed Sabo	Clarify item 27 Change or addition to Firefighters' Emergency Operation system components 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. See table above for proposed language to address this (27) Information from Robin: From DSPS Alarm FAQ: 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. 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		Tabled 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>submitted for review.</p> <p>From Alarm reviewer Tom Frechette: 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>		
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	<p>Add when performing mod or alteration to the table under escalators. Determine what modernization or alterations to existing escalators should require review and inspection.</p> <p><i>See table above for proposed language to address this (4)</i></p>	\$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?	<p>Make clear in the table or elsewhere that replacement of nearly all escalator components except the truss is a complete replacement.</p> <p><i>See table above for proposed language to address this (5)</i></p>	None	<p>Eliminate any confusion at time of budgeting and plan submittal.</p> <p><i>Adopted 11.03.17, language pending</i></p>
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	Mark U.	<p>Illinois Rule § 1000.80 (i) Miscellaneous Requirements</p> <p>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).</p> <p>2) All license holders are required to report violations of the Act, this Part and the standards listed in Section 1000.60 to OSFM.</p>	No new cost	<p>1) we would reduce the number of expired PTO's, which would collect revenue currently being missed,</p> <p>2) reduce the number of re</p>

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		<p>way, as a requirement of their license, mechanics become our eyes and ears in the field.</p> <p>useful in getting conveyances registered and keeping permits up to date.</p>		<p>3) Each licensee shall have his/her valid license, and each elevator industry apprentice or helper shall have his/her valid registration card, in his/her possession when working on conveyances covered by the Act.</p>		<p>inspection fees to owners, 3) and reduce the delays we see when owners ignore recorded violations noted during annual inspections Dismissed 11.03.17</p>
15.	<p>SPS 318.1011 (7), Inspections and permits to operate, Preparations for department inspection</p>	<p>Elevator and lift contractors occasionally only send a helper to be present at an inspection.</p>	<p>Mark U.</p>	<p>Helpers can be limited in knowledge needed to make adjustments or perform tests often necessary to complete an inspection.</p> <p>Require a licensed mechanic to be present at acceptance inspections.</p> <p>Review Proposed Amendment: SPS 318.1011 (7) PREPARATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT INSPECTION. (bm) <u>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></p>	<p>Minimal</p>	<p>Unlikely to affect current costs. Most now send a mechanic but should be required to continue to do so. Adopted 11.03.17, language pending</p>
16.	<p>SPS 318.1013, Accident Reporting</p>	<p>Elevator entrapments occur without a means to learn the cause and prevent future entrapments.</p>	<p>DIS</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>\$160-\$320</p>	<p>Will improve rider safety and reduce entrapments Dismissed 11.03.17</p>

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. Dismissed 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. Dismissed 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	Dismissed 11.03.17
20.	SPS 318.1702 (a), Electric Elevators	Current SPS 318 exempts commercial-type elevators from several codes that are necessary when installed in commercial buildings but are not necessary when installed in	DIS	The telephone requirements for elevators serving residences should be added to this section for commercial type elevators installed to serve single dwellings for consistency. SPS 318.1705 (3) (e): “Substitute the following wording for the requirements in A17.1 section 5.3.1.19: The elevator shall be provided with a hard-wired telephone or a telephone utilizing wireless, cellular, or other technology capable of operating at all points of elevator travel. The telephone shall be available in the elevator, charged if		Will allow home owners with commercial type elevators to have the same type of telephone operation as if they had a residential type

SPS 318

NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		single dwellings. The telephone should be added here the same way for consistency.		<p>battery powered, and operational any time the elevator is in use. If the telephone is not a hard-wired land line type, the elevator shall include a sign informing riders that a telephone is required to be present while operating the elevator.”</p> <p>Review Proposed Amendment: SPS 318.1702 (10) <u>(d) Private residence elevators. Substitute the following wording for the requirements in A 17.1 section 2.27.1: The elevator shall be provided with a hard-wired telephone or a telephone utilizing wireless, cellular, or other technology capable of operating at all points of elevator travel. The telephone shall be available in the elevator, charged if battery powered, and operational any time the elevator is in use. If the telephone is not a hard-wired land line type, the elevator shall include a sign informing riders that a telephone is required to be present while operating the elevator.</u></p>		<p>elevator without additional expense.</p> <p>Adopted 11.03.17, language pending</p>
21.	SPS 318.1702 (10), Electric Elevators, Emergency Operation and Signaling Devices	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. Michael's 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	<p>Would allow modern VOIP phone systems that rely on 20 minute uninterruptable power supply (UPS) to replace building phone systems including for elevators</p> <p>Dismissed 11.03.17</p>
22.	SPS 318.1702 (10),	New cellular, internet and other shared systems are too easy	John Reese - Schindle	Require land lines or strict performance requirements for other systems.		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
	Electric Elevators, Emergency Operation and Signaling Devices	to avoid required telephone monitoring system, have the service lapse or are just not working at all points in elevator travel.	r	Provide for code compliant, reliable telephones.		
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	<p>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?</p> <p>Review Proposed Amendment: SPS 318.1702 (10) (b) 3. 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 multiple lockable metal boxes, each box shall be openable by the same key.</u> 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.</p>		<p>Save time in emergency situations.</p> <p>Adopted 11.03.17, language pending</p>
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	Protect persons, for example in living units of a condominium building where a neighbor above has an elevator.

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
					industry	Dismissed 11.03.17
25.	SPS 318.1705, Special Application Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3 Scope	Code does not allow residential elevators in commercial buildings	DIS	<p>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).</p> <p>Review proposed Amendment: SPS 318.1705 (3) <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 similar residential type elevator. A new installation permit is required.</u></p>	\$300 reduction in cost per occurrence	<p>Alleviate the need and cost of a formal petition for variance to replace.</p> <p>Adopted 11.03.17, language pending</p>
26.	SPS 318.1705 (3), Special Application Elevators, Private Residence Elevators	Residential elevators are installed in commercial buildings in rare cases, such as to replace an existing 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.	DIS	<p>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.</p> <p>Proposed language pending further research. 12.01.2017</p>	Unknown	<p>Prevent design decisions that may be difficult or expensive to correct later</p> <p>Adopted 11.03.17, language pending</p>
27.	SPS 318.1705 (3) (c), Special	No vertical clearance specified between hoistway door and sill or floor surface	Mark U.	<p>Limit clearance to 3/8"</p> <p>Review proposed amendment: SPS 318.1705 (3) (c)</p>	None	Prevent the door from closing over someone's feet reducing the

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Application Elevators, Private Residence Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3.1.7.2			<u>5. The clearance between the hoistway door and the floor surface may be up to 3/8 of an inch.</u>		likelihood that a child will be able to fit in the space and possibly be injured or killed. Adopted 11.03.17, language pending
28.	SPS 318.1705 (3) (c), Special Application Elevators, Private Residence Elevators, for A17.1, 5.3.1.7.2	Space guard dimensions are not specified	DIS	Adopt as code the recommendations in the current web article regarding space guards (http://www.safetyresearch.net/blog/articles/elevator-design-hazard-%E2%80%99s-been-killing-children-decades) ? space guards are often installed but are made to different dimensions Return to review this once the standard updates have been fully reviewed.	Non	Clarify safe standard Tabled 11.03.17
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	Address code for protection of space below the hoistway for a residential type elevator. 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. Review proposed amendment: <u>(cg) 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</u>	Unknown	Adopted 11.03.17, language pending

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				<u>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>		
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	Require guarding of drums, shafts, suspension means and moving parts. <u>Review proposed amendment:</u> <u>(cr) This is a department rule in addition to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 5.3.1.16: Driving machines, sheaves, and their supports located outside of the hoistway for private residence elevators may not be located in an unguarded space.</u>	Minimal	Protect persons, especially children who may gain access to spaces containing winding drum elevator equipment. Adopted 11.03.17, 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 Dismissed 11.03.17
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	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

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
		long construction (incomplete) use of elevators as one year.				remain safe and that trained operators are operating the elevator as required.
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	<p>Add code for Change in Operating Speed or change in speed in the down direction</p> <p>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.</p>	Minimal	
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.	<p>Require lobby key boxes for existing elevators. See SPS 318.1702(10)(b) 3. a. - c.</p> <p>“3. These are department rules in addition to the requirements in ASME A17.1 section 2.27.8:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 room, control room, or control space, and the key shall be labeled for its use.</p> <p>c. Where the elevator has an inspection and test panel without a machine room, control room, or control space, the key box shall also</p>	Unknown	

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
				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.
36.	SPS 318.1708 (2) (b) 1. a., General requirements, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Testing	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 by SPS 318.1708(2)(b) 2., 3., 4. and 5.	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.
37.	SPS 318.1708 (2) (b) 1.	Exact scope of mod. project is often not transferred to the	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

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	a., General requirements, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Testing	maintenance record, or if transferred, is not done in a timely manner.				elevator personnel when needed.
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	
39.	SPS 318.1708 (2) (e) 1., General requirements, Maintenance, Repair, Replacement, and Testing	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
40.	SPS 318.1708,	Scheduling of testing of emergency or	Several recomm	Allow the owner to perform the emergency/stand-by power Cat 1 test if trained to do so.		

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	General Requirements, for A17.1, 8.6.4.19.7 and 8.6.5.14.3 (f)	stand-by power (therefore certain related elevator tests) in some facilities like hospitals can be difficult.	ended this	Elevator tests would be performed by the owner and not signed off on by a licensed elevator contractor or personnel.		
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.
42.	SPS 318.1708 (3), General Requirements, Alterations	Large scale elevator modernizations take place without updating 120 volt lighting and receptacle circuits.	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
43.	SPS 318.1708 (3), General Requirements,	Owners and elevator contractors sometimes plan to modernize one elevator in a group at a time, not knowing	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

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Alterations	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).				codes
44.	SPS 318.1708 (6) (d) 1., General Requirements for Periodic Inspections and Witnessing of Tests, A17.1, 8.11.5.4 and SPS 302	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 PTO fee	Reduce costs for building owners for small devices that do not carry a rider.
45.	SPS 318.1708 (6) (e) 1. c., General Requirements for Periodic	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.

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Inspections and Witnessing the Tests, Installation placed out of service					
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 existing buildings that may not have been built to withstand this impact.	Brian Beauchamp - Otis	Remove this test requirement from the code.	None	Avoid possible damage to building structure and elevator equipment.
47.	SPS 318.1708 (6) (f) General Requirements for Periodic Inspections and Witnessing of Tests,	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

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	Installation covered to a material lift					
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.
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. Michael's Church Wausau	Allow lift telephones to have less than 4-hour battery backup.	Reduces 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	Telephone service is required to be maintained for vertical platform lifts (VPL) similar to elevators however elevators require	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.

SPS 318

NO	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	y Signals	monitoring the phone line for a dial tone. Current SPS 318 does not adopt the phone line monitoring for VPLs.				
51.	SPS 318.1804, Inclined Stairway Chair Lifts, and SPS 302, Fee Schedule	There is no allowance for reduced fees or temporary reduction in stairway width to allow a SCL to be installed temporarily where an elevator is down for service.	DIS	Allow temporary installations of stairway chairlifts where elevator is down for repairs	Unknown	Make possible the temporary use of stairway chair lifts.
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	Completion of a 5-year full load safety	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	Minimal	Reduce time wasted finding

SPS 318

NO .	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT/COST	COMMENTS/STATUS
	(7)	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		be defaced but visible to inspectors		evidence that tests were done prior to completing inspections or issuing PTOs

Conveyance Safety Code Council

Council Member & Public Recommendations, SPS 318

SPS 318						
NO.	RULE PROVISION	ISSUE/REASON FOR CHANGE	PROPOSED BY	EXISTING LANGUAGE AND PROPOSED CHANGE	POTENTIAL IMPACT / COST	COMMENTS / STATUS
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>	